



~~Rev. L. Loring~~

Dr. J. D. West

1853

A
BRIEF VIEW
OF
CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE,

BY
MOSES M. SMART, A. M.

PRINCIPAL OF THE BIBLICAL DEPARTMENT,

CONNECTED WITH

PARSONSFIELD SEMINARY, ME.

LOWELL:
PUBLISHED BY N. L. DAYTON.
1843.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1842.

BY MOSES M. SMART,

In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of Massachusetts.

P. A. ONEILL, Printer.

P R E F A C E .

The following work embraces the outlines of the most prominent articles of divine revelation, systematically arranged, and calculated to guide the reader to a thorough knowledge of the bible.

With regard to other authors, I have taken the liberty to abridge, change, and also to intersperse original ideas, as it seemed to me necessary.

I have consulted some of the most able authors in Europe and in America. There is frequent reference to the early Fathers Primitive Christians, the Reformers and other persons of sound learning and piety. In the whole, I have endeavored to adhere closely to the Bible. In the preparation of this work, much is due to the credit of my venerable instructors in Bangor Theological Seminary, Me.; of Prof. Pond on a few subjects in particular, such as the Trinity, the Personality and Divinity of the Holy Spirit, the church, its officers, the judgment and some other topics.

His arrangement also, I have followed with some exception.

This I have done from the fact that he is so lucid, concise, and so much to the point.

I have not only noticed those points on which Christians differ, but with holy pleasure, have touched upon those in which they are agreed, and upon the prospects before them in the present and future world.

M. M. SMART.

CONTENTS.

1. Existence of God.
2. Attributes of God.
3. Necessity and desirableness of Revelation, and the canon of Scripture.
4. Authenticity and genuineness of Scripture.
5. Credibility of the Scriptures.
6. Divine authority of do.
7. Inspiration of do.
8. Divinity of Christ.
9. Personality and Divinity of the Holy Spirit.
10. The Trinity.
11. Decrees or purposes of God.
12. The Providence of God.
13. Moral Agency.
14. Natural and Moral Ability and Inability.
15. Nature of Holiness and of Sin.
16. Introduction of Sin.
17. State of Man before the Fall.
18. Total Depravity.
19. The connection between the Sin of Adam, and that of his posterity.
20. The atonement.
21. Covenants.
22. Repentance.
23. Faith in Christ.

CONTENTS.

24. Justification by Faith.
25. Regeneration and adoption.
26. Perseverance of Saints.
27. Means of Grace.
28. Prayer including the Intercession of Christ.
29. Death.
30. Immediate consequences of death.
31. Resurrection of the Dead.
32. The Judgment.
33. Final state of the Righteous and the Wicked.
34. The Sabbath.
35. The Church.
36. Officers of the Church.
37. Baptism and the Lord's Supper.
38. Subjects of Baptism.
39. Church Discipline.
40. Prospects of the Church on earth.
41. The Sinner without excuse.
42. Elementary Principles of Christian Union.
43. The Ten Commandments and their obligation.
44. Plea for the Slave.

No. I.

EXISTENCE OF GOD.

In treating on the existence and attributes of God, some proofs drawn independently of the Bible may be considered.

1st. The existence of God.

The proofs of the divine existence, may be divided into two classes.

1. *Proofs a priori.*

This is reasoning from cause to effect. The substance of Dr. Samuel Clarke's argument amounts to the following proposition that "space and time are only abstract conceptions of an immensity and eternity which force themselves on our belief; and as immensity and eternity are not substances they must be attributes of a Being who is necessarily immense, and eternal." But such arguments do not seem to carry complete conviction to the mind, and should not, therefore, be relied on, as main proof of the divine existence.

2. *Proofs a posteriori.*

This is reasoning from effect to cause. The

simplicity, and force are remarkable which this method of argument carries with itself. 1st. We behold around us a multitude of objects, and there must have been a cause for their existence. We perceive that we ourselves exist, and we know that we did not always exist. To suppose that we caused our own existence, would be to suppose that we existed before we existed; hence the necessity of a Being, eternally existent, who is the cause of all created objects; and that is God. Otherwise we must suppose that effects exist without their causes, or that a collection of finite objects, make an infinite series, which is equally absurd. It does not follow, however, that the existence of God was caused; this would presuppose a higher power, and that power would be God, and not the one previously mentioned. If there could have been a period when nothing did exist, then, nothing could ever exist: non-existence can not cause existence. With God are associated independence, immutability, &c. Hence his existence is uncaused. With man are associated dependence, mutability, &c. Hence his existence is caused, and that cause is God.

2. The next argument is founded on proofs of design in the universe; and where design appears, there must be a designer, and this designer is God.

If we survey the objects around us with any degree of attention, we must perceive marks of design. When we consider our own frame, no one can doubt that the eye was designed to see; the

ear to hear; the hand to toil; the foot to move. If design is clearly exhibited, and proved in but one of these objects, the existence of the designer which is God must be admitted till the design be disproved. Now the atheist is called upon to solve this known fact before he would lead us into the region of his mysticisms. Design is manifest not only in one, but in all the objects referred to; and it is manifest not only in their formation, but in their arrangement or position: this augments the force of the argument.

But suppose the hand to take the place of the foot; the foot of the hand; the ear of the eye; the eye of the ear; what kind of a creature would man be? But the evidence is accumulated still further. Design is manifest not only in the formation and position of the objects, but in the power of motion, adapted to this formation and position. There is all this evidence, which is but a small part, in comparison to what is exhibited in the little creature, man; and he, but a speck in the creation of God. The evidence referred to of the divine existence by "marks of design" is so clear and conclusive that children can understand it.

And it is one of the primary and well attested articles, in the christian system, to prove that there is design exhibited in the works of creation, so it should be the object of the infidel to disprove it, in order to be consistent with his principle. Till this is done, we are under no obligation to adduce oth-

er arguments, and he has no authority to suggest difficulties which lie beyond it.

If a person cannot solve a sum in simple addition, he cannot of course solve one in the rule of three, or cube root. Especially should he style himself an instructor and attempt to teach his pupils in these rules, while he could not explain the fundamental rules, we should pronounce him very unworthy of his office. Instead of calling him master of science, we should consider him the master of folly.

The above argument in favor of the divine existence, is drawn from facts well known both to christians and the infidel. Now if he cannot construct his premises on well known facts, it may justly be inferred that he cannot construct them any where.

Atheistical Objections.

The preceding arguments in favor of the divine existence, have their foundation in what we know, and can never be affected in any manner by what we do not know. It may not, however, be improper to notice the principal objections of the atheists, and the *Doctrines* connected with them, the most important of which are the following ;

- I. That things have existed in an eternal series :
- II. That their existence is casual ;
- III. That all distinct beings owe their existence to the operations of matter.

I. *That things have existed in an eternal series.*

Says Dr. Dwight, every individual in the series

(a series of men for example) had a beginning. But a collection of beings, each of which had a beginning, must, however long the series, have also had a beginning. Now this is perfectly clear to every candid mind.

The only way to evade the argument, is to suppose the first one in the series to be eternal, and self existent. The same argument must apply not only to man, but to every series of beings; to the beasts of the field, to the horse, the tiger, the leopard, the elephant, and the whole catalogue; to the fowls of the air, to the fish of the sea, and to a host of inferior creatures. Thus we must suppose a great number of eternal and self existent beings, and this too, in order to avoid admitting that there must be one supreme Being. It is justly observed by Dr. Bently, that, in the supposed infinite series, as the number of individual men is alleged to be infinite; the number of their eyes must be twice, the number of their fingers ten times, and the number of hairs on their heads many thousand times as great as the number of men. According to this supposition, there is an almost endless multitude of numbers, greater than an infinite number.

Atheists observe respecting objects,

II. *That their existence is casual.*

According to this, all beings are supposed not to have been created or caused; but to have happened.

But design exhibited in their creation, evidently disproves this doctrine. This was illustrated in our last argument on the divine existence.

III. *Atheists assert that beings owe their existence to the operations of matter.*

The eternal existence of matter is unsupported by any evidence whatever. In fact we know that this world in its present condition was not eternal; because design here is exhibited, as well as in the animate objects: consequently there must be a designer who is God. The earth is designed to yield produce for the life of its inhabitants. The floods of water send up their vapors, which are condensed to refresh the earth. The sun also yields its benign influence. Witness the regular return of the seasons, to supply the wants of man. Observe the wisdom of God in dividing time into day and night; suppose it had always been day or always night; amid the darkness of the latter, how could we labor? amid the bustle of the former, how could we sleep? But finally atheists do not admit of an intelligent cause, consequently they do not admit that matter is intelligent.

Now can an ignorant mass of matter produce thought, volition, intelligence, and establish all the laws of the mind? Well may the scriptures affirm; "*The fool hath said in his heart there is no God.*"

NO. II.

ATTRIBUTES OF GOD.

In the preceding number, the existence of God was proved, who is necessarily self-existent and eternal.

The *Attributes* of God, are particular distinct perfections, which constitute his *divine nature*.

From any one of the divine attributes, all the rest may be derived.

Eternity of God.

As God does not derive his existence from any other being, he must be self-existent.

The eternity of God, depends upon the necessity of his existence; since we cannot suppose that there ever was, or will be a period in which a necessary being did not, or will not exist. To suppose this, would be contradictory and equivalent to saying, that a necessary being is not necessary. Such was the reasoning of Plato, Parmenides and Plotinus.

The Immutability of God.

Since God is eternal, it follows that he is immutable.

If he may lose one attribute, he may another, and the whole; and thus he would lose his divine nature, to suppose which, would be absurd. And since he cannot be supposed to change for the better or worse, he must be considered immutable.

We can form some idea of this attribute, by observing the effects which God has, connected with the actions of men. Vicious conduct is followed invariably, with misery and wretchedness: virtuous, with joy and salvation.

Independence of God.

The *independence* of God, is involved in his eternity and immutability.

The Omnipotence of God.

The ground of this attribute, lies in the infinity of the divine nature. Since God is infinite, his power cannot admit of limitations. This however, does not imply that he can perform contradictions; for instance to make 2 and 2 equal to 8.

We also infer the vast power of God, from the greatness of the universe and its preservation.

The Omniscience of God.

Since God has given us a conscience, we have the power of knowing that he is eternal.

We judge that he is the fountain of all knowledge, that he is acquainted with his own nature; his perfection, his infinity; and all his attributes, which lie beyond our comprehension. On this ground we consider him *omniscient*. His knowledge is manifest in the works of creation.

While he preserves the whole, he must know the individual wants. God knows the thoughts and desires of the human heart.

The prescience or foreknowledge of God, "relates as stated by Dr. Knapp, to future objects, of three different classes. 1. Those things which result from the established course of nature, or from fixed divine decree; 2d. Those things which will

take place only on certain conditions—the evil or good that will be done by a person under given circumstances ; 3d. Those events which depend on the free will of man, or other rational beings, and therefore may, or may not come to pass.”

“Man does not perform one action or another, because it was fore-known by God ; but God fore-knew the action : *because* man in the exercise of his free will, would perform it.”

The Omnipresence of God.

This attribute includes the omniscience and omnipotence of God. As he knows all things, and upholds all things ; and since any power cannot act, where it is not, we conclude that he must be present in all things. On this ground he is called *omnipresent*.

The Wisdom of God.

This attribute of God is closely allied with his omniscience. The omniscience of God, implies that he knows the connexion of all things, and necessarily knows their relations, as *means* and *ends*. This is called his *wisdom* : that is, his wisdom consists in devising the best means, to procure the best ends.

The Will of God.

Will is the power of choosing. That God possesses a will is manifest from the fact that he pro-

poses to himself the best *ends*, and employs the best means for the accomplishment of *these ends*.

Spirituality of God.

As God is every where present, but which cannot be supposed of a material substance, he must be a spirit; and being infinite in wisdom and knowledge he is the most perfect spirit. But suppose God is a material substance, and is capable of being divided so that part of him may be in one place, and part in another; since a part is not the whole, he can not be in every place; hence to deny the *spirituality* of God, is to deny his omnipresence, which is absurd: as his power is manifest in the preservation of all his works, no one will pretend to say that this power can be exerted where he is not.

Holiness of God.

The *holiness* of God, is his inclination to what is right.

We learn this attribute from conscience which he has implanted within every man.

Conscience not only teaches us to distinguish between right and wrong but also urges us to choose what is right, and reject what is wrong.

Under the attribute of *holiness* may be included the justice and mercy, the veracity and goodness of God.

The Justice and Mercy of God.

The *justice* of God is nearly the same as his ho-

liness. As his holiness is an inclination to what is right, so his justice is manifested in the exhibition of what is right. We learn the justice of God from his distribution of rewards, and punishments. When man performs a good act his conscience approves of it; and a source of enjoyment and satisfaction is opened to his mind. But when he performs a wicked act, his conscience reproves him; and trouble, misery, loss of reputation and their attendant evils follow. But when a speedy execution against an evil work is delayed for a time, in this, is perceived the *mercy* of God. Justice being satisfied, *Mercy pardons.*

The Veracity and Goodness of God.

The wisdom, holiness, and power of God, should lead us to place unwavering confidence in him. Possessing such attributes he must be a God of *truth.* The *goodness* of God is manifest, from the adaptation of his works to the happiness of man and other creatures. He who has implanted paternal love in the bosom of man, is a source of love to his dependent beings. Afflictions are no proof against his *goodness.* These, it is known by experience work peace, hope, and reverence for the divine Being.

The Unity of God.

The *unity* of God is manifest from his perfection. Since he is competent to do all that is done, there is no reason to suppose the existence of another God.

The unity of design in the world, indicates one God. But suppose several Deities to be engaged in the creation of the world, if any one of them excels in power, then he alone is to be called God. and the rest, to be his inferior. But suppose them equal in power, in which case either one of them created the world, and is therefore God, or the power of each being insufficient, they united their powers in one to create the world, then this power can constitute only one God.*

NO. III.

NECESSITY OF REVELATION AND THE CANON OF SCRIPTURE.

In considering the preceding doctrines, we have been enabled clearly to perceive the existance of God and to form something of an idea concerning his attributes. From the works of nature we know that there is a God.—From the effects which he has attached to the conduct of men, we perceive that he is holy and cannot look upon sin with the least allowance. By the aid of conscience we are taught

* The attributes of God may be divided into Intellectual, Moral and Natural. The Intellectual include his Omniscience and Wisdom. The Moral his Holiness, Justice, Mercy, Veracity and Goodness. The Natural his Omnipotence, Omnipresence, Eternity, Immutability, independence, Spirituality, etc.

what is right and what is wrong ; so that we are without excuse. But, because we have the light of conscience it does not follow that we have no need of revelation. Men are influenced by other principles beside this ; such as passion, self love : when these are yielded to in preference to conscience, the latter becomes impaired and is imperfect in its directions. This standard then, is an imperfect one, and as it is always our duty to do right, what we do hereafter will not atone for previous wrongs ; hence if no atonement is realized, conscience must remain impaired and its directions of course uncertain : and the more it is violated so much the more imperfect or uncertain are its directions. This being the standard of the heathen and as they do not like to retain God in their thoughts ; we see why they *forsake* him and worship the sun, moon, stars, beasts of the field and creeping things and thus degenerate till they come down to the serpent himself.

But suppose conscience to remain in its best state it teaches nothing about the atonement of the Saviour, the means of pardon and many other blessings of the gospel. This being the case, and conscience becoming perverted, who will say that we do not need a revelation ? and who would not be grateful for such a revelation ? The scriptures are a perfect standard of truth. Though man becomes corrupt in his affections, erroneous in his views, and by temptation is led on from sin to sin, and thus de-

parts far from God: yet the Bible remains the same, it ever teaches the same perfect doctrines, the renewing of the affections, the correcting of erroneous views, redemption from sin and a hearty return to God.—Heathen Philosophy has failed in this; it may have had many beautiful theories, but it has not struck at the root of the evil. It remained for Christianity alone to save men on correct principles: to reform the outward conduct by a revolution within, implanting the principle of love to holiness and hatred to sin. To be satisfied on this point let us view the state of the heathen world, and also the effects of the gospel in proportion as it has been received among Christians.

Throughout the heathen world the same debasing principles are witnessed. Their deities lead them not to virtuous conduct, but rather to idleness, dissipation, licentiousness, cruelty and death. Their wisest Philosophers have failed to teach them the true principles. Socrates confesses his despair of finding a remedy, and wishes them to wait patiently till a revelation comes.

We cannot but perceive the happy effects which Christianity produces in proportion as the Gospel is received: In the same community, the same neighborhood the pious man is a living example: this is so obvious that it needs not farther illustration.

But if revelation is so desirable, it is asked, why not given to all men? we answer that it has twice

been given to all, and is still the duty of the church to extend the gospel to every creature. In the days of Adam, a revelation was made known to all. But the more corrupt men became, the less they regarded the will of God. At last they were destroyed by the flood, all except Noah and his family. He was a pious man: at this time a revelation was again made known to all. But as men, by their own transgressions departed from God and did not like to retain him in their thoughts, they became hardened in their sins, and consequently rejected the revealed will of God, and worshiped dumb idols, the work of their own hands. Notwithstanding all this, the saviour came into the world to redeem man, and enjoined it on his disciples to go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature.

When christians see a man destitute of the Bible and destitute of the means to obtain it, will they give him one, or will they refuse thus to do, and lay it to the appointment of God that the poor man must not have the Bible. Millions of such there are among christians, who are not only shut out from the privileges of the gospel, but held in cruel bondage.

But there are others in heathen lands more remote from Christian influence. It may be asked what is to become of them? They were born in the midst of idolatry and cannot help the abominations prevailing around them: they never heard of a Saviour. The Bible was never presented to them.

We answer that such will not be condemned for rejecting the Bible, for not hearing of a saviour: They must, however, suffer the inconveniences of not having a revelation and the privileges of the gospel which we enjoy.

And the Christian world also, must answer for the blood of souls found in the skirts of their garments. In pursuing this subject we come to the conclusion of Butler in his Analogy, that every man will be judged according to what he hath, and not according to what he hath not.

Canon of the Old Testament.

The word *canon* means anything determined according to a fixed measure, rule or law. The *canonical books*, are those which belong to the authorized collection of the Old and New Testament Scriptures. These are of divine authority, and as such, are the rules of our faith and practice.

In contradistinction to the canonical are the *apochryphal* books. The apochryphal books are those which do not in reality belong to the authorized scriptures, although frequently appended to them.

Many of the books of the Old Testament, were composed and some of them collected and arranged before the Babylonian exile. The books of Moses, had been collected and arranged in their present order, before the ten tribes were made captive by the Assyrians. The book of the law was kept in the sanctuary of the Temple. The oracles, sacred songs, and various other compositions of Isaiah, Hosea, and other prophets and teachers of Religion,

were afterwards preserved in the same manner. But we do not learn that before the exile, any complete collections were made of the prophets, or of all the psalms or proverbs. The original collection of psalms has been enriched by the addition of many which were not composed till after the captivity.

It is affirmed by the Jews, that Ezra completed the collection of their sacred books. This took place after the Babylonian exile. It is very probable that Ezra, was engaged in making the collection of the Old Testament scriptures; he might however, have been assisted by the priests and lawyers, who were the leading men of the nation. To the collection were added the writings of Zachariah, Malachi, and other distinguished prophets and priests who wrote during the captivity, or shortly after; likewise the books of kings, chronicles and other historical writings.

The collection thus made was ever after considered complete, and the books composing it, were called, the *Holy Scriptures, the law and the Prophets, etc.* To this collection, apochryphal books were appended by some of the Jews; but they ever made a careful distinction between these and the *canonical Scriptures*. The latter were the only ones translated as sacred national books, by the first translators of the Old Testament, the authors of the Septuagint. Besides, the Apostles, who always follow the Septuagint, never cited the apochryphal books. That the present scriptures are the true canonical books, is evident from the

following; 1st. By the catalogue of the fathers. 2. But more particularly by the sanction of our Savior and the Apostles. Though they may not have quoted from all the books, yet it is sufficient that they sanctioned the collection in which these books are contained. It is also evident from the history of Josephus, that the present canonical scriptures, were admitted as of divine authority, at the time of Jesus and his Apostles. The apocryphal books were not included in the canon, till after the time of the Apostles, and still there was a careful distinction by those who were most learned. The fathers of Palestine, and others who were acquainted with the original Hebrew, composed catalogues of the books which belong to our Bible. This was done in the second century, by Melito, cited in Eusebius, by Origen, by Cyril of Jerusalem, by Gregory, Nazianzen, Athanasius, and Epiphanius.

Some of the fathers of the Latin church carefully distinguished the apocryphal books from those which were of divine authority.

The Romish church reckoned the apocryphal books with the canonical, and even appealed to them as of divine authority. They were particularly induced to do this, because some passages in these books favored some of the particular doctrines of their church, such as the intercession of the dead.

On this account, the council at Trent, in the

NOTE. For other particulars see Horne's Introduction, vol. 1, page 626. Also, Encyclopedia of Religious knowledge. (article canon.)

sixteenth century, set aside the distinction between the canonical and apocryphal books. Says Dr. Knapp, "The more candid and enlightened theologians of the Romish church have, however, never allowed quite the same authority to the apocryphal as to the canonical scriptures."

It is evident that John sanctioned the gospels of Mathew, Mark and Luke, as his gospel is obviously a supplement to theirs. John omits or barely mentions many of those things which are set forth, and fully explained by the other evangelists; and moreover, he relates many things which they omit. They speak of the birth, life and work of Christ; John enlarges upon his divinity. Many other things we might mention to show that John sanctioned the first three gospels, and his sanction is sufficient to make them of divine authority.

It is obvious then that the four gospels were collected and arranged by John, the latter being written by himself. But we cannot affirm that he made a collection of the other books of the New Testament, neither does it appear that he sanctioned them.

It is evident from history that this collection was not made at once. Irenæus cites the gospel, of Mathew, Mark, Luke and John, as of known authority. They were cited also by Clemens of Alexandria, and Turtulian taken at the end of the second century, and Ammonius at the beginning of the third, composed harmonies of the three gospels. The gospels therefore were collected as early as the sec

ond century, and was afterwards regarded as undoubted authority throughout the Christian Church.

The *epistles* were collected at a very early period, this collection was somewhat later than that of the gospels; but both of them must have existed soon after the commencement of the second century, Ignatius speaks of the *gospels* and the *apostolical writings*. The apostolical epistles were first sent to the churches for which they were written, afterwards the collection was made which we have in the present canon. This will appear from the catalogue of Origen and that of Eusebius. The Syriac version confirms the canonical scriptures of the New Testament.

Principles of this Collection.

1. It was a rule to admit only such books into the canon as could be proved to be the productions of the apostles themselves, or of their first assistants in office.

2. The doctrines taught in a book were examined before being admitted into the canon.

NO. IV.

AUTHENTICITY AND GENUINENESS OF SCRIPTURES.

By authenticity, we mean that the scriptures were written *when* and *where* they purport to have been written, and by the persons to whom they are respectively attributed.

By genuineness we mean the same, or rather that they have come to us substantially as they were originally written.

It will be sufficient to prove the authenticity of the New Testament, for none who admit the authority of that part of the Holy Scripture, can doubt the truth of the other. The authenticity of the Scriptures was a subject of care by the Christian writers themselves. The Apostle expressly cautions his followers, against receiving any unauthenticated writing in his name; *now we beseech you brethren, that ye be not soon shaken in mind, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter, as from us.* The authenticity of the Scriptures can be proved in the same way that the authenticity of other ancient works is proved.

Suppose we turn to Quintillian who flourished within twenty years of Seneca's death, and read a criticism on his works, how do we know those works are authentic? Because from that day to the present, we see them referred to, quoted, commended, blamed by men of all classes, and of all opinions, ages and nations, differing with each other in almost every respect, but agreeing that these books are authentic. What more evidence could be desired. We are as certain of the historical fact, concerning the writings of Seneca, as we should have been, had we lived at the time.

Now the question is, how do we know that the books of the New Testament were written by the

Apostles and evangelists? Because we received these books as sacred, and the undoubted writings of their respective authors, from our parents and instructors; and they from theirs; and so on, from generation to generation, till we ascend in one connected chain, from the present time to the day of the Apostles, observing the proofs and testimonies in each period.

Because all christians, in all ages, in all nations, of all languages, have done the same. Because in history contemporary authors, Jewish, Christian and profane affirm these were the writings of the Apostles and evangelists; because amidst the sharpest opposition of heretics, these books were never denied to be authentic writings of the christian religion, but were argued upon as such; because a multitude of ancient manuscripts now exist, some dated soon after the birth of Christ.

Even heathen and Jewish adversaries, during the first four centuries, admitted and argued upon the authenticity of the scriptures.

But it may be said books are sometimes spurious, how then may they be discovered?

We think we have reason, says Michaelis, to hesitate about the authenticity of a work, when well founded doubts have been raised from its first appearance in the world, whether it proceeded from the author to whom it is ascribed. When the immediate friends of the alleged author, who were best able to decide upon the subject, denied it to be

his. When a long series of years has elapsed after his death, in which the book was unknown, and in which it must have been unavoidably quoted, if it had existed. When the style is different from that of his other works, or if none remain from what might have been reasonably expected. When events are recorded or referred to, which happened later than the time of the supposed author. When opinions are advanced, which are contrary to those which he is known to maintain in his other works.

But the New Testament does not bear a single one of these marks of spuriousness. From the first no doubts were raised whether it proceeded from the Apostles and evangelists.

The friends of those authors, who are best able to decide, acknowledge it to be theirs.

No time passed after the death of the apostles, in which these writings were unknown, or were not quoted and referred to.

The style is what would be expected. The events referred to are those and none other, which took place when they were professedly written. The opinions advanced in each book, agree with all other writings of each author.

It was morally impossible, from the nature of the case, that our sacred books should be forgeries christianity was established in the midst of enemies and persecutors. It was assaulted for three hundred years, by a succession of violent and cruel and unjust persecutions. It was morally impossible

to give currency to false writings in the midst of an angry and hostile multitude from every quarter, the Jews and heathen who were bitter enemies to christians, and had the disposition, skill and opportunity to disprove the authenticity of the christian writings, if it could have been done? Now if there were such a chance, why did they not improve it? Is it not for the objector to establish a contrary case before he can claim the attention of any reasonable person? does not the burden of proof lie on him? If he deny the authenticity or genuineness of the scriptures, let him show *when* and *where* and by *whom* they were forged, and *what* are the marks of imposture.

II. Though the preceding is sufficient proof in itself, for the authenticity of the scriptures, yet more direct proof can be given. Several different series of testimonies may be traced up in the various countries of christendom; each independent of the rest: one series in Italy, through Gregory up to Clement of Rome, in the first century. Another in France, through Hilary to Irenaeus, bishop of Lyon. One in Africa, through Fulgentius, Austin, and Cyprian, to Clemens Alexandrinus and Tertullian. Another in Syria, through Ephrem, Syrus to Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch in 107. And another in Asia Minor, through Anatolius and Pamphilus to Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna martyred in 168. All these witnesses testify, not merely that they received our books, from their immediate ancestors, but

received them as the authentic writings of their respective authors, acknowledged in all the christian churches, from the age of the apostles, and acted upon from that time, as the rule of their lives.

The numerous appeals to the Scriptures show their authenticity. In Justin Martyr (born A. D. 89, died 164,) there are about two hundred citations. In Irenaeus (A. D. 97—202) "there are (says Dr. Lardner) more and larger quotations from the small volume of the New Testament, than of all the works of Cicero, though of such uncommon excellence for thought and style, in the writers of all characters, for several ages." The list of quotations in Tertullian, occupy nearly thirty folio pages. In the third and fourth centuries, the progress of the testimony, brings us to the settlement of the canon. We have more than a hundred authors, whose works or parts of them have come down to us, and who bear witness of the genuineness of the books. The quotations are so numerous that in one christian Father, Athanasius, there are more than twelve hundred. Catalogues of the books of the New Testament expressly drawn up to distinguish them from unauthentic writings are given. The books, concerning which any hesitation prevailed; are seven, and those the precise ones which from circumstances, might be expected to be thus doubted of—and which do not, in fact, touch the general truth of the gospel doctrine. The rest were universally received as genuine. And these seven were received

by the great majority of christians, though a few doubted of their authenticity. Eusebius expressly speaks of them as "writings acknowledged by most to be genuine." And he distinguishes them from the spurious writings which form his third class. All hesitation was however, gradually dissipated; so that by the time of Jerome and Augustine, (A. D. 342—420) many catalogues are given, with all our present books, but including none other.

The authenticity of the scriptures is shown from the *admission of adversaries*. The heathen Philosopher Celsus, (about the year A. D. 175) makes all kinds of objections against christianity, but never calls in question the genuineness of the New Testament. He argues from it, as the authentic writings of its respective authors.

Porphyry in the third century, a powerful heathen opponent, admits our books.

Some passages and books were denied by Marcion, and a few enthusiasts of earlier times; but after the settlement of the canon men of all sects and heresies admitted our writings. An Arian, in the conference with St. Austin, says "If you allege anything from the divine Scriptures, which are common to all, I must hear; but what is not in the Scriptures deserves no regard." And at the council of Nice (A. D. 325.) where 318 bishops beside innumerable presbyters, deacons and others, were assembled on the occasion of the Arian heresy, "The em-

peror" says Theodoret, "recommended to the bishops to decide all things by the Scriptures. It is a pity, he said, that now when their enemies were subdued, they should differ and be divided among themselves, specially when they had the doctrine of the Holy Ghost in writing."

The *numerous ancient manuscripts of the New Testament* is an argument for its authenticity,

The manuscripts of our Sacred books, are found in every ancient library, in every part of christendom. They amount in the whole to several thousands. About five hundred have been examined and compared with great care. Many of them extend to the eighth, seventh, sixth, fifth and fourth centuries, the Codex Bezae, found in the monastery of Irenæus, at Lyon in France, is supposed by Dr. Kipling, to be of the second century. The Codex Alexandrinus and Codex Vaticanus are supposed to be of the fourth. These manuscripts extend our proofs, to the age, next but one or two to that when the last of the apostles died, and join with the manuscripts compared by Jerome and Eusebius (A. D. 315—420,) and thus carry us to the times of the promulgation of the gospel. The vast number of these manuscripts, the remote countries whence they are obtained, and the sameness of their contents with quotations in different ages, place the New Testament, above all other ancient works in point of authenticity.

The *style* of the New Testament, agrees with

the times of the apostles, and with no other. It is Greek, but intermingled with Hebrew and Syriac idioms. It is a language which no one could write, but a person who had acquired a knowledge of the Greek, after an education in a country where Chaldee and Syriac, were the vernacular tongues. The destruction of Jerusalem, and subversion of the Jewish polity, within forty years after the resurrection of Christ, made such a change in the language and knowledge of the dispersed Jews, that an imposter any time after the death of the last of the apostles, would have written in a style different from that of the New Testament.

The *simplicity* of the whole contents of the New Testament shows its authenticity.

The scriptures carry on the very face of them, all the appearance and force of truth. Their writers let every thing show for itself, they make no apologies, they conceal nothing, they hide no faults in their own conduct. They speak with perfect candor, openness and familiarity. When we read the scriptures we are decidedly convinced that they are incapable of being cunningly devised fables.

But *no such marks* attend spurious writings. The greater part of the apocryphal books, are either entirely lost, or are preserved by a single manuscript. We have no proof that any of them existed in the first century : they are not quoted by the apostolical fathers ; few or no manuscripts of them exist ; they were not read in the churches of christians ;

were not received into their volumes : are not seen in their catalogues ; were not noticed by their adversaries ; were not appealed to by different parties, as of authority in their controversies : were not subjects of versions ; commentaries &c.

There is, moreover, the strongest internal evidence that they are spurious. They contain absurd details ; they relate as miracles, frivolous stories ; their style is totally different from that of the New Testament ; they assert things contrary to authentic history, both sacred and profane ; they abound in falsehoods. Finally, there never has been a work, like the writings of the Old Testament and the New. No books were ever professed to be written by the founders of a religion, and exposed from the first, to the view of mankind, but the Holy Bible.

Heathenism had no sacred books, no authentic writings submitted by its founders to mankind. It crept into the world from the remains of revelation to our first parents, aided by the policy of human governments.

But there was no promulgation, there were no sacred books published by the authors of the system. The Koran of Mahomet is a corruption of the scriptures.

The Hindoo Shasters were never pretended to be the writings of the first founders of the religion. The Holy Bible remains alone unrivalled ; the genuine production of the founders of christianity, offered to the Scrutiny of all, and standing like the

rock of ages, the monument of divine truth.

V

CREDIBILITY OF THE SCRIPTURES.

The arguments in favor of the authenticity of the scriptures have an essential bearing on their credibility. From their authenticity then, we derive a very important argument in favor of the present subject. By the credibility of the scriptures we mean that the statements therein contained are true.

Men who publish openly to the world before all classes, learned as well as ignorant, enemies as well as friends, under their own name, grave, historical works can have no hope that these works will obtain any footing if they falsify the principal facts of their narrative. Let us for instance observe the New Testament ; for if the credibility of this can be shown that of the Old can be likewise, because they are so intimately connected.

The extraordinary prominence and importance of the principal facts of the New Testament, prove their credibility. Most of these facts relate to the birth of Christ, his life, wonderful works, sufferings and death, his resurrection and descent of the Holy Spirit. Upon the footing of these facts, the Apostles go forth to proclaim them to the world, and this too, amid dangers, persecutions and death.

It is also very evident, that the christian writers of the early centuries, do not appeal to the New

Testament, merely as the production of the Apostles, but as the undoubted record of the facts of the gospel history.

2nd. *There are other sources of information.*

The Governors of the Roman Provinces, were accustomed to send to Rome, accounts of remarkable transactions. Pontius Pilate gave an account of the death and resurrection of Christ, in his works. Acta, Pilate, Eusebius, (A. D. 315.) referring to them says, "Our Savior's resurrection being much talked of throughout Palestine, Pilate informed the Emperor of it."

Justin Martyr in his first apology, (A.D. 140) having mentioned the crucifixion of Christ, says, "and that these things were so done, you may know from the acts written in the time of Pontius Pilate. Tertullian in his apology (A. D. 198.) says; "of all these things relating to Christ, Pilate himself, in conscience, already a Christian, sent an account to Tiberius, then Emperor." In another place he says: Search your own commentaries or public writings; at the moment of Christs death, the light departed from the sun, and the land was darkened at noon day, which wonder is related in your own annals, and it is preserved in your archives to this day.

In controversies with Christians, heathen writers Celsus, Porphyry, Julian, all admit the facts of the gospel history, and argue upon them. But numerous profane authors, likewise not engaged in con-

recorded in the New Testament. There are the testimonies of Suetonius, Martial, Juvenal, Aelius, Lampridius, Lucian, Epictetus, the Emperor Marcus Antoninus, and others. But we will notice Tacitus and Pliny, the one contemporary with the Apostles, the other of the next age.

Tacitus states about the thirtieth year after the resurrection of Christ, "that the city of Rome being burnt, the emperor Nero to avert the infamy of being accounted the author of that calamity, threw the odium of it on the Christians, who had their name from Christ who suffered death in the reign of Tiberius, under his Procurator, Pontius Pilate."

Next, Pliny's letter to the Emperor Trajan, (A. D. 170) He testifies that "the Christians filled his government of Bithynia; that the heathen temples and worship had been forsaken: that they met on a certain day to sing hymns to Christ as to God; and that their lives were innocent and pure."—"comparing Pliny's letter with the account in the Acts," says a French writer, "it seems to me that I had not taken up another author, but that I was still reading the historian of that extraordinary society.

We have the testimony of Josephus, a Jewish historian. He was born A. D. 37. He wrote his history of the Jewish wars, A. D. 75, and in A. D. 93, his Jewish antiquities.

His account of the Jews, their customs, princi-

troversy with Christians, notice the chief events
ples, &c. entirely agrees with the evangelical his-
tory.

Even Mahomet, who claimed to deliver to men
a new revelation, (A. D. 612.) and a decided ene-
my of christianity, ventured not to question its
facts. He speaks of John Baptist and our Savior
by name, mentions our Savior's miraculous works,
his death, his ascension, his Apostles and the be-
lief of the Jews.

Let us observe the rites and usages of the Church
growing out of the facts of christianity, as recor-
ded in the New Testament, and which have contin-
ued from that time to the present, among all na-
tions of Christians. Again, several ancient and
authentic monuments of the events recorded in the
gospels, have survived and attest their credibility.

Amongst the proofs of early history, are coins,
medals, inscriptions, marbles formed at the time,
or soon after the time of the respective events, and
still extant. Authentic testimonies of this nature
are allowed to have the greatest weight in all his-
torical inquiries.

Now with regard to christianity, during eighteen
centuries, every genuine relic of antiquity has con-
firmed the facts of its history.

III. A very important argument is derived from
the character of the sacred writers themselves.

I. They bear testimony to facts of which they
are competent judges, the life, doctrine, miracles,

death and resurrection of Christ—events which they saw, and on which they conversed.

II. We have *twelve separate witnesses* of the specific facts of the gospel history—to whom three more, (St. Mark, St. Luke, and St. Paul,) may be added. Of these, eight composed different writings in twenty seven several works, which were read and examined by their contemporaries, both friends and foes in every part of the known world.

They had a full knowledge of the things which they related. They were eye-witnesses or companions of those who were of the four evangelists, one wrote his account within six or eight years of the crucifixion; (A. D. 38 or 40) a second about (A. D. 61.) the third (A. D. 63.) fourth (A. D. 97.)

III. The sacred writers were persons of *integrity*. Whether you regard the four evangelists, or the eight writers of the New Testament, or the Apostles generally; simplicity and honesty characterize them.

The style and manner of their writings confirm their credibility.

IV. Notice the honesty with which they record their own failings, St. Mark gives a full account of the denial and fall of Peter, and this too under the direction of Peter himself.

The Apostles were frank to acknowledge their dullness of apprehension, their unbelief, &c. They were by no means credulous or rash: they exhibited no vestage of enthusiasm: so far from being

credulous, they were slow to believe anything at all extraordinary : they could scarcely be induced to believe the resurrection of Christ. The testimony of Thomas shows what all the conduct of the Apostles proves that they had not conspired to impose on the world. In reference to our Lord's resurrection, says Thomas " 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. This does not appear like credulity. And instead of being enthusiastic their writings are characterized with soberness and impartiality.

V. They relate events *at the place where they occurred, and before the people who witnessed them.* They speak of Christ, a person well known. They relate facts at Jerusalem where they occurred, before multitudes who witnessed them. These events they related before enemies the most hostile, and before the tribunals of justice. Knowing the truth of what they asserted, they published it without hesitation. The Apostles had nothing to expect for their testimony, but persecution and death ; this they actually incurred without shrinking from the facts which they asserted.

What could induce them to falsify truth? What did they expect ? It was that they would be treated with reproach, contempt and derision being made as the filth of the earth, and the offscouring of all things. These holy men, meeting such per-

secutions, and persevering unto death in their testimony, evince that what they relate is undeniably true. Had they given up their religion, their persecutions would have ceased. But the love of truth even with perils and death they preferred, to the applause and wealth of this world. If their conduct does not evince truth, what can?

Finally if the New Testament be genuine and credible, the Old Testament is so likewise. The christian religion is the accomplishment of the Jewish; our Lord and his Apostles appealed to the books of the Old Testament, as acknowledged Scriptures, and quoted them as of unquestionable authority. Our Savior recognizes also the three divisions of the sacred books. *All things must be fulfilled, which are written in the law of Moses, and the Psalms and Prophets concerning me.*

NO. VI.

DIVINE AUTHORITY OF THE SCRIPTURES.

Having proved the credibility of the scriptures, we come now to consider their divine authority. Our object will be to prove that *the Bible is a revelation from God, and that it is clothed with divine authority.*

Since we admit the scriptures to be true, we must also admit them to be a revelation from God, because they so profess to be. Their instructions

are authoritative; our Savior taught as one "having authority, and not as the scribes."

II. We derive a very important argument from the miracles of our Savior, in favor of the divine authority of the scriptures.

By a miracle we mean the suspension of the ordinary laws of nature; as when the water pots were filled with water and it became wine; when Lazarus was raised from the dead; when blind Bartimæus received his sight. The phenomena attending our Savior's death and resurrection, were miracles in a remarkable degree.

But it is objected that these wonderful works are contrary to experience! is it meant the experience of the objector? Then he would denounce all facts of which he is not himself the eye-witness; and a person living in the torrid zone who should refuse to believe on any testimony, the fact of water being frozen, would be in the right. But if he means the experience of others, then he must come to testimony. Thus his objection would not apply.

It is further objected, that the transmission of remote facts, is weakened till it becomes extinct. But it is not so in speaking of a written testimony, where a series of separate and credible witnesses in each age, from the present, may be without interruption traced up to the apostolic.

The facts of the gospel were plain and obvious miracles, witnessed by the eyes and ears of man, so that it was impossible to mistake.

III. We can judge of these miracles by the character of those who performed them. They were done by Christ and his Apostles, professedly as divine acts; and that too, before the Jews accustomed to judge of miracles. At that time they were expecting their Messiah, and were prepared to examine these wonderful works. The Jews being hostile to our Lord, watched every opportunity to detect a fraud. Yet they ascribe divine power to the miracles of Christ, and receive impressions contrary to their wishes and prejudices.

The life of our Savior was one of miracles. *he went about all Galilee healing all manner of sickness and all manner of diseases among the people; and his fame went throughout all Syria, and they brought unto him all the 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.*

IV. The miracles of Christ are admirably calculated for the attestation of a divine religion.

Says Nicodemus, *we know that thou art a teacher come from God; for no man can do these miracles which thou doest except God be with him.* Again, that men might know that the Son of God hath power on earth to forgive sin, *he saith to the sick of the palsy, arise, take up thy bed, and go thy way into thine house.*

Finally no religion was ever established by miracles but the religion of the Bible. False religions

have made some pretensions to wonderful works, but miracles like those of our Savior, were never heard of.

PROPHECY.

II. *Prophecy is the declaration of future events.*

This affords distinct evidence of the divine authority of the Scriptures.

The extent of prophecy is vast in various points of view, it occupies a large portion of the Bible. It continued four thousand years previous to the coming of Christ. When man fell, prophecy whispered the hope of a savior. The call of Abraham was attended with a prophecy of the land of promise, and the seed in whom all nations should be blessed. Jacob foretold the increase of his sons, the twelve patriarchs; and the continuance of the law giver in Judah till the advent of Shiloh. After the long-predicted bondage of Egypt, prophecy pointed out the prophet like unto Moses, and then touched upon the most remote events of the Jewish story; whilst Job, and the testimony of Balaam occurred about the same time to testify of the Savior.

About four hundred years from the time of Moses, Samuel arose the first of a new series. David came, the prophets Elijah and Elisha followed, and reached from the time of Solomon to that of Jonah; when Hosea, Amos, and Micah succeeded, and then the prophets Isaiah, Jeremiah and Ezekiel. The latter of these accompanied the Jewish people to

Babylon, where Daniel spake of the seventy weeks reaching unto Messiah the Prince. Then come Haggai and Zechariah, and Malachi announced the herald of the Savior.

It was in accordance with prophecy that the Apostles *made known the power and coming of Christ*; describing the prophets as *testifying beforehand the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow*. Our Lord said to the Jews, *search the Scriptures for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they that testify of me. And, beginning at Moses, and all the Prophets, he expounded unto his disciples in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself*.

The first coming of Christ is the centre of one great division; the second coming of Christ comprehends the other. The spirit of Prophecy gives a surpassing attestation to the Christian religion.

We have also a more sure word of Prophecy; whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day-star arise in your hearts: knowing this first, that no prophecy of the Scripture, is of any private interpretation. 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.

THE FULFILLMENT OF PROPHECY.

III. Here let us notice some predictions respecting the Messiah, clearly fulfilled in Christ. The birth of Messiah was to take place when the sceptre

was departing from Judah, and the law-giver from between his feet; it was to be at the time the city of Jerusalem, and the second temple remained standing; it was to be when the people generally expected him; whilst the royal house of David continued distinct from others, though much depressed, it was to be at the distance of seventy weeks, or four-hundred and ninety years from the edict to rebuild Jerusalem after the captivity in Babylon.

The Messiah was to be born at Bethlehem Ephrata, so called to distinguish it from another Bethlehem in the tribe of Zabulon.

He was to spring from the family of Abraham, through Isaac and Jacob, to Judah; and from his tribe to the royal line of David, the son of Jesse.

His name was to be Emmanuel, the same as Jesus. A messenger was to be sent before his face to prepare his way.

2. The prophecies include the Messiah's birth of the seed of the woman, and of a virgin; his flight into Egypt; his education at Nazareth; his entry into Jerusalem, riding upon the foal of an ass; the cry of the children surrounding him; his manner of teaching; zeal for the worship of his father; his being betrayed; the treachery of one of his disciples; his sufferings; the gall offered him; the spear that pierced his side; his treatment when crucified; his grave with the wicked; his not being left to see corruption; his resurrection; there being no end to his kingdom.

3. Such particulars were foretold of the Messiah as constituted a peculiar character, and uniting qualities and attributes apparently the most contradictory; and therefore being found in the person of Christ they prove his Messiahship in a still more decisive manner. He was to be a branch from the root of Jesse, to be rejected and despised of men; to be a worm and no man, to be the servant of rulers, to be a stone of stumbling, and a rock of offence, to be hated without a cause, to endure shame and reproach, to be accused by false witnesses, to be a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief.

On the other hand, the Messiah was to be the Son of God, the Shiloh, the star out of Jacob, the Redeemer, the Loving One, the chief corner stone, the Lord of David, king of Israel, Emmanuel, the mighty God, the everlasting Father, the supreme God, the creator of all things.

These high, and yet humiliating descriptions were all fulfilled in the person and character of Christ. They fix by the apparent contradictions which they involve, the identity of his person. There never has been any other person to whom these particulars were ever capable of being applied.

4. Further. We have a succession of prophets during four thousand years, who arise one after another, to predict these things of the same person, the Messiah. As it has been noticed, the first pre-

diction of the birth of Christ was uttered four thousand years before the accomplishment. Two thousand years from this time passed before the family of Abraham was designated.

Three or four more centuries after the descent of Messiah was limited to Judah; and after another interval of six or seven hundred years, to the house of David, the son of Jesse. Another prophet separate from all the preceding, and three hundred years later than the promise to David, fixes the place of the Messiah's birth. Isaiah about the same time announces that a voice in the wilderness should call on men to prepare his way.

IV. The *beneficial effects of Christianity* which are so obvious to every candid observer, are a proof of the divine authority of the scriptures.

Christianity begins in the heart of man, and removes the love of sin by implanting the love of holiness. It leads him to maintain piety and good order in his family, the foundation of all good society. It influences him to love his neighbor and to do to others as he would have them do to him. It incites him to industry, to enlarge and improve his mind, in fine to *love the Lord with all his heart, and soul, and mind and strength.*

2 V. The bible determines all the points essential to man's happiness; and determines them with so much clearness as to exempt him from doubt.

In reading the discourses of the prophets in the Old Testament, or of our Lord and his Apostles in

the New, we feel that they *speak as those having authority, and not as the scribes.*

NO. VII.

INSPIRATION OF THE SCRIPTURES.

In entering upon this subject that will be taken for granted which has before been proved, viz. The authenticity, credibility and divine authority of the scriptures.

Inspiration includes not only the suggestion of what is to be written, but also its superintendence; the divine guidance afforded to the sacred writers to pen the scriptures in the clearest manner and best language.

For proof of inspiration we appeal to the testimony of the sacred writers.

1. With regard to the Old Testament, the evidence being derived from the New Testament.

“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 Pet. i. 21.

“We have also a more sure word of prophecy, whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light shining in a dark place.” “And beginning at Moses and all the prophets, Jesus expounded to them in *all the scriptures* the things concerning himself.” “And Jesus said unto them, these are the words which I spake unto you while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled which were

written concerning me, in *the law of Moses*, and in *the prophets*, and in *the Psalms*."

Again, we find in 2 Tim. iii. 16; *all scripture* is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness."

Our Lord and his Apostles treat the scriptures as possessing an authority entirely different from that of any other writings.

2. The evidence respecting the inspiration of the New Testament will now be attended to.

Our Lord commissioned his Apostles to act in his stead, as teachers of his religion and invested them with power to work miracles. Jesus said to them, "As my father hath sent me, even so send I you." Here it is evident that they were assisted by the divine spirit to become *unerring teachers*. *Christ promised to give his Apostles the Holy Spirit to assist them in their work.*

Says he "I will ask the Father and he shall give you another comforter, that he may abide with you forever; even the spirit of truth." When the Spirit of truth is come he will guide you into *all the truth*. "He shall teach you *all things*, and bring all things to your remembrance whatsoever I have said unto you. When they shall deliver you up, take no thought what or how ye shall speak; for it shall be given you in that same hour what ye shall speak. For it is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father that speaketh in you."

Says Knapp, "If the Apostles had inspiration in discourses which were merely oral, and therefore of very temporary and limited advantage: how much more in their *writings*, which were intended to exert a more lasting and extended influence."

The sacred writers considered themselves to be under the infallible guidance of the Spirit. We find the following in 1 Cor. ii. 12. 13. "Now we have received, not the spirit of the world, but the spirit which is of God, that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God. Which things also we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth."

1 Thess. iv. 8. It is stated of him who treats with contempt the instructions of the Apostles; "He that despiseth, despiseth not man but *God* who hath also given unto us his Holy Spirit."

1 John iv. 6; "We are of God. He that knoweth God, heareth us; he that is not of God heareth not us. Hereby we know the spirit of truth and the spirit of error."

The Apostles class together the writings of the Old Testament and those of the New Testament as a standard of divine truth.

Built upon the foundation of the Apostles and prophets.—That ye may be mindful of the words which were spoken before by the holy prophets, and of the commandment of us the Apostles of the Lord and Savior.

As "the evangelists Mark and Luke were not

Apostles it must be acknowledged" says Dr. Woods "that the arguments which prove the inspiration of the other books of the New Testament, do not directly prove the inspiration of their gospels." But we find in the first epistle to the Corinthians, the Apostle Paul speaks of many Christians who had supernatural gifts and who were required to exercise them for the edification of the church. Now the fact that the supernatural gifts of the spirit were conferred on so many besides the Apostles, shows it to be very probable that they were conferred on Mark and Luke. And this is more evident as they were so distinguished for usefulness and were particular companions of the Apostles.

There was moreover a tradition among the early christians, that these two gospels were written under the special direction of the Apostles.

Tertullian says, "the gospel which Mark published may be affirmed to be Peter's, whose interpreter Mark was." He says further that "Luke's history is usually ascribed to Paul;" meaning probably that it rested on Paul's authority. Says Dr. Woods "the declaration of the fathers that Paul and Peter approved and sanctioned the gospels of Mark and Luke, is not, however, to be understood to imply that these two evangelists were not themselves inspired. For Eusebius makes a similar declaration respecting the gospel of Matthew. He says that *Paul and Peter approved the gospel of Matthew, and confirmed the truth of it, as well as the gospels of*

Mark and Luke. And what can be more natural than to suppose that, whenever it was necessary, one inspired writer would give his testimony to the writings of another? In this way Peter, though indirectly, confirms the authority of the epistles of Paul 2 Pet. iii. 15, 16.

III. *Objections considered.*

1. It is said that the Apostle Paul in some cases disclaims inspiration. For instance in the following passage; "concerning virgins I have no commandment of the Lord; yet I give *my judgment*."

"She is happier if she so abide, after *my judgment*." "Herein I give *my advice*." But suppose he was not inspired to present *commandment* it does not follow that he was not inspired to give his *advice* or *judgment*. Says he "I give my judgment as one that hath obtained mercy of the Lord to be faithful."

"But the text 2 Cor. xi. 17," says Dr. Woods "is to be explained differently." "That which I speak, I speak not after the Lord," i. e. *according to his example*. The Apostle was embarrassed and oppressed with the necessity which was laid upon him to speak in his own commendation; and while doing it, charged himself with acting *foolishly*, and *not according to the example of Christ*. He probably meant, either that there was something in what he said which was *apparently* contrary to the unostentatious, humble character of Christ; or something which, in *ordinary* circumstances, would be

actually contrary; though in the singular circumstances in which he was placed, he felt himself justified."

2. An objection has been made against the inspiration of the Apostles from the consideration that they were subject to failings in their *private capacity*. It was likewise true that they were very careful to note their faults. This shows their honesty and their carefulness not to assume anything which did not belong to them. We judge then if they were not inspired, we should not have heard from the Apostles such plain confident language as the following; "I certify you, brethren, that the gospel which was preached of me, is *not after man*; for I neither received it of man, nor was I taught it, but by revelation of Jesus Christ." Now we have received not the spirit of the world, but the spirit which is of God, that we might know the things which are freely given us of God. Which things also we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth.

3. It is objected that many unimportant things are recorded in the scriptures. To this it is replied that these things are not so unimportant as not to be *useful* or for the *interest* of the church.

4. It is said if the bible was written by inspiration, the language would have been more chaste and philosophical. But who are to be the standard of taste? It will be recollected that the scriptures

were written not for one tribe or nation only, but for the world. They were written in language of common use and as it was generally understood.

5. It is said that a great part of the bible is made up of historical accounts. This is no argument against plenary or complete inspiration of the whole bible. It was very necessary for the sacred writers to have the guidance of the Holy Spirit to select and combine *such historical accounts* from the great mass. Though there may have been errors committed by translators and transcribers, yet this does not alter the original, the common standard. But with regard to past occurrences our Savior expressly promised the Holy Ghost to his Apostles, saying, "*he shall teach you all things and bring all things to your remembrance.*"

Finally it is objected that the scriptures contain records of disputes and quarrels. We do not suppose men were inspired to quarrel, neither does this prove anything against the Apostles being inspired to record these events.

As the scriptures were written for our instruction, these accounts doubtless were made to show us the contrast between the effects produced by the spirit of the world and those produced by the spirit of the gospel. At least this is one thing which they show.

IV. It is important to notice the *testimony of the early christian fathers*. Clemens Romanus bishop of Rome, (A.D.91—110.) a contemporary with the

Apostles, says, "the Apostles preached the gospel, being filled with the Holy Ghost—the scriptures are the true words of the spirit—Paul wrote to the Corinthians things true by the aid of the spirit—he being divinely inspired, admonished them by an epistle, concerning himself and Cephas and Apollos."

Justin Martyr, (A. D. 89—164.) says that "the gospels were written by men full of the Holy Ghost."

Irenaeus (A. D. 89—154.) says, that "all the Apostles received the gospel by divine revelation—that the scriptures were dictated by the spirit of God—and that therefore it is wickedness to contradict them, and sacrilege to make any alteration in them." Theophilus (A. D. 168—181.) referring to the authors of the Old and New Testament, says, "that both the one and the other spake, being inspired by one and the same Spirit." Clemens Alexandrinus (A. D. 191.) says, "that the Holy scriptures are the law of God, and that they are all divine and that the evangelists and Apostles wrote by the same Spirit that inspired the Apostles." The emperor Constantine wrote unto the council of Nice (A. D. 323.) calling the scriptures, "the doctrine of the Holy Ghost in writing." A writer in Eusebius (A. D. 315.) says, "that they who corrupt the sacred scriptures, either do not believe that the Holy Spirit uttered the divine scriptures, and then they are infidels, or think themselves wiser than the

spirit, and so seem to be possessed." Origen (A. D. 230.) teaches, that the scriptures proceeded from the Holy Spirit, that there is not one tittle in them but what expresses a divine wisdom, that there is nothing in the law, or the prophets, or the gospels, or the epistles, which did not proceed from the fullness of the spirit, that we ought, with all the faithful to say, that the scriptures are divinely inspired; that the gospels are admitted as divine in all the churches of God, and that the scriptures are no other than the organs of God.*

No. VIII.

DIVINITY OF CHRIST.

When we speak of the divinity of Christ we mean that he is properly God, and *equal with* the Father in the possession of all Divine attributes and glories. In the bible we find Christ described as possessing *Divine attributes and perfections*,† such as omnipotence, omnipresence, immutability, eternal existence &c. He is spoken of as the *Almighty* Rev. i.8. He is said to *know all things*, John 16, 30, 21, 17, He is the same yesterday to day and forever, Heb. 13, 8, he is present at the same time on earth and

*Deists as opposed to Atheists, admit the existence of God but deny his revealed word.

† Read Hebrews 1 chap. 8 and 9, expressing his titles 10, 11 and 12 verses, his eternity and immutability.

in heaven, John 3, 16, he is "the Alpha and the Omega the beginning and ending, the first and the last," Rev. 1, 8, 17.

2. We find divine *names* appropriated to Christ. His name shall be called Wonderful, Counselor, the mighty God, the everlasting Father, the Prince of peace Is. 9, 6,

He is called "the great God." Tit. 2, 13, the true God, John 5, 20, "God over all" &c. Rom. 9. 5. He is also called "Jehovah." "Jehovah of hosts." "Lord of all," "the Lord from heaven," "the King of Kings and Lord of Lords &c.

3. *Divine works* are ascribed to Christ, such as creating, upholding and ruling the universe: performing miracles; forgiving sins, judging the world. "By him were all things created," Col. 1 16. "By him all things consist Col. 1, 17. He possesses all power in heaven and earth, Matt. 28, 18. He forgave sins while on earth and raised the dead, and "shall judge the quick and the dead, at his appearing," 1 Tim. 4, 1.

4. Christ is described as receiving *Divine worship* and *honors*—honors not to be ascribed to any creature.

Stephen prayed to Christ and commended to him his spirit, Acts, 7, 59, 60. Paul prayed to him.

The primitive christians were distinguished as those who called on the name of the Lord, 1, Cor. 1, 2. He is revered by saints and angels in heaven, Rev. 1, 8, and 5, 8—13. It is worthy of

remark that the primitive christians who immediately succeeded the Apostles were all of them believers in the Divinity of Christ. They frequently speak of Christ as God, and ascribe to him divine honors.

But Christ was man as well as God. The fact of his humanity is as incontestible and is as necessary to the scheme of evangelical religion, as the fact of his divinity. He is frequently called a man in the bible. He was born, lived, ate, drank, slept, suffered, died and was buried. He possessed a human soul as well as body, and "increased in wisdom" as well as in stature, Luke 2, 52.

The humanity of Christ has often been denied. There were some in the apostles times who denied that Jesus had a real human *body*; and this led the Apostle John to insist so frequently and so strongly, that Jesus Christ had come *in the flesh*: the Ariens deny that Christ had a human soul.

The divinity and humanity of Christ is the only doctrine which meets all the representations of scripture on this great subject, and harmonizes with them all.

The representations of Christ in his humiliation have led many to deny his divinity. It is said if he increased in wisdom his knowledge could not be infinite. It is said moreover that he did not know of the destruction of Jerusalem. But it must be recollected that Christ voluntarily laid aside the glory which he had with the Father—was manifest in the flesh and as a man met our condition. While

in this humiliation, though he is said to increase in wisdom not exercising infinite knowledge, yet this is no proof that he was not able to call up this knowledge into exercise if he pleased. The same objection might be made as to his power. Just before he was crucified, we learn that he was fatigued and unable to bear his cross, and yet he was the Maker and preserver of the world. "All things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made." If Christ was God it is asked how could he die? Said he, no man taketh my life from me, I have power to lay it down and I have power to take it again. His life was within his own control. He said to the Jews, destroy this temple (meaning his body,) and in three days I will raise it up. Here Christ evidently claims to be God. It is expressly stated in scripture that "God raised up our Lord;" and we see here that Christ is the author of his own resurrection: Therefore Christ is God. There is no getting round the conclusion.

It is objected that Christ says "my Father is greater than I." But there is another passage to be noticed at the same time. "Who being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God." Scripture does not contradict itself. When two parts of it appear to be at variance, no doubt there is a mode of reconciling them. Our Savior is exhibited in two characters, as the Son of God, and as Mediator, In the former he is des-

cribed as possessing all the perfections of Deity; but in the latter, as the servant of the Father, acting in obedience to his will.

In this latter character the Father was greater than he, not essentially, but economically, as he who sends, is in this respect greater than he who is sent; and the context evidently shows that this was the character in which our Savior spoke when he said, "My Father is greater than I." The subject of conversation was his ascension in human nature, his return to the Father.

There is another objection, "I come not to do my own will but the will of him who sent me." Although two persons be of equal rank, the one may consent for a time and a particular reason, to act the part of a servant to the other, without diminution of his dignity, and in this case is inferior only in office. Notwithstanding this subordination, his rights are preserved, because it is entirely voluntary and to last only for a period, after which he will appear in his original equality. This was applicable to our Lord in his humiliation.

It is objected that his will was different from that of his Father, "Nevertheless, not as I will, but as thou wilt," Having voluntarily assumed the character of a servant, he acted in all things as the servant of the Father. It cannot be shown from this prayer that he had a will to do anything contrary to the wishes of his Father.

An objection is drawn from his answer to the one

who said, good Master &c. and the reply was, why callest thou me good. Our Lord adapted his answer to the notions which the inquirer entertained of him as a mere man. He would not allow flattering titles to be given to men.—But one word respecting the sentence, “My Father is greater than I.” We find in the same connection that Christ considers himself God. He speaks of the comforter whom the Father will send. And in the next chapter speaking of the comforter he says, “whom I will send. Here we see our savior represents himself the same as the Father, in his authority and works. That disciple whom Jesus loved and who leaned on his breast at supper time, states, in the beginning was the word, the word was with God, and the word was God.

The phrase Son of God.

This phrase in its high and peculiar sense as ascribed to Christ is to denote particularly his divinity. Christ has declared God to be his father.

In one of these instances, the *Jews* sought to kill him for claiming this character. The words which he used were, *my father worketh hitherto and I work Therefore*, says the evangelist in the following verse *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. 18. This is the comment of the Evangelist on Christs meaning in adopting this language, and it is no other than this. *That in declaring God*

to be his father, he made himself equal with God. No comment can be more decisive. *The Jews sought to kill him* for healing the impotent man at the pool of *Siloam* on the sabbath day. He justified himself by saying *my father worked hitherto and I work.*

In John x. 30. Christ said to the Jews *I and my father are one.* This seems not to have offended them; (see verse 36.) but they attempted to stone him, because he said *I am the Son of God*; as he informs us in the verse last mentioned. When asked by him for what good work they stoned him; they replied, *for a good work we stone thee not, but blasphemy, because thou, being a man, makest thyself God.*

But our Savior settles the question, *If said he, I do not the works of my father, believe me not; but if I do, though you believe not me, believe the works, that ye may know and believe that the father is in me, and I in him.*

The importance of the proper divinity of Christ is great.

If Christ is finite he must be the author of a finite salvation. Then if we are eternally saved it must be by some other salvation. The duration of our praises to the Savior will be finite.

How can we endure the thought not to praise God and the *Lamb* for ever and ever. But we rejoice that Christ is the author of *eternal* salvation.

If Christ is finite, how can sinners feeling their guilt, to be infinite, come to him in faith for pardon?

PERSONALITY AND DIVINITY

But when they conceive him to be the mighty God able and willing to save, then with faith they can approach the mercy seat. Finally those who reject the divinity of Christ reject with it the *Divinity and personality of the Holy Spirit*.

PERSONALITY, AND DIVINITY OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

NO. IX.

By the personality of the Holy Spirit we do not mean that he is a *being by himself*, separate from the father and son and independent of them. We believe that in the one living and true God, there are *distinctions or persons*, and that, in scripture one of these persons is denominated the *Holy Spirit*. Some teach that the spirit is nothing more than a *personified attribute or operation* of God. But the *connections and manner* in which the words *Holy Spirit*, Holy Ghost, &c. are used forbid such a supposition.

Baptising them in the name of the Father and of the Son, and of a *divine Attribute*. The grace of the Lord Jesus and the love of God, and the communion of a *Divine Attribute* be with you all!

Grieve not a *Divine Attribute*. This cannot be the sense of scripture. Some suppose that the words *Spirit of God*, *Holy Spirit*, &c., represent the *one God*—the *one person in the God-head*;—sus-

taining a particular office and operating in a particular way, and deny that there are any distinctions or persons in the God-head. But let us examine scripture, "And the Lord God said, Behold the man is become as *one* of us." (Gen. iii. 22.)

One of whom? if there are no distinctions. A mysterious personage is after introduced in the Old Testament, called "the angel of Jehovah." But this *angel* of Jehovah was Jehovah himself.

The *angel* or *messenger* of Jehovah is represented as distinct from Jehovah; and yet this angel was Jehovah.

We are told, in Gen. 19, 24, that "Jehovah rained upon Sodom and Gomorrah, brimstone and fire *from Jehovah* out of heaven."

If we consult the New Testament, we shall find that *Christ* in his *Divine* nature, was distinct from the Divine nature of the Father. "In the beginning was the Word &c." John 11—3.

Here the divine word, who was God, and by whom all things were made, is said to have been *with* God, and with him *in the beginning*—importing that in the God-head there have been distinctions from eternity. "And now O Father glorify thou me with the glory, which *I had with thee before the world was*, (John, 17, 5.) The *human* nature of Christ had no existence before the creation of the world. In this passage therefore, he speaks of his *divine* nature, and he represents it as from eternity *with the Father* in glory. In the first chapter

of Hebrews, we find a manifest distinction set forth, between the divine nature* of the Son, and that of the Father. The Son is here represented as the creator and upholder of the world, and yet he is clearly distinguished from the God who is speaking by him, who calls him his Son, and at whose right hand the glorified Son is exalted. "When he (the Father) bringeth his first begotten into the world, he saith, and *let all the Angels of God worship him.* "Unto the Son he (i. e. the Father) saith, thy throne O God is forever and ever; the sceptre of thy kingdom is a right sceptre. Thou hast loved righteousness and hated iniquity, therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows." Here, God the Father speaks of the Son, in his divine nature—calls him God—and yet represents himself as *his God*—necessarily implying that there are distinctions in the God-head. One passage more. Blessing and honor and glory and power be *unto him that sitteth upon the throne* and *unto the Lamb* forever." Rev. 5. 13.

Thus we see the inconsistency, for the Father, Son and Holy Spirit to be mere names of office, and to belong, all of them, to the person of the Father, 1 John 1, 2.

We shall see not only that there are personal distinctions in the God-head but that *one of them is the Holy Spirit*

*Not that each of the three separately from the others possesses a distinct essence.

“*One Spirit*, one Lord, one God and Father of all.” Eph. 4. 4.

Through him, (Christ) we have access by *one Spirit*, unto the Father.” Eph. 2, 28. Here the “one Spirit is clearly distinct, both from the Father and the Son: Again, “the heaven was opened and the Holy Ghost descended in a *bodily shape* like a dove upon him, and a voice came from heaven, which said this is my beloved Son, &c.” Matt. 3. 16.

The personality of the Spirit is evident from our Savior’s promises to his disciples. “I (the Son) will pray the *Father*, and he shall send you *another comforter*, that he may abide with you forever, even the Spirit of truth.” “The comforter who is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name he will teach you all things &c.” “When the comforter is come even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me.”

He will *reprove* the world of sin, &c.” He will guide you into all truth; for he shall not speak of himself, but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak, and he shall show you things to come.” “He shall glorify me; for he shall receive of mine, and shall show it unto you.” When these promises of the Savior were fulfilled, and the Spirit came, his intercourse with the disciples, and government over them was that of a personal agent. “The Spirit said unto Philip, go near and join thyself unto this chariot.” “The Spirit said unto Peter, be-

hold three men seek thee ; arise therefore, and go with them." "The Holy Ghost said separate me Paul and Barnabas for the work to which I have called them.

We find that the Holy Spirit is spoken of, not only as acting, but as the object of *offence* and *injury*, in a manner which proves his personality. Ananias and Sapphira "lied to the Holy Ghost." The Jews, "always resisted the Holy Ghost." We are exhorted not to *grieve* or *quench* the Holy Spirit.

It is no valid objection against the personality of the Holy Spirit; that the Greek word, translated Spirit, is in the neuter gender ; for this word is often used in connection with masculine pronouns, thus denoting that it stands for a person, and not for a thing, John 15, 16, 13, 14, 26. Eph. 1, 13.

Neither is it any objection, that the term Spirit is sometimes used, by a common figure for the *influences* or *operations* of the Spirit. In this sense it is used, when the Spirit is said to be *poured out* and *shed forth* ; and when under the appellation of Holy Ghost, miraculous powers were imparted by the laying on of the Apostles' hands. Acts 8, 17, 19, 6.

The *divinity* of the Holy Spirit is evidently proved from scripture. The *names* God and Jehovah, are often applied to the Spirit. Ananias and Sapphira "lied to the Holy Ghost," but in so doing they "lied unto God." Acts 5, 4. Christians are said to be *born of the Spirit* ; in other places they are represented by this birth as being *born of God*.

(Compare John 1, 13, with John 3, 5.) The bodies of christians are represented as the temples of God, because the *Holy Spirit dwelleth in them*. 1 Cor. 3, 16.

The Holy Spirit is represented as possessing *divine attributes*. He is said to search *all things* even the *deep things of God*;" (1 Cor. 2, 10.) a proof not only of his personality, but of his *omniscience*. He is moreover called the *eternal Spirit*."

The *works* ascribed to the Spirit are conclusive evidence of his divinity. *The inspiration of the scriptures* is ascribed to the Spirit. 2 Pet. 1, 21. So is the *conversion of sinners*, the *sanctification of believers*, the working of *miracles*.

The doctrine of the personality and divinity of the Holy Spirit is of great importance. It is so as it relates to the conversion and salvation of sinners, and the *consolation* of believers. Every person who has a true sense of his condition, feels that he needs the aid of the divine Spirit.

He needs the Spirit to enlighten his understanding, to awaken his conscience, to regenerate his soul and guide him to heaven.

THE TRINITY.

NO. X.

The doctrine of the Trinity is the doctrine of *three persons or distinctions in one God*. This doc-

trine is often represented as inconsistent with the *unity* of God ; but we believe it is not. *Trinitarians* are not *Tritheists* or *Polytheists*.

This doctrine does not assert that God is *one* and *three*, in the *same sense* ; or that *either* of the three is one, in the same sense that *all united are one*. Either of these propositions would be a contradiction—an absurdity. But the doctrine does assert that God is in *some sense one*, and in some *other* senses or respects *three* ; and this involves no contradiction. We believe that God has so revealed to us the mode of his existence. In what sense God is one, and in what three, we may not be able to explain. We must guard against such conceptions of the *unity* of God as would destroy the *Trinity* ; and such conceptions of the *Trinity*, as would destroy the *unity*.

The distinctions in the one God, are commonly denominated *persons* ; and if this would be safely understood, there is no objection to it. We must not transfer to the Deity, definitions which originate in the state of created beings. The cases are totally dissimilar. We do not affirm that there are three distinct essences in the God-head. The fact seems to be this—that the *one living and true God* exists in such a manner, that he may properly speak of himself, either in the *singular* number or the *plural* ; and he may speak of himself in the *first*, *second* or *third* person. He may say *I*, *thou* or *he*, and yet refer to no one out of himself. The per-

sons in the Trinity may sustain different offices, and perform different works. They are represented as entering into a covenant, one with another. They may speak, or be spoken of, separately or unitedly,—may speak *of* or *to* one another; while yet in some mysterious sense, they constitute but *one God*.

It is evident from scripture that *God is one*. “Hear, O Israel, the Lord thy God is *one* Lord.” “The Lord he is God, *there is none else besides him*.” Deut. 4, 35, 6, 4. “I am the Lord, and there is *none else*. There is no God besides me.” Is there a God besides me? yea *there is no God; I know not any*. Is. 44, 8, 45, 5. “Thou believest there is *one God*; thou doest well. The devils also believe and tremble.” James 2, 19.

That there is a *plurality* of persons or distinctions in the God-head, is also evident from the scriptures. “Let *us* make man in *our* image, after *our* likeness.” “The man has become as one of *us*.” Let it be observed that the existence of a *covenant*, and all the passages referring to such a covenant, prove the plurality of persons in the God-head. A covenant necessarily implies more than one.

The doctrine of the Trinity limits the personal distinctions in the God-head to *three*. This is evident from the scriptures; and from what has been established. None doubt the divinity and personality of the *Father*. We have before proved the divinity of Christ, and the personality and divinity

of the Holy Spirit. Here then we have the Trinity. We will notice again a few passages in the New Testament, which prove the Trinity. Here the names of the three persons in the Trinity are brought together and each is exhibited in his own proper office in the work of redemption.

"How much more shall the blood of *Christ*," (the second person) "who, through the eternal Spirit (the third person) offered himself without spot to God," (the Father, the first person) "purge your conscience from dead works." (Heb. 9, 14.)

An argument is founded upon the institution of baptism, and the form of administration;—go and teach all nations, baptising them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost." Baptism is a religious ordinance, which according to reason and scripture must be administered in the name of the object of worship. It is a dedication to the service of God. Is idolatry taught here or is there anything superfluous in mentioning the three persons? Now there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit. And there are differences of administrations, but the same Lord. And there are diversities of operations, but it is the same God which worketh all in all. In this dispensation of grace there are three persons, obviously exercising equal authority.

It is worthy of remark that the doctrine of the Trinity, was held and taught by the earliest christian fathers. Ignatius represents the Apostles

as subject "both to Christ, and to the Father, and the Holy Spirit;" and denies that the Magnesians "may prosper in the Son, and in the Father, and in the Holy Spirit." Polycarp says "I glorify thee (the Father) by the eternal and heavenly high priest Jesus Christ, thy beloved Son, with whom to thee, and the Holy Ghost, be glory both now and to all succeeding ages."

The doctrine of the Trinity, we believe as a *fact* revealed in the bible, and we believe it because the Bible teaches it.

So far as we can conceive of the importance of this doctrine, it gives us higher views of the glory and blessedness of the supreme Being, to conceive of him as possessing within himself, exhaustless resources of *social* blessedness.

The doctrine of the Trinity is important as it respects the covenant of redemption. It was between the three persons in the God-head, that the covenant was in eternity formed.

The divine three are each of them engaged in executing this eternal covenant.

The Father is, by office, the designer in the divine government. The Son is, by office, mediator and Redeemer. And the Spirit is by office, sanctifier and comforter. The work of neither can be dispensed with. From each of the divine persons in the Trinity we derive special advantages; and to each we are under special obligations. The Christian, who feels his necessities and knows on

what foundation to rest his hopes, regards the Trinity as the dearest object of his affections and reverence.

DECREES OR PURPOSES OF GOD.

NO. XI.

On the outset we are ready to exclaim, as to God, "there is no searching of his understanding."

The truth of the matter respecting the decrees of God appears to be this, that he absolutely decrees some things and permits others. Though we do not expect to clear this system from objections, yet we consider it less objectionable than the one that "God from all eternity did, by the most wise and holy council of his own will, freely and unchangeably ordain whatsoever comes to pass." This would necessarily make God the author of sin.

Those who advocate this doctrine affirm that God cannot foreknow that any thing will come to pass unless he has decreed that it shall come to pass. But man does not perform an act because God foreknows it; though he may foreknow that man in the exercise of his free will would perform it. In opposition to this we find the following from Hopkins; "This foreknowledge is not only to be distinguished from the decree; But must be considered as in the order of nature, consequent upon the determination and purpose of God and dependent upon it."

By the word consequent he means that foreknowledge in the order of nature, comes after determination. But this reverses the order of Scripture: "For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate;" According to the other theory it would be whom he did predestinate, then he foreknew. It is true that we cannot always prove a point from the manner in which words come. But in this case there evidently is a designed order. Suppose we reverse it, then the sense would be, he glorified these persons, then he justified them, then he called them, then he predestinated them, then and not till then he foreknew them.

There appears to be a designed order in the arrangement of these terms, commencing at the 29th verse with the conjunction for.

"For whom he did not foreknow, &c."

Now the question is whom did he foreknow? of course he foreknew all as existing. This then is not admitted to be the meaning. Is not this the sense, whom he foreknew as believers? then it must follow that these are the ones whom he predestinated.

This is the plain scriptural doctrine of election. Gods eternal purpose or decree, is to save all who believe or shall believe in Christ. "God hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth." Here let it be observed that sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth must take place with the person in this life. This is the condition on

which we are from the beginning chosen to salvation.

If we are submissive to this condition we partake of the character and come under the circumstances of the elect. But if we are not submissive to it we must suffer the consequences. If we do not believe in Christ we cannot see life, for there is no other name given under heaven, or among men whereby we can be saved.

In affirming that God foreordains whatsoever comes to pass, reference is often made to the passage respecting our Savior. "Him, being delivered by the determinate counsel, and foreknowledge of God," ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain." But let it be observed that we see here, 1st, the decree; "Him being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God," then comes the permission, "ye have taken; and by wicked hands, have crucified and slain." It is asked if God could decree to deliver our Savior to the sufferings of death, and not decree that men should inflict this death? We will answer this in the words of our Savior. "No man taketh my life from me, I lay it down of myself, I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. It is said that the betrayal, scourging and crucifixion of Christ were all foretold. Here we must remember that there is a great difference between foretelling that future events *will* take place and decreeing that they *must* take place. Also ma-

ny words in the Scripture, which seem to denote a decree actually imply no more than that such things will take place, for instance in the language of Christ to Peter, "thou *shalt* deny me" shalt evidently has the force of *wilt*.

This very denial doubtless resulted from some fault which our Savior saw in Peter; perhaps it was from his self-confidence. In this way we may account for the conduct of the Jews in crucifying our Savior. If they had not been previously wicked, they would not have done it. Who can suppose God would have decreed that devoutly pious men should crucify the Savior? If such piety would prevent them, then we must ascribe the conduct of the Jews to their gross wickedness. When God is said to put a lying spirit within persons, no more is meant than that he permitted such a spirit to possess them, on account of previous wickedness.

When God is said to harden the heart and blind the mind, it is of those who have hardened their own hearts, and blinded their own minds. This was the case with Pharoah. "For this cause have I raised thee up, for to show in thee my power." The Hebrew word here translated raised up, means to keep alive, preserve, cause to endure; and this is evidently the meaning according to the preceding verse. "For now I will stretch out my hand, that I may smite thee, and thy people with pestilence." We see no inconsistency with God in permitting Pharoah to live, and act as he willed, God

so controlling the results of his actions, to show him that his name might be declared throughout all the earth. But it is evident that God would not have hardened his heart, unless Pharoah had hardened his own heart; or in other words, had been wicked, otherwise we must say that God hardens the heart of him who is devoutly pious. It is affirmed that God sent Joseph into Egypt by his brethren; but it does not necessarily follow that they must rob him, and attempt to kill him on the way. It was on account of their wickedness that they were guilty of such conduct. It is nothing to their credit that God preserved his life in these dangers. But the question comes, who is the cause of this previous wickedness? this leads us back to the original sin.* Now who is the cause of it?

It is affirmed that in searching for the cause of original sin, we cannot refer back to another sin, as the cause for this, would be a contradiction, implying that a sin existed, before the original sin; it is therefore required that a being be perfect, in order to be the cause of the original sin; hence it is inferred that God may be the cause of sin. But let it be observed, that man was made perfect; this was sufficient then for him to be the cause of the original sin.

Now let us examine the sentence "that a perfect being is required, in order to be the cause of the original sin."

*By original sin I mean the first transgression.

This does not mean that a being must be perfect who is the cause of this sin, but that he must be perfect in order *to be* or in other words *to become* the cause of the original sin. This last sentence is likely to be misunderstood, unless it is taken in connection with the preceding one. Now we learn that man was perfect ; but he was imperfect in *actually becoming* the cause of sin. Sin is the transgression of the law ; and the original transgression is the original sin ; man committed the original transgression ; therefore man is the cause of the original sin. If Satan committed the first transgression, he may be said to be the cause of the original sin. Why then is it referred to man ? It is because the fall of man was not a *necessary* consequence of the fall of Satan. This must hold, inasmuch as man remained perfect, until he himself yielded to temptation.

Satan was punished inasmuch as he was the cause of sin. Man was the cause of sin into the world. This is further evident, since wretchedness and ruin are referred to his transgression.

Now if God decreed that man should sin in order that he might redeem him we cannot see that wisdom in the divine plan which we perceive, if, while man is the cause of his own sin, God, in his great mercy, provided his redemption, and controlled the results of Satan's conduct and that of sinful man for his own glory and the happiness of his saints. In this view of the divine plan, we are ready to ex-

claim, "O the depth of the riches, both of the wisdom and knowledge of God!"

It is necessary to remark here, that God not only did not decree that the Jews should commit the sin of crucifying our Savior, but the decree in the strongest sense that God would deliver him up, was only on conditions, and that was the fall of man. It is evident, if he had not fallen, our Savior would not have suffered to atone for him. The decree that man should fall was on condition that he ate of the forbidden fruit: if he had not violated the command of God, in partaking of the fruit of course, he would not have fallen. "But we speak the wisdom of God in a mystery, even the hidden wisdom which God ordained before the world, unto our glory; which none of the princes of this world knew, *for had they known it they would not have crucified the Lord of glory.* 1 Cor. 2, 7, 8.

It is said if God exerts his agency in electing and saving some, he exerts no agency in leaving others to their own ways. But let it be remembered, he must exert his agency in decreeing that they should become sinners, if he has absolutely decreed whatsoever comes to pass.

It is urged that a decree to permit, imposes an uncertainty upon the divine plans. But this is not the case; there can be no uncertainty in the principles of administration of a Being, who regulates the whole by the immutable rules of righteousness and truth; so that all the acts of the creature,

though performed according to his own free will, do but call forth some new illustration of an unchangeable regard to these principles.

If a man sins, he is punished; if he lives devoted to God he is blessed. This doctrine is accordant with scripture, "If thou doest well shalt thou not be accepted? but if thou doest not well, sin lieth at thy door." If ye be willing and obedient, ye shall eat the good of the land; but if ye refuse and rebel, ye shall be devoured by the sword." He that believeth and is baptised shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned.. But it is urged, if God intends to call a person into the ministry or any office, and the acceptance depends on the will or conduct of the creature, then God's plan may be frustrated. This difficulty however is clearly solved in the case of Eli, "I said, indeed, that thy house and the house of thy father should walk before me for ever; but now the Lord saith, be it far from me; "for them that honor me I will honor, and they that despise me shall be lightly esteemed." Here we see God's immutability in never changing the *principles* of his administration, one of which is, "them that honor me I will honor, and they that despise me shall be lightly esteemed."

The Precience of God is brought up as an objection to this doctrine, that, as the destruction or salvation of every individual is foreseen, it is therefore, certain, and as *certain*, it is *enevitable* and *necessary*. The answer to this is; that certainty and

necessity are not at all connected in the nature of things, and are in fact two perfectly distinct predicaments- *Certainty* relates only to the issue of an act, not to the quality of the act or event with reference to the circumstances under which it is produced. A free action is as much an event as a necessitated one, and therefore is as truly an object of foresight, which foresight cannot change the nature of the action, or of the process through which it issues because the simple knowledge of an action, whether present, past or future, has no influence upon it of any kind. Freedom or constraint, contingency or necessity, determine the nature of the action, and the rewardableness or demerit of the agent. *Certainty* in the divine mind stands there opposed, not to the contingency of the action, but to doubtfulness as to his own prescience of the result. The most certain knowledge has nothing in it which, from its nature, can control an action in any way, unless it should lead the being endowed with it to adopt measures to influence the action, and then it becomes a question, not of foreknowledge, but of *power* and *influence*, which wholly changes the affair.

It is decided by the word of God, that men who perish might have "chosen life, "*I would have gathered you as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not.*" But it is said that the will is swayed by motives; that motives arise from circumstances; that circumstances are

ordered by a power above us, and beyond our control; and that therefore, our volitions necessarily follow an order and chain of events appointed and decreed by infinite wisdom. Then it would be "I would not and ye could not."

The notion inculcated is, that motives influence the will just as a weight thrown into an even scale inclines the beam. This is the favorite metaphor used. But to make the comparison good, the will should be proved to be as passive as the balance, that the distinction between mind and matter should be annihilated. Motives are not physical causes, as weight thrown into a scale: but *reasons* of choice, *views* and *conceptions* of things in the mind, which themselves do not work as a machine, but in consideration of which *the mind itself* wills and determines. But if the mind itself were obliged to determine by the strongest motive, as the beam is to incline by the heaviest weight, it would be obliged to determine always by the best reason; for motive being but a reason of action considered in the mind, then the best reason being in the nature of things the strongest must always predominate. But this is contrary to fact; if not, all men would act reasonably. The weaker reason however, often succeeds when appetite and corrupt affections are present; that is the weaker motive. If this be not allowed, we must say, that under the influence of appetite the weaker reason always appears the strongest, which is also untrue otherwise, there

would be no sins committed against *Judgment*, and this we know to be false. It is admitted that the mind wills and acts generally under the influence of motives. But were we to admit that present reasons or motives operate irresistably upon the will, the necessary connection between motive and volition would not be established ; unless it could be proved that we have no power to displace one motive by another, nor to control those circumstances from which motives flow. Yet, may not a person shun evil company and thereby avoid many temptations ? either this must be allowed, as a certain writer observed, or else it must be a link in the necessary chain of events fixed by a superior power that we should seek not fly evil company ; and so the exhortations " when sinners entice thee consent thou not," and " go not in to the way of sinners," are very impertinent and only prove that Solomon was no philosopher. But if man cannot control, and avoid the force of motives why does he resist the same temptation at one time and yield to it at another without any visible change in the circumstance ? He can moreover change his circumstances by shunning evil company. He sometimes resists a powerful temptation, the same as a powerful motive, and at another yields to a feeble one, and knows that he does so ; it is ample proof that there is an irregularity and corruptness in the self-determining active power of the mind, independant of motive.

Again, the motive or reason for an action may be bad, and yet prevail; as a better one is not present to lead to a contrary result: but is it not often the true cause why a better reason or stronger motive is not present, that we have lived thoughtless and vain lives. little considering the good or evil of things? If so then the thoughtless might be more thoughtfull, and the ignorant might have acquired better knowledge, and thereby have placed themselves under the influence of stronger and better motives.

PROVIDENCE.

No. XII.

Providence includes two things the preservation and government of all things.

Preservation is the keeping of things in existence. Government respects the conduct of his creatures.

It is reasonable to suppose that God who is infinite in his perfections, would not dismiss from his care, the objects which he has made. As he is omniscient the minutest objects must be as well known to him as the greatest and his power is adequate to preserve all things.

Reason and revelation exhibit God to us as the guardian of all that live, as caring for the meanest of them. But as he is a God of justice he must exercise a moral government over his creatures. He will not permit them to go on without interfering to restrain or to encourage, to reward or to punish

them ; and so control the results of their conduct as to promote the ultimate end of his administration.

2. The providence of God is manifest from the dependant nature of creatures. He not only created them, but sustains them by the same power ; the continued existence of the universe is proof of a Providence.

Hence the declaration of an Apostle, that our savior, who is God, "upholds all things by the word of his power." The order maintained in the universe is proof in favour of providence.

The revolutions of the heavenly bodies are performed in their appointed times, notwithstanding the boundless regions which their orbits embrace. The operations of this machinery are conducted with such regularity that they are subject of calculation. The seasons succeed each other in their order. The earth continues to bring forth its produce. It may be said that order in the universe may be accounted for by the laws of nature, without an interposition of the Deity. But a *law* in its primary signification is a rule established and enforced by authority, and implies intelligence and power : when it is transferred to inanimate objects, there is a change of the sense. It then signifies merely the stated regular order in which they are found to subsist. The laws of nature then are the particular modes in which God exerts his power, which being uniform, are accounted nature.

In proof of a providence we find the two following

facts related by Dr. Dick. The first is the proportion between the sexes, which are so well balanced, that, if there be any difference, it is on the side of the males: provisions being thus made for the greater waste of them, by the various accidents to which they are exposed by sea and by land. The other fact referred to is the variety in the human countenance. Its features are few, but they are so wonderfully altered and combined, that, in a million of men, you shall not find two men exactly alike. If the faces of all men were alike or if instances of this kind were frequent, much inconvenience and confusion would ensue. Imposition would be daily practiced; opportunities would be offered of prying into the secrets of others of entering into their houses, of assaulting them when they have no suspicion, of committing innumerable crimes with facility, and of eluding discovery. No reason can be assigned for this distinction but the will and power of God who has provided for the safety of mankind.

The relation of Providence to the freedom of Man.

In considering the government of God we must admit the freedom and accountability of man; and in considering the agency of man we must admit the government of God.

The deity has not assigned man to a destiny independent of his will; neither has he given him faculties to will and act and then left him to his own destruction. He has not only given him these

faculties, but has granted him inducements to obedience and restraint against an opposite course. God has given man a conscience and the light of religion to distinguish between good and evil. He has commanded him to choose the good and shun the evil. When man violates this command he feels the lashing of conscience, and its attendant punishment. The intemperate man brings upon himself disgrace, poverty and woe, a fearful warning to transgressors. But it is not consonant with reason or scripture to suppose God excites man to run into this wretchedness. Says Dr. Dick, "When God is said to tempt man there is no difficulty, because this word may be used in a good or in a bad sense. It is used in a good sense, when the scripture says that "God did tempt Abraham;" for the meaning is that by commanding him to offer in sacrifice his only son, upon whose life the performance of the promises depended; he made trial of his faith and gave him an opportunity of manifesting it, to the glory of divine grace and his own honor, as well as for an example to succeeding generations. It is used in a bad sense when it expresses the methods employed to entice men to sin; and to apply it to God in this sense, would be blasphemy; "Let no man say, when he is tempted, I am tempted of God; for God cannot be tempted with evil, neither tempteth he any man." What shall we make of the following words? "If the prophet be deceived when he hath spoken a thing,

I the Lord have deceived that prophet." After the remarks already made, we cannot suppose that strong as this language is, it imports that God had actually deceived him; but it must be understood to mean, that, if the idolotrous Jews, who are mentioned in the context, had consulted a person calling himself a prophet, and he, fancying himself to be what he pretended, and imposed upon by his own imagination, had delivered a prediction which prove to be false. God was to be considered as having a righteous hand in this transaction, and making use of the presumption of this man to punish his rebellious people. God had deceived him, because he had permitted him to be the dupe of his own pretensions, and refused to impart to him a true revelation as he had formerly done to Belaam for a particular purpose.

"But we hear similar language employed by a true prophet with respect to himself; "O Lord said Jeremiah, thou hast deceived me and I was deceived." To evade the difficulty the words have been rendered, "Thou hast allured me and I was allured." It was thou who didst persuade me to undertake the prophetic office; it was by thy powerful influence upon my mind, that my reluctance was overcome, and I consented to engage in it, notwithstanding the opposition and dangers which I foresaw as the consequences of doing my duty. Without changing the translation, the words may be explained hypothetically. If I have been deceiv-

ed as my enemies allege, who do not acknowledge me to be a true prophet, I have been deceived by thee, by whom I was called to the office. But the latter being impossible, the former was not true, and consequently the charges against Jeremiah as if he had spoken lies, terminated upon God who had sent him. If neither of these views of the words should be deemed satisfactory, we may set them down to the account of human infirmity.

Perhaps they were uttered by Jeremiah, when his mind was ruffled by the contradictions and reproaches of his countrymen; and if this is the true state of the case, whatever is their meaning, he alone is answerable for it.

They are a rash and unjust charge against God, similar to that which was made by that peevish and irritable prophet Jonah, who presumed to say, in answer to the question of his maker, "Dost thou well to be angry?—I do well to be angry, even unto death."

"It is easy to apply these observations to other passages which speak of the agency of God in the sinful actions of men, as when he threatened "to take David's wives, and give them to his neighbors, who should lie with them in the sight of the sun," and when he is said to have "bidden Shimei curse him," "to have put a lying spirit into the mouths of Ahab's prophets." and "to have turned the hearts of the Egyptians to hate his people, and to deal subtilly with his servants." Some allowance should

be made, for the oriental style, which admits a boldness of expression, not so suitable to the more correct and philosophical languages of the west. When transferred into our language without qualifications, it conveys ideas different from those which were intended by the original writers. Hence, I cannot but think that those Divines have greatly erred who imagine that scripture authorised them to make use of the strongest and harshest terms in speaking of this mysterious subject. It would have been wise, since nothing is more certain than that God is not the author of sin, to have carefully avoided every term which seemed to lead to this impious conclusion." When God is said to harden the hearts and blind the minds of persons no more is meant than that he permits them to be so on account of their previous wickedness.

In scripture, the work of blinding the mind is moreover attributed to the agency of Satan. "The God of this world" says Paul 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 into them."

We would candidly enquire how God, without being the author of sin could excite men to blaspheme his name? how could he excite man to count the blood of the covenant, an unholy thing, and do despite unto the spirit of grace? Notwithstanding man violates the commands of God yet he will so overrule the results of his actions as to promote his own glory and the good of his saints.

Finally the providence of God extends to all his works.

“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. Fear ye not therefore, ye are of more value then many sparrows.” “Consider the lillies of the field how they grow.” “If God so clothe the grass of the field which to day is, and tomorrow is cast into the oven, shall he not much more clothe you?”

It is objected against the doctrine of Providence, that there are many things inconsistent with the wisdom and benevolence of an almighty Ruler of the world, viz. all the physical evils existing in the works of creation; the bareness of many places of the earth, the abundance of weeds and noxious plants; and also the calamities to which mankind are exposed.

In disposing of this objection we must take into the account the moral character of our species. As this world is a rebellious province we should not wonder should there be tokens of the displeasure of its Ruler. Still goodness is exercised to creatures, who being sinful are unworthy of it, God is not only wise and benevolent, but he is just and will punish offenders that the authority of his law may be maintained. These things then, prove the doctrine of Providence. The scripture teach us that God does not approve of the conduct of rebellious man; for it is said curst is the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all

the days of thy life. Thorns also and thistles shall it bring forth to thee; and thou shalt eat of the herb of the field. In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground.

MORAL AGENCY.

No. XIII.

In considering this subject, it is important to distinguish between a mere free agent and a moral agent. The inferior animals are free agents. They are capable of willing and acting; yet no one ever thought of holding them up to public censure or approbation,

“He is a moral agent” says Watson “who is capable of performing moral actions; and an *action* is rendered *moral* by two circumstances,—that it is *voluntary*—and that it has respect to some *rule* which determines it to be good or evil.

“The terms found in all languages, and the laws which have been enacted in all states with accompanying penalties, as well as the praise or dispraise which men in all ages have expressed respecting the conduct of each other, sufficiently show, that man has always been considered as an agent actually performing, or capable of performing moral actions, for as such he has been treated.

“The rules by which the moral quality of actions has been determined are however, not those only which have been embodied in the legislation of civil communities. Many actions would be judged good

or evil, were all civil codes abolished and others are daily condemned or approved in the judgment of mankind, which are not of a kind to be recognised by public laws. Of the moral nature of human actions there must have been a perception in the minds of men, previous to the enactment of laws. Upon this common perception all law is founded, and claims the consent and support of society, for in all human legislative codes there is an express or tacit appeal to principles previously acknowledged, as reasons for their enactment."

God has made man capable of acting in different and opposite ways as he might will or determine. If this be denied then man is not a free agent and, of course not accountable for his actions. But since he is accountable it is evident that he has the power to will and act. It is not the object of the present discussion to show that a state of indifference is necessary to willing and acting; nor that the will has any power to will, but that the mind, the man himself has this power; and when he wills and acts wrong he is punished for it. It is not denied that man is influenced by motives. If there were no motives there would be no reasons of choice. But to say he must act according to every motive presented, is absurd. If he must so act, he must always yield to the strongest motive, which is contrary to experience. The reasons or motives which God presents to do good are certainly stronger than those which Satan present to do evil. Yet

man often rejects the former and yields to the latter. And it does not help the matter to say, it appears to him that he yields to the best reason, the same as the strongest motives, he knows better when he does so. Unless by repeated sins his conscience has become seared.

Here is the guilt that he has power to reject bad motives and yield to good ones and he does not do it. It is, indeed not denied that creatures may lose the power to will that which is morally good. Such must have been the state of man, had he been left wholly to the consequences of the fall.

The power of the mind is not destroyed, but is brought so completely under the dominion of a corrupt nature, as not to be *morally* capable of choosing any thing but evil. If man is not in this condition, it is owing to that "grace of God" which is the result of the free gift bestowed upon all men; but that the power to choose that which is good, in some respects, and as a first step to the entire and exclusive choice of good in the highest degree, is in man's possession, must be certainly concluded from the calls so often made upon him in the word of God to change his conduct, and in order to this, his will. "Hear, ye deaf, and see, ye blind," is the exhortation of a prophet. While this declaration charges both spiritual deafness and blindness upon the Jews, it supposes a power existing in them, both of opening the eyes and unstopping the ears. Such are the exhortations to repentance and faith

addressed to sinners, and the threatenings consequent upon continued impenitence and unbelief, which equally supposes a power of considering, willing and acting in all things adequate to the commencement of a religious course. From what ever source it may be derived, and no other can be assigned to it consistently with the scriptures than the grace of God, this power must be experienced to the full extent of the call and the obligation to these duties. A power of choosing only to do evil, and of remaining impenitent, cannot be reconciled to such exhortations. This would be a mockery of men and a mere show of equitable government on the part of God, without any correspondant to this appearance of equity in point of fact. It is true that men, by repeated acts of wickedness, at first easily avoided, form in themselves habits to which the mind opposes a decreasing influence as they acquire strength. In this way they render themselves less and less capable of choosing good. Such are approaching the character of those mentioned in the epistle to the Hebrews whom it is impossible to renew unto repentance." Yet they are justly chargeable for the present state of their wills because their first departure was from a deliberate choice which, they might have prevented. Still there is hope so long as they are disposed to repent and forsake their sins.

But men cannot be culpable for coming into

the world with a fallen nature, this they could not help. It is on account of their actually willing and practising, evil that they come into condemnation. It is not denied, that the will in its natural state and independent of all grace communicated to man through Christ, can incline only to evil; but the question is, whether it is so left? The argument is, that an act which has the consent of the will is punishable, although the will can only choose evil; we reply, that this is only true where the time of trial is past, as in devils and apostates; and then only, because these are personally guilty of having so vitiated their wills as to render them incapable of good. But the case of men who have fallen by the fault of another, and who are still in a state of trial, is one totally different. The sentence is passed upon devils, and it is as good as past upon such apostates as the apostle describes in the Epistle to the Hebrews; but the mass of mankind are still probationers, and are appointed to be judged according to their works, whether good or evil. We deny, then, first, that they are, in any case, left without the power of willing good; and we deny it on the authority of scripture. For in no sense can life and death be set before us, in order that we may "choose life," if man is wholly left by the grace of God, and if he remains under his natural, and, (but for the grace of God given to all mankind,) his invincible inclination to evil."

We may notice several particulars which con-

firm us in the belief that man has the power of willing to do a thing or not to do it.

1st. God has so constituted us as to believe that we can act in different and opposite ways. Every one is conscious of it: and this belief comes upon us with irresistible power. If God has deceived us in this, he may have deceived us in other things. Those actions which he has made us believe to be virtuous may be vicious, and those which he has made us believe to be wicked and abominable may in fact be virtuous. But the mind revolts at such an idea of God.

2. The scripture show that man has the power of willing and acting, "Turn ye, turn ye, for why will ye die?" Such is the language of the Bible respecting man.

3. It is evident he has the power to will from the fact that he is punished when he wills to do wrong. This shows that he was under obligation, and had the power to take a different course. If from the first motives of themselves irresistibly carry the will away, man cannot prevent it and is not culpable, consequently the punishment would not come upon him but upon the motives which is absurd. Man is punished because he is guilty and not because he merely appears to be guilty. It is objected that God works in you to will and to do of his own good pleasure. But this respects those who are to work out their own salvation with fear and trembling; and it is great consolation to every

seeking inquirer feeling his helplessness to struggle against his perverse nature that God appears in his behalf, subjects his carnal inclinations and brings peace to his mind. But there are others concerning whom it is said "ye are of your Father the Devil and his works ye will do." Now it would be blasphemy to say that God works in man to will and to do the works of the devil. If he does, how can we account for the declarations of God's *hatred* to sin, and for his own express declaration that "he *willeth* not the death of him that dieth." Even his most mysterious proceedings are called "judgment;" and he is said to work all things "according to the *counsel* of his own *will*," a collation of words, which sufficiently show that not blind will, but will subject to counsel," is that sovereign will of God, who is an impartial judge, guided in all things by invariable justice.

NO. XIV.

NATURAL AND MORAL ABILITY AND INABILITY.

This subject is so intimately connected with the preceding, we need not enter into a lengthy discussion of it.

We are said to be naturally able to do a thing, when we have the opportunities and requisite faculties to perform such actions: and we are morally

unable when we have no disposition for the performance. We are morally able when we have the disposition, and naturally unable when we have not the opportunities and requisite faculties.

When we are invited to come to Christ there appears to me no necessity of making this distinction between natural ability and moral ability. If we have what is called natural ability it is certainly necessary that we have moral ability in order to accomplish the object.

It is a fact that we have by nature neither the one nor the other, for by nature we are the children of wrath. "The whole head is sick and the whole heart faint. From the sole of the foot even unto the head there is no soundness in it." Is. 1. 5, 6.

This natural ability so called, which we have of coming to Christ is all owing to the foundation laid in Zion for our redemption. This ability must be attributed not to nature, but to grace, it follows then that we have not natural ability to be a christian. It is the grace of God which enlightens our consciences, informs our judgment and opens the way for escape from sin to holiness. For the grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men, teaching us, that denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly in the present world."

Now when we say that every man in a state of probation has the power of willing and acting in

reference to christianity, we always take into view this grace "that hath appeared to all men." Christ said of the comforter," when he is come he will reprove the *world* of sin and of righteousness, and of judgment : moreover our Savior himself is that true Light "which lighteth *every* man that cometh into the world.

NO. XV.

NATURE OF HOLINESS AND OF SIN.

Holiness and sin may be predicated of voluntary exercises. If a person is not voluntary in doing good, there is no virtue in his conduct. If he is not voluntary in committing sin, nothing vicious can be ascribed to him.

Holiness and sin cannot be predicated of anything except the voluntary *exercises* and *actions* of *moral agents*. Moral agents are beings endowed with reason and conscience, thus made capable of distinguishing between right and wrong ; and herein they differ from the brutes. The latter are voluntary in their actions, yet they are not considered holy or sinful.

God has commanded man to love him. Now his affections in order to be holy or sinful, must be voluntary, or at least of a complex nature, (i. e.) in part voluntary. God would not command his

creatures to do a thing unless they have, in some way or other, had the means of complying.

It is said that some are totally ignorant of their duty, and will their doing wrong make it right? But let us examine the ground of this ignorance. If it has been accumulated by neglecting previous known duty, then they are chargeable not only for disobedience at the time, but for the very ignorance in which they are involved. But if this ignorance is not owing to their own fault, then they will be judged according to the light which they enjoy.

It is important here to consider what is *the standard of right*. Some suppose that *it is founded in the will of God*.

But it is more proper to say that God wills to do as he does, because it is right, rather than to say that a thing is right, because he wills it to be so.

The doctrine *that Right is founded in the will of God*, supposes, that *that, which is now Right, became such, because God willed it to be so; and had he not willed it to be so, it would not have been Right*.

If virtue and vice are such, only because God willed them to be such, then he might have willed virtue to be vice, and that which is now vice, he might have willed to be virtue, and according to this, vice in itself, is just as excellent as virtue, and virtue just as worthless as vice. The scriptures will decide the point. It is said in Hebrews vi. 18. *that it is impossible for God to lie*. If it now is impossible for God to lie; it has been always impos-

sible. If truth and falsehood are in their own nature indifferent, then it was once just as easy for God to lie as to speak the truth. But as this is absurd, falsehood must be totally odious in itself, and truth altogether desirable.

We come then to consider that the *foundation of virtue, is in the nature of things.*

Virtue is an eternal principle. It is a part of God's own nature. The scriptures affirm that God is love. He is also holiness, goodness, justice and truth. Our Savior says, I am the way, the truth, &c.

Holiness may be resolved into disinterested benevolence, which is to love God with all our heart, and our neighbor as ourselves.

Sin may be resolved into selfishness, which is to have an inordinate love for ourselves regardless of love to God, and of the happiness of our fellow men.

1st. Then, *holiness is a disinterested principle.* The mind possessing holiness exercises it without any partiality for its own enjoyment. The man who has such a mind, is active and imitates his Savior, who went about doing good.

2d. *This principle is One.*

By this it is meant that a virtuous man exercises the same love toward God, toward his fellow creatures and toward himself. The affection is one. The difference in its exercises arises from the difference of its objects. We are to love God supremely, with the utmost complacency, because of

his importance. We are to love our neighbor as ourselves, as sustaining a rank inferior to that of God. We can regard him with complacency so far as he is virtuous. If he is wicked, we can look upon him with benevolence.

Whatever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so unto them ; for this is the law and the Prophets.

It is our duty to love our enemies.

For if ye love them that love you, what thank have ye ?- for sinners also love those that love them. But love ye your enemies ; and do good, and lend, hoping for nothing again ; and your reward shall be great ; and ye shall be the children of the highest, for he is kind to the unthankful and to the evil.

But selfishness is a disposition to do good to others for the sake of gaining good at their hands, or to do good to them, merely because they benefit us.

It is objected *that if we are required to love others as ourselves ; we are, of course, required also to do as much for them as for ourselves ; to make the same provision for their wants, and to take the same effectual care of their concerns.* To this I would answer that it cannot be our duty to perform what is, and always has been impossible for us to do. This fact must be admitted. Our active beneficence is excluded from a great portion of our race, on account of their distance from us. It is excluded from many around us on account of their numbers. We ought however to exercise a benevolent spirit toward all, and pray for them.

But if all interests, and duties were thrown together in a mass, the concerns would be immense ; the mind of man could not comprehend them. In consequence of our want of capacity to comprehend, and arrange these concerns, they would lie in a state of universal confusion. And the ruin of all would be the inevitable consequence. Thus the foundation, of *disinterested benevolence* would be entirely destroyed.

On the *principle of division of labor*, much more can be done, and in a much better manner. "One man for example "says a distinguished writer," to whom the whole business of making so simple a thing as a *pin*, was allotted, could hardly finish twenty in a day. Ten men, dividing the several parts of the business among them, can easily finish more than forty-eight thousand. What is true of this subject is true, in different degrees, of all human business ; and extends to the ship, the manufactory, and the farm, with an influence generally the same.

Let us observe the wisdom of God, in dividing the business of mankind, by separating them into families. In this way he has so distributed their business that each has a share which he can easily manage with success. On this principle labor becomes interesting, and of course he accomplishes much more than he would, were he compelled by force. It is justly said that, "a single family, at the head of one hundred slaves, will easily consume all that is

produced by the labor of those slaves : while that of an equal number of free men would amply support five and twenty families." In families, endearing relations are formed, a foundation laid for more successful efforts in the religious and literary education of children, for training them up in the way they should go. Families thus cultivated, are prepared to combine and extend their benevolent operations ; and in a similar manner, neighborhoods, communities and nations may act. Now if we throw aside these means of discipline in families, we strike at the very root of all good society, civil and religious.

2ndly. It is objected *that we are commanded to seek eternal life, as the proper reward of our faith and obedience ; and that this reward is promised to those who believe and obey, by God himself. This it is said makes virtue mercenary, mean and selfish.* It is declared that *to those who by patient continuance in well doing seek for glory, honor and immortality, God will render as a reward, eternal life.* It must then be pleasing to God, that we seek for glory, honor, and immortality, and of course, such conduct must be eminently virtuous. *There is joy in heaven saith our Savior, over one sinner that repenteth, more than over ninety and nine just persons who need no repentance.*

If then we are sinners, it is our duty to repent that this joy may be increased, and if we are to love our neighbor as ourselves, we ought certainly

to seek our own happiness. If it is not right to seek eternal life for ourselves, of course, it is not our duty to seek, that others may enjoy eternal life; for we are not required to love our neighbor better than ourselves. Now if we neglect to seek eternal life for ourselves and others, where is the *virtue* in such conduct, such a course of proceeding cannot be pleasing to God, for *he has no pleasure* in the death of the sinner; but *would rather, that he would repent and live.* He hath commanded all men, *every where to repent.*

We must be careful to distinguish between *disinterestedness* and *uninterestedness*. To be *disinterested*, is to be *without a selfish interest*. To be *uninterested* is to have *no interest* at all, in any thing.

We should labor either directly or indirectly, for the entire conversion of the world.

The spirit of benevolence would do justice to all men.

Justice is either *commutative* or *distributive*. Distributive justice is *the rendering of such rewards as are due to those who obey law and government, and of such punishments as are due to those who disobey and rebel.*

Commutative justice is *rendering an equivalent for what we receive, whether of property or kind offices.*

The language of scripture, should be our motto, "*owe no man any thing.*" Were this command universally observed, what a change of things would follow! every promise faithfully fulfilled! every

debt paid at the time! every article of property sold at its real value! every person permitted to enjoy undisturbed the blessings which Providence has bestowed upon him. In this state of things there would be no need of gaols and prisons. We should strive for universal peace. *Holiness to the Lord* should be written on all we do.

NO. XVI.INTRODUCTION OF SIN.

Man introduced sin into the world by his own disobedience. Here it is evident that man had the power of willing, and acting in a different manner. He had the power to yield obedience, or a holy and just God would never have punished him for disobedience. From the extent of this punishment let us observe how aggravated and inconsistent was man's conduct.

God placed the strongest motives before him to obey: but here is a sad instance where man rejected the stronger motives and yielded to the weaker ones, viz. to the motives which satan presented. Here then it is false that the will is always as the strongest motive.

It is said that there are two kinds of motives, external and internal; external motives being objects presented to the view of man, to operate on the will; internal motives being the feelings or affec-

tions of the mind, which bend the will to a certain class of external motives or objects.

Now it is said when man yields to weaker external motives it is owing to internal motives, which being united to the weaker make them the strongest, and therefore must carry off the will. Now if this has always been the case with man, he never could have prevented taking the course which he has taken, and consequently would never have been guilty for any of his conduct. But how was it in the case of Adam? - There was no sinful internal motives, to unite with the weaker motives which satan presented, and thus make them the strongest.

There was nothing sinful in the mind of Adam to incline him to commit the first sin; this would be a supposition that sin existed before the first sin, which is a plain contradiction. All the internal motives were on the other side, in favor of the stronger external motives; and yet Adam yielded to the weaker motives which satan presented and rejected the stronger motives which God presented; and this was man's unreasonable conduct, and his enormous guilt and condemnation.

We do not say that man can choose without motives, but when presented they do not compel him to choose. He is permitted to consider and determine to choose for himself, and on this ground rests his responsibility.

NO. XVII.

STATE OF MAN BEFORE THE FALL,

When God made the heavens and the earth and the beasts of the field, he did not leave the world to be inhabited only by animals possessed of no higher powers than instincts and the external senses. But we find it peopled by a nobler race, who see God in the objects which surround them and are led by his goodness to acknowledge him.

Man was created on the sixth day, Having made "the beast of the earth after his kind, and cattle after their kind, and every thing that creepeth upon the earth after his kind," God said "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness; and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth. So God created man in his own image. in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them."

The body of man was made of the dust, or of the earth, hence he was called Adam.

Though his body was formed of such humble materials yet it exhibited the wisdom and goodness of God, it became the dwelling of an immortal

soul. "I will praise thee" says the Psalmist, "for I am fearfully and wonderfully made: marvellous are thy works: and that my soul knoweth right well." "It is only in a secondary sense" says Dr Dick. "that the body of man is said to have been created. It was not made of nothing, but pre-existing matter; but equal power was necessary to produce out of that matter, flesh, and blood, and bones. When the body of man was fashioned, "The Lord God," says the sacred historian breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul." The language is figurative; for breathing cannot be literally ascribed to God, who is not a corporeal being. The words import at least, that God caused the air to enter into his body, that its several parts might begin their functions, the lungs to respire, the heart to beat, and the blood to circulate. But although this process may be considered as mechanical, we know that it cannot be carried on merely by mechanical causes. If a body be dead, the introduction of air into the lungs will not set them and the other parts of the system in motion. A living principle is wanted, distinct from the body, upon which its operations depend as the motion of a machine constructed by human skill is caused by something different from the machine, as water or steam, or wind. Hence although we may not be able to prove, that breathing into man the breath of life necessarily implies the communication of this principle, yet the case re-

quires us to understand the words in this sense, especially as the effect is said to have been, that man became a living soul, as we know that the nature of man is compound, consisting of a soul as well as a body, and no mention is made of the former in any other part of the narrative, we may reasonably conclude that Moses, who certainly would not omit a particular of so much importance, here refers to its creation. The body which was made of dust, is plainly distinguished from the soul, when the wise man informs us, that at death, "the dust returns to the earth as it was, and the spirit returns to God who gave it," Eccl. 12. 7.

The living soul of man was created, in the proper sense of the term. It is not a quality, but a substance: and as it did not previously exist, it must have been produced out of nothing by the Father of spirits. These two constituent parts of human nature were joined together by an invisible and mysterious tie."

Adam having been created "there was not found an help-meet for him. And the Lord God caused a deep sleep to come over Adam, and he slept; and he took one of his ribs, and closed up the flesh instead thereof. And the rib which the Lord God had taken from man, made he a woman, and brought her unto the man. And Adam 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.

We now proceed to consider what is meant by Adam's being made in the image, and after the likeness of God.

When it is said that "God made man upright," reference is not had to his erect posture: but to the state of his mind. We may conceive the image of God to consist in the essence of the human soul, resembling the Divine essence in spirituality. The image of God cannot refer to the body because that is composed of matter, and God is not material. But the soul is immortal, capable of thought and activity. In this it resembles its Divine Author. The image of God in which Adam's was made, is visible in his superiority over other creatures. "Let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth." It may be safely considered, that man was at liberty to employ the inferior creatures for such purposes as an innocent being could desire to accomplish.

2. The image of God very properly consisted in the qualities of his soul, which were similar to the perfections of Deity.

The Apostle, addressing christians respecting their restoration to the state from which Adam fell, says, "Ye have put on the new man, which is re-

newed in knowledg after the image of Him that created him;" further "Put on the new man; which after God, is created in righteousness and true holiness."

In man's primeval state, his understanding was endowed with all necessary knowledge. There are two extremes to be avoided in speaking upon this subject.

Some represents him as a child in understanding, and maintain that he was left to acquire wisdom by degrees, in the exercise of his faculties upon the objects around him. But this opinion is at variance with scripture which affirms that he was created in the image of God, of which knowledge was a constituent part. It is rational to believe that all the knowledge, which was necessary in his circumstances, was at once infused into his mind.

Others represent his knowledge as almost equal to that of angels, and our first parent having been acquainted with all the arts and sciences which have been slowly acquired by his posterity. The truth lies between these extremes. He was not so ignorant as the former affirm, nor so enlightened as the latter would represent. He possessed, however, all the knowledge that was necessary to him as an intelligent and moral agent. We have reason to believe that his faculties were stronger and more active then those of any of his children: and it may be inferred, from his naming the inferior creatures when they passed in review

before him, that his acquaintance with natural objects was extensive and accurate. But the knowledge which chiefly distinguished him in his original state, and was an essential part of the divine image, was the knowledge of God, and his will, of every thing which it was necessary for him to know, in order to fulfil the end of his creation. He knew his relation to his maker; he knew the duty which he owed to him; he knew what he had to fear from sin, and what to hope from obedience. It may be justly called perfect knowledge, because it was accurate and full. Knowledge absolutely perfect is omniscience, which a creature is never able to possess. But man was not ignorant of any thing in which he was concerned; he did not, in a single instance, suppose good to be evil or evil to be good; he was sensible of his dependence upon God, who was his true guide, and who was always ready to grant to him such new discoveries as might be conducive to his happiness. More knowledge he might have acquired, by natural means or revelation, if he had continued in innocence, but his present knowledge was sufficient for his present condition.

Lastly. The Divine image consisted in the rectitude of man's will, He was fully disposed to the performance of his duty, or to act according to the light which he enjoyed. As he was a moral agent, it is certain that his will was Free; and that it was so is manifest from the event; for he did wander

from the path of duty, and made a choice which proved fatal, "God made man upright, but they have sought out many inventions."

But man in his state of innocence was averse to evil, and inclined to good; but he might reject the good and choose the evil,

Laws to which man was subject.

When the law of Moses was given engravened on tables of stone, *Law* was not then *first* introduced into the world. Men were accounted righteous or wicked between the giving of the law and the flood, and before the flood, and were dealt with accordingly. Noah was a righteous man, and the violence and wickedness of the old world were the causes of its destruction. Abel was righteous and Cain was wicked. Now as the moral quality of actions is determined by law, and as the bestowment of rewards and punishments supposes the administration of law; men were under a law up to the time of the fall, which law according to the reasoning of scripture, pre supposes the two great commandments. That our first parents were under a law, is evident from their history in the garden; but, though only one particular command was given in the form of a prohibition, we should not conclude that this was the compass of their requirements or measure of their obedience. Says Wesley "The law of God, speaking of the manner of men, is a copy of the eternal mind, a transcript of the Divine nature; yea, it is the fairest offspring of

the everlasting Father, the brightest efflux of his essential wisdom, the visible beauty of the most High; the original idea of truth and good; which ever lodged in the uncreated mind from eternity." It is "holy just and good."

NO. XVIII.

TOTAL DEPRAVITY.

In considering the doctrine of total depravity, it is proper to notice the circumstances and temptations to which man yielded, by which act he came into this fallen state. Man was created a free agent, a proper subject of command, and was placed under the law of his creator, the knowledge of which was immediately infused into his mind. Had Adam exerted the power which he possessed, he would have stood. God had done all for him which justice or goodness required; the failure was wholly on the part of Adam. This law was virtually the same with that which was afterwards engraven upon the two tables of stone, and is in every age the standard of duty.

He was bound to yield obedience to all the precepts of the law, and was furnished with sufficient powers for complying. God was pleased however, to sum up his obedience in one point, without loosening the obligation of the other precepts. It is thus related by Moses; "And the Lord God commanded the man, saying, of every tree of the gar-

den thou mayest freely eat ; but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it ; for in the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die."

Though the law given to man was easy, he soon broke it. The fact is related by Moses ; " Now the serpent was more subtile than any beast of the field which the Lord God had made. And he said unto the woman, yea, hath God said, ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden ? And the woman said unto the serpent, we may eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden, but of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, God hath said, ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die. And the serpent said unto the woman, ye shall not surely die : For God doth know, that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyesshall be opened, and ye shall be as Gods, knowing good and evil. And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise, she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat ; and gave also unto her husband with her, and he did eat." This passage is considered by some as an allegorical representation of the origin of moral evil. They have nothing however to guide them but mere conjecture and differ very much in their explanations. " There seems" says Dr. Dick, " to be no reason for deviating from the literal sense,* (which is favored by

*The more plausible opinion is, that the cunning of the literal ser-

other passages of scripture,) notwithstanding some difficulties which occur in the narrative. The chief difficulty consists in what is said of the serpent. There is no doubt, that the animal known by that name, was employed in the temptation of our first parents, but it may seem incredible that it should have uttered articulate sounds, as it was destitute of reason, and the gift of speech is known to be the peculiar attribute of man. The only solution of the difficulty is to suppose, that the invisible agent in the temptation," who is called satan, "was permitted to cause such vibrations of the air, by means of the organs of the serpent, or in its mouth, as made the woman hear the words already recited. The serpent had no knowledge of what was spoken and attached no meaning to the words which it uttered; they were properly the words of the superior being, who used it as his instrument. No man should say that the thing was impossible, unless he can prove that it was impossible for a superior being, with divine permission, so to move the air, that it should convey such sounds to the ear as he pleased: and every doubt should be superceded by the authority of Moses."

Though man was created holy and upright, endowed with sufficient powers, to remain in his state of purity, yet he consented to yield to the temptation.

The immediate consequences of the fall, in relation to our first parents were. 1st. "Their eyes pent and the mongrel manner in which he lived were metaphorically applied to Satan in seducing and in enduring the curse.

were opened, and they knew that they were naked." They found themselves in a state of spiritual death. The soul which was the residence of the spirit of God, was now desolate. The Holy Spirit had taken its departure.

Secondly, they were subjected to all the miseries of life, and finally to death; Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return." They were moreover expelled from paradise. "And the Lord God said, behold the man is 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, to till the ground from whence he was taken, so he drove out the man; and he 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."

Thirdly, man exposed himself to eternal death. When our Lord says "he that believeth in me shall never die;" "This is the bread which cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof and not die;" he evidently refers, not to temporal, but to eternal death. The same is to be understood in many other passages. The words of Paul are worthy of particular regard; "The wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord." It is so manifest, that here, death signifies something more than the separation of the soul from the body, that there is no

perceivable room for contradiction. The death is commensurate with the life ; the gift of God is opposed to the loss which we have sustained by disobedience.

What we mean by total depravity is, that man of himself has become by nature wholly unable to do any thing good. "The whole head is sick, and the whole heart faint. From the sole of the foot even unto the head *there is* no soundness in it." It is true, reason and conscience, the higher principles of the soul, strive against the lower principles, such as appetites and passions. But this striving is all owing to the grace of God in laying a foundation for man's recovery. Had it not been for the hope of this recovery, the conscience would have been as dark and silent, as cloudy midnight. It is thought by some that the conscience without the grace of God, and as something natural discriminates between right and wrong, it being to the mind what the eye is to the body. But of what use would the eye be, if there were no light ? In order to avail anything, the conscience must have the light of religion, either natural or revealed, or both. Now this is the case. "*That* was the true light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world." "The grace of God which bringeth salvation hath appeared unto all men." Through this grace they are rendered capable of choosing eternal life.

The spirit of man embraces the higher principles of the soul, such as reason and conscience. When

the divine spirit is admitted into the heart; he communicates himself to man's spirit, and then man is called spiritual. "The spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit that we are the children of God." Rom. 8. 16. In this state of mind, the higher principles have the ascendancy over the lower ones, the appetites and passions. But while man resists the divine spirit, and permits the lower principles to have the ascendancy, he is called *carnal*.

Scripture Declarations on Total Depravity.

"To be carnally minded is death."

"The *carnal* mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." Rom. 8. 6. 7.

In Rom. 3. 9—18. The Apostle affirms of "both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin; As it is written, there is none righteous, no, not one: there is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God. They are all gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable, there is none that doeth good, no, not one. Their throat is an open sepulchre; with their tongues they have used deceit; the poison of asps is under their lips: Whose mouth is full of cursing and bitterness; their feet are swift to shed blood:

Destruction and misery are in their ways; and the way of peace have they not known; there is no fear of God before their eyes.

In Eph. 2. 1. 2. This state of the heart is termed, being "dead in trespasses and sins."

We shall find it definitely expressed by our Lord John 5. 42, "But I know you, that ye have not the love of God in you."

NO. XIX.

THE CONNECTION, &C.

The connection between the first sins of Adam, and the sins of his posterity.

On this subject we have the following passages from Arminius, "But the whole of this sin is not peculiar to our first parents, but is common to the whole race, and to all their posterity; who, at the time when the first sin was committed, were in their loins, and who afterward descended from them in the natural mode of propagation, according to the primitive benediction. For, in Adam, all have sinned, Rom. 5, 12. Whatever punishment, therefore, was inflicted on our first parents, has, also, pervaded all their posterity, and still oppresses them; so that all are by nature, children of wrath, Eph. ii. 31; obnoxious to condemnation and to death, temporal and eternal, Rom. 5, 12; and are, lastly, devoid of that [primeval] righteousness and holiness. With which evils they would continue oppressed forever, unless they were delivered from them by Jesus Christ; to whom be glory for ever and ever! Rom. 5, 18, 19.

The following doctrine is held by the Remon-

strants, in England. They believe, "That God, to the glory of his abundant goodness, having decreed to make man after his own image, and to give him an easy and most equal law, and add thereunto a threatening of death to the transgressors thereof, and foreseeing that Adam would wilfully transgress the same, and thereby make *himself* and his *posterity* liable to condemnation; though God was, notwithstanding, mercifully affected towards man; yet, out of respect to his justice and truth, he would not give way to his mercy to save man, till his justice should be satisfied, and his serious hatred of sin and love of righteousness should be made known."

The *condemnation*, says Watson, here spoken of, as affecting Adam and his posterity, is to be understood of more than the death of the body, as being opposed to the *salvation* procured by the sacrifice of Christ.

The doctrine of the Church of England, though often claimed as exclusively Calvinistic on this point, agrees perfectly with the view of those called Arminians. "Original sin standeth not in the following or imitation of Adam, as the Pelagians do vainly talk; but it is the fault or corruption of the nature of every man, that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam, whereby man is very far gone from original righteousness, and is, of his own nature, only inclined to evil, &c."

The Remonstrants also, "hold that a man hath

not saving faith of himself, nor from the power of his own free-will, seeing that, while he is in the state of sin, he cannot of himself, nor by himself, think, will, or do any saving good."

The same is the opinion of Arminius, respecting free-will. "It is impossible for free-will, without grace, to begin or perfect any true or spiritual good. I say the grace of Christ which pertains to regeneration is simply and absolutely necessary for the illumination of the mind, the ordering of the affections, and the inclination of the will to that which is good. It is that which operates on the mind, the affections, and the will; which infuses good thoughts into the mind, inspires good desires into the affections, and leads the will to execute good thoughts and good desires. It prevents, (goes before) accompanies, and follows. It excites, assists, works in us to will, and works with us, that we may not will in vain. It averts temptation, supports us against the flesh, the world and Satan; and in the conflict, it grants us to enjoy victory. It raises up again those who are conquered and fallen, it establishes them, and endues them with new strength, and renders them more cautious.

It begins, promotes, perfects, and consummates salvation; I confess that the mind of the natural (*animalis*) and carnal man is darkened, his affections are depraved and disordered, his will is refractory, and that the man is *dead in sins*."

We come now to consider Adam as the *head* of

the human race, who, in consequence of his fall, have fallen with him. In Romans, 5, Adam and Christ are contrasted in their federal character, and the injury which mankind have derived from the one, and the remedy, they have received from the other, are also contrasted in various particulars, which are equally represented as the effects of the "offence" of Adam, and of the "obedience" of Christ. The apostle makes use of the phrases, "the first Adam," and "the second Adam," which can only be explained on the ground, that as sin and death descended from one, so righteousness and life proceed from the other; and that what Adam is to all his natural descendants, Christ is to all his spiritual seed.

The imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity, has been a subject of great debate. In theology, it is considered as *mediate* or *immediate*. The corruption of our moral nature, and our mortality of body, in virtue of our derivation from him, is what is meant by the *mediate* imputation of his sin to us; by *immediate* imputation is meant that Adam's sin is considered ours in the sight of God, by virtue of our federal relation. To support the latter notion, Adam and his posterity are considered to constitute *one moral person*, &c. Thus it destroys the distinction between a propensity to sin, and actual sin, and confounds physical and moral union. It asserts the imputation of the actual commission of Adam's sin to his descendants, which is false;

Charges us with the full latitude of his transgression, and all its attendant circumstances; and makes us, without any actual voluntary offence, equally guilty with him. Such a doctrine must be absurd in the extreme.

There is still another view of the imputation of Adam's offence to us which appears more consistent. This is stated by Dr Watts, in his answer to Dr Taylor.

“When a man has broken the law of his country, and is punished for so doing, it is plain that *sin is imputed to him; his wickedness is upon him; he bears his iniquity*; that is, he is reputed or accounted guilty; he is condemned and dealt with as an offender.”

“But if a man, having committed treason, his estate is taken from him and his children, then they *bear the iniquity of their father*, and his sin is *imputed to them* also.

“If a man lose his life and estate for murder, and his children thereby become vagabonds; then the blood of the person murdered is said to be *upon the murderer* and *upon his children* also. So the Jews, *His blood be upon us and on our children*; let us and our children be punished for it.”

“But it may be asked, how can the acts of the parent's treason be *imputed* to his little child? Since those acts were quite out of the reach of an infant, nor was it possible for him to commit them.

I answer, “Those acts of treason or acts of ser-

vice are by a common figure said to be *imputed to the children*, when they suffer or enjoy the consequences of their father's treason, or eminent service; though the *particular actions* of treason or service, could not be practised by the children. This would easily be understood, should it occur in human history. And why not when it occurs in the sacred writings?"

"Sin is taken either for an *act of disobedience* to a law, or for the *legal result* of such an act; that is, the *guilt* or *liableness to punishment*.

Now when we say, the sin of a traitor is *imputed to his children*, we do not mean that the act of the father is charged upon the child; but that the guilt or liableness to punishment is so transferred to him that he suffers banishment or poverty on account of it."

"Thus the sin of Achan was so imputed to his children, that they were all stoned on account of it, Josh. 7, 24. In like manner, the covetousness of Gehazi was *imputed* to his posterity, 2 Kings, 5, 27. When God, by his prophet, pronounced that the leprosy should cleave unto him, and to his seed forever."

"The Scriptures, both of the Old and New Testaments, use the words *sin* and *iniquity*, (both in Hebrew and Greek) to signify not only the criminal *actions* themselves, but also the *result* and consequences of those actions, that is, the *guilt* or *liableness to punishment*; and sometimes the *punish-*

ment itself, whether it fall upon the original criminal or upon others on his account.

“Indeed, when sin or righteousness is said to be imputed to any man, on account of what himself hath done, the words usually denote both the good or evil actions themselves, and the legal result of them. But when the sin or righteousness of one person is said to be imputed to *another*, then generally those words mean only the result thereof; that is, a liableness to punishment on the one hand, and to reward on the other.”

“But let us say what we will, in order to confine the sense of the imputation of sin and righteousness to the *legal result*, the reward or punishment of good or evil actions; let us ever so explicitly deny the imputation of the *actions* themselves to others; still, Dr Taylor will level almost all his arguments against the imputation of the actions themselves, and then triumph in having demolished what we never built, and in refuting what we never asserted.”

“In the sense, then, above given,” says Watson, “we may safely contend for the imputation of Adam’s sin; and this agrees precisely with the apostle Paul, who speaks of the imputation of sin to those who had not sinned after the similitude of Adam’s transgression;” that is, to all who lived between Adam and Moses; and, consequently, to infants who personally had not offended; and also declares, that, “by one man’s disobedience, many

were made, constituted, accounted; and dealt with as sinners," and treated as though they themselves had actually sinned; for, that this is the sense, is clear from what follows: "so by the obedience of one, shall many be made righteous,"—constituted, accounted, and dealt with as such, though not actually righteous, but in fact, pardoned criminals."

There is no room for attaching sin or unrighteousness to God. "For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." Whatever blessings, temporal or spiritual we have lost on account of "Adam's transgression," have been restored to us by the "obedience of Christ;" so that, if on the whole we suffer injury, it must be on account of our own personal sins.

On account of Adam's transgression, all become liable to bodily death. Here God exhibited his justice, designed to support law as that supports government.

By means of the atonement, the sentence is reversed, not by being free from bodily death, but by a glorious resurrection. Here we see displayed both the justice, and mercy of God. While the evil of sin was still to be kept visible before the world, for its admonition, by the actual infliction of death upon all men, grace was to be manifested in making up the loss by restoration to immortality.

Again: The Divine Spirit forsook the soul of Adam, now being defiled by sin. He became

morally dead and corrupt ; and, as "that which is born of the flesh, is flesh," this is the natural state of his posterity.

This is a picture to the whole world of corruption and misery ; the awful nature of sin against God's holy law : but the Second Adam, who "is a quickening Spirit," visits him from another quarter ; the purchase of his redemption designed to infuse life into his soul.

Further : As to a future state of existence, eternal life is promised to all who believe in Christ, which reverses the sentence of eternal death. Should this mercy be rejected, man stands liable to the whole penalty. In rejecting Christ, he must reject all which was secured by the "obedience of Christ," in consequence of "Adam's transgression." He consents to all rebellion against God, to that of Adam, and to his own actual transgression ; he counts the blood of the covenant an unholy thing, and does despite to the Spirit of grace.

It is impossible to impeach the equity of the Divine government, since no man suffers any injury ultimately, by the sin of Adam, but by his own wilful obstinacy,—the grace of Christ presenting to all who believe, not only compensation for all injury sustained by Adam, but nobler blessings than were forfeited in him. Not only do adult persons receive these blessings in believing in Christ, but they are in reserve for those who

have not become guilty of actual sins. Such is the case with infants. "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." Here the sin of Adam and the merits of Christ are coextensive. As this refers to the whole human race, infants must be included.

Whatever they lost in Adam, they have reserved to them in Christ. And as they cannot be guilty of actual sins, till they are susceptible of understanding, it follows that all who die in this state are saved.

The atonement does not relieve them *immediately* from the sentence of death, but it is fully realized in the resurrection. It is not contended that children are born with a pure nature, this is evident from their being liable to death. "The free gift," says Watson, "which has come upon all men, by the righteousness of one, is said to be 'unto justification of life,' the full reversal of the penalty of death; and, by the 'abundance of grace, and of the gift of righteousness,' the benefit extends to the 'reigning in life by one, Jesus Christ.'" If the "free gift," is so given to all men, that this is the end for which it is given, then is this "justification of life," and this "reigning in life by Jesus Christ," as truly within the reach of infants dying in infancy, as within the reach of adults living to years of choice. This "free gift" is bestowed

upon "all men," *cis, in order* to justification of life; it follows then, that, in the case of infants this gift may be connected with the end for which it was given, as well as in the case of adults, or it would be given in vain; and, in fact, be in no sense whatever, a gift or benefit, standing opposed, in its results, to condemnation and death.

"Now, we know clearly by what means the "free gift," which is bestowed *in order* to justification of life, (that is, that act of God by which a sinner, under sentence of death, is adjudged to life), is connected with that end in the case of adults. The gift "comes upon them" in its effects, very largely, independent of any thing they do—in the long-suffering of God: in the instructions of the gospel; the warnings of ministers; the corrective dispensations of Providence: above all, in *preventing grace*, and the *influences of the Holy Spirit*, removing so much of their spiritual death, as to excite in them various degrees of religious feeling, and enabling them to seek the face of God, to turn at his rebuke; and, by improving that grace, to repent and believe the gospel. In a word, "justification of life," is offered them; nay, more, it is pressed upon them, and they fail of it only by rejecting it. If they yield and embrace the offer, then the end for which "the free gift came," upon them is attained,—*"justification of life."*

"As to infants, they are not, indeed, born justi-

fied and regenerate; so that to say that original sin is taken away, as to infants, by Christ, is not the correct view of the case, for the reasons before given; but they are all born under the "free gift," the effects of the "righteousness" of one, which extended to "all men;" and this free gift is bestowed on them *in order* to justification of life, the adjudging of the condemned to live. All the mystery, therefore in the case, arises from this, that in adults we see the free gift connected with its *end*; actual justification, by acts of their own, repentance and faith; but as to infants, we are not informed by what process justification, with its attendant blessings, is actually bestowed, though the words of the apostle are express, that through "the righteousness of one," they are entitled to it. Nor is it surprising that this process should be hidden from us, since the gospel was written for adults, though the benefit of it is designed for all; and the knowledge of this work of God, in the spirit of an infant, must presuppose an acquaintance with the properties of the human soul; which is, in fact, out of our reach. If, however, an infant is not capable of a voluntary acceptance of the benefit of the "free gift;" neither, on the other hand, is it capable of a voluntary rejection of it; and it is by rejecting it that adults perish. If much of the benefit of this "free gift" comes upon us as adults, independent of our seeking it; and if, indeed, the very power and inclination to seek justification of

life, is thus prevenient and in the highest sense *free*. It follows, by the same rule of the Divine conduct, that the Holy Spirit may be given to children; that a Divine and an effectual influence may be exerted on them, which, meeting with no voluntary resistance, shall cure the spiritual death, and corrupt tendency of their nature; and all this, without supposing any great difference in the principles of the administration of this grace, in their case and of adults. But the different circumstances of children dying in their infancy, and adults, proves also that a different administration of the same grace, which is freely bestowed upon all, must take place. Adults are personal offenders, infants are not; for the former, confession of sin, repentance and the trust of persons consciously perishing for their transgressions, are appropriate to their circumstances, but not to those of the latter; and the very wisdom of God may assure us, that, in prescribing the terms of salvation; that is, by which the "free gift" shall pass to its issue, justification of life, the circumstances of the persons must be taken into account."

Another thing to be taken into the account is the intercession of Christ as "mediator between God and *man*," that is all mankind of course embracing children. "He took them up in his arms and *blessed* them." He declares "of such is the kingdom of heaven." But setting aside the effects of the attonemant we find all in a lost and wretched

state. The wicked are estranged from the womb, they go astray as soon as they are born, speaking lies," that is as soon as they are capable of speaking. The design of the atonement of Christ is to counteract the effects of man's depraved nature: hence his condemnation lies in rejecting this remedy; in not believing on Christ. "For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world: but that the world through him might be saved. He that believeth on 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 our God, And this is the condemnation that light has come into the world, and man loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil." John iii, 17, 18, 19.

NO. XX.

THE ATONEMENT.

To atone is to propitiate, to appease, to turn away the wrath of an offended person.

In the present case, the wrath turned away is the wrath of God; the person making the propitiation is Christ, the propitiating, offering or sacrifice, is his blood. We find the truth of the case revealed in the following passages; 1 John ii. 2. "And he is the *propitiation* for our sins." 1 John 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." Rom. 3. 25. " Whom God has set forth to be a *propitiation* through faith in his blood.

God has accepted the great offering. As, under the law he was propitious to those, who came to him by appearing before his mercy seat with the blood of their sin offerings ; so, under the gospel dispensation, he is propitious to those who come unto him by Jesus Christ, through faith in that blood, which he shed for the remission of sins. " Without shedding of blood there is no remission. This accords with Eph, 1. 7. " We have redemption *through his blood*, the remission of sins." It is only by his blood that Christ himself reconciles us to God. We should not deny his wrath against the ungodly. It is true that God is love ; but it is not necessary, in order to support this truth, to assume that he is nothing else. He has other attributes, which harmonize with this and with each other. The question is not whether God is love, in this we are agreed ; but it is, whether God is holy and just ; whether we his creatures, are under law or not : whether this law has any penalty, and whether God, in consistancy with his righteous character, is bound to execute and uphold that law. These are points clearly established, then is there wrath in God ; then is God *angry* with the wicked ; then is man, as a sinner obnoxious to this anger ; and so a propitiation becomes necessary to

turn it away from him. These terms are scriptural, they are used in the New Testament as emphatically as in the Old, though in a special sense, a revelation of the mercy of God to man. John the Baptist declares that if any man believeth not on the Son of God "the *wrath of God* abideth on him." St. Paul declares, that the *wrath of God* is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men." The day of judgment, with reference to the ungodly is said to be "the day of wrath:" God is called "a *consuming fire*;" and as such is the object of "reverence and godly fear." This displeasure of his is not light, nor the consequences of it a trifling and temporary inconvenience.

When we only regard the consequence which have followed sin in society, from the earliest ages, and in every part of the world, the many direct and fearful inflictions of punishment which have proceeded from the "judge of the whole earth," to use the language of scripture "our flesh may well tremble because of his judgments." Let us talk ever so much and eloquently of the pure benevolence of God, we cannot abolish the facts recorded in the history of human suffering in this world as the effect of transgression: nor can we discharge these fearful truths from the pages of the book of God. They cannot be criticised away; and if it is "Jesus who saves us from his wrath to come" that is, from those effects of the wrath of

God which are to come, then, but for him we should have been liable to them. That principle in God from which such effects follow the Scriptures call wrath; and they who deny the existence of wrath in God, deny therefore the Scriptures.

We do not mean by God's anger any vengeful passion, but the just declaration of God's will to punish, upon our provocation of him by our sins; we do not make the design of the satisfaction to be that God may please himself in revenging the sins of the guilty upon the most innocent person, because we make the design of punishment not to be the satisfaction of anger as a desire of revenge, but to be the vindication of the honor and rights of the offended person by such a way as he himself shall judge satisfactory to the ends of his government.

Says Bishop Stillingfleet, "upon the death and suffering of Christ, God declares that he is so satisfied with what Christ hath done and suffered in order to the reconciliation between himself and us, that he now publishes remission of sins to the world, upon those terms which the Mediator hath declared by his own doctrine, and the Apostles whom he sent to preach it. But because remission of sins doth not immediately follow upon the death of Christ, without any supposition of any act on our part, therefore the state of favor doth commence from the performance of the conditions which are required of us."

We will now consider,

The extent of the Atonement.

In considering this subject, direct appeal will be made to scripture.

The question before us placed in its most simple form is, whether our Savior did so die for all men, as to make salvation attainable by all men; and in our opinion the scriptures support the affirmative of this question. This is expressed in those passages which declare that Christ died "*for all men,*" and speak of his death as an atonement for the sins "*of the whole world.*" We understand that the phrase to die "*for us.*" signifies to die in the place and stead of man. When it is said, that Christ "*by the grace of God tasted death for every man*" and that "*he is the propitiation for our sins and not for ours only but also for the sins of the whole world :*" it must be admitted from such declarations, and from many other familiar texts, that by the death of Christ, the sins of every man are rendered remissible, and salvation is consequently attainable by every man. Further, our Lord calls himself "*the Savior of the world :*" and is by St. Paul called "*the Savior of all men.*" John the Baptist refers to him as "*the Lamb of God which taketh away the sins of the world ;*" and our Lord himself declares, "*God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should 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.*"

The affirmative of this question is maintained by those passages which give an equal extent to the effects of the death of Christ as to the effects of the fall of Adam. "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*." "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." As the unlimited extent of Christ's atonement to all mankind is clearly expressed in the above cited passages, so is it, necessarily implied,

1 In those which declare that Christ died not only for those that are saved, but for those who do, or may perish, so that it cannot be argued, from the actual condemnation of men, that they were accepted from many actual, and from all the offered benefits of his death. "And through thy knowledge shall thy weak brother perish *for whom Christ died*." Destroy not him with thy meat *for whom Christ died*." "False teachers, who privily shall bring in *damnable* heresies, even denying the Lord *that bought them*, and bring upon *themselves* *swift destruction*." Likewise in the case of those mentioned in the Epistle to the Hebrews, "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 cor-

enant, *wherewith he was sanctified*, an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the Spirit of Grace?"

2. Those passages which make it the duty of men to believe the gospel : and place them under guilt and the penalty of death for rejecting it.

"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."

"But these are written that *ye might believe* that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing ye might have life through his name."

"He that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God."

"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*."

"How shall we escape, if *we neglect* so great salvation?"

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."

3. Those passages to which man's failure to obtain salvation is placed to the account of their own obstinate wills, and made wholly their own fault.

"How often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings and *ye would not*."

"And *ye will not come to me* that ye may have life." "Bringing upon

themselves swift destruction." "Whosoever will, let him take of the water of life freely."

The New Testament, constantly exhorts men to come to Christ, reproves them for neglect, and threatens them with the penal consequences of their own folly; thus uniformly placing the bar to their salvation, just where Christ places it, in his parable of the supper, in the perverseness of those, who having been *bidden* to the feast *would not* come. As the scriptures always attribute the ruin of men's souls to their own will, and not to the will of God; we ought to seek no other cause for their condemnation. We can know nothing on this subject, but what God has revealed. He has said that it is not his will that men should perish; on the contrary, "He willeth all men to be saved," and therefore commands us to pray for "all men;" he has declared that the reason they are not saved, is not that Christ did not die for them, but that they will not come to him for the life which he died to procure for "the world," and it must therefore be concluded, that the sole bar to the salvation of all who are lost, is in themselves, and not in any such limitation of Christ's atonement, as supposes that they were not free to share in its blessings.

It has been urged, indeed, that our Lord himself says of his disciples. John, 17, 9. "I pray for them; I pray not for the world, but for them which thou hast given me." The meaning of this passage is made obvious by the context. Christ, in the former part of

his intercession, as recorded in this chapter, prays exclusively, not for his church in all ages but for his disciples then present with him ; as appears evident from verse 12, "while I was *with them in the world*, I kept them in thy name," for them he exclusively prays in the first instance : then, in verse 20, he prays for all who in future, should believe on him through their words ; and he does this in order that "the world might believe." Thus, "the world," in its largest sense, is not cut off, but expressly included in the benefits of this prayer.

John, 10, 15. "I lay down my life for the sheep," is also adduced, to prove that Christ died for none but his sheep. There is no inconsistency between his having died for them that believe, and also for them that believe not, Christ is said to be "the Savior of all men, and especially of them that believe;" two propositions which the Apostle considered perfectly consistent. The context shows that Christ laid down his life for others, beside those whom, in that passage he calls "the sheep." The sheep here intended were those of the Jewish "fold;" for he immediately adds "other sheep I have which are not of this fold," meaning the gentiles : "them must I bring." He, therefore laid down his life for them also ; for the sheep in the fold, who "knew his voice, and followed him," and for them out of the fold, who still needed "bringing in;" even for "the lost whom he came to seek and save," which is the character of all mankind ; "all we like sheep

have gone astray;" and "the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all."

"He willeth all men to be saved." Says Watson, "it is only under one condition, that he wills the salvation of any man; namely, through the death of Christ. His justice required this atonement for sin; and he could not will man to be saved to the dishonor of his justice. If, then, that atonement does not extend to all men, he cannot will the salvation of all men; for such of them as are not interested in this atonement, could not be saved consistently with his righteous administration, and he could not, therefore, will it. If then, he wills the non-elect to be saved, *in any sense*, he must will this independently of Christ's sacrifice for sin; and if he cannot will this for the reason just given, he cannot "will all men to be saved," which is contrary to the texts, quoted; he cannot, therefore, invite all men to be saved; he cannot beseech all by his ministers, to be reconciled to him; for these acts could only proceed from his willing them to be saved.

But while it remains on record that, "God willeth *all men* to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of the truth;" and that he "willeth not that *any* should perish, but that *all* should come to repentance," it must be concluded that Christ died for all; and that the reason of the destruction of any part of our race, lies not in the want of a provision for their salvation; not in any limitation of

the purchase of Christ, and the administration of his grace; but in their obstinate rejection of both.

NO. XXI.

COVENANTS.

Covenant properly speaking, is an agreement between two parties, where one promises a reward for a certain thing to be done on the part of the other.

But in the scriptures, covenant has various meanings.

1st. Covenant signifies command, as when applied to the ten commandments; the sum of which is to love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, mind and strength, and thy neighbor as thyself. On these two hang all the law and the prophets.

2. *There is the covenant of redemption.*

This covenant was entered into by the Father, Son and Holy Spirit. This does not suppose that the three persons of the trinity possessed different and opposing wills, thus destroying the unity of God. The covenant here is the plan of salvation. It was the will of the Father, to give his Son to atone for the world. It was the will of the Son to make the sacrifice. It was the will of the spirit to visit and awaken the sinner, and be his sanctifier.

This plan or covenant was made from the foundation of the world, to save all who will believe,

God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son that *whosoever believeth* on him might not perish, but have everlasting life. The covenant of redemption is referred to in the 2d, and 89th Ps. 53d chapter of Isaiah, and many other passages.

3. *Covenant of Grace.*

Of this covenant, God is the party on one hand, and believers on the other. He offers salvation to them on conditions of repentance and faith. If ye repent ye shall be forgiven. If ye believe, ye shall be saved. Believers cannot covenant with God before they exist, therefore this covenant must be made in time, "I will make an everlasting covenant with you." Now this supposes that the persons exist with whom the covenant was to be made.

The covenant of grace is founded on the covenant of redemption. If there had been no atonement, there could have been no way of escape by repentance and faith. But as the atonement is full, the way is free. "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,"

4. *Covenant of the Church.*

In this covenant, the parties are believers who make a covenant among themselves, and they together, covenant with God. So this includes the covenant of grace. Wherever a body of men make a covenant together, and their covenant includes

the essentials of the covenant of grace, they are a church. But if their covenant does not include the essentials of the covenant of grace, then they are not a church.

NO. XXII.

REPENTANCE.

The command of our Savior is, "*repent ye and believe the Gospel.*" Mark 1. 15.

In this passage our Savior evidently means that sinners should heartily repent of their sins, and turn unto God. "For Godly sorrow worketh repentance to salvation, not to be repented of; but the sorrow of the world worketh death." 2 Cor. 7 10. A criminal may have sorrow inasmuch as he is brought to justice, and still have no real desire to forsake his sinful practices. And should he escape the designed punishment, he would still be inclined to run into crime, till at length he would reap his final ruin. The sorrow which he exercised would be unto death. Godly sorrow is to lament for having broken the Divine law, and offended a just and Holy God.

It was not any thing spurious which our Savior designed to enjoin upon man but it was *real* repentance which we may define to be a *sorrow* for sin, a *hatred* to it, and a *forsaking* of it by turning unto

God. Faith, however, must be connected with repentance, in order for us to come to Christ, and receive his love, and the indwelling of his spirit in our hearts. With these preliminary remarks, we proceed to notice.

1. *The subject of repentance.*

2. *To whose work repentance is attributed.*

3. *That repentance is to salvation, or in other words, that it is a work preparatory to being "a new creature."*

1st. *The subject of repentance.*

The subject of repentance, is sinful fallen man. No one can be said to repent unless he has sinned. The sinner is emphatically required to repent. But it may be asked if the christian is not required to repent. He cannot be said to repent of holiness; if he commits sin he is required to repent, that it may be blotted out. Peter repented, and he had good reason for it, because he denied his Lord, and was guilty of cursing and swearing. If a person should always lead a perfectly holy life, it would be the height of absurdity to say that he would ever repent.

It is for sin, for his own sin, which man has to repent of. What reason then has he to repent who has spent all his life in violating God's holy law, unmindful of him who has ever been his benefactor, forgetting whence all his blessings come. The bible requires him to repent, he is expected to repent

he must repent if he would ever obtain mercy, and be redeemed by the blood of Christ.

We come then to the conclusion, that *the sinner is the subject of repentance*. This accords with the language of our Savior, for I am not come to call the righteous, but *sinners* to repentance. Mat. 9. 13. "Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish." Luke 13, 3.

2. We pass to notice *to whose work repentance is attributed*.

Repentance is effected by the agency of the holy spirit; and also the agency of man is exercised in coincidence with that of the spirit. Were it not for the operations of the spirit, man could never repent; but these are granted to him so that he is without excuse. Our Savior said to his disciples, "I tell you the truth, it is expedient for you that I go away; for if I go not away, the comforter will not come unto you: but if I depart, I will send him unto you.

And when he is come, he will reprove the *world* of sin and of righteousness, and of judgment." John 16. 7. 8.

The spirit awakens and rouses the conscience from its lethargy. The sinner begins to reflect upon eternal truths. He becomes convicted of his sins; is convinced that he is without hope and without God in the world. Our Savior is called "the true light, which lighteth *every man* that cometh into the world." John 1. 9. Christ be-

ing exalted to be a Prince and a Savior "gives repentance," as well as "remission of sins."

The Holy Spirit operates on the sinners heart, shows him how vile he is, what he ought to do, what he must do if he would be saved. Now it is enjoined on him to work out his own salvation with fear and trembling. If he neglects this, he cannot be saved. There is no getting from it he must repent, or he must perish.

It is objected that repentance is the gift of God and the work of the Holy Spirit, how then can we do any thing towards it? It is true that repentance is the gift of God, but it is equally true that we must exercise this repentance. Nor is there any inconsistency in these views of the subject. God saith, *labor* not for the meat that perisheth, but for that meat which endureth unto everlasting life, which the son of man shall *give* you."

The harvest is the gift of God, who giveth seed, rain and fruitful seasons, and causeth the earth to yield her increase; yet the husbandmen will not have these blessings without labor. He that will not plough by reason of the cold, shall beg in harvest, and have nothing. In both temporal and spiritual concerns, God gives not to the slothful but to the diligent. "Ask, and it shall be given you; seek and ye shall find; knock and it shall be opened unto you; for every one that asketh receiveth; and he that seeketh, findeth; and to him that knocketh, it shall be opened. Mat. 7. 7. 8.

Let the penitent sinner consider his ways as David did, "I thought on my ways, and turned my feet into thy testimonies." He should examine his heart and life candidly and thoroughly.

"The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked, who can know it." If he has lived without the love of God in his heart, his life is a dark account against him. There should be diligent searching of the scriptures. While he looks into his own heart, and there beholds the iniquity of sin; how ungrateful he has been to God, and how unwise towards his own benefit, spending this short life, in dishonor to his maker, and pressing on to everlasting disgrace and ruin. Let him on the other hand, meditate deeply on the sufferings of Christ. Consider for whom he suffered, and what blessings are bestowed in consequence of his sufferings that while we were yet enemies, Christ died for us, that he has so granted his grace that we may become the sons of God. Will not the hard heart melt in review of these things? Will not the sinner desire to be free from his sins, and live to him who died for him? He must not only meditate, but pray, he must pray fervently or other means will be in vain. Let him, like the publican say "God be merciful to me a sinner." If he feels to be the chief of sinners, feels that his case is the most unfavorable, let him look to Christ his only hope and redeemer. "Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth, for I

am God, and there is none else." Is. 45. 22.

But it is said that the prayer of the wicked is an abomination in the sight of God. And what is the substance of this prayer? why it is the following: "Go thy way for this time; when I have a convenient season I will call for thee." This is that abominable prayer, which impenitent sinners utter when the Holy Spirit is striving within them.

The Lord saith "but to this man will I look, even to him that is poor, and of a contrite spirit, and trembleth at my word," Is. 66. 2.

There are different stages, even of true repentance. In the earlier stages there is a powerful struggle in the mind of the sinner, to break away from the world. A thousand obstacles, temptations and discouragements rush into the mind, to keep the serious from God. In this critical crisis, satan makes his mightiest effort. The sinner is unaccustomed to a life of prayer and holy devotion; unaccustomed to take up his cross daily and follow Christ. While making this struggle to break away from his sins, he may truly be said to labor and be heavy laden. But he has every inducement to come to Christ, "come unto me, all ye that labor, and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart; and ye shall find rest unto your souls. For my yoke is easy, and my burden is light." Mat. 11, 28, 29, 30.

When the penitent sinner comes to this point, or

in other words, when he *submits*, gives all up to Christ, he obtains mercy, redemption from his sins, peace and joy in the Holy Ghost. There need not be a long process for the sinner to go through in order to find the Savior. He need not go weeping, and praying for days, months and years, before he obtains the blessing. But the moment he submits, he experiences the truth of our Savior's words. "My yoke is easy, and my burden is light." He finds the promised "rest."

3. *Repentance to Salvation.*

The sinner must come to Christ in order to be saved. He cannot become a child of God unless he repents. Suppose the sinner is regenerated before he repents, or while he is laboring, and heavy laden on account of his sins pressing upon him. How does this agree with the plain fact.

The penitent sinner, in making efforts to come to Christ, feels that in his present condition, he is a lost sinner without hope. These views of himself, being the result of the Spirit, how can we account for them, if he is regenerated? Does the Holy Spirit teach him such contradictions and falsehoods

We must be convinced that the Spirit teaches him the truth. An individual may be convinced that he is destitute of the love of God in his heart, and yet he may have a desire to enjoy this love, and there is nothing inconsistent in the doctrine. but if this is a good desire, how can it come from a

person who is unrenewed? We answer because the Holy Spirit is operating upon his heart, and yet not until he is regenerated, does he have the indwelling of this Spirit, the fruits of which are love, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost. It is perfectly reasonable and scriptural that a person should have a desire for an object, before the object is obtained. When obtained it gratifies the desire. A person may have a desire for holiness, and yet know that he is far from being holy. But the mere desire for an object, and the possession of it, are two very different predicaments. We must not only have a desire, but we must "strive to enter in at the straight gate." This evidently implies that we have not yet entered in. A degree of penitence is not life. The penitence may be real, but it is not real life, or salvation. The scriptures assure us that godly sorrow, worketh repentance *to* salvation. Here we see that repentance is not salvation, but that it is *to* salvation. The fact is this, that salvation will be granted to him who becomes truly penitent and seeks for pardon.

NO. XXIII.

FAITH IN CHRIST.

The subject of the last lecture was, "Repent ye and believe the gospel," Mark, 1, 15. Repentance,

the first part of the subject was there discussed. It is here proposed to consider the 2nd, which is, the belief of the gospel, or in other words, *faith in Christ*. It is required of sinners to believe in order that they may come to Christ and be saved. This doctrine is both reasonable and scriptural. Persons would not be expected to seek for those things of which they had no need. If sinners are not required to believe in order to be saved, then we must come to the conclusion, that when God saves them, he must save them while they are yet in unbelief, which is contrary to scripture; for "he that believeth not shall be damned." Here it is evident that a change must take place in the belief, or the sentence, cannot be revoked.

Without further remarks, we proceed to notice faith more particularly. Faith is the gift of God, but the act of faith is required of the creature.

Some particulars in which faith in Christ, is exercised by the creature, will now be considered.

1st. The first act of faith, is that of the understanding. The person assents to the truth of the christian religion; to the truth that Christ is the Messiah, the Savior of the world, God manifest in the flesh. He assents to the truth that man is a sinner, and were it not for the atonement of Christ, he must perish. He assents to the truth that he ought to repent, and become a disciple of Christ.

But a mere assent to these truths is not sufficient.

If our faith extends no farther, it can be noth-

ing more than a dead faith, which the Apostle James describes. This leads us to notice.

2. That man must not only assent but *feel* that he is a sinner, that he should without delay return to God, and unless he does, that there is no hope. He must feel that sin leads to wretchedness and woe, that to count the blood of the covenant of an unholy thing, and do despite unto the spirit of grace, denotes the greatest ingratitude and wickedness; that the honor and glory of the world, are vanity in comparison to the honor and glory of Christ.

The 3d act of faith is coming to the Savior without reserve, letting go of every other hold, and falling on the mercy of God. This is that faith which the woman exercised, who had suffered many things of many physicians, and had spent all that she had, and was nothing bettered, but rather grew worse. When she had heard of Jesus, she came in the press behind, and touched his garment; for she said if I may touch but his clothes, I shall be whole. Jesus said unto her, thy *faith* hath made thee whole. This person could witness to the truth that it was the sick who needed a physician, and not those that are whole. There is another circumstance worthy of attention in this case. The woman did not wait till she was healed before she believed and came to Christ. She moreover believed that he was abundantly competent to save her. This was the faith which the publican exercised, who said God be merciful to me a sinner. He prayed from

the sincerity of his heart, with language dictated by the Holy Spirit. He must then have had a correct view of his own state and character. He prayed as such as a penitent needy sinner; and he received the blessing: for he went down to his house, justified rather than the pharisee. He believed that the Lord was mighty to save him from his sins and make him an heir of heaven. This is the faith by which we receive Christ. Thus it is said *as many as received him to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name, John, 1. 12.*

The believing penitent should have exalted views of Christ, of his worth, and his efficiency to save.

"He that cometh unto God must believe that he is, and that he is rewarder of them that diligently seek him." Heb. ii, 6. But suppose the Savior is a finite being how then can the convinced sinner feeling to be infinitely guilty expect to be saved by this Savior? If he is a finite Savior he must be the author of finite salvation. But we do not so learn of Christ; he is called the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him. Heb. 5. 9. Again if he is a finite being he must be a mere creature, and not worthy to receive blessing honor and glory forever and ever. This also is contrary to scripture. For, "All things were made by him and without him was not any thing made that was made." John, i, 3. Moreover "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, and honor, and glory, and power be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the *Lamb* for ever and ever." Rev. 5, 12, 13. This leads us to notice the *4th act of Faith* which is to love and glorify God. As our Savior entered into a certain village there met him ten men that were lepers, which stood afar off: And they lifted up their voices, and said Jesus, Master, have mercy on us. As they obeyed the command of Christ they were cleansed. And one of them when he saw he was healed, turned back, and with a loud voice glorified God. And fell down on his face at his feet, giving him thanks: and he was a Samaritan. And Jesus answering, said, Were there not ten cleansed, but where are the nine? There are not found that returned to give glory to God, save this stranger. And he said unto him, arise, go thy way, thy *faith* hath made thee whole. In the act of leaving and glorifying God is exhibited the faith of the christian. This accords with the passage in the 5th Chap. of the first epistle of John. Whosoever *believeth* that Jesus is the Christ is born of God. This is the love of God, that we keep his commandments; and his commandments are not grievous. For whatsoever is born

of God over cometh the world: and this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our *faith*.

Who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God? There are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one.

The 5th act of faith is *trust* or *confidence* in God.

This is the faith of which the Apostle speaks, in the following passage; now faith is the substance or *confidence* of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen. In many other passages it is represented as *trust*. It is not that we may merely *believe* that Christ offered himself a sacrifice for sin, that he is "set forth as a propitiation," but that we may *trust* in him; it is not that we may merely *believe* that God has made promises to us; but that we may have *confidence* in them. This was the faith of the saints of the Old Testament. "By faith Abraham, when he was called to go out into a place which he should after receive for an inheritance, obeyed, and went out, not knowing whither he went." He had confidence, "though he slay me, yet will I *trust* in him," who is among you that seareth the Lord? Let him *trust* in the name of the Lord, and *stay* upon his God." Blesseth is the man that *trusteth* in the Lord, and whose hope the Lord is. In the New Testament also, faith is represented as *trust*. "In his name shall the Gentiles *trust*." "For therefore we both labor, and suffer reproach, because we *trust* in

the living God, who is the Savior of all men, and especially of them that believe." "For I know whom I have believed (*trusted*) and am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed unto him against that day," "If we hold the beginning of our *confidence* steadfast to the end."

"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; in whom also after that ye believed ye were sealed with that holy spirit of promise." Eph. 1, 12, 13.

NO. XXIV.

JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH.

1st. The nature of justification. And here be it observed; that justification, the pardon and remission of sin, the non-imputation of sin, and the imputation of righteousness, are terms and phrases of the same import; that is we are pardoned and treated as though we were righteous. It will be proper to notice a few passages showing the nature of justification. "I tell you this man went down to his house justified, rather than the other," Luke, 18, 13, 14. Here the term justified means pardoned, for the publican confessed himself a sinner and asked mercy as such. "Be it known unto you, men and bretheren, 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. Here likewise it is evident that forgiveness of sins and justification means the same thing, one term being used to explain the other. "But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him *that justifieth the ungodly*, his faith is counted for righteousness. Even as David describeth the blessedness of the man unto whom God *imputeth righteousness* without works, Blessed are they whose *iniquities are forgiven* and whose *sins are covered*; Blessed is the man to whom the Lord *will not impute sins*." Rom. 4, 6, 7, 8. The Apostle introducing this quotation from David' to illustrate his doctrine of the justification of the ungodly by "counting his faith for righteousness," shows clearly, that he considered "justification," "the imputing of righteousness," "the forgiveness of iniquities," the "covering of sin," the "non-imputation of sin," as of the same import.

Justification, being the pardon of sin, this view of the subject guards us against the notion that Christ's righteousness is transferred to us so that it becomes actually our own righteousness; as if we ourselves had been what he was, that is, perfectly obedient to the law of God, and had what he did as perfectly righteous. Scripture does not exhibit such a doctrine. But it is said we have such passages as these "the Lord our righteousness," and

“Christ. who is made unto us righteousness.” In a limited sense it is true that Christ represented us; that is, suffered in our stead, that we might not suffer; “but not absolutely as our delegate” says Baxter, “our persons did not, in a law sense, do in and by Christ what he did, or possess the habits which he possessed, or suffered what he suffered.” In scripture it is never said, that we suffered in Christ, but that he suffered for us. Again there is no weight in the argument, that as our sins were accounted his, so his righteousness is accounted ours. Our sins were never so accounted Christ’s as that he did them, and so justly suffered for them. Our transgressions are never said to have been imputed to him in the *fact* but only that they were laid upon him in the *penalty*.

“He then” says Goodwin “that assumeth this righteousness to himself and apparelleth himself with it, represents himself before God, not in the habit of a just or righteous man, but in the glorious attire of the great Mediator of the world, whose righteousness hath heights and depths in it, a length and breadth which infinitely exceed the proportions of all men whatever. Now, then, for a silly worm to take this robe of immeasurable majesty upon him, and to conceit himself as great in holiness and righteousness as Jesus Christ (for that is the spirit that rules in this opinion, to teach men to assume all that Christ did unto themselves, and that in no other way, nor upon any lower terms, than as if

themselves had personally done it) whether this be the right, I leave to sober men to consider."

"A crowning and most fatal objection" says Watson; "is, that this doctrine shifts the meritorious cause of man's justification from Christ's "obedience unto death," where the scriptures place it to Christ's active obedience to the precepts of the law; and leaves no rational account of the reason of Christ's vicarious sufferings." To his "blood" the New Testament writers ascribe our redemption, and "faith in his blood" is as clearly held out as the instrumental cause of our justification: but by this doctrine, the attention and hope of men are perversely turned away from his sacrificial death to his holy life, which, though necessary, both as an example to us, and also so to qualify his sacrifice that his blood should be that of "a lamb without spot," is no where represented as that on account of which men are pardoned.

The simple notion of justification as the remission of sin; could not have been maintained by Calvin had he held the notion of a distinct imputation of Christ's active righteousness; for it has always followed from that notion that they who have held it, represent justification as consisting of two parts, first, the forgiveness of sins and then the imputation of Christ's moral obedience, so that he who is forgiven may be considered personally righteous, and thus, when both meet he is justified.

The view taken by Calvin of the imputation of

Christ's righteousness in justification is obviously, that the righteousness of Christ, that is his entire obedience to the will of his Father, both in doing and in suffering, is as he says "accepted for us, as though it were our own;" so that, in virtue of it upon our believing we are accounted righteous, not personally, but by the remission or non imputation of our sins. Thus he observes on Acts, 13, 38, 39. "The justification which we have by Christ in the gospel is not a justification *with righteousness*, properly so called, but a justification from sin, and from the guilt of sin and condemnation due to it. So when Christ said to men and women in the Gospel, "thy sins are forgiven thee," then he justified them—the forgiveness of their sins was their justification."

So little, it has been thought, can be objected to the opinion of Calvin, in the article of imputed righteousness, in the main, that many divines, opposed to the Calvinian theory generally, have not hesitated, in substance, to assent to it, reserving to themselves some liberty in the use of the terms in which it is often enveloped, either to modify, explain, or reject them.

The opinion of some professedly Calvinistic divines; of Baxter and his followers, and of the majority of evangelical Arminians, is, as Baxter well expresses it, that Christ's righteousness is imputed to us in the sense "of its being accounted of God, the valuable consideration, satisfaction, and merit

(attaining God's ends) for which we are, (when we consent to the covenant of grace) forgiven and justified, against the condemning sentence of the law of innocence, and accounted and accepted of God to grace and glory." From the preceding doctrine it is evident that the atonement of Christ is the ground of our justification.

We proceed to notice,—

2d. *Faith as a condition of Justification.*

Though *faith* was discussed in the preceding lecture, it may properly be resolved into two leading views.

The first is intellectual or a mere assent to the truth; the second is that of confidence or reliance. The former may be separated from the latter, but the latter cannot exist without the former.

It is the latter with which we have to do. It is not only an intellectual assent to truth, but it is such a belief of the gospel, by the power of the spirit of God, as leads us to come to Christ to trust in him, and to commit the keeping of our souls into his hands, as in the hands of a faithful Creator.

This faith is the condition to which the promise of God annexes justification, without which justification would not take place, and in this sense it is that we are justified by faith; not by the merit of faith, but by faith instrumentally as this condition, for its connection with the benefit arises from the merits of Christ, and the promise of God.

Says Lawson, "If Christ had not merited, God had not promised, if God had not promised, justification had never followed upon this faith; so that the indissoluble connection of faith and justification is from God's institution, whereby he has bound himself to give the benefit on performance of the condition."

"But to him that worketh not, but *believeth* on him that justifieth the ungodly, *his faith is counted for righteousness*. To impute faith for righteousness, is nothing more than to be justified by faith, which is also called by St. Paul, "being made righteous," that is, being placed by an act of free forgiveness, through faith in Christ, in the condition of righteous men, in this respect, that the penalty of the law does not lie against them, and that they are restored to the favor of God."

The scriptural doctrine is, that the death of Christ is accepted in the place of our personal punishment, on condition of our faith in him, and that when we have active faith in him, God accounts our faith for righteousness; that is, pardons our sins through faith, and treats us as the objects of his restored favor.

It is objected, that as faith alone is not righteousness in the moral sense, it would be false, and therefore impossible to impute it for righteousness. But as justification simply signifies the pardon of sin, this objection has no foundation.

A second objection is, that if faith, that is, believing, is imputed for righteousness, then justifica-

tion is by works. If it mean works of obedience to the moral law, the objection is groundless, for faith is not a work of this kind; and if it mean the merit of works of any kind, it is equally unfounded; faith, in the sense of trust in the merits of another, excludes by its very nature, all assumption of merit to ourselves, or there would be no need of resorting to the merit of another; but if it mean that faith or believing is doing something in order to justification, it is in this view the performance of a condition, which is required of us in scripture. "This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent:" "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; and he that believeth not shall be damned." The apostle makes our justification by faith the proof of the gratuitous nature of the free grace of God, "for by *grace* are ye saved through *faith*." Therefore it is by *faith*, that it might be through *grace*." A third objection is, that the imputation of faith for righteousness, gives occasion to boasting. "Boasting is excluded by the law of faith;" the reason of which has been already stated, that trust in another for salvation, attributes the power and of course the honor of saving to another, and denies both to ourselves.

It is objected that there is a contradiction in the statements of St. Paul and St. James, one stating that we are justified by faith, the other by works. They are addressing persons in different circumstances. St. Paul addresses the unbelieving Jews,

who sought justification by obedience to the law of Moses. St. James had to do with such as professed the christian faith and justification by it, but erring about the nature of faith, considering it to be a mere assent to truth, which he calls a dead faith. The only sense in which St. James can take the term justification, when he says that Abraham was "justified by works when he had offered Isaac his son upon the altar," is that his works manifested or proved that he was justified, that the faith by which he was justified was not dead but active and living. So far are the two apostles from being in opposition to each other, that as to faith as well as to works, they perfectly agree. St. James declares that no man can be saved by mere faith; by faith he means not the same faith to which St. Paul alludes. He speaks of a faith which is "*alone*" and "*dead*," St. Paul, of the faith which is never alone though it alone justifieth.

Justification by faith alone is thus clearly the doctrine of the scriptures.

It is an error to suppose, as many have done, that the doctrine of justification by faith alone, is peculiarly a Calvinistic one. It is the doctrine not of the Calvinistic confessions only, but of the Lutheran church, and of the Church of England. It was the doctrine of the Dutch Remonstrants, at least, of the early divines of that party.

We may refer to Mr. Wesley, a distinguished and evangelical Arminian. "By affirming that faith

is the term or *condition of justification*, I mean, first that there is no justification without it. He that believeth not is condemned already, and so long as he believeth not, that condemnation cannot be removed, but the "wrath of God abideth on him." As there is no other name given under heaven, than that of Jesus of Nazareth, no other merit *whereby* a condemned sinner can ever be saved from the guilt of sin; so there is no other way of obtaining a share in his merit, than *by faith in his name*. So that, as long as we are without this faith, we are "strangers to the covenant of promise, we are aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and without God in the world." Whatsoever virtue (so called,) a man may have, I speak of those unto whom the gospel is preached; for "what have I to do to judge them that are without?" Whatsoever good work (so accounted;) he may do, it profiteth not; he is still a *child of wrath*, still under the curse till he believe in Jesus.

"Faith, therefore, is the *necessary* condition of justification; yea, and the *only necessary* condition thereof. This is the second point carefully to be observed; that the very moment God giveth faith (for it is the gift of God,) to the ungodly, that worketh not, that faith is counted to him for righteousness. He hath no righteousness at all antecedent to this, not so much as negative righteousness; or innocence. But "faith is imputed to him for righteousness," the very moment that he believeth.

Not that God thinketh him to be what he is not. But as "he made Christ to be a sin offering for us," that is, treated him as a sinner, punished him for our sins; so he counted us righteous from the time we believe in him; that is, he doth not punish us for our sins; yea, treats us as though we were guiltless and righteous.

"Surely, the difficulty of assenting to the proposition, that faith is the *only condition* of justification, must arise from not understanding it. We mean thereby this much, that it is the only thing without which no one is justified; the only thing that is immediately, indispensably, absolutely requisite in order to pardon. As, on the one hand, though a man should have every thing else, without faith, yet he cannot be justified; so on the other, though he be supposed to want every thing else, yet if he hath faith he cannot but be justified. For suppose a sinner of any kind or degree, in a full sense of his total ungodliness, of his utter inability to think, speak, or do good, and his absolute meetness for hell fire; suppose, I say, this sinner, helpless and hopeless, casts himself wholly on the mercy of God in Christ, (which indeed he cannot do but by the grace of God,) who can doubt, but he is forgiven in that moment? Who will affirm that any more is *indispensably required*, before that sinner can be justified?

As to the doctrine of justification by faith, Christian writers agree from ancient times.

Tertullian, who wrote about the year 194. Origen, who lived about the year 203. Justin Martyr who lived before them both. Chrysostom, St. Augustine, who lived about the year 390. Primasius, who wrote about the year 500. Bede, who lived somewhat before the year 700. Haymo about the year 840.

Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury, about the year 1090. Luther, Bucer, Peter Martyr, Calvin, Musculus, Bullinger, Gaultier, Illyricus, Pellicanus Hunnius Beza, Zunius and Tremeilins; also many of the English divines.

NO. XXV.

REGENERATION AND ADOPTION.

Regeneration is necessary, because without it, man "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. That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is Spirit. "Marvel not," saith our Savior, that I said unto thee, ye must be born again. The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth: so is every one that is born of the Spirit."

Verily, verily, I say unto thee, We speak that we do know, and testify that we have seen."

From this account of our Savior, we learn both the necessity, and the nature of Regeneration.

Regeneration signifies to be "born again," "born of the Spirit." It is expressed by many other phrases in scriptures; "to become the sons of God," to be "sealed with the Spirit."

Regeneration lays in man, a foundation for Holy exercises; such as love to God, and to his people. He is forgiven of his sins, saved by the washing of regeneration: the chain of bondage is broken, and he is set free; he walks not after the flesh, but after the Spirit; he is "dead to sin;" the fruits of the Spirit are in him, "love, joy, peace."

This is what we understand by a man's being in a *regenerate state*, and this state is so represented in the scriptures.

2. Regeneration is effected by the agency of the Holy Spirit. The sinner [is destitute of pure love to God, till it is "shed abroad in the heart of the Holy Spirit." Rom. 5. 5. "According to his mercy, *He* saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost." "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." "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 will give you a heart of flesh, and I will put my spirit

within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes." Ezek. 36, 26, 27. "By grace are ye saved, through faith, and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God." Eph. 2, 8. For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works," verse 10th.

3. What has the sinner to do? He must repent and believe. "God now commandeth all men every where to repent." "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved." According to scripture there must be repentance and faith, preparatory to regeneration. But it is asked, can the sinner repent without the work of the Spirit? This preparatory process of repentance and faith is in coincidence with man's free agency, the work of the Spirit, but not Regeneration, the being "born again." The gift of Regeneration is bestowed in answer to the prayer of faith. "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." Here it is evident that these Jews enjoyed the "power to become the sons of God," in consequence of *receiving* Christ and *believing* on his name. Suppose faith cannot come before the new birth, then it must follow, that a man can never pray for his own Regeneration; and for the very reason, that he cannot first have faith, and without faith, it is impossible for him to pray acceptably. If he has faith in consequence of being a "new creature," in this case he cannot pray for his own

Regeneration, because he already enjoys it. And if he comes to Christ with the prayer of faith to be "born again," it is a mere form, he does not receive the blessing in answer to prayer, because it was antecedently bestowed upon him. But on the hypothesis that repentance and faith are exercised before Regeneration, then the humble, believing penitent, labouring and heavy laden on account of his sins, comes to Christ in *faith* and humble prayer, and *actually* receives the blessing which he seeks, "the renewing of the Holy Ghost." And this accords with scripture, "*after* that ye believed, ye were sealed with that holy spirit of promise." In this state the man is redeemed from his sins, saved by the washing of Regeneration. He loves God supremely, he sees a peculiar excellence in the doctrine of Christ, his faith becomes more active, he enjoys the fruits of the Spirit, love, peace and joy, in the Holy Ghost. Before, he was a seeker, now he has obtained what he sought.

This previous process, has been called by divines "awakening," and "conviction," the indifference to spiritual concerns is removed, and conviction of the real case of a man, who has continued in sin, and under the dominion of the carnal mind; is fixed in the judgment and conscience. From this arises a corrected view of things; sense of guilt; desire of deliverance; abhorrence of the evils of the heart and the life; powerful efforts for freedom; resisted however, by the bondage of sinful habits, and in-

nate corruptions. He is deeply impressed with the need of pardon, and of that almighty and renewing influence which alone can effect the desired change. It is in this state of mind that the prayer becomes at once, heartfelt and appropriate, "create in me a clean heart, Oh God, and renew a right spirit within me." But this is not Regeneration; it is the effect of a painful discovery of the want of it.

But it is asked if the desire of the repenting sinner, to be redeemed from his sins, and become a Christian, is not a holy desire? How then can it come from an unrenewed heart, so as to enable the person to have faith in prayer to God? Here it must be remembered, that God does not hear our prayer on account of our holiness, independent of the Holy Spirit; if so then, the prayer of no man could ever be heard. For there is none that doeth good no not one. And Christians after they have done all, are, comparatively speaking, unprofitable servants. What then, must be the character of a person in order to pray acceptably? Why he must be a believing penitent, striving to enter in at the straight gate.

This desire being the result of the Holy Spirit upon the sinner's heart, is truly acceptable to God. It is the penitent sinner's duty and privilege to exercise this repentance and faith which God has given to him, by his Holy Spirit; and if he does he will receive the gift of regeneration. Though Repentance is exercised by aid of the Spirit, it by no

means follows that it is Regeneration. The scriptures do not suppose that a man must be a child of God before he repents of his sins. Our Lord states expressly that he came not to call the righteous but sinners to repentance. This truth is illustrated in the case of the repenting publican, standing afar off, he would not lift up so much as his eyes unto heaven, but smote upon his breast, saying, God be merciful to me a *sinner*. Thus we see he viewed himself to be a sinner; he prayed as a sinner. As these expressions were put into his mouth by our Savior, they were not only sincere; but we must consider them correct. He was a convinced sinner. This is evident from his own words, and from the whole tenor of the parable. He came with a full conviction of his sins, and his great need of salvation. Confident that he was not a christian, confessing himself to be a sinner, he earnestly besought God to have mercy upon him. His sense of his character, was perfectly just; and his prayer, being accordant with his feelings, was of course sincere. His prayer prevailed with God. He went down to his house, justified rather than the Pharisee. If this publican did not heartily repent of his sins before he was regenerated; I confess that I do not know what language could be devised, to express such a state. Every thing in the parable, shows that he was a repenting sinner, a believing penitent, and came to God to receive a real pardon of his sins, without which pardon, he could not be

a child of God, "born again," "regenerated."

Further, to affirm that repentance precedes regeneration, is not only scriptural, but is what we should naturally and reasonably expect. If man is to be brought from a state of wretchedness into a place of safety; and if he is to strive to enter in at the straight gate, we should suppose that in order to this he must be convinced of his situation, must consider that kind and holy Protector, who has ever preserved him in being; and think how ungrateful and vile he has been in despising the blessings of Providence, and going on to wretchedness and woe.

With such a view of himself, as a lost and undone sinner, we should suppose that he would supplicate the throne of grace with agonizing prayer, to be saved by the "washing of Regeneration, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost; and we believe that God, in answer to this fervent petition, would grant him the real blessing of salvation. But if the sinner is regenerated before he repents, then this contrition of soul, and fervency of prayer to become a child of God, are a mere form. His prayer to be regenerated, will not be answered; and for the very reason that this gift was bestowed upon him before he prayed.

Lastly. When the minister of the gospel tells sinners to repent, if they cannot perform this duty without Regeneration, then they may well ask him why he says that they must be regenerated in order to repent, but still tells them to repent in order to

Regeneration. Suppose he says it is their duty to repent. But how will this satisfy them to tell them it is their duty to do that which they cannot do. No one will pretend to say that they can regenerate themselves, and if repentance does not precede regeneration, of course they cannot repent. Suppose the minister tells them they have natural ability to repent. How will this satisfy them, to tell them that they are naturally able to perform an impossibility. The fact is this, as God has prepared salvation for man, he commands him to repent and believe, in order to receive this salvation, and the requisitions are perfectly reasonable. Man has no well grounded excuse for not repenting and believing, in order to become a child of God. He is blessed with the true Light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world. The Spirit and the bride say come; and whosoever will, let him come and partake of the water of life freely.

God now commandeth all men every where to repent.

Adoption.

Adoption is closely allied with regeneration; and to the extent that one cannot take place without the other. Adoption may however, be considered, somewhat in advance of Regeneration. The latter is the preparation necessary to constitute us sons of God; the former is our being received as such. All true christians of whatever name or denomination are adopted into one and the same fam-

ily having their names written in the Lamb's book of life. So far as the militant church is concerned, we are adopted, when we are baptized, and receive the right hand of fellowship. We then come to the table of our Lord, and partake of the symbols of his body and blood, commemorating his dying love for sinners. We are welcomed to all the privileges of the church. These are designed to build us up in the most holy faith, to promote love, union and efficiency in the whole body. The ties of the church very much resemble, yet strikingly surpass those of any earthly family.

It should not be understood that the mere joining of the visible church, will constitute one a Christian. He must be saved by the washing of Regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost. If we have experienced this we are indeed *Sons*. If sons then heirs; heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ to a glorious inheritance, incorruptible, undefiled and that fadeth not away.

NO. XXVI.

PERSEVERANCE OF SAINTS.

Perseverance of saints is the Christian's overcoming the world so that his name will not be blotted out of the book of life.

In this essay it is proposed to notice,

1st *How saints are to persevere, and*

2. *The promises applied to them.*

1st "As ye have therefore received Christ Jesus the Lord, so walk ye in him : Rooted and built up and established in the faith, as ye have been taught abounding therein with thanksgiving." Col. 2, 6, 7.

The Apostle gives the Thessalonians some excellent directions, how to persevere. In his concluding remarks, he says, "*prove all things ; hold fast that which is good. Abstain from all appearance of evil.*" And for the blessing which they were to receive, the Apostle then adds, "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. Our *sanctification* here alluded to, is very important.

Believing the truth, persevering as alluded to above, and being sanctified of the Spirit is the *condition* on which we are chosen to salvation, from the foundation of the world. "God hath from the beginning, chosen you to salvation through *sanctification* of the Spirit, and *belief* of the truth:" hence 2 Thes. 2, 13.

In order to make our calling and election sure we must *believe*, and persevere according to gospel principles ; as saith the apostle, "giving all diligence, add to your faith virtue ; and to virtue, knowledge ; and to knowledge temperance ; and to temperance patience ; and to patience godliness ; and to godliness brotherly kindness ; and to brotherly kindness, charity. For if these things be in you,

and abound, they make you that ye shall neither be barren, nor unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ. 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: for so an entrance shall be ministered unto you abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ." 2 Pet. 1, 5—11.

Saints must persevere by holding the beginning of their confidence, steadfast unto the end. They must be found doing the will of God. Our Savior says "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shalt enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he that doeth the will of my Father, which is in heaven. Moreover he informs us that whosoever heareth his sayings and doeth them, he will liken him unto a wise man which built his house upon a rock. He has commanded christians to watch and pray that they enter not into temptation.

Again says our Lord, "every branch in me that beareth not fruit, he taketh away: and every branch that beareth fruit, he purgeth it, that it may bring forth more fruit. 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 ye abide in me, and my words abide in you, ye shall ask what ye will, and it shall be done unto you."

According to this plain statement of the case, we must not only be in Christ, but must abide in him in order to receive what we ask, or in other words in order to be saved. An objection arises, if it is for the christian to abide in Christ, he is then somewhat his own keeper. But this objection is without the least foundation. The christian does not profess to be his own keeper, nor able to be, but as he abides in Christ, he trusts in him who will keep him, by the power of God unto salvation. And such are thus kept, they share the benefits of Christ's intercession, they are given to him. Such then as abide in Christ we notice—

2. *Share the promises.*

All that the Father giveth me, shall come to me; and him that cometh to me, I will in no wise cast out.

John 6, 37. *“My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me; and I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish; neither shall any pluck them out of my hand.”* John 10, 27, 28.

“I pray not that thou shouldst take them out of the world, but that thou shouldst keep them from the evil.”

John, 17, 15. First, our Lord says “I pray not for the world,” neither does he pray for any other Christians, but those who were given to him, viz. the Apostles. But after having prayed for his Apostles he says, verse 20th, *“Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also, which shall believe on me through their word. That they all may be one; as thou, Father art in me, and I in thee, that they also*

may be one of us ; that the world may believe that thou hast sent me."

Here we see that Christ's intercession, extends not only to other believers, but to the world. And indeed were it otherwise, how could it be possible for all to be saved ? The reason that they are not saved is as our Lord says, they will not come unto him that they might have life, Christ does not pray for any to be saved independently of their own free agency.

Certainly, both Calvinists and Arminians will acknowledge this as scriptural, so then we must voluntarily come to Christ, and abide in him in order to enjoy the full benefits of his intercession ; hence the importance of his own instructions ; "*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.*" It is on the same plan that God is said to make an everlasting covenant with his people ; this is evident from the following passage, " 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 ?" Heb. 10, 29.

The Apostle Paul in addressing the Phillipians says, " being confident of this very thing, that he which hath begun a good work in you, will perform it until the day of Christ." He then gives his rea-

son, "Even as it is meet for me to think this of you all, because I have you in my heart, inasmuch as both in my bonds, and in the defence and confirmation of the gospel, ye are all partakers of my grace." The Apostle was confident that his brethren were abiding in Christ. This is evident from what he says shortly after, "Wherefore my beloved, as ye have always obeyed, not as in my presence only, but now much more in my absence."

The Apostle expresses the same sentiment in writing to the Romans. He commences the 8th chapter thus, "There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit."

In closing the chapter he says "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."

After our Savior's resurrection he said to his disciples, "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."

Now it is evident that in complying with these instructions, they were to receive the blessings which follows.

"And lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." There are two extremes into which many run on this subject. Some consider it in such a light as nearly to eclipse the promises made to the disciples; others run into the other extreme, applying the same blessings both to the luke-warm, and to the devoted Christian, while in fact the promises are to those who are not only in Christ, but *abide in him*. *"They went out from us, but they were not of us."* 1 John, 2, 19. Were not of whom? They were not of those who abide in Christ. We find the doctrine of the apostle exhibited in the 24th verse. "Let that, therefore, abide in you, which ye have heard from the beginning." "If that which ye have heard from the beginning shall remain in you, ye also shall continue in the Son, and in the Father. And this is the promise that he hath promised us, even eternal life."

Again in the 28th verse.

"And now, little children, abide in him; that when he shall appear, we may have confidence, and not be ashamed before him, at his coming."

Finally, the following passage is frequently introduced in proof of the perseverance of the saints "For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate," &c. The doctrine here taught, has already been explained in a similar passage, viz: "God hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation through sanctification of the spirit and belief of

the truth." A further explanation of this passage will be found in the essay on the "Decrees or purposes of God."

NO. XXVII.

MEANS OF GRACE.

The principle of God's administration is to require much where much is given, and to require little where little is given. All have, in some measure, the means of knowing God. "Because that which may be known of God is manifested in them; for God hath shewn 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." Christ is called the true light which lighted every man that cometh into the world.

The Holy Spirit reproves the world of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment.

The object of the present essay is to notice *the means possessed by those who have the bible.*

And 1st. *What are the means which Christians are to employ to promote their own sanctification and that of others?*

2d. *What is the duty of the sinner?*

1st. Christians should live in intimate communion with God, by *prayer and watchfulness, by read-*

ing the scriptures, by exercising love, one toward another; by attending to public worship, and the ordinances of the Gospel; in fine, by maintaining a strict observance of all the commandments of Christ. I pass to notice the means which Christians are to employ to promote the sanctification of others.

1st. *The instruction of parents to children.* As soon as children are capable of exercising their reason and understanding, parents should instill into their minds the principles of christianity. Many seem to think it proper to wait for their children to grow up and experience religion before they give them any particular religious instruction, setting the truth home to their hearts and consciences. This is something like the conduct of the husbandman, who would plant a piece of corn, and then wait to see whether it comes to maturity before gathering out the weeds. Just so inconsistent is the conduct of some parents. They seem to forget that there is such a passage in the bible as the following: "Train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old he will not depart from it."

2d. *The institution of Sabbath Schools.*

This also is calculated to strike at the very root of early formed habits of sin, and to train up a community for God.

Here the pious teacher has every advantage to impress the youthful mind with truth which will result in much good.

3d. If we would see Christianity spread throughout the world, *Christians must not hold slaves, depriving them of their rights.* This trade should be abandoned immediately. The happy results of the latter course is beautifully exemplified in our British brethren, who have distinguished themselves above all others, in modern times, for relieving the oppressed. I will say only a few words on slavery as it is, by many, considered separate from theology. By slavery I mean American slavery, where our brethren are held in servitude for the simple reason that they are colored, and therefore ought to be deprived of their wages.

American slavery is to Christianity what "war, rum and gun-powder" are to peace.

4th. It will be proper to notice the *means* which ministers are to use to win souls to Christ,

The Word of God is the means which they are to use for the conversion of souls. With a prayerful, spiritual frame of mind, they must set this home to the hearts and consciences of sinners.

In the first epistle of Peter, chap. 1, 23, he says,

"Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever."

In 1 Tim. 4, 16. The Apostle says, *"Take heed unto thyself, and unto thy doctrine; continue in them, for in doing this thou shalt both save thyself, and them that hear thee."*

As Dr. Dwight says, "The scriptures are called

the *Word of Salvation*; the *Word of Life*; the *Word of Faith*; the *Word of Wisdom*; the *Word of Knowledge*; the *Word of Reconciliation*; and the *Sword of the Spirit*." "Is not my word like as a fire? saith the Lord; and like a hammar that breaketh the rock in pieces?" Jer. 23, 29. St. Paul, in writing to the Hebrews, 4, 12; says, "for the *word of God* is quick, and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart."

Our Lord says, *The words that I speak unto you they are Spirit, and they are Life*." "Now ye are clean *through the word* which I have spoken unto you." John, 15, 3.

"It pleased God, by the foolishness of preaching, to save them that believe," 1 Cor. 1, 21.

The gospel is the power of God unto salvation, to every one that believeth. Ministers and Christians, generally, must be prompt in their dealings with each other, and with the world. They must remember the requisition, "*Owe no man any thing*." If neglect of this requisition produces distrust in the minds of Christians, how much more so in the minds of the ungodly. Christians should be mighty in the scriptures, fervent in prayer. In private and public they should converse with sinners, pointedly and make them feel that religion is the chief concern. They should disseminate religious letters

among their acquaintances. This was the practice of the Apostles; and a great part of the New Testament is made up of such writings. Attempting only to make a glance at some of the means which Christians are to employ, I pass to notice—

2d. *The duty of the sinner.*

Sinners must become penitent for their sins. To such the Lord will look while he knoweth the proud afar off. Our Lord says he came to call sinners to repentance. They must not only repent but believe. This also is the language of our Savior: Repent ye and believe the gospel, they must obey the gospel; it is not sufficient that they barely hear. Have they not heard? yes, verily, their sound went into all the earth, and their words unto the ends of the world. But *they have not all obeyed the gospel.* Rom. 10, 16.

Our Savior, addressing sinners, says, Luke, 13, 24. *Strive to enter in at the straight gate:* and Matt. 7, 13, 14, *Enter ye in at the straight gate; because straight is the gate and narrow is the way which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it.* Those who have not entered in at the straight gate, of course, are sinners; hence he applies this instruction to such.

In Is. 55, 6, 7, is found the following passage: *Seek ye the Lord while he may be found: call ye upon him while he is near.* The persons to whom this appeal is made, are in the second verse mentioned as those who *spend money for that which is not bread,*

and their labor for that which satisfieth not. Such persons are sinners, yet they are required to seek, and call upon the Lord. If it is the minister's duty to preach the gospel to sinners, it is their duty to obey his instructions. It is certain that ministers should preach to them. "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature."

NO. XXVIII.

PRAYER.

Ist. *The nature of prayer*

Prayer includes adoration and acknowledgment of God's perfections and our obligations; the giving of thanks for the mercies we have received; humble confession of our sins: and a fervent supplication of blessing for ourselves and others. Vocal prayer is an external act, but supposes the correspondence of the will and affections; prayer may also be mental, the acts of which being conceived in the mind, when not expressed in words. The subject now under consideration is well defined in the Westminster Catechism,—“Prayer is the offering of our desires to God for things agreeable to his will in the name of Christ, with confession of our sins, and a thankful acknowledgment of his mercies.” Prayer may be divided into private, family and public.

Private Prayer. This is designed to bring us

as individuals into direct communion with God, there to confess our sins and cultivate personal piety in our hearts. Our Savior enjoins secret prayer, "But thou, when thou prayest, enter in to thy closet, and when thou hast shut the door, pray to thy Father which is in secret; and thy Father which seeth in secret, shall reward thee openly." In this duty we have the example of Christ. He retired in private, that he might "pray."

Family Prayer. Great responsibilities arise from the relation of parents to children. They are required to bring them up in the "nurture and admonition of the Lord." They are to instill into their youthful minds the principles of Christianity, both by precept and example.

Says Anderson, "The disposition of some men, professing Christianity, to ask peremptorily for a *particular precept* in all cases of incumbent moral duty, is one which every Christian would do well to examine; not only that he may never be troubled with it himself, but that he may be at no loss in answering such a man, if he is called to converse with him. The particular duty to which he refers, —say for example, family worship,—is comparatively of small account. His question itself is indicative not merely of great ignorance; it is symptomatic of the want of religious principle. When a man says that he can *only* be bound to such a duty, a moral duty, by a positive and particular precept, I am satisfied he could not perform it, in

obedience to any precept whatever ; nor could he even now, though he were to try. The truth is, that this man has no disposition towards such worship, and he rather requires to be informed of the grounds of all such obligation.

“ The duty of family devotion, therefore, let it be remembered, though it had been minutely enjoined as to both substance and season, would not, after all have been founded only on such injunctions. I want the reader thoroughly to understand the *character* of a christian, the *constitution* of the family ; and out of this character, and that constitution, he will find certain duties to arise *necessarily* : that is, they are essential to the continuance and well-being of himself as a christian parent, and of the constitution over which he is set. In this case there can be no question as to their obligation, and for a precept there is no necessity. The Almighty, in his word, has not only said nothing in vain, but nothing except what is necessary. Now, as to family worship, for a particular precept I have no wish ; no, not even for the sake of *others*, because I am persuaded that the Christian, in his sober senses, *will* naturally obey and no other *can*.

To apply, however, this request for a precise precept to some other branches of family duty ; What would be thought of me. were I to demand an express precept to enforce my obligation to feed my children, and another to oblige me to clothe them ; one to express my obligation to teach them the use

of letters, and another to secure my training them to lawful or creditable professions or employments? All this very properly you might reply, is absurd in the highest degree; your obligation rests on much higher ground; nay, doth not *nature* itself teach you in this and much more than this? Very true, I reply; and is *renewed nature*, then, not to teach me far more still? To what other nature are such words as these addressed?—

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."

"Independantly, however, of all this evidence with any rational christian parent, I may confirm, and establish his mind on much higher ground then even that which these pointed examples afford. To such a parent I might say. Without hesitation you will admit that your obligations to your family are to be measured now, and on the day of final account by your *capacity*, as a man by your natural, as a christian by your spiritual capacity? and, however you may feel conscious of falling short daily, that you are under obligation to honor God to the utmost limit of this capacity; You will also allow that, standing where you do, you are not now like a solitary orphan without relations to be regarded only as a single individual. God himself, your Creator, your Savior and your Judge,

regards you as the *head of a family* ; and, therefore in possession of a sacred trust ? you have the care of souls ? Now if you do really measure obligation by capacity, then you will also at once allow, that you must do what you can, that he may from your family, have as much honor as possible.

“Without hesitation you will also allow that God daily *preserves* you. And does he not also preserve your family ? But if he preserves, he has a right of property in each and all under your roof. Shall he not therefore, have from you acknowledgment of this ? If daily he preserves, shall he not be daily acknowledged ? And if acknowledged at all, how ought he to be so, if not upon your knees ? And how can they know this if they do no *hear* it ?”

When *Joshua* tells the children of *Israel*, that “as for him and his house, they will serve the Lord ;” he teaches us plainly, that they maintained this service.

The Lord's Prayer, says Dr. Dwight, after the manner we are directed by Christ to pray, is a social prayer ; and seems plainly to have been intended, not for an individual, not for the closet, not for the Church ; but for the family and the fireside. In this prayer we are directed to ask for our daily bread, on the day in which the prayer is used. As therefore, we need, and are bound to ask for, our daily bread, every day, it was plainly designed to be a daily prayer ; and could not, therefore, be in-

tended for the Church; since mankind are not, and cannot be present in the Church every day. That it was not intended for the closet is obvious from the fact, that it is addressed to God by more than one. That it may be used in the Church and in the closet as to its substance, I readily acknowledge; but it was, I think, plainly intended principally for the household. "What a live coal," says *Dr. Hunter*, beautifully "is applied to devotion, when the solitary *my* Father and *my* God, is changed into the social *our* Father and *our* God!" How delightful, let me add, how interesting, how animating, how encouraging to every amiable and virtuous emotion, for the pair thus united, to be able to say, and actually to say "Behold here are we, and the children whom thou hast given us."

Many are the good effects of family prayer. Here children are taught to lisp the praises of their God. Early impressions are easily made on the youthful mind, and remain indelible in old age.

Public Prayer.

The course of the synagogue worship became the model of that of the Christian Church. It consisted in prayer, reading and explaining the scriptures and in singing. In this way the means of spreading and maintaining religion among a people, passed from the Jews into all Christian countries. The command to preach the gospel shows that persons should assemble to hear it. A *Church* signifies an assembly of Christians for the transaction

of business. And as the business of a christian assembly must necessarily be spiritual, it includes the exercise of prayer, singing and reading the scriptures. Some of the Epistles of Paul are commanded to be read in the Churches. The singing of psalms and hymns is enjoined as an act of Divine worship. St. Paul reminds the Hebrews that they "forsake not the assembling of themselves together." The Lord's supper was celebrated by the assembly of believers. The Apostle instructs the Corinthians as to the exercises of prayer and prophesyings, "when they come together in the church." The benefits of public prayer are seen not only in ancient but in modern times. We cannot but notice the powerful and almost unparalleled revivals in America which have resulted in meetings of public prayer. Here saints have been quickened and animated; mourners have been comforted, and tears have suffused the eyes of sinners.

2. Prayer of Faith.

This is believing that God is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him. We may not receive every particular thing which we might conceive of asking for, and for the very reason that it would not be for our good and the glory of God. But no good thing will be withheld, and surely it would be a great blessing for those things to be withheld which would be for our injury; so then the prayer of faith is always answered, inasmuch as every necessary good is bestow-

ed. In 2, Cor. 12, 7, Paul says "there was given to me a thorn in the flesh." In the 8th verse he says, "For this thing I besought the Lord thrice, that it might depart from me." Though it did not depart yet his prayer was heard and he received a greater blessing; for the Lord said unto him "*My grace is sufficient for thee.*" This was all the Apostle could desire; and that he was satisfied is evident from what follows, "for my strength is made perfect in weakness." Most gladly therefore will I rather glory in my infirmities, that the power of Christ may rest on me.

3. *The duty of Prayer* is evident from the preceding remarks. We are dependant beings and it is our duty to look to Him who is our sufficiency. Prayer is enjoined upon us in scripture: "Watch ye, therefore and pray always." Luke 21, 36. "Be careful for nothing; but, in every thing by prayer and supplication with thanksgiving, let your requests be made known unto God." Pil. 4, 6. "Pray without ceasing," 1 Thess. 5, 17. Our Lord has taught us that we ought "to pray and not faint." We are to pray for others "Peter was therefore kept in prison; but prayer was made without ceasing of the church unto God for him," Acts, 12, 5. "Confess your faults one to another, and pray one for another that ye may be healed," James 5, 16.

IV. *Utility of Prayer.*

The utility of prayer is evident from the fact,

that God has established prayer as a condition on which we are to receive certain favors. The reasonableness of this condition, is obvious from the dependance of all creatures upon him. That prayer is a condition on which God bestows favors is evident from the following passages: "Ask, and it shall be given you, seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you: For every one that asketh receiveth; and he that seeketh findeth; and to him that knocketh it shall be opened. Or what man is there of you, whom if his son ask bread will he give him a stone? Or if he ask a fish, will he give him a serpent? If ye, then being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your Father which is in heaven give good things to them that ask him?" Mat. 7, 7,—11.

Objections.

It is said if the efficacy of prayer as to ourselves be granted, its influence upon others is more difficult to conceive.

When we pray for others, we must pray for them in consistancy with their own free agency and the principles of God's government. This is the plan on which our Savior prayed for man. He never prayed for them to be saved in their sins, refusing to come to him that they might have life; hence the importance of the scripture injunction; "Turn ye, turn ye, for why will ye die?" "Look

unto me and be ye saved all ye ends of the earth; for I am God, and there is none else.

The second objection is, that God will do right whether we pray or not. To this it is sufficient to answer, that it may be right for God to bestow favors on those who pray, which it would not be right for him to bestow if they did not pray.

A third objection has been grounded upon a supposed decree of whatever comes to pass; and the argument is that as this decree cannot be altered, prayer, which supposes that God will depart from it, is useless. The answer which our predestinarian brethren would give to this objection is. That the argument drawn from the predestination of God lies with the same force against every other humane effort as against prayer; and that God's decree to give food to man does not render the cultivation of the earth useless, so neither does the predestination of things exclude the efficacy of prayer. It would also be urged, that God has ordained the means as well as the end; and though he is unchangeable, it is a part of his unchangeable system to hear and answer prayer.

Those who reject these views of predestination will answer the objection differently. In their views the preceding answer with such premises is unsatisfactory. They would give the following: Although God has absolutely decreed some things, he permits others which respects his government of free and moral agents. The true immutability of

God consists in his never changing the *principles* of his administration; and he may therefore in perfect accordance with his decrees, and the immutability of his nature, purposes to do under certain conditions dependant upon the free agency of man, what he will not do under others; and for this reason, that an immutable adherence to the *principles* of a just and gracious government, requires it. Prayer is in scripture made one of these conditions: and if God has established it as one of the principles of his moral government to accept prayer, in every case in which he has given us authority to ask, he has not entangled his government of the world, with such a decree of particular events, as to reduce prayer to a mere form of words, or not to be able, consistently with his decrees, to answer it whenever it is encouraged by his promises.

Intercession of Christ.

The intercession of Christ relates to what he is now doing for his saints in heaven. He has finished the work of atonement. He has died. He has risen from the dead. Our Lord has ascended to heaven; and ever liveth there to *make intercession for his people*.

This part of the Savior's work belongs to his *priestly office*, and was typified under the Jewish dispensation, by a part of the service of the high priest. The priest in Israel went *daily* into the *holy* place, to do the service of God. But none

except the high priest, went into the *most holy place*, and he only once a year. Here he sprinkled the mercy seat with the blood of atonement, and burned incense before the Lord. "But Christ," says the apostle, "being 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 in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us." Heb. 9, 11, 12.

Again, "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." Heb. 6, 24. It is evident, from these passages, that that part of the service of the high priest to which we have referred—the most solemn of all his services—was typical of the intercession of Christ in heaven. But how does Christ intercede? The sense of scripture appears to be this:—

1. Christ intercedes in heaven by *appearing there with the blood of atonement*, which has been shed for man. As the high priest in Israel went into the most holy place with the blood of atonement; so our great High Priest has gone into the heavens, with his own blood, there to appear in the presence of God for us. He appears there as a Lamb that has been slain. The blood of Christ speaketh better things than the blood of Abel. It

pleads for mercy to the guilty. Christ appears before the throne with a full atonement.

The law is honored; its demands are satisfied; that God might offer pardon to sinners; "that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus."

2. Christ intercedes in heaven by offering *literal prayers* for his people. Thus the subject was understood by the Christian Fathers, and by the older Protestant commentators. A different view has been given by some recent interpreter, but the testimony of scripture, favors the Ancients.

2. The supposition that Christ literally intercedes in heaven, is in itself *reasonable*. Our Savior exists as really in heaven as he did on earth. When the disciples saw him ascend into heaven, there was no loss in the reality of his bodily existence. While our Savior is in heaven, in the more immediate presence of God, yet he cares for his needy followers on earth; he grants them his holy spirit; he *intercedes* for them.

Nothing is more reasonable than to suppose that Christ in his intercourse with the Father, prays for his people, for whom he died and rose again.

3. That Christ literally prays in heaven is visible in the typical service of the Jewish high priest.

He went into the most holy place, not only with the blood of atonement, but *with incense*. He was directed "to take a censer full of burning coals from the altar, before the Lord, and his hands full

of sweet incense, and bring it within the vail, and to put the incense upon the fire before the Lord, that the cloud of the incense might cover the mercy seat." Lev. 16, 12. Whether the priest literally prayed, in the performance of this service, we are not informed; but the incense which he offered was the known *symbol of prayer*. "Let my prayer," says David, "be set forth as incense." Ps. 141, 2. The four and twenty elders "fell down before the Lamb, having every one of them harps, and golden vials full of odors, (or incense) which are the *prayers of saints*." Rev. 5, 8.

4. That Christ in heaven literally prays for his people, appears from plain *declarations of scripture*. "Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth, 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*." Rom. 8, 33, 34."

Christ, because he continueth ever, hath an unchangeable priesthood. Wherefore 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. 7, 24, 25.

There is also another term by which the intercession of Christ is set forth, which conveys the same idea. "If any man sin, we have an *advocate* with the Father." 1 John 2, 1. The word here rendered advocate, properly signifies an *intercessor*. —one who pleads for another.

5. Christ promised his disciples, just before he left them, that he would *pray* for them ; which appears to mean that he would intercede for them in heaven. "I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another comforter, that he may abide with you forever." John 14, 16. We have no evidence that Christ fulfilled this promise previous to his ascension, but much reason to believe that he fulfilled it afterwards, since it was some days after the ascension of Christ that the prayer was heard, and the Holy Spirit came.

3. Another mode of Christ's *intercession* consists in his *presenting*, before the throne of his Father, *the prayers of his saints*. This mode, like both of the preceding, was typified in the services of the ancient temple. While the priest went in, with his censer, to appear before God, the multitude of the people remained *praying without*, in the time of incense. Luke 1, 10.

All this is represented in one of the visions of the Apostle John. "Another angel came and stood at the altar, having a golden censer, and there was given to him much *incense* that he should offer it with *the prayers of all saints*, upon the golden altar that was before the throne. And the smoke of the incense, *which came with the prayers of saints*, ascended up before God out of the angels hand." Rev. 8, 3.

We can have access to God in prayer only *through Christ* ; (Eph. 2, 18.) but we can come in

his name, and have whatever we need. "Whatsoever," saith our Savior, "ye shall ask the Father, in my name, he will do it."

We are dependant both on the atonement and intercession of Christ, that we may be presented acceptable worshippers of God.

4. *The extent of Christ's Intercession.*

From the preceding remarks we have seen that the atonement of Christ, would be of no avail to the salvation of men, were it not for his intercession. Now as the way is open to the salvation of *all*, it is evident that *Christ's intercession* must extend to *all*. It extends not only to the saints, but to the world, otherwise there would be a plain denial of scripture, where our Lord is represented as coming into the world, "*that the world through him might be saved.*" Why then are the world not saved? It is because they will not come unto Christ, that they may have life. Christ does not pray for us to be saved in our sins, it is on condition that we repent and believe the gospel. We must confess our sins, "If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness."

It has been previously noticed that an *advocate* means an *intercessor*, one who pleads for another. "And 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." 1 John 2, 1, 2.

And not only does Christ, while in heaven intercede for the world, but his prayer extended to them when he was upon earth.

First he prays for his Apostles who were given him, "I pray for them, I pray not for the world," neither does he pray for any other disciples who should believe, but for them whom the Father had given him, viz. the Apostles. Afterwards he says, "Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word. That they all may be one : as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us. *That the world may believe that thou hast sent me.*" Thus we see that the intercession of Christ, not only extends now to the world, while he is in heaven, but that it also extended to them, when he was on earth. Be it remembered that those who live in enmity towards God, slight not only the atonement of Christ, but also his *intercession*. And how shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation.

NO. XXIX.

DEATH.

Death is the separation between the soul and body. Though the body returns to the dust, the soul survives, that it is immortal is abundantly evident from several arguments.

1. The natural instinctive *desire* of immortality, the dread of annihilation. By some it is considered questionable whether this argument possesses much solidity. It is stated that this desire does not appear to be different from the love of life, which is common to us, and the inferior animals. But this reasoning does not seem to be valid. Christians certainly, may be resigned to give up their temporal lives, while they would recoil at the thoughts of annihilation.

2. The fact that the belief in a future state of existence *has prevailed*. Doubtless among all nations, showing that this is a *natural* sentiment, one which would not have prevailed so extensively, had there been no foundation for it in truth.

The belief of the immortality of the soul, is found in the history of all civilized nations, and even among savage tribes. It prevailed among the Romans, Greeks, Egyptians, Chaldeans, Persians, Indians, and Gauls, and wherever modern travellers have gone and ascertained the opinions of the nations, it has been found that the belief of a future state has prevailed, more or less distinct. "The immortality of the soul," says Cicero, "is established by the consent of all nations."

3. The soul of man, unlike that of the mere animal is endowed with *faculties* and *capacities* which indicate that it was *made for eternity*. Among these *faculties* is *conscience*. By this faculty, we are enabled to distinguish between right and wrong

and feel the force of moral obligation. By this we have the sense of accountability, and are pointed forward to a future retribution. Among the capacities of the soul, worthy of our attention, is that of its *vast improvement* in wisdom and knowledge.

4. From the *unequal distribution of rewards and punishments in this life*, it may be inferred that there is another state of existence, where the disorders of the present will be rectified;—where the good will be rewarded, and the wicked punished according to their own works.

Some who have held to a future state, have supposed that death was a temporary cessation of rational, conscious existence. They believe that the entire man rests in the grave till the resurrection, and that there his existence is to be renewed.

But the soul may exist and be active, separate from the body. God who is a spirit, exists without a material body. Angels who are spirits, exist without material bodies. And if the soul of man is a spiritual substance, why may it not exist in a disembodied state? It is impossible to conceive a spirit to be insensible, when freed from the frail body, “as the idea” says a distinguished writer, which is always entertained of it is, that it is a living, thinking, active substance; and that its separation from the body, instead of being an argument for its insensibility, as if it could not act without bodily organs, is rather an argument against it; because being no longer fettered and impeded by a sub-

stance dull and inert, it is at full liberty to exert its native energies, as smothered fire breaks out into a flame, when it obtains a free communication with the atmosphere."

2. *Scripture Testimony.*

We have evidence from the testimony of our Savior, both of the immortality of the soul, and that the saints will be with him immediately after death.

—"one sentence from whose lips" saith Dr. Dick, "is of greater weight than all the reasonings of philosophers, whether heathen or christian. Why should we follow a circuitous and uncertain path, when the highway is before us? Or why should we light a torch, when the sun is pouring around us the full splendor of its beams?" "Jesus Christ hath abolished death, and brought life and immortality to light, through the gospel."

2 Tim. 1. 10. "I go to prepare a place for you, and if I go away, I will come again, and receive you to myself that where I am there ye may be also."

From our Savior's promise to the penitent thief, we learn the state of the saints, immediately after death. To day shalt thou be with me in paradise. If language has any meaning, this implies that on that day, his soul should be in the same place with that of Christ that is, in paradise. The word "paradise" is well known to designate a place of enjoyment. It points to the blessedness which the penitent sought "Lord, remember me when thou com

est into thy kingdom." The Savior heard his prayer.

Stephen evidently expected that his soul would go immediately to heaven, when he prayed, "Lord Jesus, *receive my spirit.*" Paul proceeds upon the supposition that the saints as soon as they leave this world, enter their heavenly rest "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. The entrance into heaven is the removal from earth. The same sentiment is implied when he says that he was "in a strait betwixt two" whether to remain upon earth, or "to depart and to be with Christ, which was far better." Phil. 1, 23. We must certainly suppose he believed, that as soon as he departed, he should be with Christ. This is clear from the fact that he could not have hesitated for a moment whether to remain inactive and in a state of insensibility for thousands of years or to live and be engaged in the cause of Christ, and enjoy communion with God. It may be objected that this long period would appear to him but a moment. But this supposition is in no way applicable to the following words; "Therefore we are always confident, knowing that whilst we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord." "We are confident and willing rather to be absent from the body, and to be present with the Lord." 2 Cor. 5, 6, 8. We could not express in a clear

er manner, the immediate transition of the soul from the present world into the presence of Christ. Our departure from the body, is what introduces us into the presence of the Lord.

“When the dust returns to the earth as it was, the Spirit will return to God who gave it.” Eccl. 12, 7.

The appearance of Moses and Elias at the transfiguration of our Savior, gives us some view of their existence, after leaving this world. One of them was an embodied Spirit; the other disembodied. Elias is another name for Elijah; he, as we all know, was translated to heaven without seeing death, and of course exists as the saints will after the resurrection. But Moses died, and very probably exists as the rest of the saints do before the resurrection, and as they immediately leave the present world. The disciples James, Peter and John, saw both Moses and Elias with Christ, conversing with him. And the interview with them was interesting to the disciples, not only with our Savior and Elias, but also with Moses. This must be the case, for Peter says to the Savior, let us build here *three* tabernacles; one for *thee*, one for *Moses* and one for *Elias*. Here we see that the disciples were interested in the society of Moses as well as that of Elias and our Savior. We do not suppose that either of the former, engaged their attention so much as our Savior.

The saints at death will be freed from temptation

and sin. The souls in heaven are called "the spirits of just men made perfect."

As heaven is a place of infinite blessedness, we cannot suppose any to enter there, who are not made free from sin. "There shall in no wise enter into it any thing that defileth, neither whatsoever worketh abomination or maketh a lie ; but they which are written in the Lamb's book of life." Rev. 21. 27. Unless the Saints were perfectly pure, they would not be prepared for the society of the blessed. But as they are at death set free from temptation and sin, the souls of the saints will enjoy the felicity of a future state.

The perfect holiness which the soul attains at death, is not changeable like that of Adam, but it is fixed and eternal. "Him that overcometh will I make a pillar in the temple of my God, and he *shall go no more out*, and I will write upon him the name of my God, and the name of the city of my God, which is new Jerusalem, which cometh down out of heaven from my God, and I will write upon him my new name."

Death ends our Probation.

The idea of a probation beyond the grave, is contradicted by the general tenor of scripture. I need not discuss this point at length here as the doctrine will be considered in the lecture on the final state of the righteous and wicked. It may be observed however, that the scriptures represent this life, as the seed time, and the only time in

which to lay up treasures in heaven. If we here sow to the flesh, we shall of the flesh, reap corruption. The rich man and Lazarus, after death, are represented as having their conditions eternally fixed. Luke, 16, 26. There are no changes of worlds beyond the grave, but every one will be treated according to the deeds *done here in the body*. "He that is unjust, let him be unjust still; and he which is filthy, let him be filthy still; and he that is righteous, let him be righteous still; and he that is holy let him be holy still." Rev. 22, 11, But in this life, the offers of the gospel are spread out. Come, for all things are now ready. "Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might, for there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in the grave whither thou goest." Eccl. 9, 10.

The inquiry arises, why is death inflicted? It is on account of sin, that "death has passed upon all men." "Sin is not imputed, when there is no law. Nevertheless, death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression." It still reigns over those that have not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression. Infants die although they are not capable of actual disobedience. It may be asked, how then is it right for them to be involved in this infliction? The answer is whatever they have lost in Adam involuntary on their part they have secured to them in Christ involuntary on

their part. Though their bodies return to dust yet they are restored in the resurrection, even in a better situation than before the fall. They are no more exposed to death, but are destined to be with Christ forever.

It may be asked, why *believers* experience death if Christ has secured to them salvation from sin. It is sufficient to answer that their bodily existence is restored in the resurrection; and why it is deferred till that time we need not enquire. By death, we are constantly reminded of the sad effects of sin, which should humble us, and bring us to the feet of Jesus; there it is our privilege to grow up into Christ, to awake in his likeness, be joint heirs with him, become kings and priests unto God.

It has pleased God that we should live here by faith. Here the saints are afflicted; like other men they die; yet their language should be, "Though he slay me yet will I trust in him."

NO. XXX.

IMMEDIATE CONSEQUENCES OF DEATH.

The consequences of death to the human body are very obvious. Immediately on the departure of the soul, the body becomes senseless, lifeless; is consigned to the grave, and soon moulders back to dust.

The consequences of death to the soul of man,

are of the greatest importance; and we may inquire, 1. Does the disembodied soul pass through any *trial* or *judgment* previous to the resurrection? That it does, is intimated in the scriptures, and is in accordance with the common apprehension of Christians. We speak of a person when he dies, as having *gone with his account to God*. It appears that the soul, immediately on leaving the body, is fully conscious of its character and state; it perceives clearly what manner of spirit it is of, and for what world it is prepared and destined. The moment the soul leaves the body, it is made fully conscious of the Divine presence, of its own character and destiny. See Lecture xxix, for a more full account of the conscious existence of the soul immediately after death. It is judged at once in the presence of God; and enters either happiness or misery.—Such a judgment does not obviate the necessity of a *final* and *general* judgment. If the object of the final judgment were to satisfy man as to his own proper character and state it would be superseded and unnecessary. But this is not the object of the great judgment day. Its object is higher than this, and one with which the judgment passed upon the soul at death does not interfere.

2. Are the souls of the righteous and wicked separated in point of *place*, previous to the resurrection? The solution of this question depends partly on another, viz: Are spirits capable of being fixed in any particular place? That they are, may

be shown from facts. Are not our spirits now fixed in a *place*—in the body—in this world? And if they may exist in a place here, why not hereafter? The angels are spirits, and do not they exist each of them in some place? Were not the angels in some place, who were seen of the disciples at the sepulchre of our Saviour? The scriptures represent the righteous and wicked as being separated at death; and this separation is obviously one of place. In heaven, where the spirits of just men made perfect dwell, there are now glorified bodies; and these, we know, must exist in some place. There is the glorified body of our Saviour. There also, are, the bodies of Enoch and Elijah. With these, no doubt, are associated the glorified spirits of the just; who, of course, are situated with them in a place, viz: heaven. From this holy place, the souls of the wicked are *separated*. They are in the *place* prepared for the devil and his angels. An objection to this view, may, perhaps, be raised from the signification of the term *sheol*, and its corresponding Greek term, *Hades*, in the original scriptures. It is evident, on examination, that these words are used to express, generally, the region of the dead. They often signify the grave, also the place of departed spirits, and particularly, of *wicked spirits*. In this sense it is used in the following passage: “The *wicked* shall be turned into (*sheol*) hell, and all the *nations that forget God*. Every candid man

must acknowledge that this is not spoken as applicable to the righteous, but that it is restricted to the *wicked* and the *nations that forget God*. "In hell (Hades) he lifted up his eyes being in torment." Luke 16, 23.

3. Of what nature are the enjoyments and the sufferings of souls previous to the resurrection?—It is certain that they are not corporeal, sensual or animal; since the soul is now separate from the body. They must, therefore, be *intellectual, moral or spiritual*,—such as are adapted to the nature of a disembodied spirit. Some of the sources of happiness to the spirits of just men made perfect are, then, the investigation and discovery of truth, the approbation of conscience, joyful recollections and anticipations, the society of the blessed, the presence of Christ, communion with God. The opposite of these are sources of torment to the wicked spirits.

4. Do separate souls know each other, and renew former acquaintance and intercourse in the other world? This appears from scripture to be the fact. Abraham and the rich man, and Lazarus are represented as perfectly knowing each other in the teachings of our Savior. The kings of the nations are represented as knowing the king of Babylon, when he came down to them into hell, and as taunting over him. Is. 14, 10. The souls of the martyrs, who had come out of great tribulation, and had washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb, undoubtedly knew each

other, and sympathized in each others joys. The fact of this inquiry seems to be taken for granted, rather than directly taught, in the various representations of scripture on the subject. Did not Moses and Elias know each other, when they appeared at our Savior's transfiguration? Here is a beautiful example showing not merely that the disembodied spirits have knowledge, but that they associate with embodied spirits. Elias, who is Elijah, was an embodied spirit, but Moses disembodied;* yet both of them could be with Christ and converse with him.

*It is thought by some that the body of Moses had been raised when he appeared with Elijah and the Savior on the mount of transfiguration. But of this there is no valid evidence. The strongest presumptive proof of Moses' resurrection is, that his body was not to be found some time after it was buried. We have, however, positive evidence that Moses had not been raised when he appeared on the mount of transfiguration; because Christ is become the *first fruits* of them that slept. 1 Cor. 15, 20. *Afterwards* they that are Christ's at his coming. Verse 23.

As Christ is the *first fruits*, Moses could not have been raised when he appeared on the mount, because that was before the resurrection of Christ, and thus Moses would have been the first fruits, and not Christ. It may be said that Christ raised Lazarus before his own resurrection. Lazarus was not at that time raised to immortality.—It was a miraculous restoration of natural life. The whole force of the context shows this to be the case.

It is clear then that Moses only in his glorified spirit appeared with our Savior on the mount of transfiguration. It is a clear exhibition of what the saints will be as soon as they die; and as they look into the glories of the resurrection, how must their souls be filled with rapture. No rolling tear down the blooming cheek. No howling winds around the peaceful place. Not a cloud in all the heavenly region.

5. Have separate souls any means of becoming acquainted with what is transacted here on earth? It appears that they have. It is certain that the angels, both the holy and the fallen, maintain a constant intercourse between this world and the world of spirits, and may carry intelligence from the one to the other. It is also certain that multitudes are continually leaving this world and going to the world of spirits, who may carry intelligence. At any rate, spirits in the other world are represented as knowing what is transacted here. The rich man in hell knew that his five brethren were still living, and that they were likely to follow him to that place of torment. The souls under the altar knew that their blood had not, at that time, been avenged on their persecutors. The repentance of a sinner is known in heaven. Man on earth is represented as calling together his friends and neighbors, saying unto them rejoice with me. "I say unto you, that likewise joy shall be in heaven over one sinner that repenteth, more than over ninety and nine just persons which need no repentance." Luke 15, 7. It is very probable that spirits in the other world feel a deep interest in the transactions on earth, especially in such as relate to the kingdom of Christ.

NO. XXXI.

RESURRECTION OF THE DEAD.

By the resurrection of the dead we mean that

the bodies which are laid in the grave, will be raised and will be again united with their souls, to continue in existence forever. It is clearly revealed in the Bible, not only in the New Testament but also in the Old. The following words of Job have been much discussed. But the circumstances and manner in which they were spoken evidently point to something more than a temporal deliverance. "Oh that my words were now written! Oh that they were printed in a book! that they were graven with an iron pen and lead in the rock forever! For I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth: And though after my skin worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God; whom I shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold, and not another; though my reins be consumed within me." Job 19: 23—27. It is taught in Isaiah: "He will swallow up death in victory, and the Lord God will wipe away tears from off all faces." Is. 25: 8. Likewise in Isaiah 26: 19. "Thy dead men shall live, together with my dead body shall they arise. Awake and sing, ye that dwell in dust; for thy dew is as the dew of herbs, and the earth shall cast out the dead." We find the following passage in the prophecies of Daniel 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 for ever and ever."—The resurrection of the dead both of the righteous and the wicked, is also abundantly taught in the New Testament. "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." John 5: 28, 29.

Paul believed in the resurrection, "both of the just and the unjust." Acts 24: 15.

The New Testament reveals that the Jews firmly believed in the doctrine of the resurrection, and that they believed this previous to the gospel dispensation: "And others were tortured, not accepting deliverance, that they might obtain a better resurrection." Heb. 11: 35.

It may be asked whether our bodies will be raised or new ones be formed? They evidently will be raised. "It is objected," says Dr. Dick, "that the bodies of men often enter in the composition of other substances; that they not only serve for the nutrition of vegetables and are the food of carnivorous animals, but that they are occasionally devoured by cannibals, and converted into a part of their bodies. It is easy to conceive them to be reclaimed from animals and vegetables; but what shall be done in those cases in which the same particles happen to belong to different men? Two things are supposed in this objection. First, that all the

particles which have ever belonged to an individual will be united in the composition of his future body ; and secondly, that a part of the substance of one man may become part of the substance of another. It is evident that, if the first supposition is true, the second is false ; and that, if the second is true, the first is false ; but we cannot affirm any thing certainly, concerning either. The objection is addressed to our ignorance ; but the objectors themselves are equally ignorant and as, on this account, they have no right to advance the objection, so we are under no obligation to put ourselves to the trouble of answering it. It is enough for us to know that God, all-wise and almighty, is able to perform what he has promised." Though our bodies while living are refreshed with new particles while old ones pass off, yet we know that we are the same identical persons that we were in childhood. After the resurrection we shall be the same identical person that we are now, though our bodies will then be glorified. The word resurrection, and the corresponding term (*anastasis*) both signify the rising or standing up of something which had fallen or lain down. The formation of a different body for the separate spirit would not be a resurrection but a creation. So Paul did not speak of a creation, although he says : " That which thou sowest, thou sowest not that body that shall be, but bare grain, it may chance of wheat, or of some other grain. But God giveth it a body as it hath pleased him, and to every

seed his own body. His design obviously is to show, that the bodies of the saints, of whom alone he is speaking, will undergo a great and glorious change, and will not be the same as they now are in respect of their qualities, but they will be the same in kind. They will not be contaminated with sin, but Christ shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body. Phil. 3: 21.

It is a fact, that the plant is not different from the seed, as the new bodies are supposed to be from the old; for, it is derived from the seed and is of its substance; and the Apostle proceeds upon this idea when he says: "Thou fool, that which thou sowest is not quickened, except it die," plainly supposing that that which is quickened, is the same substance which died. He expresses his meaning in the clearest manner when contrasting the present and future state of the body: "This corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality." The Apostle is evidently vindicating here not the doctrine of a mere *creation*, but the glorious doctrine of the *resurrection*. And, "Why should it seem an incredible thing that God should raise the dead?"

Though the dead, both the just and the unjust, will be raised by the power of God, yet there is a peculiar connection between the resurrection of Christ and that of his saints. When the saints die they are said to "die in the Lord," and "sleep in Jesus." Rev. 14: 13. "For if we believe that

Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him." 1 Thes. 4: 14.

Such have received the gospel. 1 Cor. 15 chap. "By which also," saith the Apostle, "ye are saved, if ye keep in memory what I preached unto you, unless ye have believed in vain. For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how 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 born out of due time. 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." The argument is, if Christ be not raised, "Then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished." But the Apostle affirms, "now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the first fruits of them that slept," plainly showing that since Christ is risen those who are united to him in this world must necessarily rise in him, awaking in his likeness. O what a thought! that we shall as really exist with Christ and his saints in the other world, as we exist with each other in this. He has become victo-

rious over death and the grave. And does it seem too much to believe ? The disciples that were with Christ were slow to believe, notwithstanding the overwhelming evidence that he had risen. This was especially the case with Thomas, but our Lord convinced him, as we shall find in the 20th Chapter of John : On the day of his resurrection " 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. And when he had so said, he showed them his hands and his side. Then were the disciples glad when they saw the Lord.

" 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." A week from that time, " 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. And Thomas answered and said unto him, My Lord and my God. Jesus saith unto him, Thomas, because thou hast seen me

thou hast believed : blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed."

We find in 24th Chap. of Luke that when the disciples saw the Lord, they supposed that they had seen a spirit. To convince them that he was not a mere spirit, he says to them, Behold 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 shewed them his hands and his feet. And while they yet believed not for joy, and wondered, he said unto them, Have ye here any meat? And they gave him a piece of a broiled fish, and of an honey-comb. And he took it, and did eat before them. We do not suppose that the glorified body of Christ needed to be nourished with food, but he doubtless partook of it to convince them that he was not a mere spirit. While our Savior blessed the disciples, he was parted from them and carried up into heaven. And they worshipped him, and returned to Jerusalem with great joy; And were continually in the temple praising and blessing God. But our Savior will come the second time; "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. It may be asked when the resurrection of the dead

will occur. The sacred writers intimately connect it with the general judgment at this second appearing of our Lord.

It has been believed by some, that part of the dead will be raised, previous to the Millenium, and will reign *personally* with Christ on earth, during the whole of that period. Those who embrace this opinion are called Millenarians. They found their opinion on a passage in the 20th Chap. of Rev. "And I saw thrones, and they set upon them, and judgment was given unto them: and I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God, and which had not worshipped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads, or in their hands; and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years. But the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished. This is the first resurrection." As it was observed, this passage has given rise to the notion of the personal reign of Christ upon earth. It is considered, however, too obscure to be made the foundation of a positive opinion. It is thought to refer to a spiritual resurrection,—a resurrection of the cause or enterprise of the martyrs; while persons of the same spirit will arise and reign with Christ, in the undisturbed enjoyment of religion, Satan being bound, and his agents reduced to silence. It is thought some such interpretation is favored by this circumstance, that John speaks not of the bodies, but of the souls of those who had been slain.

NO. XXXII.

THE JUDGMENT.

The general judgment will follow the resurrection of the dead, when small and great shall stand before God to receive their final sentence. Christ will make a visible appearance, who will come with great power and glory. "Before him shall be gathered all nations; and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats; and he shall set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on the left" Matt. 25, 32, 33. In the revelation of John it is said that "the books were opened; and another book was opened, which is the book of life." It is out of this book that the saints will be judged. To the law, as the rule of justification and condemnation, they are not amenable: for they have been delivered from it by Jesus Christ, and when they believed in him, they declared that they ceased to seek righteousness by it. The question, will be whether they possess the true and living faith which God has appointed to be the only means of obtaining salvation. This faith will necessarily be connected with good works. "Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come ye, blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world: For I was an hungered and ye gave me meat: I was thirsty

and ye gave me drink ; I was a stranger, and ye took me in, naked and ye clothed me ; I was sick and ye visited me ; I was in prison and ye came unto me." Matt. 25, 34,—36.

2. *The Coming of Christ* denotes the judgment. "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." Matt. 25, 31. Though this prediction is mentioned in connexion with those which relate to the destruction of Jerusalem, yet this, as it is seen on the very face of it and from the context, undeniably refers to the *last judgment*. And though "*the coming of Christ*," in some instances, is used with reference to the destruction of Jerusalem, yet it is certain that this is not the uniform and general signification of the expression. It is used by the Apostle John, long after Jerusalem was destroyed. "Little children, abide in him, that when he (Christ) *shall appear*, we may have confidence, and not be ashamed before him *at his coming*." 1 John, 2, 28. In another passage, we are informed expressly when the coming of Christ shall be. It shall be at the time of the general resurrection. "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."

Thes. 4, 15. *The coming of Christ* here certainly refers to the *general judgment*, when all the dead shall be raised and the living shall be changed. "We beseech you," says Paul in 2 Thess. 2; 1. "by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and our gathering together unto him." Again "He (God) hath appointed a day in which he will judge the world in righteousness, by that man whom he hath ordained." Acts 17, 31. Further, "I charge thee before God and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead, at his appearing." 2 Tim. 4, 1. It is asserted in these passages, that at the appearing of Christ, the period before spoken of, he shall judge *the world, the living and the dead*; referring evidently to a *general judgment*. In other passages, Paul says, "We shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ." Rom. 14, 10. Also 2 Cor. 5, 10. "We must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ."

In showing that there will be a general judgment we have incidentally shown *when it is to be*. It is to follow immediately upon the resurrection. Before these great events take place, there is to be a long period of rest and peace to the church on earth, commonly denominated the Millenium. At the close of this period, Satan is to be loosed for a little season; but in the midst of his career, and the triumph of the ungodly, while they are coming up upon the breadth of the earth, as the sand of the sea, and compassing the camp of the saints

about and the beloved city, suddenly the trumpet will sound, and the scenes of the last judgment will be visible to the universe. Respecting the personage who is to be judge, in the final day, the scriptures are plain. The judge is to be the *Lord Jesus Christ*. "The Father hath committed all judgment unto *the Son*."

He hath given him authority to execute judgment, also, because he is the Son of man. John 5, 22, 27. "*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."

The last work of Christ which he, as mediator, is to perform, is that of judging the world. When this is ended, and the final sentences are pronounced and executed, he will then deliver up his mediatorial kingdom, and God will be all in all.

The beings to be judged will be, first, the *whole human family*, saints and sinners,—all who have ever lived upon the earth. "Before him shall be gathered *all nations*." "God will bring *every* work into judgment."

"Every one of us shall give an account of himself to God." We may also expect that the *angels* will be called into judgment.

Of the *fallen* angels we are expressly told, that they "are reserved in everlasting chains, under darkness, unto the judgment of the great day." Jude 6. We are not so explicitly informed respecting the judgment of holy angels; but from the fact that

they were once *on trial*, and as ministering spirits, they are *concerned with us during our trial*, it is thought to be reasonably concluded that they will appear with us in the final judgment. We have no account in the Bible, of any other rational creatures besides angels and men. The question has been asked, whether men are to be called into judgment in the final day, for their *whole character*, from the beginning of life up to that period, or only for their character *while on probation*. The latter seems the more reasonable supposition. *Probation* and the *judgment* are connected ideas. Men are now on probation *for the judgment*. They are here forming characters *for the judgment*. The presumption, therefore is, that they will be called into judgment, only for the character sustained by them during the period of their trial.

The bible informs us that men are to be judged according to their works; works as they are with or without true faith in Christ; and that too while they are *done here in the body*. "We must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things *done in his body*, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad." 2 Cor. 5, 10.

Respecting the *duration* of the judgment scene, different opinions have been entertained, and the scriptures afford us no positive information. We are abundantly informed that there is to be a *day* of judgment. "God hath appointed a *day* in

which he will judge the world in righteousness.

But how long this period will be, we cannot decide. It will not probably be very long. The process of judgment however will continue long enough, to answer all the purposes for which it was instituted. It will be sufficiently long to bring every work and every secret thing into clear view of every individual, so that each may see, that not only his own sentence, but that of every other individual, is perfectly right. The excuses which sinners now offer for not repenting and believing the gospel will there appear, if not repented of, to their shame and everlasting contempt.

The object of the last judgment is not, as I understand it, to satisfy man, what his condition is, whether happy or miserable in the future world. Of this doubtless, he will be fully satisfied as soon as he leaves this world. The object of the judgment is to answer more noble ends. There will be a full exhibition to the universe, what are the characters of all. It will be seen that God has been perfectly just, and benevolent in all his proceedings. God will show to each and every one of his creatures, that he has done right, not only in respect to that one, but to all the rest. Those who now on the ground of their many good works, refuse to repent and find ransom in a Savior's blood, will then fully realize the truth of our Savior's language; "I was an hungered and ye gave me no meat; I was thirsty and ye gave me no drink; I was a stran-

ger and ye took me not in ; naked and ye clothed me not ; sick and in prison, and ye visited me not."

"And these shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal."

While the righteous may wonder at the validity of their title, and say, Lord, when saw we thee an hungered, and, fed thee? or thirsty and gave thee drink? When saw we thee a stranger and took thee in? or naked and clothed thee? or when saw we thee sick or in prison, and came unto thee? The king shall answer and say unto them, verily I say unto you, inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me.

NO. XXIII.

FINAL STATE OF THE RIGHTEOUS AND THE WICKED.

Immediately after the judgment, the righteous will go into life eternal. Heaven will be their abode.

But the question arises, is heaven a place or is it merely a state or an imaginary residence. Heaven is certainly a place. This is evident from the fact that the saints after the resurrection, will exist with bodies as really as they do in the present world, hence there must be a place in which they exist. This agrees with the language of our Savior, "I go to prepare a *place* for you." John 14, 2.

The enjoyment of heaven is beyond expression.

“Now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be : but we know that when he shall appear, we shall be like him ; for we shall see him as he is.” Yes, we shall be with Christ. Says he, “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.” The saints will see Christ and be with him as really as the ancient disciples saw him, and were with him on earth after his resurrection. How interesting is the account of our Savior’s conversation with the two disciples on their way to Emmaus ! though they did not know him, until he “took bread and blessed it, and brake and gave to them.” “And they said one to another, did not our heart burn within us, while he talked with us by the way, and while he opened to us the scriptures ?” While our Lord blessed the disciples “he was parted from them and carried up into heaven. And they worshipped him, and returned to Jerusalem with great joy ; And were continually in the temple praising and blessing God.” Luke 24 : 52, 53.

If on account of this interview with our risen Lord, continual praise was the theme of the disciples, while in this world of sin and temptation, what will it be when they rise in the likeness of Christ ? If continual praise could be their theme in view of our Lord’s resurrection although he ascended out of their sight, what will it be when he comes to re-

ceive them to himself? The saints will not only have communion with Christ, but they will enjoy the society and friendship of one another. We cannot suppose that the same identical persons who assembled in the sanctuary on earth to worship God, will be separated from all the society of each other when they arrive in heaven. Can we imagine that they are to reside in secluded cells? This is far from the description of our Savior. "In my Father's house are many mansions, if it were not so I would have told you." Here the natural suggestion is, that in heaven all those comforts will be found which we usually enjoy in a house.—Society, friendship, peace and rest. The saints will be free from sin and temptation; they will also be free from their evil consequences. "There shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain, for the former things are passed away." Rev. 21: 4. "God himself shall wipe away all tears from their eyes."

The clear view of heavenly things, and more extensive knowledge of them, will add greatly to our enjoyment. "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.

The enjoyment of the saint will be great from the fact that it is everlasting. Christ being made perfect "he became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him." Here is made known

the eternal felicity of the righteous; and not only is it eternal, but all the sources of enjoyment are restored to the saints which had been lost by sin.—On account of sin, man was exposed to spiritual, natural and eternal death; but through faith in Christ there is a “resurrection of all things.” Acts 3: 21. It may be asked if the saints do not still experience natural death although they exercise true faith in Christ. They do: but their lives in this respect are secured to them in the resurrection. Yes, the saints are to live again, not merely five, ten or fifteen years, but how long? Will their lives expire at three score years and ten? Ah, no! they will live eternally, “he became the author of *eternal* salvation unto all them that obey him.” They will sing the song of complete victory over death and the grave. By this is not meant that the saints will exist eternally with some restricted sources of enjoyment. If death has finally cut off the source of society, of friendship, of knowledge, of communing with one another, or in any way lessen our praise and adoration to God; then there must be something to death, some victory to the grave. But this will not be our song: it will be, “O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?”

The saints will enjoy every thing which they can wish or desire. They will be satisfied. This is the language of the Psalmist. Ps. 16: 15. “As for me, I will behold thy face in righteousness: I shall be *satisfied*, when I awake with thy likeness.” Says

Dr. Dick: "Who can conceive the calm of the heavenly regions, where no tempest blows, and the sound of lamentation is never heard." Well may we all thus say. And similar is the language of inspiration itself. "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."

The state of the wicked.

And these shall go away into everlasting punishment; but the righteous into life eternal. Here the same Greek word (*Aconios*) is used to designate the durability of the punishment of the wicked as is used to designate the life of the righteous. "Everlasting punishment" is contrasted with "life eternal," and of course equally extensive in its duration. Although we may enjoy eternal life here, yet this eternal life does not become finite and end at death, but continues after the death of the body, and is more fully enjoyed, especially after the resurrection; hence, eternal life is peculiarly applicable to that state, and to that it has reference in the text. So everlasting punishment is applicable to the wicked after the resurrection.

The proper meaning of *aconios*, is *eternal* or *everlasting, unlimited*. It is used to express the eternity of God, and of his glory.

Rom. 16: 26. "According to the commandment of the *everlasting* God."

1 Tim. 6: 16. "To whom be honor and power *everlasting*."

If this word does not properly designate the everlasting punishment of the wicked, neither does it the happiness of the righteous, nor the eternity of of God's existence and of his glory.

If one cannot be proved the other cannot.

Aionios is a derivative of *aion*. The proper meaning of *aion* is *eternity, unlimited time*. It is frequently used in reference to God. Rom. 9: 5. "God; over all, blessed *forever*," (*eis tous aionas*.) Rom. 11: 36. "To whom be glory *forever*," (*eis tous aionas*.)

If this word has any other meaning it must be owing to the nature of the object to which it is applied. For instance, sometimes it means *world*, the *present world*, and the *future world*. It has this meaning in the following passage: Matt. 12: 32. "Whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come."

But suppose world here means age, which is affirmed to be the same as dispensation. It shall not be forgiven him in this dispensation nor the dispensation to come; that is, he shall not be forgiven under the Jewish dispensation, nor under the gospel dispensation. Under what dispensation then will he be forgiven? He must die without being forgiven. Man cannot repent and be forgiven while in the grave: hence, the injunction of scripture,

“Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might, for there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom in the grave whither thou goest.” There will be no probation after the resurrection and judgment, because Christ will have given up the office of Mediator. It cannot be said that man will suffer what he justly deserves, and then enjoy the bliss of heaven; if so, he will not be saved through Christ. He will have no song of praise to God and the Lamb forever and ever. As this will be the song of all the saints, of course he will not be included among them.

Now the only appeal is to the resurrection for proof that all men will finally be saved. “As in Adam all died, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.” Here the apostle is speaking in direct reference to the resurrection of the body. He does not mean that the wicked as well as the righteous will be made partakers of heavenly joys; this is evident, from what follows. 1 Cor. 15: 23. “But every man in his own order: Christ the first fruits; afterward they that are Christ’s at his coming.—Then cometh the end, that is, when all will be raised and come to judgement.” In order to decide more fully upon this subject, let us compare passages together.

A passage respecting the state of the wicked after the resurrection, is found in the 5th Chap. of John. The dead here represented to be raised, are said to be those who are dead in trespasses and in sins.

This is indeed true, of the 25th verse, "Verily, verily I say unto you, the hour is coming, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God: and they that hear shall live." But in the 28th verse there is a transition to something more wonderful. "Marvel not at this; for the hour is coming." It is not said "now is" as in the verse first mentioned, neither is the precise time designated; but "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." The dead here spoken of, as being raised, do not mean those who are dead in trespasses and sins; if so, then the sense of the passage would be as follows: They shall come forth: they, being dead in trespasses and sins, who have done good, unto the resurrection of life. Here is a plain contradiction. It presents the palpable absurdity of persons being raised to life for having done good while dead in trespasses and sins.

Moreover our Lord became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him. In the first place, *eternal* salvation could not be applicable to man, unless he was exposed to *eternal* ruin. In the second place, this salvation is unto those and those only who obey him. 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 ?

NO. XXXIV.
THE SABBATH.

Original Institutions of the Sabbath.

“Thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them. 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.” God sanctified the day, evidently showing that it was to be considered sacred, not merely by any particular people, but by the whole human race. From the preceding remarks it is evident that the Sabbath was instituted previous to the giving of the law by Moses. There are other references in scripture which are proof of the same point. That the Sabbath was instituted is evident from the fact that time was divided into weeks. “And, in process of time, it came to pass that Cain brought of the fruit of the ground an offering to the Lord.” The words, rendered “in process of time,” signify “at the end of days.” “The end of days,” when Cain and Abel offered sacrifices has been supposed to be the Sabbath. Noah observed the division of time

into weeks. We are informed, that he, at the end of forty days opened the window of the ark; "and he stayed yet other seven days, and again he sent forth the dove out of the ark; and the dove came in to him in the evening, and lo! in her mouth was an olive leaf plucked off. So Noah knew that the waters were abated from off the earth. And he stayed yet other seven days, and sent forth the dove, which returned not again unto him any more."

The Greeks and Romans observed the division of time into weeks. Hesiod mentions the seventh day as "the splendid light of the sun." Homer calls it the "sacred day."

It has been observed, that the division of time, which prevailed among the patriarchs, cannot be satisfactorily accounted for; but by the previous institution of the Sabbath: for the creation was finished in six days, how then came the ancients to divide time by seven days if God had not sanctified the seventh day?

The Sabbath is mentioned shortly after the Israelites had left Egypt, and were fed with manna in the wilderness. Exodus 16: 22, 30. Though this occurs before the giving of the law, yet when first alluded to, it is spoken of as a thing known. Says Dr. Wayland, "God, first, without referring to the Sabbath, informs Moses, that, on the sixth day, the Israelites should gather twice as much manna as on any other day. From this, it seems that the division of time by weeks was known; and that it

was taken for granted that they would know the reason for the making of this distinction. In the whole of the narration, there is no precept given for the keeping of the day, but they are reprov'd for not suitably keeping it, as an institution *with which they ought to have been familiar.*"

2. The following is the precept for the observance of the Sabbath at the giving of the law: "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work; but the seventh is the Sabbath of the Lord 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 thy cattle, nor the 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 seventh day and hallowed it." Exodus 20: 11.

Here we see that the observance of the Sabbath is not confined to any particular people, but is of universal obligation. It is found among the *ten commandments*, which are always referred to in scripture as containing the sum of the moral precepts of God to man. Our Savior, and the apostles made the most decided distinction between moral and ceremonial observances, yet they always allude to the law of the ten commandments as of permanent and universal obligation. The high moral obligation of this commandment is frequently referred to by the prophets. Is. 56: 2, 6. Jer. 17: 24, 25. Neh. 13: 15, 21.

Part of the duty of the Sabbath was to meet together for worship, and the reading of the scriptures.

"Six days shalt work be done; but the seventh is the Sabbath of rest; *a holy convocation.*" Lev. 23:

3. "Moses of old time hath in every city them that *preach him, being read in the synagogues every Sabbath day.*" Acts 15: 21.

Some have thought that the Sabbath was instituted only for the Jews, after they left the land of Egypt, and that it was not instituted for man at the close of creation, because so little reference in scripture is made to it during this long interval. So we might disprove circumcision, there not being one instance of it recorded during the long interval from the Jews' entrance into Canaan, to the circumcision of the Baptist. But it is said: God gave the Israelites a Sabbath, and he gave it for "a sign between him and them." Exodus 31: 13, 17. Ezek. 20: 12, 20. His giving them the Sabbath does not imply that it was a new institution, any more than his giving the other nine precepts implies that they were new and not previously binding—the meaning is that they were published anew to them with additional observances. The Sabbath might be a sign, because its observance, would serve, with their other religious rites, to distinguish them from idolatrous nations, and remind them of their recent redemption. Hence, in repeating the precept, these words are added: "And remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and that the Lord thy God

brought thee out thence, through a mighty hand, and by a stretched out arm; therefore, the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath day." Deut. 5: 15.

Though the Jews were to observe the Sabbath with respect to certain rites; it does not follow when these rites cease, that the Sabbath, as to its moral and general precepts either ceases or commenced with these rites; hence there is nothing in the above to show that the Sabbath was designed only for the Jews, or that it was not instituted at the creation. The scriptures assure us that it was designed, not merely for the Israelites, but that "the Sabbath was made for man." Thus we see that its obligations are universal. This view of the subject appears to be confirmed by the example and precept of Christ, who taught how to keep the Sabbath, and was himself accustomed to observe the day for the purposes of religious worship. "*As his custom was, he went into the synagogue on the Sabbath day, and stood up to read.*" Luke 4: 16. See likewise Matthew 12: 2—13.

The Sabbath under the Christian Dispensation.

Under the Christian dispensation, the first day of the week is observed as the Sabbath. It is said by some, that we do not regard the precept of the Sabbath in the law of the ten commandments, because that requires us to observe the seventh day. The force of the precept is that we observe *the seventh*

part of the time. "Six days shalt thou labor." It is evident that we are to observe every seventh day in rotation, after six days of labor. If we go beyond this, we are involved in difficulty. It is not expected that we must begin at a particular hour to compute time, for days begin at different periods in different parts of the earth. This difference increases as we travel east or west; some days being earlier, and others later than the days with us. It seems undeniable that it is the seventh part of the time that we are to regard as the Sabbath. The command may have circumstances which are capable of being altered in perfect accordance with its moral principles, and the moral ends which it proposes.

There are worthy indications that the day on which the Christian Sabbath is to be kept, should be specially honored under the new dispensation.

On that day our Savior arose from the dead; and on the same evening met with his Apostles: a week from his resurrection he met with them again. Thus he sanctioned this day as sacred by his presence with the disciples. On this, was the day of Pentecost, when the spirit was poured out in so remarkable a manner.

That the primitive Christians in all places, were accustomed to meet statedly, to worship and celebrate the Lords Supper is evident from 1 Cor. 11: 1, 20, 23, 26. And that these meetings were on the first day of the week, we may learn from 1 Cor. 16: 1, 2. Also, Acts 20: 6—11.

In Revelations 1, 10. John observes, "I was in the spirit *on the Lord's day*"; a name which has continued to distinguish it.

The early Christian fathers refer to this day as set apart for religious worship; and allude to the difference between keeping this day, and keeping the Jewish Sabbath, specially as it was the day of our Savior's resurrection. The observance of this day is alluded to by heathen historians. Pliny, in his letter to Trajan, states that the Christians "were accustomed, on a *stated day*, to meet before daylight, and to repeat among themselves a hymn to Christ, as to a God, and to bind themselves, by a sacred obligation, not to commit any wickedness, but on the contrary, to abstain from thefts, robberies, and adulteries; also, not to violate their promise, or deny a pledge; after which it was their custom to separate, and meet again at a promiscuous and harmless meal."

The precept of the Sabbath requires us to consecrate, for the service of God, one whole day in seven, reckoned, like other days, according to the established mode of computing time. It requires us to abstain from our worldly employments, both of the body and the mind, and from all unnecessary words and thoughts respecting such subjects; likewise from recreations and amusements. There are duties which are exceptions; first, of necessity.—By this are meant works which could not have been done on a previous day, and cannot be deferred till

the next. We must travel to and from the house of God. If it is our duty to be on a voyage of ten days at sea, we must be out one Sabbath, but we should be careful not to commence our voyage so late in the week as would require us to be out two Sabbaths. Next: the necessary works of mercy. If our fellow men are in distress, we should administer to their relief. In like manner we should exercise care towards animals.

The Sabbath is an emblem of the heavenly rest, where sin will not appear, and we shall be employed in constant devotion.

The precept of the Sabbath requires us to spend the time in devotional exercises, in prayer, religious reading, meditation and pious conversation in the families where we reside.

It requires us to observe public worship, the ordinances of the Gospel, the pious instruction of children in Sabbath Schools.

NO. XXXV.

THE CHURCH.

The Greek word which in the New Testament is applied to the church signifies an *assembly*. It denotes, 1st. The *invisible church*, embracing all christians.

2. The general *visible church*, embracing all church members of every christian denomination.

3. *Particular churches* of the general visible church.

When did God's visible church commence? From the earliest times there appear to be those who offered sacrifices and called upon the name of the Lord; evidently *having taken upon themselves the title of the Sons of God, considering themselves as his children by adoption, in distinction from the ungodly, who were children by Creation only*, and had forfeited this relation by their apostacy. By this title they professed to be penitents and believers, as children to love and serve God. The phraseology *the Sons of God, his children, his people*, is ever used to denote the church. There appears, however, to have been no regularly organized, visible church till the time of Abraham, when the Jewish Church was established. Then it was furnished with a series of written revelations and had new Sacraments instituted. The Church continues ever the same in its essential features. There have been changes in its organization, for instance at the closing of the Jewish dispensation. Certain rites and ceremonies which were to be observed till the coming of Christ, were dispensed with when he came. He instituted baptism and the Lord's supper, and gave other directions to his disciples. Though occasional errors have crept into the Church, yet it has not been destroyed. It is to be purged from these.

Our Savior has not given us an exact pattern for every particular proceeding in a church.

The essential principles however, are laid down, and remain unchangeable, such as require that public worship, and the ordinances of the gospel be maintained; that there be the ministry and the deaconship: and so of other requisitions. But there are other things which must be guided by circumstances. There is no particular precept given, how each church shall build a meeting house; what shall be the materials, and in what particular place it shall be situated.

Ought a church to have a covenant? Those who associate together for any particular purpose, must have a *covenant* expressed or implied. There must be some agreement or understanding between them, otherwise there would be no union by which they could accomplish their object. It is evident that the Apostles covenanted together, or agreed as to what measures were to be adopted for the promotion of religion; whether their covenants were written or not, we have no particular information. We are informed in 2 Cor. 8, 5. that christians gave themselves, first unto the Lord, and to each other by the will of God. In the age immediately succeeding that of the Apostles, there is frequent notice of the covenants of the churches. Tertullian represents the church as united by "*an agreement in discipline,*" "*a covenant of hope.*"—Justin Martyr, represents them as "*agreeing in a resolution*" to serve God. Pliny, who was a heathen, after stating the time and manner of the an-

cient Christians assembling together for worship, to repeat a hymn to Christ as to a God, goes on to state that they were accustomed "to *bind themselves by a sacred obligation*, not to commit any wickedness, but on the contrary, to abstain from thefts, robberies, and adulteries; also, not to violate their promise, or deny a pledge." Now it is easy to see that a covenant written down, would more readily be made familiar to each member of the church, and to those who wish to join. The same may be said respecting the *articles of faith*.

And no one I presume will doubt that such articles are necessary. No one can believe anything without a creed. If we believe in the divinity of Christ, his ability and willingness to save, that is our creed or *articles of faith*. Our creed is a mere transcript of what we believe to be the doctrine of the bible. The bible we consider to be our only rule of faith and practice, still it is beneficial to have a *plain statement of what we deem the doctrine of Scripture*. Written articles not only contribute to our own benefit, enabling us more readily perceive that we are united in the essential principles of the gospel, but they can be submitted to the careful and thorough examination of those who wish to join the same church. *Ought a creed to embrace only such articles, as can be adopted by christians of all opinions, or ought it to be more full or minute?* The number of articles should be sufficient to embrace what we deem the essential prin-

ciples of the christian system. Where a church does not observe this, persons frequently join, thinking that they believe with the church, but afterwards find they do not, and become dissatisfied. Though the articles of faith should be full and expressive, yet the church have no right to compel a man to embrace their creed or articles. They should consider him voluntary to join that, or any other christian church. They have no right to bind his conscience, neither has he any right to bind theirs.

Terms of admission.

Proper subjects for admission into the church, are such as are *penitent* and *believing*, and *gladly receive the word*. "Then they that *gladly receive his word* were baptised; and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls." Acts. 2, 41. The eunich said to Philip; "what doth hinder me to be baptized? And Phillip said, if thou *believest with all thine heart*, thou mayest. Acts. 8, 37.

Ananias baptized Saul of Tarsus *after* the Lord convinced him that he was a christian, Acts 3, 15.

Independence of Churches.

In the age of the Apostles, the churches were independant of each other, so far as *jurisdiction* and *authority* were concerned. One church did not embrace the whole. This is evident from the fact, that *churches* are frequently spoken of in the New

Testament, and are represented as assembling together in *distinct bodies*. There were the *churches* of Judea, of Syria, of Galatia, of Asia and of Macedonia. See Acts 9, 31, 15, 41. 1 Cor. 16, 1, 19. 2 Cor. 8, 1.

The church at Jerusalem, on the day of Pentecost, were assembled "with one accord in *one place*."

Upon the first day of the week, the church at Troas "*came together* to break bread." Acts 20, 7.

Waddington, an Episcopalian of the church of England, says of the church in the first century: Every church was essentially *independent of every other*. The churches thus constituted and regulated, formed a sort of federative body of *independent religious communities*, dispersed through the greater part of the Roman empire, in continual communication, and in constant harmony with each other." Eccl. Hist. p. 43.

Mosheim, a Lutheran, describing the state of things in the first century, says, "All the churches in those primitive times were *independent bodies*: or none of them subject to the jurisdiction of any other. For though the churches which were founded by the Apostles themselves, frequently had the honor shown them, to be consulted in difficult cases, yet they had *no judicial authority, no control, no power of giving laws*. On the contrary, *it is clear as the noonday, that all christian churches had equal rights, and were in all respects on a footing of*

equality." Speaking of the second century, he says "during a great part of this century, all the churches continued to be, as at first, *independent of each other*, or were connected by no consociations or confederations. Each church was a kind of little *independent republic*, governed by its own laws, which were enacted, or at least, sanctioned by the people." Ecc. Hist. (Murdock's edition.) vol. 1, pp. 86, 142.

Fellowship of the Churches.

Though one church was not permitted to exercise authority over another, yet they held communion one with another. The greatest care was taken to preserve union among churches. Messengers were chosen and sent from one church to another. In like manner, churches now may exist in friendship with each other—Ministers may exchange labors—churches may commune together; still one has no right to exercise authority over another. If difficulties exist in any particular church, a council may be called from other churches, to consult and advise, but the church is at liberty to receive or reject such advice. If a church becomes disorderly, other churches, however, can withdraw fellowship.

The Power and Rights of a Church.

A church has the power and right to admit and exclude members, to choose its own officers; for instance, its minister, though the church is not

qualified to ordain him. This is to be done by a body of neighboring ministers. The church *chose* Matthias as an Apostle to take a part in the ministry. Acts, 1, 26.

In like manner deacons must be set apart. "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." They then chose them "Whom they set before the Apostles, and when they had prayed, they laid their hands on them." Acts 6, 3, 6.

Churches have the power of choosing messengers, or delegates. "Then pleased it the Apostles and elders, with the *whole church* to send *chosen men* of their own company, to Antioch, with Paul and Barnabas, Acts 15, 22. The Apostle in 2 Cor. 8, 19, speaks of one "who was also chosen of the *churches*" to travel with them.

Privileges of the Churches.

The churches are brought into near communion with Christ. In them dwells his Holy Spirit to cheer and gladden the heart. Here are many spiritual blessings. Where can the soul find life, if not in the church of Christ? Can he find it in the broad mazes of the world, where no prayer, as incense goes up before God? Where no christian love twines around the heart? In coming into the church, we feel new springs of action, we have peculiar motives to observe the ordinances of the

gospel, to come around the table of our Lord, and partake the symbols of his dying love. The impenitent should not think that they are freed from these obligations, because they do not belong to the church. They are guilty inasmuch as they do not repent and believe, and become members of the church. The tide of argument is overwhelming, why they should escape for their lives, and tarry not in all the plain.

NO. XXXVI.

OFFICERS OF THE CHURCH.

There are *two* distinct orders of officers in the church. These officers are pastors and deacons. Our Episcopalian brethren divide the order of pastors into those of bishops and presbyters, making *three* distinct orders.

They affirm that it belongs to bishops, each in his own diocese, to plant churches, to confirm and exclude members, to ordain ministers, and in general to control the church. To maintain their views.

They have sometimes founded an argument upon the constitution of the Jewish church, in which there was a gradation of ranks: the Levites, to perform inferior services in the tabernacle and temple, the priests to offer sacrifices, and the high priest to preside over them all. But the christian dispensation is so different from the Jewish, that no conclusion respecting the former, can be drawn from the government of the latter. The ceremoni-

al system, was dispensed with at the death of Christ. Indeed the best Episcopal writers, do not consider this argument valid.

2. In the second place, it has been urged in favor of three orders of ministers, that *during the personal ministry of Christ*, there were three orders, viz. himself, the twelve apostles and the seventy. This supposes that on the death of Christ, the apostles were promoted to the same rank in the church which he held, and on their death that bishops, likewise were placed in the same rank.

With regard to the seventy; their ministry was *temporary*. They were sent out for a particular purpose; to go before the Savior, into every city and place where he wished to go: Luke, 10, 1. The object of their ministry being accomplished, their labor in this respect ceased. So nothing more is said of them. But the argument is completely refuted by what has been insisted upon even by an Episcopalian author. "It is obviously observable in the evangelical records, that the church was not and could not be founded till our Lord was risen from the dead, seeing that it was to be founded on his resurrection." The truth of this remark is very clear as will be seen in the following. "If the christian Church had no being before Christ's resurrection, then certainly there was no government; and if no government, then certainly not prelatial government; and consequently, the argument is lost to all intents and purposes. It is

clear as light, that the followers of Christ in the days of his flesh, were under no distinct government but that of the Jewish Church, with which they were still incorporated, and from which, as we have already proved, no consequences can be drawn for the nature of the christian government."

In the third place it is urged that *three orders of ministers actually existed in the primitive churches*: There were the apostles elders and deacons. It is said that the apostles ordained Timothy and Titus as bishops, successors to themselves. There is not only no evidence that Timothy and Titus were bishops, but it is absolutely certain that they were not. Timothy is expressly called an Evangelist. Titus is commonly supposed to have held the same office. It is evident that Timothy was not stationed at Ephesus, because he would have left when Paul went into Macedonia, had not the apostle entreated him to remain on account of difficulties in the church. If Timothy had been bishop of Ephesus, he would not have been expected to abandon his station: nor would Paul afterwards have requested him to come to him at Rome, as he does in the second Epistle, 4, 9; to be his companion and his assistant there. Hence it is evident that his residence in Ephesus was merely temporary.

The argument with respect to Titus is equally without foundation. He was left in Crete to ordain elders, and reprove those who had become disorderly. But according to Episcopal prin-

ciples his office was extraordinary. It will be seen that the elders whom he was to ordain are called bishops. Titus, then, must have been an Archbishop, in order to perform this work, and no one will pretend to show that the apostolic churches had such an officer. It is evident that Titus was not the bishop of Crete. If he had been, the Apostle would not have requested him to leave his stated charge to come to him at Nicopolis, where he had determined to winter. Tit. 3—12.

Moreover, it is evident, from scripture, that bishops are of the same order, as elders or presbyters. We find that bishop and elder are convertible terms and are applied indiscriminately to the same individual. When Paul was on his way to Jerusalem he stopped at Miletus, from which he sent to Ephesus, and called the elders of the church. He does not mention the bishop for the good reason that it had several bishops, and these were the very elders, Acts, 20, 17, whom the Apostle had summoned to meet him for he says to them, "Take heed to yourselves, and to all the flock over which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers. Acts, 20, 28. The Greek word which here signifies *overseers* is translated *bishops* in other places. In Paul's epistle to Titus, we see that bishops and elders are the same. He says to him. "For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldst set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders in every city, as I had appointed thee. If any be blame-

less the husband of one wife, having faithful children, not accused of riot or unruly. For a Bishop must be blameless, as the steward of God." Tit. 1, 5—7. From this nothing appears more plain than that bishops and elders are the same, And hence we perceive the reason why, in Paul's first Epistle to Timothy, he makes no mention at all of elders, but speaks only of bishops and deacons. For the same reason he takes no notice of elders, in his Epistle to the Philippians, but speaks to the bishops and deacons, Phil. 1, 1. Bishops then were elders. Such were the bishops and such only whom the apostles ordained as their successors. They are successors of the apostles *as simple ministers of Christ*. In this sense the apostles themselves are called *elders*. Thus they speak. "Let a man so account of us as of the ministers of Christ." "Who hath made us able ministers of Jesus Christ. 2 Cor. 4: 1. 2 Cor. 3: 6. "The elders which are among you I exhort, who am also an elder." 2 Pet. 5, 1. But in the higher character of the apostles no bishops exist as their successors.

To bear witness to the actions and sufferings of Jesus, and his resurrection was a peculiar characteristic of the Apostles. So it was said at the appointment of Matthias to the Apostleship; "One must be ordained to be a witness with us of his resurrection." Acts 1; 22.

The Apostles were the *first founders of churches*.

They could *impart* the gift of working miracles. They were *inspired* men.

In these respects certainly the apostles have left no successors. Again, it has been urged that our Savior, in his epistles to the seven churches of Asia addresses an individual in each, whom he calls *its angel*. This is supposed to be a bishop. There is no doubt that the angel signifies an individual, but it does not follow that it signifies a bishop in the Episcopalian sense. It is a name not of order, but office which the Jews gave to the president of their synagogues, as he offered up prayers to God in the name of the assembly. This being the sense in which the Jews understood the word. John who was himself a Jew, naturally applied it to the president of a christian church. The most that can be inferred is, that in each of the Asiatic churches, one of the elders was chosen to preside.

It is further urged that three orders of ministers prevailed in the ages immediately succeeding the Apostles, and (with few exceptions) have prevailed ever since.

In reply to this argument it is proposed to give a concise view of *the fathers of the first two centuries*.

Hermas, the author of the Shepherd, was a member of the church at Rome, and lived in the first century. He uses the terms bishop and presbyter promiscuously, and speaks of presbyters as *presiding over* the church at Rome. Vis. ii. Sect. 4.

The first epistle of the Roman Clement to the

Corinthians is addressed, not from one bishop to another, but from the *church* at Rome to the *church* at Corinth. In it the writer says, that the Apostles every where appointed *bishops* and *deacons* in the churches—making no mention of a third order. He says that presbyters had been *placed over* the Church at Corinth, and complains that presbyters had been ejected from the *episcopate*. He exhorts the Corinthian brethren to restore these ejected presbyters, and to *submit themselves* to them.

We have only one epistle of Polycarp remaining, which is addressed, not to the bishop, but to the *church* at Philippi. In it the word bishop does not once occur. Polycarp exhorts the Philippians to be subject to their *presbyters* and *deacons*. Sect. 5.

In what remains of Papias, there is no mention made of bishops, but of presbyters only. He denominates the Apostles *presbyters*. "If I met any where with one who had conversed with the presbyters, I enquired after the sayings of the presbyters; what Andrew, what Peter, what Philip, what Thomas or James had said." In Euseb, Ecc. Hist. book 3, Chap. 39. In the writings of Justin, there is no mention made of bishops. He speaks of one in each church as its *president*, and the president and deacon are the only church officers of which he gives us any account. Apol. 1, pp. 95, 97.

Irenaeus uses the terms bishop and presbyter, interchangeably. "We ought to obey those *pres-*

byters, who have succession from the Apostles, who with the succession of the *episcopate*, received the certain gift of truth." "Such *presbyters* the church nourishes, concerning whom the prophet says, I will give you *princes* in peace, and *bishops* in righteousness." Advers, Haeres lib. 4. Cap. 43. 44. Writing to Victor, bishop of Rome, Irenaeus repeatedly denominates the early bishops of Rome those who had preceded Victor, *Presbyters*, see Euseb. Ecc. Hist. book 5, Chapter 24.

The bishops of the church of England, commonly trace their succession through the church of Rome, to the Apostle Peter. Now beside all other difficulties, here is one in the very first stages. No one can prove that Peter was bishop of Rome, or that the first ministers of this church, were any thing more than *presbyters*? Irenaeus expressly calls them *presbyters*, and it is very certain that they were *presbyters*—Again, who can tell who these first ministers were, and in what order they succeeded each other?

Says Dr. Doddridge, "it is a very precarious and uncomfortable foundation for christian hope, which is laid in the doctrine of an uninterrupted succession of bishops, and which makes the validity of the administration of christian ministers depend upon such a succession." Irenaeus speaks of "traditions preserved in the churches through a succession of *presbyters*." He represents Polycarp, as "an apostolical *presbyter*," who was bishop of the church

at Smyrna, Epis, to Florinus in Euseb, Ecc. Hist. book 5, ch. 20.

Clemens Alexandrinus, (a presbyter) speaks of himself and others like him, as having *rule over the churches*, and as being called pastors. He sometimes speaks of bishop and presbyter as the same, and sometimes makes a distinction between them. Paedog. Lib. 1. 6. see also tract "Quis Dives" &c. Various epistles have been published under the name of Ignatius. From these seven have been prepared and published by archbishop Wake, as being probably genuine. There is no doubt however, but that these seven are spurious, or at least, have been interpolated with special reverence to this subject. In these epistles, the three orders of ministers are distinctly recognized. Of these epistles, the style, the spirit, the sentiments do not agree to the alleged circumstances of the writer, or to the age in which he lived. They are like nothing which has come down to us from the first century of the christian era, or the early part of the second. There is this, however, to be considered; the bishop of Ignatius is never a *diocesan* bishop, but the mere pastor of a single church. Bishop Burnet says "the names of bishop and presbyter are used for the same thing in scripture, and also *are used promiscuously by the writers of the two first centuries.*" See vindication of the church of Scotland, p. 311.

In the third and fourth centuries, and onwards,

important changes of church government took place. Bishops generally claimed to be a distinct and superior order of ministers. Still they had not the exclusive power of ordination, nor did intelligent christians believe, that the distinction between them and presbyters was of apostolic origin. Thus Jerome testifies that it had been the custom at Alexandria, for more than two hundred years after Christ, for presbyters to choose, and to constitute their bishops, Epis to Evagrius. And Eusebius affirms, that in his day, evangelists sometimes "ordained pastors, Ecc. Hist. Lib. 3, Chap. 37.

The author of an ancient commentary, ascribed to Ambrose, says, "the ordination of a bishop and presbyter is the same:" since "a bishop is only the first among presbyters." Again, "the presbyters were called bishops:" "in Egypt, the *presbyters consecrate*, if the bishop be not present." In a work ascribed to Augustine, the author says, "the Apostle Paul proves that by presbyter, is to be understood bishop; since he instructs Timothy, whom he had ordained a presbyter, how he ought to constitute bishops. For what is a bishop but a chief presbyter, a high priest? For in Alexandria, and in all Egypt, when the bishop is absent, the presbyter consecrates." Eutychius a patriarch of Alexandria, (A. D. 930.) says, "Mark, the evangelist, appointed twelve presbyters. who should reside with the patriarch, that when the patriarchate might be vacant, they might choose one of their

number, on whose head the other eleven might impose hands and bless him, and constitute him patriarch. In Gieseler's Ecc. Hist. Sect. 32.

Jerome in his commentary on Tit. 1, 5, explains how the distinction between bishop and presbyter came into the church. He says a presbyter is the *same as a bishop*; and before there were parties in religion, the churches were governed *by the joint councils of presbyters*. But afterwards, it was decreed, throughout the whole world, that one chosen from among the presbyters, should be put over the rest, and that the whole care of the church should be committed to him." He says, further, "Our design in these remarks is to show, that among the ancients, *presbyter and bishop were the very same*. But by degrees, that the plants of dissension might be plucked up, the whole concern was devolved upon an individual. As the presbyters therefore know, that they are subjected, *by the custom of the church*, to him who was set over them, so let the bishops know that they are greater than presbyters more by *custom*, than by any real appointment of Christ."

Augustine held to the same doctrine, writing to Jerome he says, "Although according to the names of honor which *the usage of the church has now acquired*, the office of bishop is greater than that of presbyter, yet in many things is Augustine inferior to Jerome. Epis. 82. Chrysostom and Theophylact affirm that "while the Apostles lived, and for

some ages after the names of bishops and presbyters were not distinguished."

"It is remarkable," says Gieseler, "how long the opinion of the original identity of bishops and presbyters was retained in the church." At the head of each church," (in the first century,) "were the elders, *all officially of equal rank*, though in several instances a peculiar authority seems to have been conceded to some one individual, from personal considerations." Sect. 29. "After the death of apostles, and the pupils of the apostles, to whom the general direction of the churches had always been conceded, some one among the presbyters of each church was suffered gradually to take the lead of its affairs. In the same irregular way, the title bishop was appropriated to this first presbyter."—Sect. 32.

Bernald says, "since, therefore, presbyters and bishops may have been said anciently to have been *the same*, it is not to be doubted that they had the same power of binding and loosing, and *every thing else which is now peculiar to bishops*."

Pope Urban ii. at the council of Beneventum (A. D. 1091,) speaking of the "the sacred orders of deacons and presbyters," says, "*since these only the primitive church is said to have had*, concerning these alone we have a command of the apostle." Nicholas Tudeschus, an archbishop, (A. D. 1458,) says, "Formerly presbyters governed the church in common, and ordained priests."

As bishop Burnet testifies, the Catholic church both canonists and schoolman, generally received and insisted on this doctrine, until past the middle of the sixteenth century, when the opposite opinion was affirmed by the Council of Trent. On the ground of this decision with reference to this subject, Michael de Medina declared (A. D. 1570) that "the ancient fathers were *material heretics*; although on account of the reverence due to these fathers, their opinion was not openly condemned" in the Council. At the time of the reformation, John Wickliffe, in the fourteenth century, and Cranmer, and Jewell, and Grindall, and Whitgift, and most of the early reformers and dignitaries of the English Episcopal church, taught the doctrine of the original parity of Christ's ministers. Bishop Jewell, in his remarks on Augustine says, "The office of a bishop is above the office of a priest, *not by the authority of scripture*, but after the names of honor, which, through the custom of the church, have now obtained."

In 1543, a work called "A necessary Erudition for a Christian Man" was published in England. It was drawn up by a committee of bishops and divines, and read and approved by the lords spiritual and temporal, and by the lower house of parliament. It was corrected by Henry VIII, and on this account was sometimes called "The King's Book." This book says, "*Of these two orders only priests and deacons, scripture maketh express mention.*"—

About the same time, there was another paper drawn up; signed by Cromwell, the two archbishops, eleven bishops, and twenty divines and canonists, declaring, among other things, "that in the New Testament, there is no mention made but of deacons or ministers, and priests or bishops." Burnet's History of the reformation, vol. 1, pp. 585.

Says Bishop Burnet, "As for the notion of the distinct offices of bishop and presbyter, *I confess it is not so clear to me*; and, therefore, since I look upon the sacramental actions as the highest of sacred performances, I cannot but acknowledge that those who are empowered for them, (as presbyters confessedly are) must be of *the highest office in the church*." Burnet's History of the reformation, vol. 1, pp. 585.

Archbishop Usher, in his letter to Dr. Bernard, says: "I have ever declared my opinion to be, that bishop and presbyter differ in degree only, not in order; and that in places where bishops cannot be had, *ordination by presbyters stands valid*." In his answer to Baxter, he says: "That the king (Charles I.) having asked him, at the Isle of Wight, whether he found in antiquity that *presbyters alone ordained any*, he replied, yes; and that he could show his majesty more, even where *presbyters alone successively ordained bishops*." He then adduced the case referred to by Jerome, in his epistle to Evangelus, "of the presbyters of Alexandria, choosing and making their own bishops, from the days of Mark, the evangelist, till those of Heraclas and Dionysius." Life of Baxter, pp. 206.

Bishop Crofts says: "I hope my reader will see what weak proofs are brought for this distinction and superiority of order," between bishops and presbyters; "no scripture, no primitive general council, no general consent of primitive doctors, and fathers, no, not one primitive father of note, speaking particularly and home to our purpose." *Naked Truth*, pp. 47.

Selden, styled the "the glory of the English nation," turned the doctrine of the divine right of bishops into a jest.

Archbishop Bancroft is said to have been the first of the English Protestant clergy, who insisted on the divine right of bishops: and he seems to have been somewhat wavering, for (A. D. 1610,) when it was moved that the Scotch bishops elect might first be ordained presbyters, Bancroft replied that there was no need of it, since *ordination by presbyters was valid*. In Neal's *History of the Puritans*, vol. 2, pp. 413. It appears evident, then, that in the primitive churches there were only *two* orders of officers, viz: *elders* and *deacons*. Presbyters and bishops are the same as elders.

The first deacons were appointed to relieve the apostles of a burthen of secular cares and duties, that so they might give themselves more entirely to the ministry of the word. Acts 6: 4. It is certain, however, that those who were faithful to their trust were in many instances promoted to the higher office. This was the case with Philip. Acts 21: 8.

Church officers should be officially ordained.—The first deacons were ordained. Ministers of the gospel, in order to be prepared for their office should be ordained. The power of ordination is vested with ministers. To this, however, there may be exceptions, in extreme necessity. In the primitive church “Frumentius and Ædesius, two young men, who had no external call or commission to preach the gospel, being carried captive into India, converted a nation and *settled several churches among them.*” “The Iberians were first converted by a captive woman, who *established churches, and constituted the king and queen preachers of the gospel to their people.*” *Socrat. Ecc. Hist.*, Lib. 1, Chap. 19, 20.—*Theod.* Lib. 1. Chap. 23. We should not infer from these instances that ordination was not the peculiar work of ministers. It is the privilege of the church to choose their own minister, and to apply to an association of ministers in a quarterly meeting for his ordination. And moreover these ministers have no right to ordain a man over said church without their consent. It may be said that the power of ordination lies with the church after all. But this is not the case. The ordination is at the discretion of the ministers, even if the church do apply. That the power of ordination is vested with ministers, is evident from the fact that instances occur when it is their duty to ordain a man who does not expect to take the charge of any particular church, but considers it his duty to be an evangelist. It is evi-

dent from scripture testimony, that this power lies with ministers. It is perfectly reasonable. Ministers are better prepared to judge of a man's qualifications and call for the ministry.

NO. XXXVII.

BAPTISM.

It is evident that baptism is a divine institution. This we learn from Christ's own words: "Go teach all nations *baptizing* them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."

Immersion we believe to be the apostolic mode of baptism. To this it is objected that immersion is not calculated for *universal practice*. It is said there are places where water is not found. And in the northern regions among the mountains of ice and snow, it must be very inconvenient to immerse. But it should be remembered, that no person, unless he is of a different species from ours, can live in a place without water. And we should suppose that he must have this every day for drink and other common uses; and if this is the case, can he not obtain water enough in which to be immersed at least once during his whole life?

And even if immersion is more inconvenient than sprinkling, there is no proof that it is on that account less beneficial and heart cheering. But sup-

pose immersion is sometimes impracticable by means of a drought bringing famine and pestilence. But why does God send this judgment, if it is not on account of men's sins and a previous neglect of the great command, to believe and be *baptized*? If religious privileges are taken from them, this is no proof that they are not enjoyed by others.

It is said that it is often impracticable for a Christian in a declining state of health to be immersed. This supposes also that he has all his life time been neglecting the duty of baptism. And now, though he has passed by the privilege of being baptized, yet he has the greatest reason for gratitude to God that he has been renewed by the Holy Spirit, and will soon be permitted to join the Church triumphant.

2. The word baptize is the same as the Greek word baptizo. The primary meaning of baptizo, and its primitive bapto, is invariably to immerse, dip, or in some way to put under water. This is confirmed by the learned lexicographers. But as some affirm, suppose the word baptizo may mean to sprinkle. If it will admit of this meaning it must be a secondary one. This is no proof that we should embrace the secondary meaning as the primary. In some cases at least, we should see that this would be the subversion of the Christian system. The primary meaning of *aion* is eternity, yet the scriptures warrant it to have a restricted meaning. But this is no reason why we should embrace

the secondary meaning for the primary, and thus become Universalists.

3. This *signification* of water baptism shows that it is by immersion. It signifies the washing of regeneration our death to sin and resurrection to newness of life, and how this blessing is obtained, viz: by the death and resurrection of Christ. It is said, however, that the descending of the Spirit upon the heart is uniformly by *pouring* or *sprinkling*. But we shall find that when the person is renewed and united to Christ, this inward work is represented by a burial with Christ by baptism.

“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. For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection.” Rom. 6: 4, 5.

It is said that what is here spoken of is spiritual baptism. Suppose that it is, it follows then that spiritual baptism is by a *burial*, and not “uniformly by *pouring* or *sprinkling*. In fact we learn that *being buried* was the uniform mode in which persons were baptized *into Jesus Christ*; for saith the apostle, “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.” If we are *buried* for spiritual baptism there is reason to think that we should be *buried* for water baptism.

But here is evidently a plain reference to water baptism, and the very idea which we have of baptism, implies that we are not only immersed in water but raised from it, so that one part of the antithesis corresponds with the other and does away the objection which Prof. Stuart mentions.

The design of water baptism appears to be this: it represents our death to sin and resurrection, to newness of life; it exhibits the acknowledgment of our belief in the death and resurrection of Christ, and that we shall awake in his likeness.

4. The accounts of baptism in the New Testament evidently show that it was by immersion.—The only apparent objections are respecting the gaoler, the season of Pentecost and a few other cases. But when we learn the circumstances, the custom of the Jews, their conveniences for bathing, these objections at once vanish. Respecting the three thousand, Prof. Stuart remarks: "However, I concede that there are some points here, which are left undetermined, and which may serve to aid those who differ from me, in replying to these remarks. It is true that we do not know, that baptism was performed by the apostles only, nor that all the three thousand were baptized before the going down of the sun. The work may have extended into the evening; and so, many being engaged in it, and more time being given, there was a possibility that the work in question should be performed, although immersion was practised." pp. 333.

The Greek church, it is said, has always continued to preserve immersion, "even down to the present time." And says Prof. Stuart, "that the Greek fathers, and the Latin ones who were familiar with the Greek language, understood the usual import of the word *baptizo*, would hardly seem to be capable of a denial." pp. 362.

It will be further seen that those who are not baptists, consider the apostles to have baptized by immersion.

Prof. Woods gives it as his opinion, that immersion was the invariable mode of baptism mentioned in the New Testament, and this he affirms is substantiated not so much by the particles as by history.

Jaspis commenting on the Epistles says, "Paul in this place, alludes to the custom then usual, of immersing the whole body; which immersion resembled the laying of a man in a sepulchre."

Rosenmuller says, "Immersion in the water of baptism, and coming forth out of it, was a symbol of a persons renouncing his former life, and on the contrary, beginning a new one The learned have rightly reminded us, that, on account of this emblematical meaning of baptism, the rite of *immersion* ought to have been retained in the Christian church." *Scholia in Novum Testamentum*. Vol. 3, pp. 454.

Luther, after speaking of baptism as a symbol of death and resurrection says: "On this account I could wish that such as are to be baptized, should

be completely immersed into water, according to the meaning of the word, and the signification of the ordinance; not because I think it necessary, but because it would be beautiful to have a full and perfect sign of so full and perfect a thing; *as also without doubt it was instituted by Christ.*" *Captivitas Babylonica* in the collection. *Omni. Oper. M. LUTHER.* Tom. ii. pp. 76, ed. 1551.

Dr. Knapp, speaking of Rom. 6: 3, 4, and Col. 2: 12, 13, says: "We are, like Christ, buried as dead persons by baptism; and should arise like him to a new life." Says he: "The image is here taken from baptized persons as they were *immersed*, (*buried*,) and as they *emerged*, (*rose again*;) so it was understood by Chrysostom. Since immersion has been disused, the full significance of this comparison is no longer perceived." Knapp's *Theology*, vol. 11, pp. 525.

The Lord's Supper.

This consists in the elements of bread and wine. Various opinions have been entertained respecting this sacrament. The church of Rome hold that the bread and wine are literally changed into the body and blood of Christ; so that they are no longer bread and wine. This change is called transubstantiation. Luther held that the bread and wine remained the same; but, that *together with them*, the body and blood of Christ are *literally* received by the communicants; this is called consubstantiation. A cor-

rect view, as held by the Protestant Church generally, appears to be this: they consider that the bread and wine represent the body and blood of Christ, and that communicants who are in a right frame of mind, partake *spiritually* of the body and blood of Christ. So, then, it is more than a mere commemorative rite. They eat the bread in remembrance of Christ, of his death in particular; not that he merely died, but that he died as a *sacrifice* for sin. They partake of the cup remembering, not merely that Christ's blood was shed, but that it was shed as the blood of "the new covenant," and for "the remission of sins." This implies "faith in his blood," as the blood of atonement. From the nature of the sacrament, we perceive that all those who flee unto Christ and share in the efficacy of his death and sufferings, should have the privilege to partake of the symbols which represent such a participation. But some of our brethren say that the Lords supper is a church ordinance, and that we are inconsistent for communing with those who have not been baptized. Well, admit that it is a church ordinance; if so, it extends to all church members. If, then, it does not extend to Congregationalists, Presbyterians, Methodists, &c., it must be because they are not churches of Christ, and if so, they have no christian ministry; and yet these same brethren who call us inconsistent, will associate with the ministers of these churches as minsters of Christ. They will exchange pulpits with them and in vari-

ous ways manifest their fellowship ; now do they not exhibit the greatest inconsistency for not communing with them at the Lord's Table ? They know not how to affirm that these are not ministers of Christ, and their people not churches of Christ.

2. It is affirmed that the apostles administered this ordinance to those church members only who had been immersed : and is there not a very good reason for it ? viz : that there were no others. We affirm that when Christ presented the cup, his command was for *all* the disciples to partake of it ; church members if you please. And we perceive no authority why now only a part should partake. Can it be shown, if churches had then existed as they do now, that they would not have communed together ? If Christ were now here personally, and we should say to him that we forbid our brother, because he followeth not us, we have every reason to believe that he would say unto us forbid him not.

3. Pede-Baptists believe that they have been baptized ; they respect the ordinance. Now it is not right to say that it is just as unscriptural to commune with them, as it would be to commune with those who do not respect the commands of Christ. No sound reasoner or philologist would, I presume, adduce such an argument.

4. The evils and heart rendings occasioned by close communion, are serious objections to it. Any one, who has had even but a little experience, is not

a stranger to the tears and the sobs, which have occurred on account of this practice. But we would not accuse our brethren for not receiving persons merely because they have not been baptized. There appears to be some other reason; this we infer from the fact, that there are hosts of Baptists whom they will not receive.* To say the least, we think that close communion is not a very brilliant omen of the Millenium, when all will flock to the standard of Christ, and share in his dying love; when we shall witness the fulfilment of his prayer, that all his disciples may be one.

* These remarks do not apply to many Baptist churches.

NO. XXXVIII.

SUBJECTS, OF BAPTISM.

Faith in Christ, being his disciples and receiving his word, or in other words *regeneration* is prerequisite to baptism. The eunuch said to Philip; what doth hinder me to be baptized? And Philip said. If thou *believest with all thine heart*, thou mayest, Acts 8, 37. The great command of our Savior is go ye, therefore, and *teach* all nations, that is *disciple* all nations, baptizing them, Mark, 28, 19. Then they that *gladly received his word* were baptized, Acts, 2, 41.

It is not so clear to me that infants should be baptised from the fact infants were circumcised under the Jewish dispensation. It is said that the covenant with Abraham was the same as it is with us, that circumcision was then the token of the covenant and that baptism has now taken its place and is the token of the same covenant. Admit that the covenant is the same. The Lord said unto Jacob, I am the Lord God of Abraham, thy Father, and the God of Isaac. The land whereon thou liest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed. And thy seed shall be as the dust of the earth; and thou shalt spread abroad to the west and to the east; and to the north and to the south; and in thee, and in thy seed, shall all the families of the earth be blessed." Gen. 28; 13—15. In the New Testament, Acts 3, 25. it is thus asserted, "Ye are the children of the prophets, and of the covenant which God made with our Fathers, saying unto Abraham, And in thy seed shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed." This covenant we see fulfilled. God granted to Abraham a numerous posterity in the Jewish nation. He bestowed upon them peculiar blessings. In the line of Abraham, the Savior was to be born. Abraham is represented as the father of the Jews. But in one sense, the unbelieving Jews are not the children of Abraham. This is according to our Savior's words. As the covenant stands with us, all believers in Christ, whether Jews or Gentiles, are the only true

children of Abraham. So he is the father of all them that believe. The right of circumcision was performed upon children to constitute them Jews, that they should be subject to the law, it does not impart that persons *are actually cleansed*. But it is said that circumcision was a *token of regeneration*, and that baptism is a *token of regeneration*, therefore they are the same. Circumcision, as we shall perceive, pointed forward to the birth of Christ, and cleansing for them in the gospel. In this way it is a token of regeneration. Baptism, however, does not point forward to the birth of Christ. Our assurance is that Christ has come, that he has died and risen again: baptism signifies that we have shared in the work of his grace upon our hearts. In this way baptism is a token of regeneration. Circumcision was a prefixed token of regeneration but baptism is a token affixed; so that a person is required to believe with all his heart, in order to be baptized. It is urged that Abraham received the sign of circumcision after he believed; and why? not that he might be the father of the Jewish nation: but that he might be the father of all that believe, though they be not circumcised. If circumcision was the same as baptism, and if Abraham, in order to be our spiritual father received the sign after he believed we should suppose that we according to this analogy, should receive the sign after we believe. But I do not rest my argument on this. Circumcision pointed forward to the coming

of Christ; and when he came, it was to be abolished with the ceremonial law. If it had been the same as baptism, there would have been no need of its abolition. The moral law was not abolished for something else to take its place, but it continues the same, which requires us to love God with all our heart, and our neighbor as ourselves. As circumcision pointed forward to the coming of our Savior, so when he came, it ceased. In Christ, neither circumcision availeth anything nor uncircumcision; but faith which worketh by love; He is a Jew, which is one inwardly. Baptism is a rite which our Savior instituted to be received on believing in him. He that *believeth* and is baptized shall be saved. If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest be baptized.

2. Proselyte baptism, has been adduced as favouring infant baptism. It seems to be rather doubtful whether proselyte baptism existed among the Jews; be this as it may, the analogy from such a rite, does not favor the practice of Christian parents in having their infants baptized. It was administered to those children only, who were born before their parents became Jews. Those born afterwards, were not to be baptized. According to this, children born after their parents become church members are not to be baptized.

3. It is thought that children of believing parents, should be baptized, inasmuch as they are denominated Holy. In what respect are they Ho-

ly? Not real, but relative holiness is here intended. It is said that "The unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife; and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband, else were your children unclean, but now are they holy." 1 Cor. 7.

14. The sanctification here spoken of, is also relative. The unbeliever continues to remain with the christian partner, and is within christian influence. We shall see the force of this passage, by reading another in the same connexion. If any brother hath a wife that believeth not, and she be pleased to dwell with him, let him not put her away. And the woman which hath an husband that believeth not, and if he be pleased to dwell with her, let her not leave him. By their living together, their children will be holy in the same sense that they are legitimate. But we should not suppose that infants should be baptized, merely because they are legitimate.

It is said that Christ took little children up in his arms and blessed them. But we are not informed that he baptized them.

4. Circumcision was applied to none but males.

Baptism is applied to all believers both male and female. But it is said that females were included in the covenant with Abraham, although, they bore not the external mark; we too may say that children of pious parents, receive promised blessings of the covenant, though they are not baptized.

The baptism of the infant is considered the seal

of the covenant, not between God and the infant but between God and the parent, respecting the child.

Now what objection to saying that the baptism of the parent himself, is the seal of the covenant, between God and the parent, respecting the child? The parent is under the strongest obligations to train up his children in the fear of the Lord. And many are so trained up till they believe for themselves and are baptised. So then in this case the promise is not only to the parents but to their children. It is generally conceded that infant baptism is not very clearly taught in the New Testament, though some historians pretend to trace it back nearly or quite to the time of the apostles. But some of the most able and learned Theologians and those too, highly esteemed by Pedo-baptists, consider that infant baptism, is not so easily proved.

Scheiermacher remarks, all traces of infant baptism, which one will find in the new Testament, *must first be put into it.*" He calls it "a departure from the original institution."

Prof. Hahn, says "Neither in the scriptures, nor during the first hundred and fifty years, is a *sure example of infant baptism* to be found; *and we must concede that the numerous opposers of it cannot be contradicted on gospel ground,*" In another place he says, "It arose from false views of original sin, and of the magical power of consecrated water." If

infant baptism was not practised by the apostles and those immediately succeeding them. Some have thought it remarkable that there was no more opposition to its introduction; but when we consider how extensive the belief was that water baptism was a saving ordinance we shall not wonder why the baptism of infants was so easily introduced. Any one, I presume, would have his child baptized if he believed the child would be saved on that account.

NO. XXXIX.

CHURCH DISCIPLINE.

The discipline of a church includes those principles and rules which are adopted to promote the peace and order of its members. Church discipline has respect particularly, to that course which churches are to pursue towards *offending members*. It include private instruction, admonition, reproof, excommunication, &c.

By *offending members* are not meant such persons as are subject, merely to those infirmities, which are common to good men as well as others, but such as being united to the church are known to walk disorderly. With these persons, the church is bound to take measures for their reformation or exclusion.

The power of discipline is in the *church*. It is, however, the duty of individual members to reconcile difficulties when consistent, and not burden the church with them : but when these efforts fail, it belongs to the church to take the affair into consideration. That the power of discipline lies with the church, is expressly recognized in the New Testament. If the offender neglects to hear previous counsel, the doctrine of Christ requires it to be laid before the church, "and if he neglect to hear the church," he is then to be considered "as an heathen man and a publican." "Put away from among yourself that wicked person." 1 Cor. 5, 13. "Mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrines which ye have learned and avoid them" Rom. 16. 17. "Withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly. 2 Thess. 3, 6. These exhortations are enjoined upon the churches : hence the power of discipline is vested in them.

The ends to be answered by church discipline are the recovery of the offenders if possible, or his exclusion from the church. The principles of discipline must be sustained in order to the purity and success of the church.

The church cannot exert a hallowed influence, if it is defiled by the conduct of disorderly members. The offender must either confess and reform or be separated from the communion of the church.

The question arises, how far are we to consider

the direction of Christ, in the eighteenth chapter of Mathew, as a rule of church discipline ? It is evident that we should always maintain the spirit of this rule, and the letter of it so far as circumstances will permit. Except in outrageous crime, there should always be in the first place, private admonition if practicable. Let some one in meekness, go to the offender and converse with him in private, and urge him to repentance and reformation. Let him if necessary, converse with him the second time. If the offence is known only to one member of the church, and it cannot be proved, the individual who knows of it can labor only in a private way. He cannot properly bring it before the church. If he cannot by private admonition persuade him to reform, he must let the tare and the wheat grow together until the harvest.

But if the offence is susceptible of proof the process of discipline appears to be this.

One who is spiritual visits the offender and labors with him in private. If the offender does not hear him, he is to take two or three more with him. If the offender will not hear them the case is laid before the church. If the church act upon it, a day is appointed for trial before the church and the offender is notified to be present. If the charges or any considerable part of them are found to be proved and the offender is obstinate he is suspended from communion and admonished by the church. After a convenient time he may be

admonished again. Tit. 3, 10. If he does not regard this, he is to be excommunicated. If the offender is dissatisfied with the decision of the church he has the right to ask a mutual council : and it is the duty of the church, ordinarily, to unite with him in calling such a council, if he desires it. But no council has a right to dictate to the church.

No member in good standing, should on account of difficulties in the church, refuse coming to the communion table. If it is right for him to be connected with the church it is right for him to commune.

It seems to me proper to have a committee in a church to look after its general interests. This should not, however, be understood to free other members from exerting their influence in favor of the order, purity and success of the church, whenever they may find opportunity.

The satisfaction which the church is to require of offenders is *evidence of repentance ; confession of sin and reformation of life*. If the offence is private, a confession may be private. But if the offence has been brought before the church, or in any way has become public, a public confession must be required. Nothing short of this, can secure the honor of religion and the purity of the church.

And both parties, if they are in a right state of feeling, will not desire that a different course should be pursued.

It is often the case that due care is not taken to

prevent the feelings of penitents from being needlessly wounded. But no feelings of unkindness should be gratified or harbored against them. All should remember that they are alike exposed to temptation. It sometimes happens, that the most prudent measures are not taken towards those that have offended who now desire to comply with the principles of the gospel. In such cases, knowing that "to err is human," each should not only be willing, but make it a point to yield as much as the case may require. Excommunicated persons should not be considered as released from their covenant obligations. They should be made the subject of special prayer. Christians should seek to benefit them. They should not however countenance in the least degree their wicked conduct. It is the duty of the church to seek the good of those who are excommunicated and to meet them with compassion when they are willing to return.

From what has been said we see the importance of church discipline. We should consider it not as an arbitrary, unwelcome restraint, but as gently leading us to the path of righteousness, peace and joy in the Holy Ghost.

NO. XL.

PROSPECTS OF THE CHURCH ON
EARTH.

Though there are many things which seem to

impede the progress of christianity yet it is destined to prevail throughout the world.

Our Savior compared his kingdom in the world to leaven hid in three measures of meal until *the whole was leavened* .

The time of this general spread of christianity, is called the Millenium. The promise respecting the seed of the woman shows that the christain religion is to triumph in the earth. 'And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed.' It (referring to Christ) *shall bruise thy head and thou shalt bruise his heel.* The serpent has bruised the heel of the seed of the woman. Christ has suffered. He was a man of sorrow and acquainted with grief. He was persecuted even unto death, but he rose triumphant from the grave and ever liveth to make intercession for his people. They are coming up out of great tribulation. Though they meet with conflicts and in some places severe persecution, yet they are to prevail, their cause to spread over the world. Their conflicts and persecutions will end. They will be permitted to set under their own vines and fig trees, and none to molest or to make them afraid. But as the powers of darkness are now striving to defeat the christian religion, the *seed of the woman* is yet to bruise the serpent's head. It will be said, 'the kingdoms of this world have become the kingdoms of our Lord, and his Christ. And he, shall reign for ever and ever.' It was said

to Abraham *'In thy seed'* (Christ) *shall all the nations and families of the earth be blessed.*' The Savior is to have the heathen for his inheritance and the uttermost parts of the earth for a possession. He says, "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth will draw all men unto me." The prediction of the psalmist is, that 'all the ends of the world shall remember and turn unto the Lord, and all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before him. God shall bless us, and all the ends of the earth shall fear him. All kings shall fall down before him; all nations shall serve him. Men shall be blessed in him, all nations shall call him blessed. According to Isaiah and the prophets, 'in the last days the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills, and all nations shall flow unto it. The glory of the Lord shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see it together.

Jerusalem shall be called the throne of the Lord, and all nations shall be gathered unto it, neither shall they walk any more after the imagination of their evil heart. His dominion shall be from sea to sea, and from the rivers unto the ends of the earth. According to Daniel, 'there was given him (that is Christ) dominion and glory, and a kingdom, that all people nations and languages shall serve him. And the kingdom and dominion and greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the saints of the Most High.'—'At the

name of Jesus every knee shall bow, and every tongue shall confess he is Lord, to the glory of God the Father. *The earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea.* Is. 11, 9.

This is what is to be understood by the Millenium. Without adducing other passages to show that there will be a Millenium I pass to notice.

2. The question, when will the Millinium take place? Not while christians are unfriendly to each other, thinking that in the cause of Christ they have separate interests, and forgetting that they belong to one great brotherhood. Not while we are holding our fellow men in the cruel bonds of Slavery excluding them from the privileges of education and of reading God's holy word, denying them their rights, forbidding that their children should be trained up in the nurture and admonition of our Lord, severing their families and amid tears and sobs of grief scattering them to the four winds, Not while we needlessly treasure up wealth refusing to contribute to the support of the ministry and to send the gospel to the benighted nations of the earth. 'Whoso hath this world's goods, and seeth his brother have need, and shutteth up his bowels of compassion from him, how dwelleth the love of God in him?' 1 John 3, 17. How shall they call on him in whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe in him whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher? and

how shall they preach except they be sent, and how can they be sent except we use the means to aid them, which God has given us, and which means he imperatively requires us to use in order to the universal spread of the gospel.

But when the Millinium commences there will be a more glorious state of things. The hearts of christians will be open for all nations to receive the gospel and they all shall know the Lord from the least to the greatest. The bands of slavery will be sundered, every yoke will be broken and the oppressed shall be set free. They will have the privilege of reading God's holy word, and worshipping in his sanctuary. They will be permitted to live quietly by their own fire sides. Joy and hope will beam in every eye.

The noise of war will cease. They shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning hooks: nation shall not lift up their sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more.

But they shall set every man under his vine and under his fig-tree; and none shall make them afraid: for the mouth of the Lord of hosts hath spoken it Micah, 4, 34. Is. 2, 4. Christians will feel that their interest is one. They will understand the force of our Savior's command, viz. 'This is my commandment, that ye love one another, as I have loved you. John 15, 12. Ministers will publish peace and salvation. 'How beautiful upon the

mountains are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings, that publisheth peace: that bringeth good tidings of good that publisheth salvation, that saith unto Zion, Thy God reigneth!

Thy watchman shall lift up the voice, with the voice together shall they sing, for they shall see eye to eye, when the Lord shall bring again Zion, Break forth into joy, sing together ye waste places of Jerusalem, for the Lord hath comforted his people, he hath redeemed Jerusalem. The Lord hath made bare his holy arm in the eyes of all the nations and all the ends of the earth shall see the salvation of our God. Is. 5, 2, 7—10.

With regard to the dates in Daniel respecting the end of the world, I do not think it proper here to say much for two reasons. 1st. this compressed volume will not allow an extensive discussion. 2. it is not necessary as there is so much stated to the point in other works which may be found in almost every bookstore. The reader may be referred to Stuart's Hints on the Interpretation of Prophecy, To Wm. H. Brewster's Exposition &c. on the one hand, and to Miller's Lectures and those of his followers, on the other.

It will be well however to consider the 20th chapter of Revelation, which has an important bearing on this subject.

After a careful examination I submit the few remarks which follow.

Revelation, Chap. 20, 1—3. 'And I saw an

angel come down from heaven, having the key of the bottomless pit and a great chain in his hand. And he laid hold on the dragon, that old serpent, which is the devil, and satan, and bound him a thousand years. And cast him into the bottomless pit and shut him up, and set a seal upon him, that he should deceive the nations no more, till the thousand years should be fulfilled, and after that he must be loosed a little season."

Here we see the powerful and restraining influence which is put upon Satan, during the thousand years of prosperity to the church on earth. At the close of this period, Satan is to be loosed a little season.

4th. *And I saw thrones, and they sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them :*

Here are represented the different governments of the world, and the authority which they exercise *and I saw the souls of them that were beheaded, for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God, and which had not worshipped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads, or in their hands ; and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years.*

This passage teaches the resurrection of the souls of the saints, and not of their bodies. It is indeed true that in all ages when souls are converted they are risen with Christ, but this passage is more particularly designed to exhibit the period when there will be a more general display of God's power in

bringing dead sinners to life. The spirit of the martyrs will be revived. Great zeal will be exhibited in removing every obstacle, and in worshipping God in spirit and in truth. Christ will reign with his people on the earth a thousand years, though not personally. When he comes personally, the saints will be caught up to meet the Lord in the air; *and so shall we ever be with the Lord*, and not merely a thousand years.

5th. *But the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished.* Here is an allusion to the resurrection of the body, though the *description* is not given till we come to the 12th verse. But the rest of the dead, i. e. dead bodies, particular reference being made to the dead bodies of these saints before spoken of. Though the souls of these saints were to live and reign with Christ a thousand years, their bodies were not to be raised and united with their souls to the judgment.

This is the first Resurrection.

The first resurrection refers to the resurrection of the souls of the saints, who were to live and reign with Christ a thousand years. This is evident from the whole context. It is confirmed by the next verse.

6th. Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the *first resurrection*; on such, the second death hath no power; but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and *shall reign with him a thousand years.*

The first resurrection then, here spoken of, is that of the soul, special reference being made to the numerous conversions that will occur during the thousand years previous to the resurrection of the body. It does not appear scriptural to consider the bodily resurrection of the righteous, a thousand years previous to that of the wicked. It is said the dead in Christ, shall rise first : what then ? Why then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up *together with them* in the clouds. We cannot suppose that the dead in Christ, are raised a thousand years before the living saints are changed. If so, how can they be caught *up together* ? Will the dead in Christ rise and wait a thousand years on the earth, for the living saints to be changed, before the Lord takes them to himself ? No more can we suppose that the dead in Christ, will rise a thousand years before the wicked dead. We will admit that the dead in Christ, do rise before the wicked, but not sufficiently long to make two judgments of two great days.

I would now state the proposition, that *the term resurrection is as appropriately applied to the soul as to the body.*

1st. Men are morally dead and need have their souls raised from this death.

Eph. 2; 1. "Who were dead in trespasses and sins."

Col. 2: 13. And you being *dead in your sins.*

Jude 12. Twice *dead* plucked up by the roots.

2d. Resurrection of the soul directly taught. Eph. 2 : 4, 5. But God, who is rich in mercy, for his great love, wherewith he loved us, even when we were *dead* in sins, hath *quickened* (*raised*) us together with Christ.

Col. 3: 1. If ye then be *risen* with Christ, seek those things which are above.

3d. The resurrection of the soul, is mentioned in connexion with that of the body. The present chapter gives an example. Another example is found in John 5, 25, resurrection of the soul, verily, verily I say unto you, the hour is coming, and now is when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and they that hear shall *live*. Resurrection of the body; verse 28 and 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. 7—10 “And when the thousand years are expired, Satan shall be loosed out of his prison, and shall go out to deceive the nations which are in the four quarters of the earth, Gog and Magog, to gather them together to battle; the number of whom, is as the sand of the sea. And they went up on the breadth of the earth, and compassed the camp of the saints about, and the beloved city: and fire came down from God out of heaven, and devoured them. And the devil that deceived them, was cast into the lake

of fire and brimstone, where the beast and the false prophets are, and shall be tormented day and night forever and ever."

From the preceding verses, we learn that at the close of the thousand years, Satan will be loosed for a short season, and will go out to deceive the nations. Many doubtless, who profess religion at that time, will fall away from their steadfastness, and thus, Satan will have a great company, who for a very short time will be permitted to disturb the saints. But in the midst of their career, God will come in judgment, which has already been alluded to in the preceding verses.

11th. 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 no place for them.

In this verse the sacred writer makes an introduction to the great day judgment.

I saw a *great white throne*, not thrones, as in the 4th verse, denoting the kings and kingdoms of the world, but a *white throne* denoting the purity and righteousness of the Eternal Judge who sits upon it. Then will he make the elements melt with fervent heat, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and obey not the gospel. This is clear from the latter clause; *from whose face the earth and the heaven fled away*.

12th. 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.

In this verse is exhibited the general resurrection of the dead, small and great, and the books were opened; and another book was opened, which was the book of life, in which are found the names of the saints.

13th. 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. The 13th verse carries out the same doctrine as taught in the 12th but it is done in a more specific manner. In this we are taught not only that the graves and tombs gave up their dead, but also the sea gave up the dead. In this we are taught not only that the righteous were raised from the dead, but also that death and hell delivered up the dead.

14th. And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death.

15th. And whosoever was not found written in the book of life, was cast into the lake of fire.

In the preceding essay, we discover the success of the church on earth, and are carried forward to the second coming of Christ, the judgment of the great day, when he shall appear in the clouds of heaven, to receive his saints to himself, and so shall they be ever with the Lord. These views are enough to fill the soul with rapture. Some say that this glorious scene will take place within a

few months ; but the doctrine of our Savior is, that we be always ready. Thousands are going out of the world every day, and their accounts are as much sealed up, as they will be when the world shall be on fire. We have no authority to four months, and then cometh the harvest. Every watchman should raise his warning and cry, *now*, Now is the accepted time, and behold NOW is the day of salvation.

NO. XLI.

THE SINNER WITHOUT EXCUSE.

"They have no cloak for their sin." John 15,22. Our Savior here refers to the sin of the unbelieving Jews in rejecting him. It is evident also, that he means to inculcate, not merely that the Jews were without excuse, but that all who are favored with his instructions and reject him, have no cloak for their sin.

In considering this subject, it will be proper to notice *in what way man endeavors to cloak his sin*.

To cloak means to hide or conceal. In this case it serves as a covering which man throws around his crimes, to make it appear that he is innocent.

This cloak is made up of the various excuses which men offer for not embracing the gospel. Whenever an excuse is offered, it implies some sup-

posed reason which the individual has in his mind for pursuing his own chosen way.

Though these excuses often appear to the framers of them more or less plausible yet they are very pernicious in their results. Indulgence in them tends to blind the mind, blunt the conscience, pervert the judgement and form fatal habits of iniquity.

There are many and varied excuses which the impenitent offer for not becoming pious. I shall however be able on the present occasion to notice but a few of them.

1st. One of the most common and apparently plausible, but yet one of the most fatal in its consequences, is that offered by the youth. When urged with all the pathos of an apostle, to embrace the subject of religion, they excuse themselves that they are yet young and amid worldly amusements thinking there can be no great harm to put away the subject for the present. They do not consider it unimportant but calculate to give it due attention at some future time. The great danger of this course is, that early impressions though sinful become if indulged, deeply printed in the mind and are hable to remain permanent. Habits then formed are not easily broken up. Likewise religious impressions, if adhered to become confirmed; good habits are formed, and thus the growth of false principles is prevented. Noxious plants, when small are more easily rooted out by the agricultur-

alist then when they are full grown, their roots extending far and wide, deep and firm. It is of the greatest importance, what impressions are at first received and cherished by the young. This fact is clear to every one who has carefully observed the operations of the human mind. Now the enemy of all righteousness is as well acquainted with these operations as any of us : hence he does not come to tell us at first that religion is a delusion, a phantom or a dream, but rather to *waive* the subject. Yes his language is waive the subject for the present, let my principles and notions have the first place in the mind, let them be carefully attended to, and then the subject of religion may receive attention. Here Satan would fain make it appear that he is an angel of light, admitting religion to be valuable, but better calculated to be observed by those who are settled in life, and to employ the leisure hours and contemplation of the aged. Thus he lulls men to sleep till he has them fast in his dominion.

Now opposite to the undermining, insinuating way of destroying souls, God has laid down plain, pointed and prominent requisitions. “Remember now thy Creator in the days of thy youth *before the evil days come*.—Seek *first the kingdom* of heaven.—Escape for thy life ; look not behind thee, *neither stay thou in all the plain*, escape to the mountain lest thou be consumed.

2. Another excuse which the impenitent offer

for not becoming pious is, *the advocates of religion conduct improperly.* This is similar to the one presented by the Jews, in the time of Christ. They complained that he violated the Sabbath, called God his father, making himself equal with God, that he was a friend of publicans and sinners. They complained that his disciples fast not and in many cases disregard the traditions of the fathers. They had so often rejected the principles of true religion, that false notions and principles became incorporated into their very being. Such principles they considered preferable to those of Christianity, and thought that in many respects they surpassed Christians in good works and noble life. Of their conduct we can learn something in noticing the Pharisee who went up to pray, thanking God that he was not as other men, extortioners, unjust. In viewing the prevalence of this spirit our Savior affirmed to Nicodemus, marvel not that I said unto thee, ye must be born again. The same appeal is now made to the unconverted, who excuse themselves that their conduct is not so very bad, that they discover many faults in Christians of which they would not be guilty themselves.

But suppose Christians do err, it is no reason why you should. Suppose your neighbors are intemperate, should you, therefore, be intemperate? Suppose they waste their property, bring disgrace upon broken-hearted wives and suffering children, should you therefore find the same pit of wo?

Such reasoning is not to say sophistical or absurd, but it is phrenzy, it is madness.

3d. It is said again, that because an Atonement has been made for all men therefore all will be saved. Those who present this as an excuse for not obeying the commands of Christ, would do well to notice its tendencies and results. Let us observe how this excuse appears in a child who refuses to obey his father, and then assigns the reason; why I did not obey my father because it appeared evident that I could get clear of punishment. Such a child as this in a quiet, harmonious circle, is a pure anomaly.—Will not obey his father because he can get clear of punishment. It shows how much love he has for his father. Such conduct invariably produces disorder, wrangles and tumults. It confirms the truth of our Savior's words: a house divided against itself cannot stand. But let us notice again the force of the excuse founded on the universality of the Atonement. It is necessary to observe that the Atonement is not Redemption. The former prepares the way for men's salvation, but they are not redeemed till there is an application of the Atonement.

4th. The sinner excuses himself on the ground that he cannot repent. In considering our fallen nature this excuse would appear somewhat plausible, were it not that we have an High Priest, who can be touched with the feelings of our infirmities. The Lord is merciful and gracious, slow to anger,

and plenteous in mercy. He knoweth our frame; he remembereth that we are dust. Though we can of ourselves do nothing, yet through Christ strengthening us we can do all things which he requires of us.

However plausible to the sinner the above excuse may appear, it is groundless and it will be so perceived at the final day, not only in view of the divine law, but in his own view. It will be his shame that he made such an excuse to cover his sins and iniquity. He will see why many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt. This shame will not consist in his being unfortunately placed in a wretched condition without his own fault, but it will consist exclusively in the fact that his excuses have not the slightest foundation, that his punishment has come upon him, not merely as an unfortunate man, ruined by the fault of another, but as a rebel, a despiser of God's justice, goodness and mercy. He will not be condemned for Adam's sin.

His condemnation consists in grieving the Holy Spirit; refusing to embrace the gospel, obey the Savior and trust in his merits. It consists in trampling under foot the blood of the Son of God, going down to perdition amid warnings, prayers, tears, entreaties, supplications, sobs and weeping.

No easy allusion, in the judgment, can be made to Adam's sin. The sinner will be pointed to the

cross, to a crucified and suffering Redeemer. The difficulty with the sinner will be, that *his footsteps are marked with blood.*

Now the Lord commandeth all men every where to repent; still the sinner complains that Christ is a hard Master, requiring that of him which he cannot do.

It will avail him nothing in that day to say: Lord, I knew thee that thou art an hard man, reaping where thou hast not sown, and gathering where thou hast not strewed; his Lord answering to him: thou *wicked* and *slothful* servant, will make him feel his guilt. He will be reminded of past privileges and opportunities which he enjoyed. Do the unconverted still think Christ a hard master? Let them now within the sound of salvation, turn their thoughts for a moment to his compassion. Should any of you see a band of men in a perilous condition, no way to save themselves, a friend come to afford them relief, they abuse and repel him; should he repeat his deed of charity the second or third time, and meet with like abuse, would you not pronounce him a man of singular compassion, warm-hearted beyond expression? And yet the great compassion of Christ you seem to deny. He has seen man's wretched condition and has come to afford relief. He visited you when you were but a child and said: *Son, give me thine heart.* You repelled him; you framed excuses that you were young and wished to enjoy the pleasures of

sin for a season. You have been preserved while many have been called away by death, many of your friends, some very dear. You have lived to witness revivals of religion; they have come near you; your intimate friends have shared in them; during these seasons and in your private walks, your conscience has been agitated and awakened by the power of the Holy Spirit. The language of our Savior has been plain: *Son, give me thine heart.* You repelled him. You continue to be blessed with the means of grace—have the privileges of the sanctuary. By various means God teaches you your obligation; by his providence, his judgments and mercies by the ministry of his word, from Sabbath to Sabbath. It is nothing short of the grace and love of God, which so prepare the minds and hearts of his servants as willingly to endure privations, toils and hardships, to travel over hills and through dales; amidst winds, storms and tempests, that they may win souls to Christ. That you may become reconciled to God. Our Savior comes to-day with his entreaties, saying it is high time to awake out of sleep. *Son, give me thine heart.* And do you repel him? Think of these visits. And they are not merely occasional, they are continued. Our Lord says, “Behold I *stand*, at the door, and knock; if any man hear my voice, and open the door, I will come into him, and will sup with him, and he with me.” Here evidently is denoted continuance, but how long? why till his

head is filled with dew, and his locks with the drops of the night. If any one is at a loss to know that Christ is compassionate, let him turn his thoughts to the time when our Savior stood and looked weeping over Jerusalem. If this is not sufficient, follow him to the cross, and hear his words. My God, my God! why hast thou *forsaken* me. At this *forsaken* hour, with the sins of the world pressing upon him, yet observe how quickly he turned his eye upon the penitent supplicating thief, saying to-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise. Hear him pray for his murderers. And now where is the foundation for excuses? It was no excuse for the Jew to continue in sin, because the national law did not sanction Christianity. But you live under a christian government where professors of religion are protected in the worship of God. It was no excuse for the Jew to continue in sin, because the community and nations around were idolaters, looking down upon Christians with contempt, persecuting them from place to place, and even to death. But you live in a land of Bibles, a community of Christians, whose prayers come up before God like holy incense. You are entreated and urged to embrace the subject of religion. You are remembered in prayer in the closet, at the fire-side, and in the assembly of the saints. And now as a friend I would candidly present one question for your consideration, viz: If in an impenitent state and going on to the judg-

ment, you find your pathway through this land of bibles, if you wade through this tide of prayer, this ocean of privileges, how ! O tell, how ! will you plead your cause at that day ? It will avail nothing to say, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name, and in thy name done many wonderful works ? How will, how *must* you feel to look back upon Christian America, and see whence and through what has been your pathway to perdition.

You will see no ground for your excuses ; you will perceive your guilt through no dark, intervening shade, but it will be clear as light pouring down from the meridian sun. You will see written in broad, full and living characters, *Ye have no cloak for your sin.*

NO. XLII.

ELEMENTARY PRINCIPLES OF CHRISTIAN UNION.

The grand design of christianity is to reform mankind, by an internal renovation, creating aversion to sin and love to holiness.

My object in this discussion will be, to point out one or two leading principles, which are particularly calculated to heal existing divisions in the church, and prepare it for the great work of converting the world.

None will doubt the importance of such principles, when they consider the sectarian feelings which characterize us, as a professed christian people. We are so divided, thwarted, and opposed to one another, that some good men have thought our case *incurable*. They have supposed that sectarianism must continue as it now exists, and that its evil consequences must be perpetual. But since God has designed the christian system for the recovery of man from these and other effects of sin he has doubtless embodied in this system the necessary elements to procure such a result.

If now, in the progress of religion, we do not discover harmony among its professors, it is not because the system is wanting in its proper elementary principles, but it is because these principles are overlooked; they are not imbibed and exhibited in practice.

Before proceeding to my position, let us notice some well intended, though ineffectual measures, which have been proposed to secure the unity of the church.

Some have thought that a creed might be formed, from which all disputed points among christians should be excluded. But waiving all other objections to such an instrument it must be itself of a very meagre and worthless character.

Others have proposed an instrument more full than this, from which only the more offensive points should be excluded: and then that each

christian, after sacrificing what ever was inconsistent with the creed, should subscribe his name. But such an instrument is even more objectionable than the other. Its great fault is, that it demands a violation of conscience. Each dissenting christian is required to give up some points, not because he has found them erroneous but because the unity of the church is supposed to require it. Suppose he does yield some points which he firmly believes to be true : the surrender is only in appearance, and not in reality ; and when truth comes to be discussed, the real sentiments of his heart will be exhibited.

The true method of union supposes that we hold ourselves in a situation to be guarded against erroneous sentiments, and influenced to embrace correct ones ; and that we yield certain points of doctrine only because they seem to us *erroneous*. The principles to be advanced in this discussion are all embodied in the instructions of our Savior, and are strictly philosophical.

The first is found in the following requisition : *Watch and pray that ye may enter not into temptation.* Here is a requisition and the reason of it, viz. that we *shall be guarded against temptation.* At the throne of grace we shall be likely to have consistent views of sin and holiness.—If we are inclined ever to be disarmed of prejudice, to discover and renounce our errors, and embrace the truth *it is here.* If we ever perceive the value of

the soul, and what is to be done for a ruined world it is here. If we ever value the cementing and combined effect of christian influence *it is here.*

The second principle to be adduced grows out of the first, and is expressed in the command of our Savior, "*That ye love one another.*" This is among the last instructions of our Lord before he was betrayed and crucified. So great stress did he lay upon this requisition, that he calls it, a new *commandment.* He repeats it once and again: "*This is my commandment, that ye love one another as I have loved you.*" The same doctrine was taught by John who was one of the most intimate friends of our Savior, and who leaned upon his breast at supper. It is said of him, when he was so advanced in age that he could preach but a few words at a time the drift of his discourse would perpetually be, "*little children love one another.*"

In adopting the principle here advanced to secure the unity of the church, it is *not* supposed that all christians must have the same views, with regard to every particular point of doctrine. This cannot be expected, as long as the human mind remains what it is. It is too feeble to comprehend the eternal mind whose judgments are unsearchable and his ways past finding out. Some take one view of the subject of religion and adopt their opinions accordingly: others take another view, and thence draw *their* opinions. The true method is to take every view of which we are capable, looking to

God for wisdom to direct, and relying implicitly upon his word.

In adopting the principle of love to each other, it is supposed that christians search the scriptures, not merely for the sake of argument, but for love of the truth; and that they have *confidence* in each other.

Christians may conscientiously differ in minor points, not only of doctrine, but also of practice. They may adopt different measures to promote the kingdom of Christ, to remove obstacles, and direct influence for the conversion of the world. In promoting this object, some think they can do more to become pastors of churches; others to engage as sabbath school teachers; some to be home missionaries: others to encounter the dangers of the ocean, to labor in China, in Burmah, in Hindoostan and the Isles of the sea: some to reason of righteousness, temperance and judgment to come; others to preach deliverance to the captives, and the opening of the prison doors to them that are bound.

Now let these efforts diverge, not to be weakened in their designed effects, but like the spreading fire to burn up the hay, wood and stubble.

That love to each other is wanting in carrying forward the great enterprises of the day, is evident from the frequent and disastrous contentions of those who might otherwise be the benefactors of mankind.

It is to be greatly lamented too, that we discover so little mutual confidence, among those who are the professed expounders of the christian doctrine. This failure is most generally seen in works which are written upon the more difficult topics in the christian system. The most consummate skill, is exhibited in making Theological distinctions, to establish each point beyond controversy; and all this not merely to convince the unconverted that our position is true; but the great secret is, there is *a band of christians*, whom we expect to commence *hostilities* upon us. Instead of christians coming together, and uniting their efforts in the cause of Christ, it appears they must spend their strength in erecting bulwarks and batteries for mutual aggression and defence.

That christians have love to each other, is indispensable in the work of converting the world. In this way they are to be as lights in the world; as the salt of the earth; and as a city set on a hill, which cannot be hid.—Overlooking this element how can they expect to prevail with the heathen or the infidel? The christian advocate must write a volume to convince the atheists that there is a God. He must write another to prove the divine origin of christianity. And then he must write a very large one, summoning all his skill in metaphysics, to show that there are christians in the world, and to reconcile their contentions and strife with the religion of him who is the Prince of

Peace. But in order to convince sinners, even the most obdurate, our Lord has taught a more excellent way; *by this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another.*—His prayer to the father is to this effect; that they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us; that *the world may believe* that thou hast sent me.

These principles should be carefully adopted by the church, and especially by the rising ministry. Let the christian student write them on his study table. Let him engrave them on the posts and lintel of his door.—Let him inscribe them on the tablets of *his heart*. Then shall he not labor in vain, in promoting the cause of truth and holiness in the earth. Imbibing the spirit of his Savior, and obeying his commands, *his blessing* shall attend him, and fruits of righteousness shall be multiplied around him. And his reward in the great day of reckoning shall be sure. They that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament: and they that turn many to righteousness, as the stars for ever and ever. The laurels of the christian advocate in that day are *living sons*, the seal of his ministry.

NO. XLIII.

THE TEN COMMANDMENTS AND THEIR
OBLIGATION.*First Commandment.*

Ex. 20 ; 3. 'Thou shalt have no other Gods before me.'

Second Commandment.

Ex. 20 ; 4—6. 'Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of anything 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, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me ; and showing mercy unto thousands of them that love me, and keep my commandments.'

Third Commandment.

Ex. 20 ; 7, '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.'

Fourth Commandment.

Ex. 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.'

Fifth Commandment.

Exo. 20 : 12, "Honor thy father and thy mother ; that thy days may be long upon the land, which the Lord thy God giveth thee."

Sixth Commandment.

Exo. 20 : 13. 'Thou shalt not kill.'

Seventh Commandment.

Exo. 20 ; 14. 'Thou shalt not commit adultery.'

Eighth Commandment.

Exo. 20 ; 15. 'Thou shalt not steal.'

Ninth Commandment.

Exo. 20 ; 16. 'Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor.'

Tenth Commandment.

Exo. 20 ; 17. 'Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's house, thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife, nor his man-servant, nor his maid-servant,

nor his ox, nor his ass, nor anything that is thy neighbor's.'

The ten commandments constitute the *Moral Law*, which God gave to man by Moses.

This law is still binding on us. Though found in the Old Testament, it is in the New Testament, set forth and enforced by Christ and his apostles.

The apostle Paul, however, states that we are dead to the Law, referring to this law, as he calls it holy, just and good. These terms cannot apply to the ceremonial law of rites and sacrifices for they were abolished, having been fulfilled in Christ were of none effect, and could not be then considered holy, just and good. What goodness or worth can be attached to them, when they could not make him that did the service perfect? But Christ being come a 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 in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us.'

What then did the apostle mean when he said that we are dead to that law, which is holy, just and good. Ans. That we are dead to it so far as our justification is concerned, and for justification we must have faith alone in the blood of Christ. The law is effectual to teach us our guilt, but renders no relief. Finally, it is clear that we are not free from the obligations of the moral law. Our

being justified by the blood of Christ does not free us from the obligations of this law, the design of the New Birth is to bring us into a situation to obey the law. We are expected to obey it. The highest state of the christian is fully to carry out the very spirit of this law.

They who violate it incur the judgments of God. How are their sorrows increased, that hasten after another God. The adulterer shall not inherit the kingdom of God. The adulterer may be found not only in a social capacity, but in a private one. His sin is exhibited in a prostrated constitution. Our Savior taught that this awful sin may be effectually committed, even in the thoughts.

NO. XLIV.

PLEA FOR THE SLAVE.

*The cause of Christ, of peace aloud proclaims
That Afric's sons be free from galling chains.
Yes, equal rights, the Christian Faith, Science,
Must be our walls and bulwarks of defence.
Is this the way the sons of peace we train,
For equal rights confer the clanking chain ;
For sciences' gem confer dull ignorance
With all her train of guilt, such sad expense ;
For Christian Faith and love, confer debate,
Carnage and death, remorse and fear and hate ?
No Bible truth, the passions to control
And make the man upright, and perfect, whole ;
No Bible truth to guide the infant mind,
Secure from evil deeds, to parents kind.
And then to make the Slave his master fear,
When work is done his task is more severe ;
He's doomed to spend the night in darkness round,
And oft to grope in tears, in irons bound.
With such a plan men seem to have a view
That all in peace may live, their *rights* pursue,
And what a vain pretence ! With facts like these,
From such undue, unlawful premises,
Is the conclusion drawn, that we shall rest*

In peace and hope and love, heirs of the bless'd?
What short of Christian love could thus endure
Such wrongs and cruel strife, from year to year?
See families broken up, all dress'd in tears.
No stranger nigh, no friend to calm their fears;
See them asunder go, sire from the son,
Mother, daughter, far from each other torn,
See others bound, their time and strength to spend
In drudg'ry foul, till days and lives shall end;
See some in mingled gore, by masters slain,
Others in tortures keen, in wreathing pain.
But why should man be made the slave of man
To toil for others good, his own resign?
'Tis not for crimes of slaves that they are held
And kept as property, purchased and sold.
No, color must decide who wears the chain,
Although the mind of Newton share the brain,
Now let us have no spirit to affirm
That men must live as slaves, this sin confirm,
Please grant what conscience, Nature, nature's God
Unfold to men in all his works, his word,
That man is bound, his wife, his child to keep,
Secure from harm from every cruel grasp.
Then let the slave this right as his embrace,
So dear to man, to all the human race.
If now 'tis wrong to keep our fellow men
In dungeons dark, these horrible gloomy dens,
How long then must we cease to act upright,
To free these men that they may share their rights?
Some ask should not we now instruct the slave,
While we attempt his rights, his worth to save?
Ah yes, with heart and hand we would engage
To teach, direct, and save from cruel rage.

But will the slave improve with more success,
 With fetters off, or on? judge which's the best.
 Students accomplish more with bodies sound,
 With cheerful minds, than if in chains they're bound;
 Their minds arrayed in thick'ning, settled gloom,
 Their labors lost, bruises and strife their doom,
 Yes indeed freedom's men in Indies west
 Can tell you plainly now what mode is best.
 And who can paint the wrath which is reserved
 For those who keep their fellow-men enslaved?
As we to others mete of poverty
Or wealth, of all, of bonds or liberty,
To us so will the measure be again,
By him who rules and will forever reign,
 Each act of man, as good or bad it be,
 Will have its consequent in due degree,
 This law in moral, as the natural world,
 In mercy, justice, truth will ever hold,
 Can he, who plunges down a lofty tower,
 Evade the fall by his unaided power;
 Can he, a man make gravitation cease,
 And thus prevent to find the dread abyss;
 Or with superior skill can he arise,
 Resist its law, aidless ascend the skies?
 Ah no! neither can one avoid the wrath
 Which he deserves, lays up at every breath,
 Who plunders, kidnaps, wrongs the slave
 And does the child, the husband, wife bereave.
 Though fortune seems indeed a time to own
 And sanction all the wrongs which he has done,
 And he in safety, joyful, passes by,
 Thus presses on, heeds not humanity's cry,
 Yet soon a recompense he'll surely find,
 Severe as he has been unjust, unkind,

Because an evil work does not receive
In haste the sentence just which it deserves,
The heart of man is fully set to do
The wrong he loves, whatever may ensue.
And does he think that he who rules above
In wisdom, justice, truth as well as love,
Will not observe his conduct and reward
Him as he 's sinned in thought and deed and word ?
What tho' his heart be steel, his brow be brass,
Yet God will make him know he ne'er shall pass.
In states where slaves are held in cruel chains,
Enduring wrongs, and none to heed their pains,
The mis'ry and the want of virtue, health,
The waste of time and the decline of wealth,
Ah these are but the omens which portend
The right'ous judgments God will shortly send
On those who love the ways and works of crime,
And value not eternity or time.
Now what shall save our land from pending fate,
From mobs which slavery does and will create ?
With morals thus debased, and virtue gone,
'Tis asked with Afric's race what shall be done ?
How can the master save his rights so dear
From such set free, their own loved rights to share ?
And what we ask will be the precious gain.
If we do *not* redeem from slavery's chain ?
As slavery is if threat'ning danger lies
At masters view for fear the slaves would rise,
If more portentous still the cloud appear,
As Afric's sons are chained from year to year.
Pursuing such a course we ask, O when !
Will peace and hope prevail, salvation reign ?
'Tis not in man quiet to have his son,
His wife his daughter from his bosom torn.

We need not think to quell the growing strife,
 Amid such crimes to have a peaceful life.
 Though the volcanic flames we think subside,
 And all appears serene on every side,
 Is there not force within which ne'er revolts,
 Prepared to hurl its hottest fiery bolts?
 Tis not the slave, but slavery makes the rage
 Which stains our native land from age to age.
 Then let this cruel monster be dethroned,
 And slaves as men in truth and love be owned.
 Let equal rights freedom to them be given;
 Give them God's word to guide their way to heaven.
 Yes let their dear abodes be ever bless'd,
 Themselves, their friends in hope and union res.
 And teach them knowledge truth, and peace and love,
 Be kind and move their heart to sore above.
 Will such treatment their minds and wills prepare
 To show vengeance the sword of terror bear?
 The grand Catholican for this disease,
 A remedy sure, is this, and only this,
That what we would others to us should do,
Should we return of justice mercy too.

In Christian land Columbia,
 Where science opes her store,
 Where Europ's sons are mighty,
 But Afric's base and poor;
 In dark abodes of slavery,
 The scenes of many a sigh,
 They need us be unwearied
 To free them ere they die.

Ah ! here's a land of freedom
By some her sons confess'd,
While others are forbidden
To sit among the bless'd.
And will these stores of kindness
Remain to us supply'd,
If those we keep in blindness
For whom the Savior died ?

Can we the sons of plenty,
And Christians too in heart,
Forbid to men this bounty,
Not Bibles, life, impart !
Columbia ! O Columbia !
Thou favor'd child of God,
Arise and banish slavery,
Remembering all thy good.

O may this land, the Southern,
The Northern join in love,
To loose the yoke, the burden,
And lead her sons above ;
Then will the scenes of nature
Their shining beauties wear,
When ev'ry human creature
The Christian image bears.

THE END.

