

THE
REMEDIAL SYSTEM;

OR,
MAN AND HIS REDEEMER.

IN
TWO PARTS.

BY
H. CHRISTOPHER, A. M., M. D.

“There is one God, the Father, of whom are all things; and one Lord Jesus Christ, through whom are all things.”

“What is Man that thou art mindful of him?”

1876.

Transylvania Printing and Publishing Company,
LEXINGTON, KY.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1875, by

H. CHRISTOPHER, A. M., M. D.,

In the office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington, D. C.

TRANSYLVANIA PRESS.

CONTENTS.

PART I.

INTRODUCTION.

CHAPTER I.

THE GODHEAD: ἡ Θεότης· ὁ Θεός, ὁ Λόγος, τὸ Πνεῦμα.

CHAPTER II.

THE CREATION: ἡ κτίσις.

SEC. 1. ANGELS.

SEC. 2. THE IRRUPTION OF SIN.

CHAPTER III.

CREATION: ὁ κόσμος.

SEC. 1. THE INORGANIC WORLD.

SEC. 2. THE ORGANIC WORLD: ἡ ψυχὴ.

SEC. 3. MAN.

CHAPTER IV.

MOSES AND GEOLOGY.

CHAPTER V.

THE INTRODUCTION OF SIN INTO THIS WORLD.

SEC. 1. EDEN.

SEC. 2. THE "FALL."

SEC. 3. ITS CONSEQUENCES.

CHAPTER VI.

THE REMEDIAL SYSTEM.

SEC. 1. ITS OCCASION.

SEC. 2. ITS ELEMENTS: 1. SACRIFICE; 2. THE ALTAR; 3. THE
PRIESTHOOD.

CHAPTER VII.

THE FLOOD: ITS OBJECT AND EXTENT.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE NEW WORLD.

SEC. 1. THE NEW RACE.

SEC. 2. MELCHIZEDEK.

CHAPTER IX.

THE ABRAHAMIC COVENANTS.

CHAPTER X.

THE JEWISH INSTITUTION.

- SEC. 1. THE DELIVERANCE OF ISRAEL FROM EGYPT.
- SEC. 2. THE LAW.
- SEC. 3. THE CEREMONIES.
- SEC. 4. THE TABERNACLE.

PART II.

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTION OF THE GOSPEL.

- SEC. 1. THE MISSION OF JOHN, THE BAPTIST.
- SEC. 2. THE PERSONAL MINISTRY OF JESUS.

CHAPTER II.

THE ATONEMENT.

CHAPTER III.

THE KINGDOM OF GOD.

- SEC. 1. THE CORONATION OF JESUS.
- SEC. 2. THE MISSION OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.
- SEC. 3. THE ORGANIC LAW:
 - 1. FAITH; 2. REPENTANCE; 3. BAPTISM.

CHAPTER IV.

THE BLESSINGS AND PRIVILEGES OF THE CITIZEN.

- SEC. 1. THE REMISSION OF SINS.
- SEC. 2. THE GIFT OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

CHAPTER V.

THE CHURCH.

- SEC. 1. WHAT IT IS.
- SEC. 2. WHO CONSTITUTE IT.
- SEC. 3. ITS FOUNDATION.
- SEC. 4. ITS NECESSITY AND PURPOSE.
- SEC. 5. ITS WORSHIP.
- SEC. 6. ITS ORGANIZATION AND GOVERNMENT.
- SEC. 7. ITS TRIUMPH: THE MILLENNIUM.

CHAPTER VI.

THE KINGDOM OF GLORY.

- SEC. 1. THE RESURRECTION.
- SEC. 2. THE JUDGMENT.

CHAPTER VII.

THE THREE DISPENSATIONS.

CHAPTER VIII.

NATURE AND REVELATION.

PREFACE.

The outlines of what is presented in this volume have been in my mind for many years. They began to be sketched on paper as long ago as 1862, when the country was distracted by a fratricidal war. In a quiet and retired place my leisure hours were employed in thinking and writing on these themes. As I proceeded, the subjects grew and expanded, and I felt constrained to narrower limits than I could otherwise have desired; nevertheless, I trust that they have been treated with sufficient fulness for the purposes which they are designed to display in this volume.

The work has been one of pleasure, rather than of labor, since it has led me to a closer study of the word of God than I would otherwise have probably given it; and if what is here presented shall lead others to a closer study of this great and good Book, their time in reading it, and mine in writing it, will not have been misspent.

If what is here written accords with God's word and works, and presents him in his true light before the world, I can not but wish the volume a generous reception by the public. My sincere desire and aim have been to utter nothing but truth. I have no love for error in any form, or in any field of knowledge, and least of all in matters which involve man's eternal interests. If any thing here written is not truth, I wish it discarded. I can not pretend or expect that no error will be found. This would be more than human. Hence, those who may detect it, and feel disposed to point it out, are invited to do so: my sincere desire is that, as error will not glorify God, it may not injure man.

ST. LOUIS, 1326 Pine.

INTRODUCTION.

The subjects discussed in the following pages are not unfamiliar to the general reader. Some of them have appeared in monographs, and others as subordinate subjects in works on science and religion. Here they may be thought to appear in a novel relation; but I trust it will be seen in the end that such association is not more novel than important and interesting. This association is intended to show the relations and connections of the systems of nature with the spiritual, and all as constituent elements of *one* great system of the universe, which embraces not only the systems of this world, but all beings, created and uncreated, and all that God has done on this earth from the dawn of creation to the completion of the Remedial System.

As the systems of nature are but integral elements of one great system; and as man constitutes the reason and purpose of the mundane systems, and is the link connecting these with the spiritual realm of the universe, it is not surprising to find him assigned so conspicuous a position before the universe. Through the spirit nature of his being he is connected with the spiritual and unseen world, and through his animal organism he is connected with the material and organic worlds of this planet. Therefore, by and through him, the visible and the invisible worlds are connected. Hence, it is not a poetic fiction or extravagance that asserts of him:

“Connection exquisite of distant worlds,”
the

“Distinguished link in being’s endless chain.”

This wonderful and complex being is the reason and explanation of all of God’s works in this world; the link that connects the natural and the supernatural. In his organism the material and organic systems of this world find their necessity and purpose, and in his spiritual and eternal interests the Remedial System finds its aim and object; *and all* in the ultimate work and result of the Atonement. All this I have endeavored to show in this work. I have endeavored to present man and the systems with which he is connected in their normal relations, and in the line of argument that culminates in the solution of the problem by the atonement of Christ.

System is the natural work of Reason. Its work can not be otherwise than systematic. The work of the Infinite Reason must be pre-eminently such. Therefore, since Nature and Reve-

lation are the work of the Infinite Reason, it follows that all we find in them must be rational and systematic. Order, beauty, and adaptation are found in all that God has said or done. The confusion which appears such to the ignorant, is only apparent. The genius of man has shown system to exist everywhere. Stars do not swing in space at random; light and sound and air are not capricious in their movements. The rocks which seem scattered in confusion in the strata of the earth's crust were all laid in order; and the inhabitants of land and sea have their families, genera, and species, and their natural and defined habitats. All in earth and air and sea have their order, beauty, and adaptation; and all things swing in system.

What is true of Nature is also true of Revelation. Here also we find order, beauty, and adaptation. Here also is the *development* of great thoughts and purposes. Here the Infinite Reason has thought and worked in system.

The Remedial System is the development of his mind and purposes as respects man involved in sin; and my design has been to show that all that God has done here is as characteristic of Infinite Reason as are the works of nature. In the accomplishment of this purpose I have judged the arrangement and association of subjects here adopted as not only interesting and important, but as really necessary to a clear understanding and a proper appreciation of the work of redemption. In such a connection and relation the several systems of this world appear as parts of one great whole, and develop the method and process by which the great question of sin has been treated, and the sinner's salvation effected.

The relations and connections of the Remedial System with other systems of the universe having been considered, I have proceeded to trace the outlines of the plan of salvation as these are presented under the Patriarchal and Jewish dispensations. Here we find the elements of the remedial system; and these must be well understood before we can appreciate the nature and work of the atonement under Christianity, of which these elements were but the types and shadows. In the Patriarchal and Jewish dispensations the ground work was laid for the Christian; and hence the necessity of first understanding the provisions and elements of these before proceeding to the consideration of the Christian dispensation.

The elements of the former dispensations having been determined and considered, I have then proceeded to the consideration of the Christian, and have endeavored to show here that all the purposes for which a remedial system is necessary, or was instituted, are fully and perfectly realized and accomplished by the provisions of the Christian institution; and that all its elements are not only consistent with themselves, but also with all the constituent elements of the Remedial System as presented and developed under the Patriarchal and Jewish dispensations. Under

such a general view, it occurred to me that the plan of salvation would appear in a much clearer and more beautiful light than in any in which it has yet been presented. The human mind loves order and beauty, and grasps and holds with much greater ease facts and truths when systematically presented and grouped, than when thrown before it without order or arrangement. This feeling is gratified, and this strength afforded the mind when we contemplate the christian scheme in all its relations to, and bearings on, other systems or works of God. In such a light it appears both beautiful and philosophical.

Connected with this aim and purpose there has been another object in view which immeasurably aggrandizes all these subjects, and to the development of which these various subjects have been but tributary. This object has reference to that stupendous fact which, under the views here presented, gave rise to the creation of the material and organic systems of this world, and to the remedial system in particular, which system develops the still greater and more wonderful fact of the atonement of the incarnate *Logos*. This fact is the existence of sin; an evil in the work of creation which has amazed and perplexed many of the best and most thoughtful of mankind; an evil which seems to have given rise to questions out of which have come the creation of the material and psυχical worlds. The nature and consequences of this evil have been shown to be so great and fearful among men as to have reasonably called for the intervention of God, and this he has displayed in the work of the remedial system.

The work accomplished by the atonement of Christ may be viewed as the solution of a problem originating in the existence of sin among angels. Viewing the development of the remedial system as the progressive steps in the solution of this problem, we may see in these the process of solution, and thus acquire a better and more exalted view of Revelation and its purposes, and especially of the Atonement of Christ, than is possible by any other means, or from any other point of view. It has been one of my chief objects to present the Remedial System in this light. Such a view of sin and its remedy necessitated the determination of the requirements of the problem, and then the application of the principles involved, and means provided for the solution by the infinitely wise and omniscient ruler of the universe. The complete and perfect solution is found in the expiation, intercession, and mediation of Christ, and my work has been to show the application of these to the purposes in view.

Out of the corruptions which have overtaken and flooded the church since the days of the apostles, as respects both doctrine and practice, many systems of theology have arisen and given origin and form to corresponding religious societies, generically called sects, which have had for their object, not the presentation and restoration of *apostolic* christianity, but really only the pre-

sentation and maintenance of some partial view of the work of salvation as wrought out by their respective systems of theology. They are at least but partial views of the truth, carved out of the mass as it lies *in situ* in the Bible. They resemble edifices built of fragments of quarried rock. Like the stone in such edifices, truths have been removed from the great quarry, and shaped and dressed to suit the views and tastes of the builders. They can not, therefore, represent the whole truth, or the truth as a whole. Such is not the work to show the beauty and symmetry of the divine system. To do this, the work must resemble that of the geologist, who studies and classifies the rocks or formations as they lie *in situ*. The rocks are not removed and chiseled and shaped to suit preconceived views; but are arranged and classified from their general and individual characteristics.

A similar work has been attempted in these pages. The facts and truths of Revelation lie all over its broad surface, in the order and arrangement which God has given them; and, though like the strata of the earth's crust, they may appear in confusion, yet to the student they yield their divine arrangement and beauty. My effort has been to determine and exhibit their divine order and arrangement. Like the geologist, I have sought to show the relations and connections of the facts and truths of Revelation, and to classify them as they lie *in situ* in the Sacred Volume, and so to trace their connections and dependencies as to present them in the order and beauty of system. I have not removed them from their natural position, nor disturbed their divine relation, but only shown how they lie in position.

The conflicting opinions lying at the basis of the various religious societies of the present day, evidently retard the progress of the gospel, and cripple its power and influence over the minds and hearts of mankind, and prevent the more intelligent from giving that attention to the word of God which their own eternal interests demand, and the general welfare of the world at large requires; and any work that will show that such conflicting opinions are the result of but partial or incorrect views, or of the elevation of subordinate subjects to the chief position, and not of any confusion or contradiction in Revelation, is certainly a desideratum at the present time. Such is the aim of the work I have attempted; but in what degree I have succeeded must be left to the judgment of the reader.

THE REMEDIAL SYSTEM.

PART I.

CHAPTER I.

THE GODHEAD: ἡ Θεότης· ὁ Θεος, ὁ Λόγος, τὸ Πνεῦμα.

No more rational, consistent, or satisfactory account of the origin of the world has been, or can be given, than that which we have in the Jewish and Christian Scriptures. And if it be assumed, (as it is in these pages), that these Scriptures were dictated by the Spirit of God, as is almost universally believed, then must this account be received and accepted as above question, however much scientists may insist that it is not in accordance with the facts of nature, or the deductions of human reason. With all their knowledge of nature, and wonderful attainments in science, men have not yet done better, and it may be safely affirmed that they never will. The human mind, however endowed or developed, can never repose its confidence on the deductions of science, in a matter involving such momentous interests, with the same composure, as on the simple statements of the Inspired Volume. Scientists may continue to accumulate facts, and gather up from the deep unknown, things startling and wonderful; and philosophers to multiply deductions, and in the light of these, assign some secondary cause as the primary agent or author of all we see and know; but Reason and Philosophy can never attain the certainty of the Divine Record.

Thus far the facts of nature and the deductions of reason have confirmed the utterances of the Bible, and man's best efforts have ended where the Sacred Record begins: for it matters not what course of reasoning we may pursue, or line of argument adopt, we must come at last to the statement of facts as given in the Sacred Scriptures. that the universe owes "its origin to the knowledge, wisdom, and power of a FIRST CAUSE, who is infinite and eternal, that was the first cause of this structure and

fabric, whereon we and all creatures dwell; that depends on no other. never was produced by any other, but was what he is from eternity, and can not be otherwise; and is not what he is by will, but nature, necessarily existing without any capacity or possibility ever not to be."¹ To this conclusion all reasoning and argument must come at last, however numerous or powerful the secondary causes may be which skepticism may interpose.

The assumption of a First Cause competent to the production of this wonderful fabric, which we call nature—an assumption necessitated by the highest reason—floods the pathway of investigation with light which we may hope for in vain from science, and gives the mind a starting point from which proceeding, it may find a rational and satisfactory cause for all phenomena of all worlds. Its light leads the mind through and beyond the phenomena of the physical and organic worlds, and all secondary causes and agencies, and settles it at last on one primary and adequate cause for all we see and know.

The service which the phenomena of nature render us in the argument of Cause and Effect, is not exhausted when they place us on the solid ground of a Primary Cause. They give us no little or unimportant light in respect to the nature and attributes of this First Cause. Assuming that this cause must be at least equal, if not superior, to the effects which it produces—an assumption, if not necessitated, yet justified, by reason—we must find a *nature* in it equal, if not superior, to anything we may find in the effect; and also attributes which are the same in nature and kind, as those observed in the intelligent beings which he has created, since that which is created can not excel, or be superior to, that which creates. If, therefore, we find *mind* in the effect, we must infer its existence in the cause. That mind exists in created beings is too evident to require proof or illustration. Hence, the existence of mind in creatures demonstrates its existence in the creator, and necessitates the conclusion that the First Cause is an intelligent being.

The argument that infers intelligence in the First Cause, from the presence of mind or intelligence in created beings, presumes the identity of mind, as to its nature, in whatever being it may be manifested. Mind in man does not differ from mind in animals, except in degree; and mind in man and mind in God differs in no other respect. The immense disparity in either case is no argument against identity.

The argument by which this identity of the human and the divine minds is proved, is beautiful and forcible in the extreme, and exalts man, as its author, immeasurably in the world of mind, thus showing that mind in him is allied in nature with the mind of the creator. This argument is based on the apprehension and appreciation by man of the thoughts and system in the

¹ Charnock on the Divine Attributes, p. 50. .

divine mind as manifested in the works of his hands, and is well expressed in the following extract:

“In the prosecution of modern physical sciences, the human mind has demonstrated the congruity of the human reason with that Reason of which the material universe is the product; for when we say that (within certain limits) we understand the scheme of the world as to its structure, and as to its dynamics, we affirm that the mind which understands and the mind which has produced this scheme of things, are in unison, or that they are convertible the one into the other.”¹

To appreciate the argument involved in this statement, we should know and consider the great work which science has done in reducing the apparent chaos of nature to the beauty and symmetry of system. The facts and phenomena of nature, and the laws producing and regulating these, have been so defined, limited, and classified as to give order and beauty to that confusion which seems, to the unlearned, to exist every where. This work of the genius and labor of man is but the discovery of the order and system in the mind of God when creating; and in this the human has proved its essential identity with the divine mind. The argument, therefore, is conclusive that the First Cause, or Creator of all things, is an intelligent being.

The identity of the human and divine minds being established, we have but to know the faculties and attributes of the human to logically infer those of the divine mind. And since a *moral* nature is conspicuous in man, the same course of reasoning will assign a moral nature to the First Cause; so that we have in the creator, not only an intelligent, but a moral nature. We can, therefore, affirm of him, that he is not only a being of intelligence and wisdom, but also of goodness, mercy, justice, love, and truthfulness.

A First Cause is itself uncaused. It had no beginning, and hence no creator. This intelligent being is, therefore, unoriginated, uncreated, and uncaused, and, consequently, self-existent, eternal, and infinite. All his powers and attributes are infinite. We have, then, the First Cause an intelligent, moral being, unoriginated and eternal as to his existence, and infinite in all the powers and attributes of his being.

Thus far we are led by the phenomena of nature and the suggestions of human reason. But great as this light is, and important as its revelations are, it falls far short of what man needs and wishes. It throws not a ray of light on the purposes of man's existence here, nor of his destiny, if he have any, beyond the grave. So far as the light of nature extends man dies like the animals below him. The phenomena of death in each are the same; no difference can be discerned. How should there be when that which dies is the animal? Though man be honored with sepulture, yet nature sheds no light on his grave. But man

¹ Taylors' World of Mind. p. 327.

is more than an animal. He is conscious of wrong-doing. Human laws assure him of this. He is conscious of sin and that he is a sinner. Sacrifice among all nations is a proof of this. Somehow he feels that the gods have some concern about his actions, and a desire pervades his heart to placate them. The sacredness which the laws of civilized nations throw around human life, and the distinction which they make between the same act in a man and in an animal, clearly says that he is more than an animal, and that the sepulchre is not, possibly, the last of him. But he has no *certain knowledge*. All is, at best, but inference and conjecture. In the midst of nature's darkness, the heart has yearned for light. The vexed and anxious mind has questioned all phenomena with no result but ambiguous replies or profound silence. The aching void continues. The light of phenomena can not fill it. Conjectures and inferences can not satisfy. Knowledge alone can do this, and this must come from a supernatural source. "The world by wisdom knew not God," and "who by searching, can find out the Almighty"?

In this extremity Revelation was given to the world, under whose light all the questions which have vexed the mind and exhausted its powers, are solved and settled. Doubt gives place to certainty, and conjecture to knowledge. In its light man sees himself as he has been, as he is, and as he will be. Life is no longer a dream, nor death an endless sleep. The consequences of right and wrong-doing are set clearly before him, and the grave is but the passage way into eternal life;—a life of woe for wrong-doing, and of bliss for right-doing.

In connection with this comes the knowledge of the creator himself, not only of the nature and attributes of his being, but of his relations to the works of his hand, and the meaning and purpose of these relations. By it the First Cause is known to be spirit as to his nature, eternal as to his being, and infinite as to all his attributes; the *only originating cause* of all things and all living beings; enthroned in light unapproachable, for whose glory and pleasure all things are and were created; the object of worship and adoration by all intelligent beings; the dispenser of all good; the administrator of justice final and eternal; and a being of love and mercy so wonderful and compassionate as to embrace in his heart the interests of all creatures, and hold in his hands the breath of every living thing.

The glory and majesty and greatness of this being are represented by negations. His nature and attributes are expressed by words familiar to the human vocabulary, and are applied in an appropriate sense to man. But when applied to God they are qualified by negation, and he is described as a being *unoriginated* as to his existence, and *infinite* in all his attributes.

We may conceive of the Jehovah of the Jewish scriptures as existing before time—before any created being or thing; when he dwelt alone in the eternal solitude of his own wonderful be-

ing; when he was the *one Jehovah* of eternity, and meditating on the greatness, grandeur, and sublimity of the work which is now embraced in the one word—Universe. He was then without relation. But when creation came into existence he then became related to the works of his hands; to the *physical* universe as its absolute governor, swaying and controlling it in all its departments, and as a whole, by the force and power of his almighty will; and to the *spiritual*, as its wise and beneficent ruler, governing spirit-beings by reason and motive, and admitting them to the familiarity of social intercourse and spiritual communion with himself.

The infinite chasm between the infinite creator and the finite creature renders it impossible on the part of the creature to have any knowledge or appreciation of the creator, beyond the little that may be suggested by the greatness and beauty of his works, unless the creator make himself known in some more intelligible and explicit manner. He must be represented to the eyes of the body or of the mind, if the creature is to have any positive and certain knowledge of him. This necessity grows out of no imperfection in the creator, but out of the nature of finite beings, whose powers are limited by the nature of their being. All this was anticipated, so to speak, in the nature of the being of the Jehovah of eternity. Hence, when creation had become a fact, and beings of wonderful intellectual capacities and powers stood before him, glorious in person and massive in the grandeur of their powers, suitable and worthy associates of the infinite creator, he adjusted himself, so to speak, to their capacity, and developed the nature of a related being. He has, therefore, revealed himself by several different names, each expressive of a peculiar relation to the universe. As the creator of all things, he is revealed as *Elohim*, a word of plural signification: "And Elohim said, 'Let *us* make a man in *our* image and after *our* likeness.'" As the owner and possessor of all things and all beings, he is the *Lord*. These names derive their significance from the fact that he is the creator and possessor of all things, and express his relations to his works.

The idea of plurality in the Divinity seems to have led men to the conception of a plurality of gods, and hence arose idolatry, and the worship of so many different deities. While it can not be doubted that the Divinity is in some way a being of more than one person, if we are to take the names by which he has revealed himself in their human signification, as we must, or there can be no *revelation to men*; yet the First Cause of all must be, at the same time, but ONE JEHOVAH. Hence arises that grandest of all mysteries—the Trinity—a being incomprehensible to the human mind, though revealed in intelligible language; a fact above reason, and apprehended only by faith.

The *unity* of the Divinity is expressed by the word Jehovah, which means simply existence—"I am,"—pure and absolute

being, and appropriately applied to the Divinity of ante-creation. This name he revealed, for the first time, to Moses at the burning bush. God then said to Moses: "I am the Lord: I appeared to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob by the name of God Almighty, but by my name Jehovah was I not known to them." They knew him as the *Elohim*, and consequently had but an imperfect conception of his being. Their descendants were then in Egypt, enslaved in mind and body, with their traditional views of God almost totally obscured. But they were the germs of a great people, through whom God had determined to reveal himself more fully to the world. He presented himself to that people, and before the world, as "The God of the Hebrews," and through them proposed to place himself in bold contrast with the gods of all other nations. On the threshold, then, of the revelation he proposed to make of himself and of his plan for the recovery of mankind from the guilt and thralldom of sin, it was important that this people should start with a true knowledge of his being and character—important for themselves and for the world at large. He was the one, unoriginated, self-existent being of eternity; the only living and true God, besides whom there was no other in heaven or earth; and it was necessary and important, in order that the human mind might have as full a knowledge of his being, nature, and character as human language can express, that mankind should know him as the *one* living and true God, and that there are none besides him. This truth was sufficient to redeem them at once from idolatry; and also, as he ever made his presence among them felt and realized, sufficient to preserve them from idolatry. The true conception of God embraced more than Abraham and his family had enjoyed; more than mankind had till then received. The *Elohim* of creation was now supplemented by the Jehovah of eternity; and the plurality of *Elohim* was lost for the time in the oneness of Jehovah.

A change in the attitude of the Divinity so important as that which was effected by the fact of creation, which converts the unrelated Jehovah into the related *Elohim*, demands more than the simple statement of the fact. The change effected being expressed by the word relation, we will understand this change the better when we understand what is meant by relation as used in this connection.

Relation implies the *existence* of more than one person or thing, and an *attitude* which the one sustains to the other. The attitude may be that of simple opposition, as the poles of the earth; or of influence, as the sun and earth; or of rational communion, as between intelligent and spiritual beings. If there be, however, but one person or thing, it is evident that there can be no relation of any kind.

Now, the Divinity has existed under two different and distinct states or conditions, separated by the act of creation. In the

eternity which preceded time, or creation, the Divinity existed alone, and hence was *then* an unrelated being, because he stood in relation to no other being, since none other existed. But when he brought into being the innumerable intelligences that now exist in the spirit or angelic world, he passed from this state of non-relation into the state or condition of relation to these creatures, in which spiritual beings feel and enjoy the influence of his presence and power.

Related as creator to the works of his hands, the Divinity sustains to these the attitudes or relations of opposition, influence, and rational communion. Over all his works in the material universe he rules with omnipotent power. He can modify or change at will, and all worlds lie under the power of his hand. But over the realm of spirit beings he rules by motive and reason, attracting by moral influence their wills to his, and controlling their actions by moral forces, and not physical power. These beings he elevates to the plane of communion and spiritual intercourse with himself, for which, it would seem, they were chiefly created, and by which the highest possible happiness was alone attainable.

In order that there may be rational communion between the infinite Jehovah and his finite creatures, not unlike that which takes place between the angels of heaven, and between men on the earth, it is necessary that there shall be in the being of each party to the communion a medium of connection or communion through which thought and sentiment may flow from the one to the other, by which interflow joy, happiness, and pleasure may come to each. In order that this medium of connection or communion between such extremes may appear, the Jehovah is developed into, or appears as, the Elohim—the WE of creation, who spoke the language of plurality when, pausing to make man, he said: "Let *us* make man in *our* image, and after *our* likeness." When creatures, capacitated by the nature of their being for spiritual intercourse and communion with the Divinity, were created, it was necessary that the absolute Jehovah should appear in relation to these beings, and exhibit himself to them in some appreciable way, which would make the communion, not only possible, but actual. This was realized in the plural Elohim.

The necessity of plurality of being as an essential prerequisite to intelligent intercourse between spirit-beings, becomes apparent when we consider the necessary conditions of communion among finite beings. Among men, we know that there can be no communion between the spirits of men, except through the media furnished by their organism. "No man knows the spirit of man, save the spirit of man that is in him," or he to whom it may be revealed. This is a matter of knowledge with all men, and needs no proof or illustration. Equally true is it that no one knows the mind of God but himself, unless uttered or revealed. This communication of thought is not from spirit to spirit immediately,

but mediately. The spirit of the creature becomes cognizant of the mind of God through the media through which the revealed knowledge must necessarily flow. Among men these media belong to and are of his organism or body; and the same is essentially true of angels. They receive knowledge through the media established for this purpose, and these media pertain and belong to their body.

The media of reception are also the media of the impartation of knowledge; and equally necessary are they in the one case as in the other. This is unquestionably true of all created beings. We have, then, in the communion and spiritual intercourse which take place among and between created intelligent beings, a plurality of being as absolutely essential to their social intercourse, one integer of which is the *spirit*, which alone knows and wills and feels, and the other, *the body* or organism, which affords to the spirit its means of receiving and imparting knowledge.

It is not only an oracle of reason, but a declaration of the Divine Spirit, that the spirit of created beings, that personality that knows and thinks, and imparts what it feels and thinks and knows, is confined and limited to the organs of its organism in the reception and impartation of thought and knowledge. The spirit must see or hear before it can know, and must utter or express its thoughts and feelings before these can be known by others. Spirit-beings, in their normal state, do not commune directly or immediately; only through the media of their organism.

These facts, being incontrovertible, not only warrant, but demand, the conclusion, that *an organism existing in one party to the communion, necessitates the existence of an organism in the other party*. This being true, we must have an organism, or that which answers to one, in the Jehovah; and this we have realized in the plurality of his being.

This conclusion, which may appear both startling and violent to some who are not prepared for it by the argument here presented, may require further proof and elucidation. A further and more extended view of the subject will afford us still more light, and lead us into a clearer appreciation of the argument pursued, if not into the conviction of the correctness of the conclusion.

An organism is not merely and solely a lifeless machine. We do not degrade a being by predicating of it an organism. In no order of living beings is it mere matter. In all it is a living body, and in some a thinking body. The mind which we observe in animals belongs to their organism. They have not a separate and separable psychical being, which lives after the body has perished, and to which might be assigned all the phenomena of mind. Hence, their organism being a living thing, partakes of the nature of life, and is, therefore, far removed from the nature of materiality. This much may be truly said of the animal organism which utterly perishes in death, its elements no more

combining to form the same body or structure. How much further removed from materiality must that organism be which is imperishable, immortal, and consequently eternal? Man, who lives in a frail tenement here, will have an immortal, imperishable, and eternal tenement in the heavens; an organism more fully adapted to the nature and wants of his spirit than the present. We know not what will be the nature of man's future body. We know that it will be immortal and spiritual; but what these words mean beyond simple imperishability, it is difficult to determine. But this much may be affirmed with confidence, that the *spiritual body* is so far removed from our conceptions of the nature of materiality as to be of the nature of spirit.

Therefore, in predicating an organism of the Jehovah, or that which answers to one in finite beings, we do not materialize or degrade the Divinity; but rather rise in the scale of organisms still further, and reach in the Godhead a true spiritual and eternal *form* (*ἡ μορφή*)¹ or visible manifestation, by which the infinite, eternal and omnipresent Divinity is made cognizable to all the spirit-beings of the true spirit-realm, and without which finite beings could have no knowledge of his existence, nor enjoyment of his society; an organism by and through which the Divinity is placed in relation to his intelligent creatures, and holds spiritual intercourse and communion with them.

In affirming an organism in the Jehovah, we assert no more than plurality of being. In all beings in whom we find an organism, as men and angels, we also find plurality. The one can not exist without the other; so that if we prove the one we establish the other. All this can be clearly seen and appreciated in the case of man, because we are so well acquainted with the nature and constitution of his being, but seems difficult of belief in the case of other spirit-beings. This can not result from any defect in the logic by which we are driven to our conclusion; but from some erroneous preconceptions in regard to the nature of an organism. But our preconceptions can not do away with stern and stubborn facts. It is beyond question that man has an organism; that there is plurality in his being. It is equally true that he will have an organism in the world to come, and that plurality will then still inhere in the nature of his being. With these incontestable facts before us, we have only to know some facts respecting his future being to affirm the same nature of angels as is predicated of man glorified. These facts are pretty clearly developed in the christian scriptures. These scriptures show, by the statements and inferences bearing on the subject, that there will be no essential distinction between man glorified and the angels of heaven. Knowing, then, that man glorified will possess plurality of being, or more accurately speaking, will be a *dual* being, having a spirit which once lived on this earth, and an organism with which it was clothed when it passed from

the state of mortality into that of immortality; and that man thus invested will not differ essentially from the angels with whom he will thenceforth be associated, we may rest fully assured that angels have the same nature and plurality of being.

These facts being placed beyond question, the statement that plurality of being implies the presence of an organism is also beyond question. This being so, we have only to prove plurality of being in the Jehovah, to prove the presence of an organism in the Divinity, which we will find represented by one of the persons of the triune Jehovah.

When we speak of an organism existing in the being of Jehovah, we strip it of all adventitious or circumstantial properties or attributes, and view it in its simplest light, the one purpose of its existence, viz: the means or medium by which the being is placed in relation to others, and through which spiritual or intelligent intercourse and communion between beings of a similar nature take place. Hence, in affirming an organism in the Jehovah, we mean no more, and intend no more, than to assert that there is, in the plurality of his being, a person who is the medium of relation and intercourse on the part of the Divinity with the highest intelligences of the spiritual universe.

That there is plurality in the Godhead the Sacred Oracles positively declare. In the christian scriptures we have the Godhead distinguished and represented by three persons, who appear for the first time distinct in the work of redemption. To these three persons the inspired volume appropriates three distinct words, which names are more definite and distinct in the Greek than in the English language, and consequently more descriptive. The Jehovah of the Jewish dispensation is the Godhead or Divinity (*ἡ Θεότης*)¹ of the Christian, who is manifested under this reign, as *ὁ Θεός*, *ὁ Λόγος*, and *τὸ Πνεῦμα*. These three persons of the Divinity worked jointly and separately in the work of creation and redemption, and now sustain to each other relations which have determined the field and character of their respective operations.

Where the attributes of infinity, omniscience, omnipresence, and eternity exist, there can be no such thing as supremacy, and hence, between the three persons of the Divinity there is equality in all things, without distinction in any direction but that of the work which each seems to have done in creation and redemption.

Of the relations of these to each other we have but little said in the inspired volume, but this little seems to enlarge in its meaning and significance as we approach and scrutinize it closely. The *Theos* "dwells in light unapproachable," himself invisible except by that light; "who covers himself with light as with a garment," and by this effulgence is made transcendently and unspeakably glorious. Dwelling *within* this transcendent light, he is not that light—not the garment with which he enshrouds

¹ 1 Col. 2: 9.

himself; but far more glorious than even this light, itself being but his visible manifestation.

This light is the *Logos*. He is the splendor, the brightness, and the effulgence of the *Theos*, through whom the power of the Divinity flowed in the creation "of all things, whether in heaven or on earth; Thrones, Dominions, Principalities and Powers." The names applied to him are descriptive of his relation to the *Theos*, and show, as well as human language can, the close and intimate relation that exists between them. As the visible manifestation of the *Theos*, he is represented, 1, as the effulgence or brightness of his glory ("απαύγασμα τῆς δόξης"); 2, as the exact representation of his being, or image, as the coin represents exactly the form of the die ("ἡ χαρακτήρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ"); 3, as the form or visible manifestation of the *Theos*, through and by which he is related to, and cognizable by, all the created intelligences of the spiritual universe (ἡ μορφή του θεου); and 4, as the *Logos*, the expression, the word, the *Theos* dwelling in him as the idea dwells in the word, so that all that is known, or can be known, of the *Theos*, is found in and derived through the *Logos*. Thus, as the thought is fully expressed by a word that embraces the thought in all its entirety, or to the full extent of the capacity of the word, so in the *Logos* dwells all the fulness of the Divinity or Godhead, and this too in his pre-incarnate as well as in his incarnate state.

This person of the Godhead, securing the purposes of relation and intercourse, is the analogue of that which we call an organism in created beings; and when we speak of him as such, we use the word in its highest, purest, and simplest sense, as indicating simply the medium of relation and communion, the grade of the medium being determined by the grade of the being. In this view organisms are not necessarily confined to created beings.

That the *Logos* is a *person* in the usual and ordinary acceptance of the word, there can be no reasonable doubt, if we receive the plain statements of the christian scriptures, and accept inferences that are necessary and legitimate. In the intercessory prayer of our Lord who was the *Logos* incarnate—which he offered to his father, the *Theos*, we have these remarkable words: "And now, O father, glorify thou me with thyself, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was."¹ The person who here prays to be reinvested with his original and divine glory, which he enjoyed with God from all eternity, is none other than the *Logos* become man, by having divested himself of his divine glory, and assumed the human form, in which he appeared, and was known as Jesus of Nazareth. If, therefore, the *Theos* is a person, personality can not be denied the *Logos*, "who was in the beginning with God, and who was God."²

The Holy Spirit is the "third person of the Trinity," who never appears as a person until he is commissioned with the ad-

¹ John 17: 5; ² John 1: 1, and note of Alford *in loco*.

ministration of Christ's kingdom on the earth, dwelling in the church as the Paraclete of Christ's disciples. During the existence of the Theocracy, he did not appear conspicuously as a person in the revelation and government of that dispensation; nor was he conceived of as such by the Jewish mind. Their revelation announced to them that the Lord their God was *one* Lord; and it would have been strange if they had regarded him otherwise. The idea of the personality of the *Logos* was the growth of the centuries just preceding his advent; but the Spirit was still looked on more as the power and wisdom of Jehovah. The Jews conceived of the Spirit of God more as a manifestation of his power or exertion of his divine energy, or as the prescience of God.¹ The unity of God was a cardinal thought with the Jew, and one of the chief objects of that revelation to teach. Hence, conceiving of the Jehovah their Lord as *one* God, they could regard the *Logos* and *Pneuma* only as attributes of the Divinity, however strongly their revelation might indicate their equal personality.² It was reserved for the christian revelation to make known distinctly these persons of the Godhead, and to exhibit the work which each performs in the work of redemption; a revelation consequent upon the incarnation of the one, and of the mission of the other to the church as the Paraclete of the christian institution. This revelation places the personality of both the *Logos* and the *Pneuma* on an equality with that of God himself (ὁ Θεός), by stating that all christians sustain a personal relation to all the persons of the Godhead, by their immersion "into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit."

That the Divine Originator of the universe should be a triune being, such as he has revealed himself to be, manifesting himself at one time as the Jehovah of eternity, the *one* Lord; and at another as the Elohim of creation, may lie beyond the reach of the human mind to fully comprehend; yet, with the light which the phenomena of the universe afford us, not beyond our appreciation, or power to discover some reason why the creator is, and should be, such a being. The fact of plurality would seem to suggest that there must be some profound reason and necessity for such a nature; and if we may assume that there is profound philosophy in all that God has said and done, we may assume the same as regards the nature of his being. The fact of creation manifesting the Jehovah as the related Elohim of creation, makes manifest also the necessity of his plurality of being, since plurality is necessary to relation among spirit-beings, between whom spiritual intercourse and communion obtain. This relation is of the highest type, and exists with the view to the happiness of the creature.

When we consider the full force and purpose of relation, and view the phenomena attending it, the statement, that the exist-

¹ Job 26: 13; Ps. 33: 6; 104: 30. ² Gen. 41: 38; Num. 24: 2; Neh. 9: 10.
³ Ps. 139: 7; Is. 48: 16.

ence of intelligent created beings presumes the plurality of being in the creator, and that plurality in him was the prediction and pledge of the creator of such beings, becomes almost self-evident. The force and purpose of relation, and the phenomena attending it, appear thus evident, when illustrated by the nature of man and the various relations which he sustains to the universe.

By the light of nature we could not know that man is more than animal. The wonderful psychical powers which he manifests may, for aught this light affords, depend solely on his superior cerebral development. Man's brain alone would give him a great mind, far transcending anything seen in the animal world; and were he only an animal, he would still manifest wonderful psychical powers. Even with the knowledge which revelation has given of his nature, that he has a spirit, a being of spirit, united for a time with the animal, this spirit is so blended with the animal in its manifestation of psychical phenomena, that it is impossible for us to say how much of what we see is of the animal and how much of the spirit. Were it not for what the Bible reveals, we would have to look on man as simply an animal. But revelation says that he is more; and that the spirit will outlive the body. Man is, therefore, at least a *dual* being; more frequently is he spoken of as a trinity, having a body, soul, and spirit.

We know nothing of what this being, his spirit, thinks and feels and wills, but as these are made known through his organism, the animal body. It is his organism that puts him in relation with the world and the beings that are in it. Out of this body the spirit is not of this world, and, consequently, holds no relation to it. In the beyond, whither his spirit goes on the death of animal organism, he will be again invested with a body, and one, too, which will place him in relation to the beings of that world, by which organism he will hold spiritual intercourse and communion with those beings. That body will place his spirit in relation to, and connection with that world as his animal body places his spirit in relation to this world. In its normal state, the spirit of man is in union with a body, by which alone it seems capable of enjoying its being.

In the conception, therefore, of such a being as man, the full and complete development of the physical and organic worlds, with which man is intimately, and, in this world, indissolubly connected, was clearly and distinctly before the mind of the creator. These departments of nature were as much parts of that conception as was any part of his being. God could not conceive of man without, at the same time, conceiving of them, and in connection with him. When, therefore, man stood before the mind of God in all his entirety, all the relations which his organism sustains to the physical and organic systems were in his mind and fixed in his purposes; and nothing that now exists,

and belonging to these systems, was an after-thought with him. This world with all its infinite variety of being and relations was in the conception of man, who is the central thought, the reason and aim and object of this mundane system. Consequently, the creation of man having been determined on, the physical and organic worlds became absolutely necessary to the realization of that conception. Man could not exist until these were produced; and the fact shows that he did not. It is thus seen that in the nature of man we have the pledge of all the systems with which he is connected; and in the pre-existence of these we have the prediction of him. Man's nature is the reason of the existence of these systems, and the existence of these is the proof of such a nature in man. Thus does the force and purpose of relation as an argument, and the phenomena attending it, show the statement to be correct, that the existence of an organism on one part, necessitates the existence of an organism on the other.

But further. In the conception of such a being as man there was more involved than the systems with which his organism is connected. The future relations of his spirit were involved in that conception. After the death of his animal body, man ascends to the spirit-realm, and is there invested with another and an immortal body, and takes rank and equality with beings immortal in the entirety of their beings. Man involved in sin can not end his existence with the grave. His creation is not complete until his body has been made immortal in the heavens. When, therefore, he was conceived of by God he was in this last state, and as fully and as clearly seen in the relations of that world, as in the relations of this. Not only, then, were the material and organic systems of nature involved in the Divine conception of man, but so also was the angelic world of the heavens. The creation of man involved and necessitated the creation of all we see and know of the universe, in order that he might exist in all the relations for which his complex being and fortunes in life fit him. In these relations we discover the reason of his plurality of being, and of the existence of the systems with which he is connected.

The same argument applies with equal force to the creator; for as the various realms of the universe with which man is closely and intimately connected, existed, in point of fact, long before his advent into the world, and was the prediction and pledge of his appearance; so the universe, in all its departments and categories of being, actually existing, demonstrates the plurality of being of the creator by and through which all the relations which he sustains to the works of his hands, are developed. If his relation to his works be more than that of simple opposition; if it rises to that of spiritual intercourse and communion, then there is, and must be, a medium establishing the relation, and making possible communion between the finite and the infinite. This medium of relation in the being of the Elohim

we conceive of as the analogue of the medium existing in finite beings, which is their organism; and hence we conceive the Divinity as a being having by nature and necessity, and not by appointment or accident, plurality in person, the philosophy and necessity of which lie in the fact that, with creation, he is a being of relation.

Thus is it shown that plurality of being is absolutely essential to relation and spiritual communion between spirit-beings; and that to this relation and communion an organism in the sense in which it is here used, is equally necessary.

The faith is not without some reason, in view of the facts and reasoning here presented, if we but knew more of the immediate and special part that each person of the Divinity took in the work of creation and redemption, that this knowledge would still more forcibly and clearly prove and illustrate the plurality of the Godhead, and the relation that the one person sustains to the other, and each and all to the works of creation, and would possibly exhibit the *Theos* as the designer and conceiver of creation; the *Logos* as the executor and medium through, (*δια*), and by (*εν*), whom all the powers of the Godhead were exerted; and the *Pneuma* as the *life-giving* energy of the Deity, the result of whose power and influence is seen in that *pneuma-like* nature which is manifested in *living, intelligent, and spiritual* beings, which people this and other realms of the universe.

But further. The irruption of sin, with all its disastrous history, was foreseen by Jehovah before he began his creation, and all his purposes in regard to it were matured and settled before it appeared. In the outlook that lay before his mind when contemplating a creation, sin appeared in all its varied history, and, in connection with that history, the mightiest work of infinite wisdom—the atonement of Jesus Christ—also appeared in all its fulness and completeness. When we come to consider this great subject, we will see what connection the Divinity has with it, and what essential part the *Logos* takes in it. It will then be seen how important and necessary the connection of the Divinity in the work of redemption; how essential and indispensable the incarnation of the *Logos* in order to the perfection and efficacy of an atonement. The nature of this work will be found to be such as to require the functions of expiation, intercession, and mediation; and these will be seen to lie, in part, above the capabilities of any creature, and to demand the interposition of the Divinity. In order that these may be discharged by the Divinity there must be, as there is, a trinity of being in the Godhead. Without such trinity it would seem that the atonement could not exist. Hence, the whole work of Jehovah, embraced under the categories of creation and redemption, indicates and declares the fact and necessity of a plurality of being in the Godhead.

Viewing, then, the Godhead in the light which revelation and

creation have given as to his nature and being; and viewing him also in the essential relations and connections which he sustains to the universe; and considering the purposes of this creation, we discover that a plurality of being was necessary to his varied relations with the works of his hands, and their relations to him; so that we may affirm, with no little confidence in its truth, that *the Triune nature of the being of the Jehovah was the pledge, necessity, and prediction of the created universe; and that the existence of the universe as a fact, is proof of the trinity of the Jehovah.* This conclusion has the same logical force as that which affirms that the conception of man was the pledge, necessity, and prediction of the creation of the material, organic, and spiritual worlds, with which man is so intimately connected; and that the existence of these before he was created, was the pledge, necessity, and prediction that man would and must exist; otherwise there would be a great work on the part of God without use, meaning, or purpose, a conclusion utterly in antagonism to every conception we have of the Divinity.

Starting, then, in our proposed survey of the Remedial System, with a fact so wonderful and overwhelming as the plurality of being of the Creator, Preserver, and Benefactor of the race, we shall find many incidental proofs and illustrations of its truth, and the pathway of our investigation into the further development and revelation he has made of himself as to his purposes in creation and redemption, greatly illuminated by a fact at once so transcendent in its grandeur, and so overwhelmingly wonderful and beautiful in its philosophy.

CHAPTER II.

THE CREATION: ἡ κτίσις.

SEC. I. ANGELS.

The Inspired Volume not only assures us that this material world, and the living beings upon it, were created by God; that matter, as also the beings which are formed of it, owe their existence to him directly; but it also reveals the existence of another order of beings, who inhabit a world invisible to us; who constitute a distinct category of intelligent creatures; and who, as a world, form an integral part of the universe. On one side, and as to the essential part of their nature, these beings are allied to man, since both are essentially spirit-beings, differing specifically in nothing but the grade and nature of the bodies which their spirits inhabit. From this only source of knowledge of things invisible to us, and of the true and reliable history of the race from the creation to the end of revelation, we may be able to gather sufficient knowledge of the nature of these invisible beings to form some just and rational conception as to their nature, being, and history.

The generic name of *angel* is given to this order of spirit-beings. Some of them have names, as men, descriptive of some attribute or station possibly; but all are classed under the general name of angels, or messengers. We conceive of them as beings very high in the scale of creation, possessing powers similar to those of man, but far transcending his in every particular. They are classified in the christian scriptures as "Thrones, Dominions, Principalities, and Powers,"¹ names indicative of rank, glory, and majesty. What transcendent powers of mind they possess when compared with man's! What grandeur, beauty, and majesty of person! What wonderful rapidity and ease of motion, moving as if borne on the wings of thought!² Great, glorious, and majestic beyond our highest conception of these qualities, they are worthy creatures of the first *fiat* of the Almighty. They first broke the isolation of the Jehovah of eternity, falling from his hands as "star dust" from the depths of space, rushing into life like burning suns, and making the universe luminous by their presence. With capacities almost infinite; with powers excelled only by those of the Omnipotent himself; invested with glory too dazzling for human eyes to gaze upon, they stand out in the front rank of creation, the glorious and wonderful work of the infinite and omnipotent God, and worthy of that rank of being,

¹ Col. 1: 16. ² Danl. 9: 20-23.

which secures them intelligent intercourse and communion with the author of their being.

They differ from men in one very important and essential particular: *They are not derived beings.* They were not multiplied in number by a system of reproduction as men are.¹ They were created like Adam, individually, each owing his existence to a special creative act of God. Hence, they have not the relations among them, which are found among men; as those of the family. There is no genetic connection between individual angels as necessarily exists among men. This, with the difference of organism, is the only real and essential distinction between these two classes of spirit-beings. In this is found the germ of man's mortality; here the essential and necessary immortality of angels. The derivative nature of man's creation constitutes him, essentially and necessarily, a mortal being; whereas angels, being underived, and created by individuals, are necessarily immortal and imperishable in all the entirety of their being.

Mortality is predicable of that only which is perishable, and immortality of that which is imperishable. These qualities inhere in those things which are perishable or imperishable in their nature. Spirit, as it is of the essence or nature of God, is imperishable by virtue of its nature. Hence, in the case of created spirit-beings, mortality is predicable only of their bodies—of that which is the created part of their being, whilst immortality inheres in their spirit nature.

We attain to some rational conception of the nature of angels by comparing what is said of them in the Sacred Volume with what is known and said of man, mortal and immortal. As man is said to have been made "a little lower than the angels," and that he will be "like the angels" when made immortal in the heavens, the conclusion is very evident that man, in his present state, differs in nothing from angels but as to the nature of his body; consequently, when his body shall be made immortal, or he become "like the angels," the conclusion is equally clear and evident that man immortal and angels will differ in no specific particular. This being so, we have only to know what man immortalized will be in order to know what angels are.

Man immortal will differ in nothing from man mortal, but in the nature of his organism—his body. The spirit is unchanged as to its nature, because unchangeable. Man will have a body in the heavens as he has here, only that it will there be imperishable. If, then, man, when immortalized, will be "like the angels," it follows conclusively that angels differ in no specific particular from man immortalized. Hence, as man will, in that state, be the same spirit-being he is here, but having an imperishable body which his spirit will inhabit, angels must be specifically the same order of spirit-beings, inhabiting a body which is in all essential particulars the same in kind as the immortal body of man. An

¹ Matt. 22: 30.

gels, therefore, are dual beings, having a spirit and a body, the latter serving similar purposes for the spirit, as the mortal body of man does for him in this world.

Of the nature of their bodies we know nothing. Yet we know they have bodies. The scriptures affirm this of immortalized man; and the specific identity of the two beings, makes the affirmation applicable to angels. But it confounds all our ideas of a body to find angels assuming the human form, and appearing to our senses as if really men, under such circumstances and in such a manner as not to be distinguishable from men. In this form they have spoken and acted as men; and their true nature could not be detected except by the purposes of their mission. Could they, in such instances, have divested themselves of their own body and assumed the human instead, or did they take the human upon and over their own entire being? The latter view is the more probable, since there is no reason for believing that the spirit and body of angels are separable. On the contrary, there is much reason for believing that their union is permanent and indissoluble.

Angels are also finite and created beings; *finite* as to the being and powers of their spirit, and *created* as to their body. Creation, in the sense in which it is affirmed of the body, can not be predicated of the spirit, since it is of the essence and nature of the uncreated Deity. But limitation, which is a necessary consequence of creation, is also a quality inseparable from finiteness; so that the spirit element of the being of angels being finite, though uncreated, is necessarily limited as to all its powers and capacities. Limitation inhering in the spirit by virtue of its finiteness, and in the body by virtue of its creation, limitation is a quality or attribute of their entire being.

That *spirit* may become a *person*, finite as to its being, and limited as to all its powers and capacities, we must conceive, it would seem, that in this act of creation, spirit is, in some way, so individualized as to become a personal, individual spirit-being, such as we recognize in the spirit of man, and conceive the spirit of angels to be. But of the process or mode we know no more, nor indeed less, than we know of any *creative* act; yet this ignorance should be no argument against such an hypothesis.

The individualization of spirit and the creation of its organism or body were, it would seem, correlative and cotemporaneous events, the one creating the necessity for the existence of the other, as is evidently the fact in the case of the multiplication of human beings through and by the system of reproduction. The organism is essentially necessary to the manifestation of the spirit in space, and to the enjoyment of the powers and faculties of its being through the exercise of these in social and spiritual intercourse and communion with beings with whom it is placed by that organism in such relation.

Such we conceive to be the nature and origin of the being of

angels. Thus constituted they are finite in their entire being, and limited in the exercise of their powers and faculties.¹

SEC. 2. THE IRRUPTION OF SIN.

The nature and faculties of such beings are necessarily and constitutionally defective, with an inherent weakness beyond their utmost powers to overcome; incapable of many things; deficient in knowledge and wisdom; and, consequently, ever liable to *err*. Besides, they possess those passions which belong to the soul; they feel the sentiments of love, admiration, and reverence; and are capable of the opposites of these,—hatred, disgust, and irreverence. They possess all the sentiments, feelings, and passions that are inherent in psychical beings; and since they have finiteness impressing its limitations and defects on their entire being, they are capable of *wrong* in thought and action. A being that *can not err* must be infinite in all his attributes. Wherever there is finiteness, there is necessarily and unavoidably the possibility and capability of wrong-thinking and wrong-doing. Absolute perfection inheres only in the Infinite, and *because* he is infinite. Imperfection inheres in the finite, *because they are finite*. *Here lies the potential origin of sin; the possibility of sinning being inseparable from, and inherent in, finite beings*. It may lie dormant, as in the infant, or subdued as in the saint; but in the former, time will show that the power needs only the development of manhood, and in the latter, temptation will show that it is only subdued, not eradicated. On the horizon, therefore, of creation hung the cloud of peccability, but seen only by the creator himself. Angels knew naught of the innate and undeveloped powers and sentiments of their nature, and were unconscious of the evil lurking deep below the surface, like the germ in the seed, and awaiting only the necessary influences and excitements to arouse the dormant powers into activity. It may seem strange to talk of influences and exciting causes capable of developing sin in heaven, among beings of whom all our conceptions embrace the ideas of purity and happiness; yet sin first erupted in heaven.²

Angels are indeed grand and glorious beings; magnificent in person, and sublimely grand in the massiveness and splendor of

¹The individualization of spirit is the creation of a spirit-being. As the creation of angels and men in this particular is the same, we may conceive of the method by which spirit is individualized or created, from the manner in which it was created in the case of man. When God had formed man's body, he then, it is said, breathed into him the breath of life, or then placed the spirit in his body. We conceive, then, that God creates spirit-beings by breathing them into existence, the spirit arising from him as the unwasting source, by each breath he makes, just as we might conceive balls of light to be thrown or jetted from an unwasting fountain of light.

²Jude 6.

their minds; and surpassingly wonderful in the greatness of their physical powers, as witnessed in the death of the first-born of Egypt, and the destruction of the host of Sennacherib. They could but have been to each other the objects of unaffected admiration. Those "Thrones, Dominions, Principalities, and Powers" of angel and archangel, rose, rank on rank, in splendor and magnificence, until their glory and grandeur seemed to approach the throne of the Infinite. Exhibiting the most wonderful displays of intellectual power; and realizing that these powers were constantly increasing in strength and sweep; grasping and handling with ease and elegance the great thoughts of the Mind-World, it need not be thought strange that finite wisdom was too blind to see, and finite intelligence too narrow and defective to perceive, whither the unguarded growth and constant development of the psychical powers of their being were leading them. Ambition is the frailty of finite beings, however exalted in the scale of creation. Dazzled by their grandeur and magnificence, and excited by desires which are native to the soul; realizing the power and reach of their mighty intellects, and losing sight, for the moment, of the true and proper object of admiration, adoration, and praise, we may imagine that the thought flashed across their mind, that their greatness and magnificence entitled them to the homage of others. Such a thought was born of ambition unrestrained, of innate desires uncontrolled, and disturbed that obedience and submission of the soul, alone compatible with true allegiance and homage due the infinite creator. That thought was a jar to the spiritual universe, and sent a thrill of agony through the Heart-World; and when the thought assumed the life of action, a dark cloud arose on that bright world of glorious spirit-beings, casting a shadow of doubt, gloom, and dread over that fair realm. That cloud was sin. On its face flashed the lurid lightnings of God's wrath, and over its dark folds rolled the thunders of his indignation. One sweep of his almighty hand cleared the heavens of its presence, and swept it into the regions of eternal darkness, leaving heaven as bright and beautiful; as peaceful and happy, as before.

The consequences which followed the transgression of angels were fearful and terrible in the extreme. All that makes the mind joyous and the heart happy; that makes our being enjoyable; that supplies the soul with all the sources and means of unalloyed and boundless happiness; that secured ineffable bliss and glory, was gone at once and forever. All was lost, and lost forever. Far away into some remote region of space—into regions of "outer darkness," the sinning angels were driven; flying from the presence of the insulted Divinity, with furious and defying looks and blaspheming tongues; yet seeking as a refuge the deep gulf of eternal darkness, into which no ray of light will ever peer, or whose gloom one ray of hope will ever lighten or cheer. There desolation reigns supreme; there memory broods

over the past, and fills the soul with thousands of hateful things, that bite, and sting, and poison life with the dreadful agonies of remorse, and wailing, and unavailing repentance. Despair and hatred alone support life; mountain billows of blasphemies their only comfort; and rage and madness, vain defiance and empty threats, are all that make their being tolerable. There remorse eternally lashes those frenzied spirits, and woe and misery add their keenest pangs. There all the passions of infuriated beings burn and rage with violence and unbridled fury; passions, the parent of all agony, distress, and misery; passions which have brought desolation on this earth; which have filled the world with groans and tears and blood; which have wasted households with fire and sword; which have stained every page of human history with the foulest crimes; which have marred and defaced the fairest works of God, and driven paradise from the earth; all these passions burn and rage in those regions with the intensest fury, making their abode the home of curses, blasphemies, hatreds, violence, unrest, and misery, under the weight and oppression of which only immortal beings could survive. There sin bears its ripest fruit; earth sees only its buds and blossoms—the gentle wind compared with the sweeping tempest!

Such a disaster occurring in the universe, followed as it was, by such fearful consequences, to the surprise and consternation of the unfallen angels, seems calculated to call in question either the wisdom, the goodness, or power of the Jehovah. If his *wisdom* could have devised a universe in which sin *could not* have occurred; if his *power* could have created intelligent beings *incapable* of sin, then, it is claimed, his *goodness* is impeached, because he has not created such a universe, or such beings. If he could not have created *impeccable* beings, then both his wisdom and power are impeached, and infinity must be denied them as a quality.

So some men have reasoned in regard to the existence of sin among men, and sought to throw all responsibility for the evils which sin has wrought in the world on the creator, and free man from all blame and responsibility.

A conclusion that attaches any blame to the creator for the existence of sin, in either heaven or earth, is irreverent and illogical, unsanctioned by enlightened reason, and inconsistent with all that we know of God, and of the nature of created beings. It is the result of but a partial view of the subject, and can not, for this reason alone, be correct or just. It considers only the infinity of God's attributes, assuming that infinity can do any and everything, simply because it is infinite; and wholly ignores the nature of created beings, and the limitations by which a finite work circumscribes the action of the infinite Worker. The impeachment denies to God infinity of attributes, because the results do not accord with the deductions of human reason, unenlightened by the works and word of God. If the Jehovah be

really infinite in all his attributes, as he must be on any hypothesis which admits or assumes his existence, the conclusion is rational and necessary, that he devised and created the best possible universe. This being so, we can not for a moment suppose that the disaster of sin, which has followed creation, was unseen or unexpected by the creator. On the contrary, it must have been as fully and as clearly before his mind before he created, as the fact was apparent afterwards. Nothing can be a surprise to omniscience. All knowledge with Jehovah is present. The *history of the universe, as now known*, was in his mind before the first event occurred in time. Nothing has taken him by surprise. Everything, whether inherent or contingent, necessary or accidental, was fully and maturely considered by God before he began his creation; so that, being infinite in knowledge, wisdom, power, and goodness, these attributes demanded and required that what he proposed to do, should be the best that could be done. He saw sin arise and sweep ruin through his fair work. He saw at the beginning all that sin has done and will have done in the end; and we may well conceive that the greatness, extent, and magnitude of the disaster would have caused him to pause and consider whether it were better, under such circumstances, and with such certain results, to create or forbear. *With the history of Time before him*, he proceeded to create, and the universe as it is, came into being.

The occurrence and consequences of sin, we affirm, were wholly unavoidable; that it was impossible for God to create a universe in which the disaster of sin was not possible of occurrence; and in affirming this, we impeach no attribute of his being. We do not impeach his power when we say that *Omnipotence can not be exhausted on a finite object*, nor his omniscience, when we say that it knows not how to make an *infinite creature*. God can not do a self-contradictory thing, and this absurdity might reasonably have been charged upon him, had he attempted an impeccable intelligent being. Self-contradictory things are impossible by nature, which nature was first imposed on them by God himself; and could he do such an absurd thing, he would contradict himself, a thing simply impossible. Therefore, in affirming some things as impossible with God, we affirm no more than what is true and necessary.¹

These impossibilities are imposed on God by the limitations which inhere in created beings. Finiteness limits the exercise of infinite powers; and the impossibility on the part of God is to be wholly ascribed to the finiteness of the creature, which is its nature, and without which it could not be what it is.

No created being can be absolutely perfect. This is found only in the Infinite. Their whole being is projected on a finite scale, and hence imperfection *inheres* in them. Here lies the *capability* of their nature to err. In their finiteness inheres their

¹ Charnock on the Attributes, pp. 26, 27.

peccability. They could not have been created void of this inherent possibility.¹ Hence, their *whole nature* is necessarily and unavoidably peccable.² So the alternative was, the creation of a peccable being, or no creation; and if there were no creation, the existence of the Infinite Jehovah would have been without purpose or meaning.

Because of this peccability of nature, all finite intelligent beings were placed under law,—under the expressed will of the creator, and the moral influences of association with him, as the best means of rendering this peccability virtually nugatory; as an opposing power from without to control the power within, by keeping it dormant, or restraining it fully, should it be awakened to consciousness. This being true, the real and true question involved in the creation of rational peccable beings is, *Are the means appropriate and sufficient for the end in view, so that what was a constitutional and an inherent defect, might be fully supplemented from without?*

The function of law in this direction is to direct or to restrain. Direction implies ignorance, and restraint implies at least the possibility of wrong action. Law also permits and prohibits; and were there no possibility of wrong-doing; there would be nothing to permit or prohibit. Hence, law clearly implies and assumes the possibility of wrong-doing, or a peccable nature in rational creatures. That angels were under law needs no proof or argument; their punishment demonstrates this.

We can not suppose that such a heinous and disastrous evil as sin has proved itself to be, would have been permitted to occur, if it could have been prevented. All our conceptions and knowledge of the character of God forbid the thought. It is dishonoring to God to suppose that sin was and is permitted in order to exhibit his character more fully and resplendently; that he can “do evil that good may come;” that the glory and greatness of his character needed this dark back-ground to exhibit his perfections to a better effect. Such a thought is not simply irreverent, but blasphemous. Could he have created impeccable rational beings, such as men and angels, all that we know or can conceive of his character assures he would have done so.

But sin, though *foreseen*, was not *permitted*. The power to sin inheres in the nature of the creature; and this power being natural or constitutional, its exercise depends on the will of the being in whom the power inheres, and on no other. The act of an intelligent being is the act of that being's *will*, which is self-determining, and is no more the act of God than of another being like itself; and God exercises no more direct or arbitrary power to prevent sin in such a creature than one creature does with another. It is the nature of will to determine its own acts; and it is just as sovereign in the creature as in the creator. This is the

¹ Nature and the Supernatural, pp. 92, 93. ² Charnock on the Attributes, p. 321; Nature and the Supernatural, p. 96.

potential attribute of all rational beings, without which they would be mere passive machines, wholly subject to the law of cause and effect, and could no more be the *author* of their own acts than dead matter could be capable of intelligent action. When, therefore, God made rational beings he made them capable of determining their own actions, and placed them in the domain of reason, and under the influence of psychical powers, where they were beyond his direct power and control, and subject to him only through the act of their self-determining will. Hence; such beings sin, if they sin at all, not by God's permission, but by the choice of their own will. These truths lie at the foundation of God's government over rational beings, and of their responsibility.

While God does not *permit* sin for the reasons above stated, neither does he *prevent* it by the exercise of his physical or arbitrary power for the same reasons. Yet he has done all in his power to prevent it, and this fact discharges him from all blame for, or complicity with, its existence. He *has* exerted all the psychical powers of his being to prevent it, which alone was capable of effecting any good results, and if these failed, the failure can not be attributed to him or the powers exercised; but to the perverse will of the creature. It may seem strange to the unreflecting, that will possesses such power; but the existence of sin proves, beyond all gain-saying, that it has, and the fact should startle every human being. While such remains the nature of created beings, the occurrence of sin lies beyond the power of God to prevent it, except by those means which he has used to prevent it. In employing these psychical forces, he did all that was possible for him to do; and if the means fail, he can not be charged with its occurrence or blamed for holding the sinner responsible, and punishing him for the sin.

Sin deserves punishment, and every principle of the government of God demands that it shall be punished, because of its nature and consequences; and if angels or men become involved in it, the same principles demand that they shall be punished. If God were in any way responsible for the existence and consequences of sin, then it might be claimed that he could not consistently punish rational beings involved in it; but since he is not responsible, he not only may, but certainly must and will, punish transgressors. An act, whether sinful or un sinful, is the action of a self-determining being—the action of a being who is the sovereign of his own determinations, for which no other being, whether creator or creature, can, in the nature of things, be held in any way responsible; otherwise the act could not be considered the action of a self-determining being, but that of a superior; and this would destroy all self-action. But since the act of a rational being is wholly self-determined, the actor must, in the nature of things, be held responsible, and, consequently, punishable.

Sin, for which rational beings are punishable, is not a *nature*, but an *act*. These two things are as different as any two things can well be, and have different authors. Of the nature of rational beings God is the author; and were their nature the same as that which we ascribe to inert matter, he would be responsible for all the consequences of that nature. Of the *action* of a rational being, that being is the sole author. His nature, peccable though it be, is not the author; but himself—the self-acting Ego, whose will, the immediate author of the action, is wholly free and undetermined. Sin, therefore, has its potential origin in the will of finite beings.

A being of infinite attributes, as the Deity is, can not be regarded as having a peccable nature, simply because he is infinite. Infinite in all his attributes, he must be perfect in nature and character, and consequently beyond and above the range and power of influences which can or may determine action. His will is supremely free and determinative; and he being infinitely wise and good, the determinations of his will are always and of necessity right.

This is not the case with finite rational beings. They are subjects of influences which may degrade or elevate; retard or accelerate their growth. They are essentially and necessarily progressive in their nature.¹ They are, therefore, *mutable*; and if mutable, then *unstable*, and ultimately peccable. Finite wisdom and knowledge must hesitate under the pressure of perplexing questions, and out of hesitation may come the wrong choice, though honest, earnest, and sincere.

Besides, those beings have powers and desires which are inherent in their nature, and inseparable from their being. On these, influences exert their legitimate force, and produce their natural results. One power may be increased by these, while others lie dormant, because not excited to action. So with desires—some are active and some are dormant, because of the presence or absence of influences capable of arousing them to activity, and increasing their strength, and confirming the growth consequent on their activity. While any power or desire is active, the being is under its influence more or less, unless its reason and will wholly resist. The will is master of every power and every desire; so that, after all, *its choice* is the action of the being, whether good or bad. The actual existence of sin, therefore, depends on the choice or determination of the will, and not really on either the nature of finite beings, or the character and strength or weakness of the influences operating on them; for the will can keep down the peccable nature, and resist all influences whatsoever, and thus assert its majesty and divinity. The positive power of resistance and determination must certainly be greater than any negative weakness that may spring from a peccable nature, or finiteness of its powers.

¹ Charnock on the Attributes, p. 321.

In the creation of such beings as these, partaking so much of his own nature, peccable though they are, God is far more honored and glorified, and derives far more pleasure than if he had created only material objects and irrational creatures. Hence, when he contemplated the creation of the universe, and clearly saw the end and consequences even before the beginning, he, nevertheless, "preferred to create powers, and not things only; because he loves character, and apart from this, cares not for all the mere things that can be piled in the infinitude of space itself, even though they be diamonds; because, in bestowing on a creature the perilous capacity of character, he bestowed the highest possibility of wealth and glory; a capacity to know, to love, to enjoy, to be consciously great, and blessed in the participation of his own divinity and character. For if all the orbs of heaven were so many solid Kohinoors, glittering eternally in the sun, what were they, either to themselves or to him; or if they should roll eternally undisturbed in the balance of their attractions, what are they to each other? Is it any impeachment of God that he did not care to reign over an empire of stones? If he has deliberately chosen a kind of empire not ruled by force; if he has deliberately set his children beyond that kind of control, that they may be governed by truth, reason, love, want, fear, and the like, acting through their consent; if we find them able to act even against the will of God, as stones and vegetable can not, what more is necessary to vindicate his goodness, than to suggest that he has given them, possibly, a capacity to break allegiance in order that there may be meaning and glory in allegiance when they choose it?"¹

As character is a higher and a more glorious thing than property of matter; as spirit-power is more resplendent in its phenomena than physical force, and yields a greater wealth of honor and glory to the creator; so God preferred to create intelligent beings, and not merely vast and numerous worlds of inert, lifeless matter. And since the capacity of wrong-doing is inherent in the nature of such beings, their creation brought with it the possibility of sin in the universe; so that the alternative was the creation of matter only, with none of that wealth of glory that arises and flows from the powers of rational beings; or the creation of intelligent beings with the contingencies and possibilities inseparable from their existence.

But we have already said, the *power* to sin, or a *peccable nature* is not sin. Sin is an act of the will in contravention of some law, or known moral principle. "I would not have known," says the apostle Paul, "that lust was sinful, if the law had not said, 'Thou shalt not lust.'"² It requires law, which, in its broadest and simplest sense, is simply the will of God, to make an act sinful; and an act of the will of the subject to make the conception of sin, a fact. We are created capable of committing

¹Nature and the Supernatural, p. 96. ²Rom. 7: 7.

murder; but the crime does not stain the soul until the act is committed in thought or act; and the act is not committed until the will acts.

The fact that created beings have an inherent, organic, or constitutional power—the Will—which is capable of determining, and which does actually determine, acting independently of, and contrary to influences which may and can legitimately affect it, and in some sense and degree determine its choice, removes the Will completely from the domain of cause and effect, the world of physical nature, whose forces acting on dead matter,—unresisting, passive matter,—present us with unavoidable effects of causes operating. The will is not such an object as matter, passive and unresisting; nor do rational influences, in operating on it, present us with unvarying results. The powers which act on the will, such as reasons, motives, considerations, and such like, may or may not be followed by the natural and expected results; because the will may, and sometimes does, act contrary to, and irrespective of, them. This is not only true of angels and men, but of the higher grades of animals below man. It is true of all beings that act under the sway of a will, and to the extent of their action under it.

Beings who are thus capable of determining their choice, and who are sovereigns of their actions, must, in the very nature of the case, be held responsible for the choice they may make, or the act they may do, if there be such a thing as a wrong choice, and a wrong action. The will can plead no excuse based on the finiteness of its nature, or the peccability of its being. If the will has weakness, it has also strength. If it should plead in excuse the weakness of its powers in yielding to temptation, it could not deny the fact that it can, and sometimes does, resist influences which urge its obedience. Hence, if it plead its weakness to fall, it can not deny that it also has the power to stand. So long as it manifests the power to resist good influences, it can not plead its weakness in extenuation of its sin in yielding to bad ones.

Such being the nature of rational beings, such as men and angels, the existence of sin, with its sad and terrible consequences among these beings, can not be attributed to God in any way, or to any extent that will implicate him in so fearful a contingency as sin has been shown to be.

The universe having been created, and the glory of the Infinite Creator been made unspeakably resplendent by such mighty beings as angels truly are, ages must have rolled away before an Adversary could have arisen from those glorious ranks, and boldly and defiantly thrown himself against the authority and majesty of God. How long Satan was conceiving and maturing his rebellion; how long in bringing himself up to the mighty and daring deed, we can not even conjecture; but all that time the eye of the infinite Jehovah was upon him; and when the stand-

ard of revolt was raised, every interest of his government, and the well-being of the universe, demanded a punishment swift, terrible, and irrevocable; and, hence, all were rapidly hurried away into "outer darkness," far remote from those "blest scenes of permanent delight," now lost to them forever.

An event so startling and so amazing was enough to confuse and confound even celestial minds, and send a thrill of terror and agony through every heart. They could but ask themselves, what all this meant? They could not answer, and no response came from the throne; and they could only gaze, and wonder, and ponder over an event so thrilling, so terrible, and so disastrous.

Eternity alone can return a full response, and develop fully the nature, tendency, and consequences of that which brought such ruin and disaster to intelligent, glorious, and wonderful beings, and cast on the fair face of the universe so dark and so dismal a cloud.

In the consequences which overtook the disobedient angels, the transgression of law, or sin, is shown to be the most serious and calamitous event that can befall intelligent beings. Its history has shown it to be an evil which will undermine all government, disrupt and confound all order, and annihilate all that is beautiful, glorious, and happy in the wide range of rational being. Like a destructive ferment, it works and consumes, ruins and destroys, all it touches; ever consuming, but never consumed; the gnawing worm that dies not, and the fire that is never quenched.

An event so momentous and calamitous, so strange and terrible as were the irruption of sin and its punishment, seems well calculated to start questions and excite reflections bearing on the character and government of God as involved in the catastrophe. The finite mind can not see an event in all its bearings and consequences, and much less an event so great as this; and in its darkness and ignorance inquiries naturally arise, which seek light, knowledge, and satisfaction. The desire for such knowledge can hardly be regarded as offensive to God, since it is his pleasure to unfold himself in all his divine majesty and glory to his rational creatures, that he may be honored by them, and they made happy by their knowledge and service of him.

If the irruption of sin and its terrible punishment did excite any reflections in the minds of those who still maintained their allegiance, and did ask some *wherefore* for what had occurred; if this event started any difficulty in their minds of which they sincerely and reverently desired a solution; and if God regarded the state of their minds with any consideration, then it is apparent that this terrible calamity was but the threshold of another and a greater work—the reason and necessity of a work greater than that of creation itself; a work that would still further unfold the attributes of Jehovah, and present him in a still more glorious attitude before his intelligent creatures.

The justification of character is a work far more difficult of accomplishment than the creation of worlds, since the field of its operations is the mind and will of rational beings, where effects do not invariably follow legitimate and efficient causes; and since character is connected with, and flows from, the harmonious play of seemingly conflicting attributes in the Deity. This justification calls into exercise attributes of God, which were not displayed in creation, though connected with it, and calls for the reconciliation of apparently conflicting attributes, and adjustment of claims on the part of these attributes, which seems to finite minds difficult of execution.

Assuming as natural and extremely probable that an interest was kindled in the minds of the obedient angels by the catastrophe which had overtaken the others; and that that interest looked to some satisfactory solution of the difficulties which the event had occasioned in their minds, involving the character of God as a wise, benevolent, and just creator, we make the lapse and punishment of angels the initial point of a work complicated in the extreme, and seemingly incapable of execution; a work that would embody and develop the weightiest argument ever presented before the intelligent universe.

This work embraces all that has taken place in the counsels of God since that terrible day; and the argument demanded the creation of this mundane system, with man at its head, though last in appearance. This great work and argument is the solution of the problem which the occurrence of sin has raised; a problem that could find no solution among angels, and hence required a new creation.

But it may be asked, Why could not the solution have been made with angels? Why could not a Remedial System have been instituted for them, and not have required a new creation?

That a Remedial System has not been provided for angels, and never will, the scriptures of divine truth make positively certain. For this distinction between angels and men, important in the extreme, there must be some wise and substantial reason; for there is no reason to suppose that he loves angels less than he loves men. The reason does not lie in any such direction. The distinction has its foundation and reason in impossibility; and the impossibility arises from the wide and essential difference between the nature of men and angels; a difference inherent in, and growing out of, their different modes of creation. This difference is found in the fact that angels were created by individuals, each being the creation of a separate creative act, the same in all cases. On the contrary, men are created (except the first pair) by a system of reproduction, a secondary or demiurgic mode of creation, by which individuals from one pair are indefinitely multiplied. This system of creation gives rise to the relations which belong to human society, and to the influences which accompany and are incident thereto. Hence, men appear

in all stages of physical and mental development and decay, and subject to influences that are peculiar and incident to every age, condition, and circumstance in life. On the contrary, angels were all created fully developed individuals, with manhood minds and strong wills, and surrounded by all that was capable of strengthening and calculated to strengthen and confirm them in the uprightness in which they were placed by creation. But not so with man. He begins life a helpless creature, without strength of body or mind, and matures gradually and slowly, surrounded by influences which may retard or divert and prevent his normal growth in the direction begun and contemplated by his creation; under "tutors and governors," until the majority of his mind, which guides may be indifferent to, or negligent of, the grave and important charge committed to their hands, through which indifference and negligence he may be exposed to evil influences, for which he is in no way responsible, and thus, before he becomes the full master of himself, he is contaminated with sin, and exposed to its consequences. Such condition and circumstances plead loudly for mercy, and the pleading cry is heard.

But what bearing has the Remedial System on the solution of the problem of sin, and what part does it play in the solution?

The particular and important fact which this system is designed to make stand out clearly and conspicuously, is, that the whole question of sin, as regards its occurrence and treatment, turns upon, and depends on, the act of a sovereign will, whose choice is its own, and not another's; that transgression or obedience, or sin or allegiance, is the act of an intelligent being who is master of his own choice through the sovereignty of his will, and which is not to be ascribed to the will or power of another. It shows to the universe that, when pardon is offered to the condemned, this great boon is accepted or rejected by the will of the offender; and it can not be determined beforehand what reception the good news will meet with, since *will* does not belong to the domain of cause and effect, and is not subject to causative influences as dead matter is. These statements are confirmed by the actual working of the Remedial System; by actual facts in the history of God's dealings with men. A case in point we have in God's commands to the prophet Ezekiel when he was sent to the people of Israel: "And he said to me, son of man, I send thee to the children of Israel, to a rebellious nation, that hath rebelled against me; * * * for they are impudent children and stiff-hearted. I do send thee unto them; and thou shalt say unto them. Thus saith the Lord God. And they *whether they will hear, or whether they will forbear* (for they are a rebellious house) *yet shall know that there hath been a prophet among them:*"¹ thus proving that obedience or disobedience is the act of the will, and has no connection, as cause and effect, with the *nature of the*

Ezek. iii: 3-5.

creature of which God is the author. Hence, though finite beings are *capable of sinning*, yet actual sin finds its origin in the choice of the will.

Why the *will* sins in any case is as inexplicable as *how* the will acts; but it is sufficient to know that in the nature of rational beings, there is the power to stand as well as the power to fall; and the motives and considerations which are presented to maintain allegiance are certainly as numerous and as strong as can be any temptation to break allegiance. This is even true of men, growing up from the helpless and unconscious state of childhood to manhood and mental maturity, exposed to sinful influences during every stage of their mental development; and much more was it true of angels whose relations and circumstances were so different. Hence, if hearkening and allegiance are reasonably expected of men, much more ought they to have been expected of angels.

There is no justifiable excuse, therefore, which rational beings can give for their sinning; and hence they deserve, and will meet with proper and merited punishment, without reflecting, in the least, upon the creator for making them peccable beings.

CHAPTER III.

THE CREATION: *ὁ κόσμος.*

SEC. I. THE INORGANIC WORLD.

The triune being of man which gives rise to his complicated relation with the universe, is the connecting link between the spirit realm and this organic system, uniting this world with the unseen as the two grand divisions of the created universe. In addition to this, certain events in the history of these two empires of sentient beings still more clearly show the logical connection and bearing which the one has with and upon the other. These events were the irruption of sin among angels and men, and the treatment which was pursued towards each, the one punished without mercy and hope, the other granted a remedial system.

That the treatment of sin through the Remedial System has a bearing on the question of sin among angels; that the management of this great evil through an atonement, is really and truly a complete and satisfactory solution of the problem of sin in the abstract—as related to both men and angels, is the almost positive and emphatic declaration of the inspired apostle, when speaking on this subject. Regarding the Remedial System as having an important connection with, and a bearing, in the purposes of God, on the occurrence of sin among angels, he alludes to the connection which the Atonement has with the Principalities and Powers in the heavens, in the following eloquent and glowing statement: “To me who am the least of all the saints is this grace given, that I should preach among the Gentiles the *unsearchable riches of Christ*, and to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God who created all things by Jesus Christ: *to the intent* (v. 8) *that now unto the Principalities and Powers in heavenly places* (Col. 1: 16) *might be made known by the church the manifold wisdom of God, according to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord.*”¹

A logical connection obtaining between the eruption of sin in the heavens, and the Remedial System in this world, and the latter following the former in the order of time, it is fair to presume that the occurrence of sin among angels was the logical cause of the purpose to establish a Remedial System for men, and this the necessary cause of the creation of this world with all that belongs to it, both celestial and terrestrial; for, without man, the Remedial System could have no existence, and without

¹ Eph. 3: 8-11. 1 Pet. 1: 12.

the material and organic worlds man could not exist. There is, therefore, a logical and necessary connection between the occurrence of sin among angels and the creation of the material and organic worlds.

The reason of this connection has its foundation in the fact that the occurrence of sin and the terrible disaster which it brought on angels, gave rise to a problem the importance, grandeur, and magnitude of which have no parallel in all the domain of God, which problem, finding no possible solution among angels, made absolutely necessary the creation of another order of spirit-beings, whose nature and condition under sin would allow a Remedial System, and afford the necessary data for the solution of the problem.

The nature of this new order of spirit-beings allied them, on one side of their being, to the angels among whom sin had originated, and on the other, to the material and organic worlds of which they were, as to their organism, a part, and out of which arose their peculiar condition under sin. It was essentially necessary that they should be so closely allied to angels as to be *virtually* the same as to their *spirit*, in order that every circumstance and condition necessary to the solution might be present, so that the solution, effected through the new order of beings, might be regarded as a true and satisfactory determination of the question as it pertained to angels.

It was equally necessary, on the other hand, that the new order of beings should differ from angels in such respect as to permit the necessary conditions to exist, on which should be grounded the possibility of a Remedial System. This difference is found in the peculiarities of their being, which connect them with the material and organic worlds, and constitute them a new order of beings. This difference is seen to exist in the fact that men, after the first pair, are *derived* beings; that they are thence created, or numerically increased, by a system of derivation or reproduction; whereas angels were created as individuals, each being the creation of a separate and distinct act of the creator. To this nature of man the existence of the material and organic worlds was essentially and absolutely necessary.

The magnitude and importance of the object proposed are measured by the means employed to accomplish it. The conception of man involved the conception and creation of the entire material universe, and the complicated and diversified organic system belonging to this world. The creation of these with man as their reason and end, was a work of great magnitude, and a grander display of wisdom and knowledge, than the creation of all that had preceded them; for here are diversities, complications, relations, connections, and compensations in the midst of unity and system, which seem to tax even the Infinite Mind to adjust, reconcile, and balance into the uniqueness of order, beauty, and perfection.

The extent of the material universe is beyond the knowledge of man. His powerful telescopes have penetrated far into the depths of space, and as far as his vision has been extended by this means, worlds are found to exist. Beyond the limits of his telescopic vision, space may be as fully studded with suns and planets as it is within, the light of some of which may yet come into the field of telescopic or natural vision. As far as man sees now the extent and magnitude of the material universe are vast in the extreme. If, then, all these were necessary to the existence of man, great and grand, and glorious must *he* be, or the *purposes* of God which are to be accomplished through him.

This earth is but a speck in the immensity of the material universe. The matter in it is too slight as to quantity to bear any comparison to the great mass created; yet the drama acted on it aggrandizes it even beyond this immensity. To this it owes all its importance; and this justifies the creation of all that is necessary to its existence, and that of the living forms belonging to it, whose well-being depends in no small degree upon the influence which other heavenly bodies exert upon the earth, through light and heat. Without the light of the sun, the centre of the planetary system to which the earth belongs, no living thing could exist; and in point of fact no living thing was created until the earth enjoyed the light and heat of that central luminary.

The revelations of science make it almost positively certain that this earth has been developed from a state of chaos to the order, symmetry, and perfection of the present physical world, which make it a fit abode for the highest forms of life. There was a period in its history when no living creature existed on it; when it was "without form and void," and darkness brooded over its dark and turbulent waters; when the light of the sun was shut out by the thick clouds of vapor that arose from its surface by the force of heat within. There was a time, too, when it emerged from this darkness, and kissed the light of sun and moon and stars, and rejoiced in the beauty of grass and herb and tree; when it felt for the first time the motion-thrill of living forms coursing through its waters, and bounding over its surface, and entered upon the career that marks it out as the true and only living centre of the vast universe of which it is, physically, so small a part.

Its history is replete with interest and wonder; full of type and prophecy. All along the shores of Time, and through every period of its long history—periods measured by almost innumerable ages—lie the wrecks of once living and populous worlds, whose remains mark the eras of its history, and the stages of growth through which the material and organic worlds have come up from the long past beginning, (which seems, from its remoteness, to sink back into eternity,) to the present, which witnesses the close of creation, and opens the way for the Great Drama. "For this earth rose from chaos; man from earth," the greatness and

grandeur of whose being are seen in the vast preparations that were made for his advent. The earth, therefore, is hoary with age. Its life is measured, not by years, nor by centuries, but by periods, whose vast length surpasses computation. Antiquity is written on its smoothest feature; the deep furrows speak the language of eternity:—

“Eternity hath snowed its years upon her,
And the white winter of her age has come.”

If the theory that supposes that the earth was once in a fluid state be true, (and there are many reasons for believing that it is,) the creation of the earth must be placed very remotely in the past, in order to give the necessary time for the changes, which the earth has undergone, to have taken place. It is quite probable that matter was created in its elementary form, and that the multitudinous and multifarious compounds of matter, which have since existed on the earth, are the results of the affinities and attractions with which the elements were endowed at the time of their creation.

The world beginning in such a crude and chaotic state, it was long before the action and play of the physical forces had wrought the necessary changes and conditions in the matter of its surface, which would fit it for the abode of living beings, even of the lowest forms. In point of fact such was the case; for the earth had reached that condition in which the vapor in the atmosphere, that enveloped the earth in total darkness, was precipitated in the form of water, before any living creature was made. This period was too remote to be computed, or even approximated, by man.

The history of the earth, as revealed by geology, shows many changes and revolutions in the condition of its surface. Continents have been worn away by the restless waters of the ocean, and ocean beds upheaved by forces confined beneath the surface, and made continents. These in turn have been carried away, or depressed below the waters, and sea and land have again and again changed their position. Thus have air and water, and heat and frost comminuted the adamant rock, and made the soil of the earth. Thus has the earth, from age to age, been gradually made fit for life. The physical forces of nature, with the aid which plants and animals have afforded, have worked and wrought to the present hour, and effected changes which gradually brought the earth into a more perfect condition, the great changes being marked by the creation of advancing grades of animals and plants. The successive creations, which constitute great eras in the earth's history, extend over a vast period of time, and give an age even to the organic world, which baffles the powers of man to compute in years. Add to this the ages required for the earth to cool from its fluid state to that when all the water would lie on its surface, and we have an age for the

earth and material universe, which is not exceeded in comparison by its immensity of extent.

SECTION II.

THE ORGANIC WORLD: LIFE: ἡ Ψῦχῆ.

Up to the time when living forms were brought on the earth, the physical forces of the inorganic world were alone sufficient to effect the changes and conditions in the earth's surface necessary to the existence and well-being of living creatures. They were sufficient to break down, comminute, and pulverize the huge igneous rocks, and distribute the dust over the surface of the globe, and prepare the way for the vegetable world, whose living forms, in time, became the support of the animal. Physical agents and forces find their true field in the physical world; but they are not without some influence on the organic.

This influence is limited, and extends not to the production of living forms. Life is a power unknown to the inorganic world; is not one of its forces. It is a power above and beyond these, and categorically distinct from them. While living forms are of this world, yet its forces have not created them. These are as truly a creation as matter itself; and physical forces have as much power to create matter as they have to create the organisms of life; forms that exhibit phenomena that are kindred to the realm of spirit.

The theory that organized beings owe their existence to the action and play of physical agents; that "they originated spontaneously by the immediate agency of physical forces, and have become successively more and more diversified by changes produced gradually upon them by these same forces;" that "by multiplication and intensifying of individual differences, and the projection of these upon the branching lines of the courses of development from a lower to a higher life, the diverse and successively more elevated types of each grand division have originated upon this globe,"¹ is one of the strangest conceits that learned men have ever seriously advocated.² These theories ascribe the existence of organized beings to the force and action of what they call *law*, which is the action of physical forces in producing a living organism, and the co-action of the organic forces developed by the organism, acting in accordance with the nature and force impressed on them by—what, we are not definitely and

¹ Mind in Nature, p. 279.

² This theory has been most vigorously assailed and most successfully refuted by Prof. Agassiz in his Essay on Classification.

positively told If matter be eternal, (which seems to be their supposition), and the laws which pertain to it be connate with it, then, indeed, is all agency of a spiritual and divine character denied to the origin of the organic world, and *life* is without distinction from physical force, and the world without an intelligent creator. Mind itself must originate from the play of physical agents on dead and inert matter. And even more absurd than this; man's *spirit* must own the parentage of heat and light, of chemical affinity, electricity, and magnetism, and confine its aspirations and hopes to the field bounded by the material and organic worlds. Mind in animals belongs to their organism. Its degree of development depends on the grade of development of the organism; and seems as much a part of the organism as the vital and chemical forces concerned in its functions. But since psychical phenomena are so clearly and categorically distinct from the phenomena of physical forces, we must conclude that the *psychical* agent, whatever it may be, is not identical with the *physical*. Psychical phenomena are never witnessed except in a living, sentient being, one capable of thought, and possessing a will; and such a being must be impossible to physical forces, since in their own field of operation they have not, in all the long ages of the world, presented one single phenomenon of mind. But it will be hereafter shown that the agent to which living organisms are to be ascribed, has exhibited psychical phenomena in other departments of the universe; and this fact separates it, *toto coelo*, in nature and phenomena, from physical forces.

We meet with organic bodies of three distinct forms, whose origin, direct or remote, is to be ascribed to the same agent; the first of which, in the order of time, is the living organism itself, which is the parent of all the individuals of its species; the second, organized substances which are the *products* of the living organism, and wholly destitute of the power of reproduction; and the third, are bodies of an organic nature and origin, but the results of changes which take place in the other two classes. Thus we have, as belonging to the second class, starch, cellulose, sugar, albumen, and fibrin; acids and alkaloids, and neutral bodies. These are the products of the living organism, but are themselves destitute of life. Among the third class we have the secondary organic compounds, the result of changes effected in the compounds, as the various alcohols, ethers, acids, and neutral bodies without number. These are the result of natural decay, or the action of other substances, organic and inorganic, upon them. This last class is within the power of the chemist to produce, and they have been produced in the laboratory to an indefinite extent. But it is of the first only that we predicate creation. The living, self-perpetuating organism is the living creature, which no power but the divine can originate. We may grant that the chemist may make starch or sugar, and may, in some cases, combine the inorganic elements; so as to form

a body of the third class, and by means of it, a body of the second; but there his power is stayed. He can not make a living organism. The germinative cells, from which the living creature grows to maturity, and which reproduces themselves in the living organism into which they mature, are wholly beyond the field of the chemist's operations; much more the matured being, in whose organism these germinative cells are reproduced.

There is one marked distinction between the action of the life-principle (whatever it may be) and the action of physical agents. This distinction is that of *growth*. It is the nature of living organisms to grow. There is no such a thing in the inorganic world. A creation and aggregation of matter are not processes of growth. There is no assimilation from without, nor disintegration from within, in crystals, salts, or gases. The distinction between growth and aggregation is the distinction between the power we call life, and physical agents, and this is as broad as life and death.

The vital force is the immediate agent concerned in the process of growth; but it is only the *product* of the living organism. It is not the originator of the organism. Its relation to the organic world is analogous to the relation of physical force to the inorganic world; the force that is concerned in vital operations as the physical force in physical changes. It is the force or power of organic matter, as the physical force is the power of inorganic matter; and hence, being a creature, can not be a creator or originator.

That the vital force is categorically distinct from the physical, is proved by the fact that its action is upward, as in growth, while the action of physical agents is downward, as in the decay of organic matter, when separated from the living organism. If, then, the active, building force of the living organism is categorically distinct from the physical (which can, in no case, produce this phenomenon of vitality), then is it certain and true that the physical force is not the author of the vital, and *a fortiori*, not of the living organism.

But there are yet other phenomena of the living organism, which increase the weight of testimony against the theory in question. The phenomena of growth and reproduction belong alike to all grades of living organisms, but among the higher, and conspicuously in the highest, we have psychical phenomena. In man these phenomena can not be distinguished from the spiritual—those that flow from, and belong to, man's spirit, and not simply to his animal mind which he has in common with the animals below him. The psychical faculties of animals pertain to their well-being, and look towards, and contribute to, the enjoyment of their being, which is certainly a higher and different attribute of being, than the chemical affinity of a salt, or the force of crystalization in the diamond. Now, it would seem utterly impossible that the physical agent that wrought carbon into the

beautiful form of the diamond, should be the same agent that produces the psychical phenomena in animals. Yet this must be so, if organized beings owe their existence to physical agents.

Moreover, we find a complicated adaptation of the organism of animals to the media in which they live and the purposes of their existence, which can be ascribed to no other origin than one possessing mind in a very high degree. The organs and functions of the animal organism, which place them in fixed and definite relations to the external world, and to one another, show a higher power at work in their creation than the forces of the inorganic world. If these adaptations exist, which can not be doubted, then do they prove that the author of living organisms understood well the physical conditions necessary and essential to the well-being of such creatures, and also what nature, organs, and functions in plants and animals would be best fitted to these conditions, and to the purposes of their own existence; a knowledge which can in no wise be ascribed to physical agents. None but an infinite Mind could have grasped and comprehended the varied and complicated relations which obtain between the organic and inorganic worlds, and designed and perfected the differentiations which appear in the structure of living organisms; and to ascribe the origin of these to the play and force of physical agents, is to invest them with omniscience and omnipotence; than which no absurdity can be greater. The fact that the psychical phenomena witnessed in animals are not to be distinguished categorically from those manifested by man, and that their psychical faculties are essentially identical as to nature, goes far to prove that their faculties have their seat and basis in the same nature; and that this nature is purely spiritual; that that which is called the vital *principle is, as to its nature and being, pure spirit.*

Mind is an essential attribute of spirit-beings; of all beings whose nature and constitution embrace spirit in some form or degree. Intelligence, the natural phenomenon of mind, is an inherent and inseparable quality of spirit; so that, wherever it is present, *spirit* is present. If, then, the immaterial principle in animals, on which their psychical faculties are based, is spirit as to its nature and being; and if this was the agent in creation, then we must confound spirit with physical force, if living organisms owe their existence to the forces of the inorganic world.

But further—With an intelligent nature we find a moral nature associated with, resting on, and proceeding from, the same immaterial basis. That a moral nature exists in man, is universally conceded and believed. But it may be argued; that this nature rests on, and proceeds from, his spirit nature, and is to be ascribed to the fact that he has a spirit in addition to all that is animal. But such an argument is not sound, nor the conclusion unquestionable. The presumption is against it, if the immaterial principle in animals and spirit in man are as to nature the same;

for, if even the veriest rudiment of a moral nature is discoverable in animals, then must this nature have a basis common to men and animals. The only basis from which a moral nature can proceed, which is common to both, is the immaterial principle which is the basis of the intellectual nature.

It has generally been considered that a moral nature is peculiar to man; that it is the nature that distinguishes men from animals, and hence this nature has been regarded as "the image of God," in the likeness of which man was created. But this view can not be correct if a moral nature is perceptible in animals. Have, then, animals a moral nature even in a rudimentary state?

Animals exhibit all the passions that belong to man. "When they fight with one another, when they associate for a common purpose, when they warn one another in danger, when they come to the rescue of one another, when they display pain or joy, they manifest impulses of the same kind as are considered among the moral attributes of man. The range of their passions is even as extensive as that of the human mind, and I am at a loss to perceive a difference of kind between them, however much they may differ in degree, and in the manner in which they are expressed. The gradations of the moral faculties among the higher animals and man are moreover so imperceptible, that, to deny to the first a certain sense of responsibility¹ and consciousness, would certainly be an exaggeration of the differences which distinguish animals and man. There exists besides, as much individuality, within their respective capabilities, among animals as among men. * * * *. This argues strongly in favor of the existence in every animal of an *immaterial principle* similar to that which, by its excellence and superior endowments, places man so much above animals. Yet this principle unquestionably exists, and whether it be called soul, reason or instinct, it presents, in the whole range of organized beings, a series of phenomena closely linked together; *and upon it are based not only the higher manifestations of the mind*, but the very permanency of the specific differences which characterize every organism."² * * * *. "A close study of the dog might satisfy every one of the similarity of his impulses with those of man; and these impulses are regulated in a manner which discloses *psychical faculties in every respect of the same kind as those in man.*"³

If, then, the psychical faculties of man and animals are essentially the same, and identical as to the nature on which they rest, and differ only in degree, which can be no longer questioned; and if we find a moral nature in man, (which is universally believed), we can not deny the possibility of such a nature in

¹ The punishment inflicted by man on animals is based on such responsibility.

² Essay on Classification, pp. 96-9.

³ Essay on Classification, p. 98.

animals, and, in point of fact, its actual existence, in a rudimentary form, in some of the higher animals. How, then, can the immaterial principle on which such a nature rests, be regarded as identical with physical force, which must be the case if living organisms owe their existence to the action of physical agents? There is nothing moral in their nature or action, and how then can they be the originating cause of moral phenomena and a moral nature? The thing is impossible and absurd in the highest degree.

But, if this immaterial principle be *spirit* as to its nature and being, whence is it? and what is it? Every conception we have of it removes it entirely from the domain of matter, and assigns it to that realm which we regard as purely spiritual. The manifestations of mind which it displays in the creation of living organisms are so great and wonderful; so full of wisdom and knowledge; so divine and glorious, as to forbid any other hypothesis than that this immaterial principle is nothing less than the spirit—the *πνεύμα*—which, “brooding over the deep,” breathed life into the dull, inert “dust of the earth,” and filled sea and land with their myriad forms of life and beauty.

But the immaterial principle does not appear in living organisms as an individual, personal spirit-being; because the same principle is common to plants and animals. Its psychical manifestations appear only in the higher classes of the vertebrates, and conspicuously in the higher mammals; and their manifestation in these depends on the nature of their organism. Their grade of development depends on the grade of development of the brain organ, and keeps pace with it; so that the organism is but the *avenue* through which the Pneuma manifests its true spirit-nature, and not the temple of a personal and independent spirit as in man.

The mind of man is as organic as that of animals, so far as man is an animal. But if he is more than an animal; if he has an individual, personal spirit-being, which is separable from his organism in its entirety, and can and does exist in this state of separation, this also manifests psychical faculties, but only through the organic mind. Having no means of manifesting its individual psychical powers, separate and distinct from the mind which he has by virtue of animal organism, we can not determine how much of the psychical phenomena of man is to be ascribed to the organic mind, and how much to his spirit-being, nor draw any line by which his psychical faculties can be defined, as to origin, the one from the other.

We assume for the present that there is in man a spirit wholly independent of his organism, which places him in another and higher category of existence, and connects him with another and a higher order of created beings. This knowledge, we confess, is derived from a supernatural source; but still it is a piece of knowledge which the advocates of the developmental theory do

not positively and unequivocally deny. So far as science goes we could not know this; but since it is admitted, we are authorized to regard the whole man as embracing this addition to his animal organism. If we can not determine from the psychical phenomena which he presents, where the organic mind ends and where the spirit-mind begins, it only shows how dim and feeble is the line which separates them, and especially how identical as to nature are the immaterial principle, (the basis of the organic mind), and the personal, individual spirit in man; and still more how impossible it is that man should owe his existence to the play and force of physical agents. By what processes of "multiplication and intensification of individual differences," and "projections upon branching lines of development," could physical agents have created an individual personal spirit for man, which could live after and beyond the death of the organism which, it is claimed, they originated? A theory so utterly absurd, so contemptuously derisive of divine agency in creation, and so positively subversive of revealed religion, every one who believes he has a higher parentage than that of the monkey, who scorns to trail his dignity in the dust, and especially he who glories in the Atonement of Christ, will spurn with ineffable contempt and derision.

SECTION III. MAN.

Man closes the series of organized beings. Seen from the beginning he appears at the end of the ages, and in his person completes the work of creation, and connects this world with the next. The great thought struggling through the geological ages for utterance finds its full expression in him. His organism illuminates, epitomizes, and completes the Past, and develops the intent and meaning of all the creations that preceded him.

But between the conception and the reality, vast ages intervened, and were consumed in preparing the way for his introduction. The facts of creation as revealed by geology show that the great thought which finds its full expression in him was gradually developed. This thought contemplated a perfect animal organism; and the stages of its development were marked by the grades of organisms as they were gradually and successively introduced upon the earth.

The relations which living organisms sustain to the Inorganic World, rendered necessary a perfect development of the condition of physical nature; and this could not be attained without the lapse of much time, and the influence of physical and organic agents on the matter that composes the crust of the earth.

Whatever theory we may adopt as it respects the original state or condition of the earth; whether it has cooled from a state of igneous fusion, or was precipitated from some universal solvent,

matters not, since it does not alter the fact that in its early state it was wholly unsuited to living organisms. We know that soil is necessary to the existence of the vegetable world; and we also know that soil is but the dust of once igneous rocks of the earlier ages, and in later times, the dust of every kind of rock, with the remains of once living organisms. The nidus of the vegetable world had to be prepared before plants could be created, and this preparation was effected through the lapse of ages by the physical agents.

But these agents were not alone sufficient to prepare the earth for the higher grades of living organisms. The remains of these organisms were also found necessary. Hence, we find along the geological ages, that new and distinct species of plants and animals were introduced as the physical condition of the surface became changed by the action of physical agents, one age preparing the way for another, until the earth, reaching a perfect physical condition, was ready for man, and the animals and plants associated with him.

That living organisms are capable of effecting great changes in the physical condition of the earth, we have the most abundant proof. Their effect is perceptible, both while living and dead, and possibly never so great and marked as during the Carboniferous Period, when the vegetable world so thoroughly depurated the atmosphere of its super-abundant carbonic acid, and fixed it in the plants of that age, as to prepare the way for the introduction of air-breathing animals of the following periods. The remains of these plants we find in the great deposits of coal, which lie in the earth's crust. The carbon of this coal was once in the atmosphere, and then no warm-blooded, air-breathing animal could live.

Besides the effect which plants have on the air, they have a marked effect on the constitution and productiveness of the soil by the decomposition of their tissues. The same is true of the remains of animals. These effects appear very conspicuous in the oases of deserts. The wild waste of sand which makes the country a desert, is the debris of disintegrated rocks, and wholly inorganic matter. Deserts are consequently arid and unfertile. But mingle with the sand a sufficient quantity of vegetable matter, and let plants flourish and die on its surface, generation after generation, and the desert will be filled with life and beauty. And so in all the past ages of the earth, they have worked with physical agents for the improvement of the physical condition of the earth, that from their graves a higher order of living organisms might arise and flourish.

The effects which animals produce in modifying and changing the physical and chemical condition of the earth's surface, are not less marked than those of plants. These effects are to be seen in almost every age, and in every part of the world. The decay of their soft tissues fertilizes the soil, and their shells and

skeletons modify its chemical constitution. The extensive coral deposits that stud the ocean with islands, and line the shores of continents with reefs, are composed of the carbonate of lime excreted by polypi. These deposits when disintegrated by the action of physical agents, and scattered over the floor of the ocean by wave and stream, become in time vast chalk deposits. These extensive strata show the vast amount of matter that passed through the organisms of animals, and the influence which even such tiny animals have exerted in changing and modifying the physical conditions of the earth's surface. In some isolated cases this deposit may be of chemical origin; but the microscope has revealed the most of it to be the detritus of the skeletons of animals.¹

Besides these deposits resulting from the comminution of shells and corals of the smaller animals, there are the remains of the larger, scattered through almost every stratum of the earth's crust, which impress us with wonder at the great number of living creatures that roamed over the land and swarmed in the seas in past ages. Yet these remains, however numerous, can not be representatives of all that lived. How many have lived and died, and left no such evidence of their existence as is found in fossils, the traces of animal matter found in almost every soil,² leave us only to conjecture.

While living organisms were active, both while living and after death by their remains, in effecting changes and modifications in the physical condition of the earth, the forces of the Inorganic World were not idle. Storm and tempest swept over land and sea; floods and streams furrowed hill-side and plain; waves beat and broke on continent and island; rivers transported land to the seas, and ocean currents scattered it far and wide; land rose and sank; shores and bays shifted places; the subtle powers of earth and air wrought continually in their secret chambers; and all the phenomena of air, land, and sea, which are observed now, appeared in every age of the earth's long history. These mighty forces, working through long ages, have progressively wrought great changes in the physical condition of the earth, and prepared the way for the successive creations which mark and distinguish the geological periods. As great changes have taken place on the earth's surface, the intervals of which are measured by ages, which witnessed the destruction of a living world by time or flood, great changes have taken place in the living organisms whose creation followed the cataclysm; so that world after world has successively walked over the graveyards of those that went before.³

The records of these long buried worlds, which we have in their remains entombed in rocks, clearly demonstrate that all

¹ Wonders of Geology, p. 305.

² The phosphate of lime found in the soil, and possibly coal oil, is of animal origin. ³ Essay on Classification, pp. 155-7.

were not one and the same creation; but that they were the results of different and widely separated acts of creative Power to which is to be ascribed the *origin* of all things. The living organisms of the earlier and later geological eras, differed so widely in their specific characters, that there can be no doubt as to their being distinct and independent creations. "The general results of geology proper and of paleontology concur in the main to prove, that while the globe has been at repeated intervals, and indeed frequently, though after immensely long periods, altered and altered again, until it has assumed its present condition, so also have animals and plants, living upon its surface, been again and again extinguished and replaced by others, until those now living were called into existence with man at their head. The investigation is not in every case sufficiently complete to show everywhere a coincidence between this renovation of animals and plants and the great physical revolutions which have altered the general aspect of the globe, but it is already extensive enough to exhibit a frequent synchronism and correlation, and to warrant the expectation, that it will in the end, lead to a complete demonstration of their mutual dependence, not as a cause and effect, but as steps in the same progressive development of a plan which embraces the physical as well as the organic world." ¹

As the animal kingdom was developed or differentiated in time, so was the condition of the earth's surface improved from age to age, until the first reached its end and perfection in man, and the latter in the present geological period. As the earth improved in condition, and became adapted to organisms of a higher grade, new and higher forms were introduced. These ever advancing grades clearly pointed, in their differentiations, to the perfectly differentiated organism presented by man, and these stages of development of the animal kingdom were the gradual utterance of the great thought which is fully expressed in man.

That the types of animals, which distinguished and characterized the creations of past geological eras, pointed to man as the perfection of animal organisms and the end of the series, the relation of rank which these types sustain to the types of the present era, and the relation which the living races sustain to man, most clearly and fully demonstrate. And this relation of man to the races of the past and the present, is still more fully confirmed by the fact that "the different and successive stages of growth of young animals of a higher group, correspond to the permanent characters of full grown individuals of inferior types." That is to say, the differentiations or stages of development appearing in the embryonic development of animals of a higher type, represent the permanent forms of the inferior grades. The successive types, as they appeared in geological eras, correspond

¹ Essay on Classification, p. 158.

to the regular and successive grades of living species; and since the living species find their end and reason in the perfectly differentiated organism of man, so did all the types of the past point to man as also *their* end and reason. Through all these various types "there seems an evident tendency towards the production of higher and higher types, until, at last, Man crowns the whole series. Seen, as it were, at a distance, so that the mind can take a general survey of the whole, and perceive the connection of the successive steps, without being bewildered by details, such a series appears like the development of a great conception, expressed in proportions so harmonious that every link appears necessary to the full comprehension of its meaning, and yet so independent and perfect in itself, that it might be mistaken for a complete whole, and again so intimately connected with the preceding and following members of the series, that one might be viewed as flowing out of the other. What is universally acknowledged as the highest conceptions of genius is here displayed in a fullness, a richness, a magnificence, an amplitude, a perfection of details, a complication of relations, which baffle our skill and our most persevering efforts to appreciate all its beauties. Who can look upon such a series, coinciding to such an extent, and not read in them the successive manifestations of a thought, expressed at different times in forms ever new, and yet tending to the same end, onwards to the coming of Man, whose advent is already prophesied in the first appearance of the earliest Fishes?"¹

Man's position in the series of organized beings, and the relations he sustains to these, will be considered in a future chapter,² and some reasons given why his organism should be regarded as the end and crown of the series. Here it is only necessary to observe further, that what has been presented is quite sufficient to warrant the statement that Man is the only reason that can be given for the successive creations of the past, and his the only name that can give significance to the numerous, varied, and successive types of living organisms, that crowded the land and swarmed in the seas in the long by-gone ages.

When the organic and inorganic worlds are viewed from various stand points, and considered in their manifold and diversified relations, and purposes of their existence, there can be no room left for conjecture as it regards their origin or creator. There has been no greater display of mind than we have presented in the phenomena of these worlds or kingdoms. There is the most beautiful harmony in the midst of apparent confusion; plan and design in the midst of seeming chaos; and the utterances of a great thought instead of babbling chance or accident. We had as well believe that the Principia of Newton was written by the play of chemical affinity, or that the laws worked out by the im-

¹ Essay on Classification, pp. 166-7. ² The last.

mortal Kepler, were evolved by physical forces, as to suppose that the organic and inorganic worlds had any other author than one of Infinite Intelligence.

So far as man is animal, we can discover no difference between him and the animals immediately below him, but what concerns the form of his organism, and the grade of his intelligence.¹ His form differs from theirs, but it is built on the same plan. His psychical faculties are the same in nature, but differ only in degree; and if we regard him only as an animal, we can only say of him that he is a perfect animal, as fully and as perfectly differentiated as an animal organism can be designed or made. But with only this knowledge of him, great and full as it is, we are yet ignorant of the most important fact about him. He is great as the capital of the serial column; but he is still greater as being more than an animal. Events have occurred in his history, and a moral quality is attached to his acts by the almost universal consent of mankind, and these suggest a nature of being very materially different from that of animals. What it is that constitutes him a different being and so far removes him from the animal kingdom as to connect him with another sphere of being, reason nor science can ever determine. The moral quality attaching to his acts may possibly afford some rational suggestion; but neither reason nor science has any light by which the fact can be positively determined. We may, however, rationally conjecture that a being, of whose actions we may predicate the quality of wrong-doing, is allied, in some degree, to angels, as to his higher nature and being. But for that light which can change conjecture to certainty, we must look to the realm whence only such knowledge can come.

If we receive, as indisputable, the two most important events in human history, viz: Man's ejection from Eden, and the Atonement of Jesus of Nazareth, then must we assert for man a nature that connects him with the world above, and ranks him with its superior order of beings; otherwise, we have an atonement for mere animals, which would make the act of killing them as verily murder as is the killing of man.

A being of such a nature, with such a history, and such relations and connections, as is man, is a creature of wonderful significance, whose organism is the reason for the material and organic worlds; whose advent into the world had reference to an event that long antedated his creation; and in whose person will be solved the greatest, the most serious, and important question that has ever arisen under the government of God; a question that has been the reason and foundation of all God's acts since the condemnation of the sinning angels. This great purpose of his creation will continue to unfold as we proceed in his history.

¹ Carpenter's Principles of Comparative Physiology, pp. 692-3.

CHAPTER IV.

MOSES AND GEOLOGY.

It is not to be disguised that the Mosaic account of the creation, *as ordinarily interpreted*, is in conflict with the teachings of Geology. The common view is, that Moses records that God created this world and the heavenly bodies in six natural days;—that from the time he commanded “light to shine out of darkness,” until the day he completed his work by creating man, there were only six literal days. In the law, which God wrote on the tables of stone, we read the following: “For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested on the seventh day.” The view which would be naturally formed from this and similar statements in the writings of Moses, is, that God created all things in six natural days, and about six thousand years ago; whereas, Geology shows that the first two day’s work, described by Moses, were completed long and indefinite ages in the past; and that there have been many creations, as distinct as that mentioned by Moses; that the seas have swarmed with living creatures, and the land groaned under the tread of monsters, now no longer known among the living species; and that the earth brought forth abundantly of trees and herbs and grasses, ages before the period when man came upon the earth. In the earliest periods of the paleozoic age, light shone on the earth, and aquatic plants and animals flourished on the earth and swarmed in the seas. Moses says that the waters brought forth abundantly “of fowls that fly in the midst of heaven,” on the same day that every creature that lives in water was created. But geology tells us that birds did not appear until a time long subsequent to that period when the sea swarmed with living creatures in the paleozoic age.

Had Moses not included in his account the first two days’ work, and had spoken only of the plants and animals created with man, as he appears to do, we might conclude that he recorded only the present creation, and had no reference to the creations which took place in the ages antecedent to the present. But by including the first two days’ work in his account, it would seem that he intended to include *all* the creations of God on this earth, and to convey to our minds the idea that the creation which took place when man was introduced, was *the only creation God had ever made*. Had such an impression not been made on the mind, the common view could not have so univer-

sally obtained. Geology alone has corrected this impression, and shown that the present is only one of many creations which have been introduced on the earth. Had Geology not uncovered the remains of dead empires, we could never have known that plants and animals, differing specifically from the present, had once lived and flourished on the earth. Some of the animals of which Moses speaks, as having been created on the fifth day, with fishes, the reptiles and fowls for instance, were not brought on the earth until ages subsequent to the existence of light, and of an atmosphere on the earth. In the absence of geology, the natural conclusion has, therefore, been, that Moses gives an account of all that God has done on the earth, in the work of creation, and that all was done in six natural days. With such a view as this, it can not be denied that the facts of geology are in open and direct conflict; and such has been the judgment both of theologians and geologists. On account of this conflict, too extreme parties have arisen, one rejecting geology as opposed to revelation, and, therefore, infidel in its tendency, and subversive of Divine truth; and the other discarding the Bible as unworthy of credit. But as theologians have become better acquainted with the teachings of geology, the stubbornness of its facts have compelled them to seek for some method, by which the two accounts may be reconciled. Their faith is too strong to give up the Bible, and their candor too honest and sincere to deny the facts of geology; and regarding both as the work of God, they know there can be no real contradiction. The geologist, however, feeling himself so completely intrenched by the facts and principles of his science, is contented to leave the reconciliation to the theologian; and hence to the firm believers in the Bible and geology, are we indebted for every effort that has been made to harmonize the two accounts.

With this purpose in view, several theories have been advanced, each of which has its earnest advocates. And where this is the case, it is a matter of no surprise to find objections to all of the theories.

The most prominent of these theories are, 1st. That which makes the days of creation immense and indefinite *periods*. This theory "regards the six days of creation (called the *demiurgic days*), in the Mosaic account, as not literal days of twenty-four hours, but periods of indefinite and unequal length, or as the representatives of indefinite periods."¹

2d. That which makes the days *symbolical* of indefinite periods. "The great advantage of this view of the subject over that which makes the days a figurative representation of long periods is, that hereby we can take the scriptural statement in its plain, literal sense. Yet these literal days may be stretched by symbolization over the widest periods which geology shows to have separated the Divine creative acts."²

¹ Hitchcock's Geology, p. 348, Ed. '59. ² *Ib.*, p. 387, Ed. '60.

3d. That which regards "the Mosaic account as a pictorial representation of the successive productions of the different parts of creation, having truth for its foundation, yet not to be regarded as literally and exactly true. The terms employed, however, are to be understood in their literal sense."¹

4th. That "which is now most extensively adopted among geologists," and which "supposes that Moses merely stated that God created the world in the beginning, without fixing the date of that beginning; and that passing in silence an unknown period of its history, during which the extinct animals and plants found in the rocks might have lived and died, he describes only the present creation, which took place in six literal days, less than 6,000 years ago."²

5th. In addition to the above, Dr. Jno. Pye Smith has proposed such a modification of the last theory, "as in fact to form a new method of reconciling geology with revelation. His principal positions are the following:—1st. The first verse of Genesis describes the creation of the matter of the whole universe, probably in a state of mere elements, at some indefinite epoch in past eternity. 2d. The term create, as used in the subsequent verses of Genesis, describing the work of six days, was designed to express the part of our world which God was adapting for the dwelling of man—and the animals connected with him." 3d. The narrative of six days' work is a "description in expressions adapted to the ideas and capacities of mankind in the earliest ages, of a series of operations, by which the Being of omnipotent wisdom and goodness adjusted and finished, not the earth generally, but as the particular subject under consideration here, a PORTION of its surface for most glorious purposes. This portion of the earth I conceive to have been a large part of Asia, lying between the Caucasian ridge, the Caspian sea, and Tartary, on the north; the Persian and Indian seas on the south, and the high mountain ridges which run at considerable distances on the eastern and western flanks." * * "This region was first by atmospheric and geological causes of previous operations under the will of the Almighty, brought into a condition of superficial ruin or some kind of general disorder." 4th. The sun, moon, and stars were not created on the fourth day; but were then made, constituted, or appointed to be luminaries. 5th. The Noachian deluge was limited to that part of the world occupied by the human race, and therefore we ought not to expect that any traces of it on the globe can now be distinguished from those of previous and analogous deluges."³

Against all of these theories there are strong and solid objections. The difficulties presented are not overcome by any one of them. In regard to the first theory, which supposes the days mentioned by Moses to be long and indefinite periods; that the

¹ Hitchcock's Geology, p. 350, Ed. '60. ² *Ib.*, p. 350.

³ Hitchcock's Theology, p. 352, Ed. of 1859

word day is used in a figurative and not in its literal sense, there is one objection which appears, in my judgment, sufficient to show that this theory can not remove the difficulties presented by the apparent discrepancy between the two accounts of creation. To make a definite period represent an indefinite one, as this theory does, is an abuse and a perversion of symbolical language. The geological periods are confessedly indefinite and unequal; and by what kind of a figure can we represent these by so well a defined period as a day? If the geological periods were definite and equal, like the days of a week, then they might figuratively represent the periods in the geological history of creation. But were these periods as well defined and equal as days, there would yet remain a serious difficulty, which must be removed before the theory could be received. Moses says that six days were consumed in the creation he records; and on this fact is based the division of time into weeks, a most important and significant fact. The geological periods are not limited to six. There have been many creations, as separate and distinct from each other as the present is from the past, the number of which may reach one hundred.¹

And by what forced construction of language can six become the representative of one hundred? There being, then, in these periods neither the definiteness of a day, nor the number as mentioned by the inspired historian, the theory which supposes the days of creation the representatives of indefinite periods, can not be true, and can not, therefore, reconcile the two accounts.

The second theory, as above enumerated, which regards the days of Moses as *symbolical* of indefinite periods, is subject to the same objections as the preceding; for the thing symbolized should be as definite as the symbol. As a day can not *represent* an indefinite period, neither can it *symbolize* it. A day, in the scriptures, is frequently used to represent a year. But here we have two symbolical characters. A year is as definite a period of time as a day, and hence a day can represent or symbolize it. But how can it symbolize an indefinite period? We can not, without a perversion of symbolical language, make a definite and limited object, the symbol of an indefinite and an unlimited one. For these reasons alone we would reject this method of reconciling the two accounts of creation.

The same objection applies with equal force to the theory that the creation is represented by a succession of pictures. If the periods in geological history are not sufficiently definite to be represented or symbolized by days, the panoramic views which represent the periods, could not be so definite in length and number as to be figuratively represented by days. For, if every creation which has taken place on the earth, be a different scene in the panorama, as it ought, then the number of views in the panorama, would be extended far beyond the number of days

¹ Essay on Classification, p. 157.

mentioned by Moses. Either the panorama which is supposed to have passed before the writer while in a trance, fails as a true representation, or Moses was mistaken in the account he has given of the creation. Believing in Moses, we unhesitatingly reject this theory of reconciliation.

The theory which supposes that Moses refers only to the present creation, presents as many difficulties as the preceding. According to the chronology of Moses, and other writers in the Bible, and of profane history, man has been about six thousand years on the earth. We can not positively know that the present species of animals and plants were created with him; that is, the same number of years ago. The present geological period far exceeds that number of years. It embraces all the changes that have taken place, since the close of the Tertiary period. During this time all the deposits of the Drift and Alluvium have taken place. The periods of the Drift and Alluvium are regarded as belonging to the same epoch, and as varieties only of the same formation.¹ It is also called the Post-Tertiary, and consists of "alluvial accumulations in rivers, lakes, and seas during recent times; together with contemporaneous volcanic eruptions, and this series is divisible into two groups, chronologically distinct. 1st. The latest, termed the Human or Modern, comprising superficial deposits, characterized by the remains of man and his works, and of animals and plants contemporaneous with the human race; 2d. (The Pre-historic) similar deposits formed immediately before the introduction of man upon the earth, and containing remains of shell-fish and other animals of still existing species, together with some that are now altogether extinct, and others that are no longer found alive in the localities where their remains occur."²

The older or coarser Drift is almost entirely, if not wholly, destitute of organic remains, but they increase as we ascend through the several stages of modified Drift to the present time. At the commencement of the Drift period, the ocean is supposed to have covered the present land. The submergence of the land which allowed the ocean to cover it to a great depth, closed the Tertiary period, and while the land remained below the waters, that peculiar deposit called the Drift was formed. When the land again emerged from the ocean, the present condition of things had its commencement, and has so continued until the present. The existing species were likely introduced at this time. The period that has elapsed since that time is indeed vast, when compared with man's existence on the earth. Proofs as to the extent of this time are to be found in various places. One of these is supposed to be the cut through which the Niagara river now runs, extending from the falls to the heights of Queenstown, a distance of seven miles. The time required for the recession of the falls from Queenstown to their present locality at the foot of Goat

¹ Hitchcock's Geology, p. 278.

² Wonders of Geology, p. 200.

³ Hitchcock's Geology.

Island, is estimated by Lyell at thirty-five thousand years.¹ "Such facts indicate an antiquity to the drift period little imagined hitherto, and show that the time of man's existence on the globe has been merely a small fraction of the alluvial period."² The creation of a portion, at least, of existing species must have taken place many thousands of years before man is supposed to have made his appearance. The creation of new species has generally taken place after the occurrence of some great change in the physical condition of the earth, by which the existing species were destroyed; and it seems that such changes in the physical conditions of the earth, by which existing species are destroyed, have always preceded the introduction of new species, or the creation of a new world of plants and animals.³

But while the various species of animals which have lived in the different geological ages of the past, may have had their existence on the earth terminated by physical changes; yet many species may have lived out their time, and perished from causes inherent in their organism, before the geological period in which they lived, was terminated by some change in the earth's condition. We know that such has been the case with some species of the present or alluvial period. The fossil mammalia found buried in alluvium in different parts of the world became extinct since the commencement of the present geological period.⁴ When the present races of animals were introduced, whether with those that are now extinct, or immediately following, or whether but a few thousand years ago, geology can not determine. But enough is known to enable us to affirm that the species of the present day reach far back into the past, and antedate, by thousands of years, the human, or historic period. There is every reason to suppose that the land and seas had been teeming with animals for thousands of years when man came upon the earth; and, whether or not, a new world of plants and animals, identical in species with the present, was created *with* him, and during the same week, we can not know. Since, therefore, we can not know that the present living world was introduced when man was created, the theory, which we are now considering, can not reconcile the account which Moses gives with the facts as made known by geology.

But, even admitting that the present living species of plants and animals were created with man, some few thousands of years ago, we then only get clear of a part of the difficulties which this theory involves. What shall we do with the work of the first, second, and fourth days? Did darkness cover the deep during the Paleozoic, Secondary, and Tertiary ages? Was there no aerial ocean enveloping the earth before the human period? Was there no sun, nor moon, nor stars shining on the earth during all the geological ages preceding the present? The geological his-

¹ Principles of Geology, p. 217.

² Hitchcock's Geology, p. 279.

³ Wonders of Geology, p. 124. ⁴ *Ib.*, p. 125. ⁵ Lyell's Elements, p. 143.

tory of the earth shows that light, and air, and sun, and moon, and stars have existed from the earliest ages of the world, in which plants and animals have lived. The work, therefore, of these days can not be included in a creation of plants and animals which may have taken place only a few thousand years ago.

Conscious of this difficulty, and its weight, and the importance of meeting it, Dr. John Pye Smith has proposed such an addition to the interpretation just considered, as, in his judgment, meets these difficulties. The principal points of his theory have been given. This theory makes the creation of man and the species of plants and animals introduced with him local, and confined within the limits he specifies, the western portion of Asia. But is it not evident to every one who looks at the facts of geology, as developed in the history of the earth, that the supposition that this locality was brought into such a state of chaos as to meet the description of Moses, is the purest *assumption*. Such a local chaos, as he imagines, can not possibly be proved. There is no evidence in history, and there is none to be derived from geology, in support of such an hypothesis. Can any one conceive a reason, or a necessity for bringing about such a "superficial ruin" over a very limited area in order to introduce a new species of living beings? In all the changes which have taken place in the past, when superficial ruin, or some kind of general disorder attended the destruction of a living world and the introduction of a new one, did darkness cover the deep? or did no atmosphere exist? or were the sun, and moon, and stars created, or even made light bearers, then for the first time? If such a supposition had not been made, and supported by one of so much learning, it would have been termed preposterous.

While the language of scripture may justify us, in certain instances, in understanding terms of a general import in a restricted sense, yet does this principle of interpretation apply to the terms used in the first chapter of Genesis? The language introducing the fifth day's work is too universal to allow of a limited signification. "And God said: Let the *waters* bring forth abundantly," etc.; and among the animals created on that day, there are myriads which are not found in the seas adjoining the country supposed to have been the theatre of the present creation. Were the aquatic animals of the Arctic seas created in the Mediterranean? Were the fishes and reptiles of the Western Continent created in Asia, and then transported here?

The creation, therefore, which Moses describes, so far, at least, as aquatic animals are concerned, could not have been limited to that district of country. And if we find that the creation was not local in one particular, we have no reason to suppose that it was local in any other, only so far as man himself is concerned. There are many centres of creation, it is true, and every district, whether of land or sea, has plants and animals peculiar to itself, and which are not found elsewhere; but it does not follow

that the species of these several districts were introduced at different times, or at the same time. Man, constituting one species in himself, was limited in his creation to one locality. The different *types* of mankind are not different *species*, having different centres of creation, but one and the same species originating in one locality and diverging from one centre. But while he is necessarily local as to his origin, it does not follow that a local creation was introduced with him; for he has a wider range of habitation than the animals below him. Intended to exist in any part of the earth, why should not provision have been made for him in every part of the earth? Why should the animals associated with him have been limited to one locality and not extended over every part of the earth capable of habitation? Events have proved that the latter has been the case; and wherever man has made his abode, he has there found plants and animals as much adapted to his wants as are those in the district named.

This theory, therefore, must be assigned to the same fate as those which have preceded it; for they all fail, if not equally, yet in important particulars, in reconciling the two accounts of creation.

But though men may fail in their attempts to reconcile these accounts; yet there can be no real conflict between them. They have the same infinitely wise and intelligent author, and *must therefore* be consistent; and a day will come, when they will be found to perfectly agree. The difficulty is still in understanding Moses. The teachings of geology are sufficiently explicit and determined. But the theories of reconciliation, which have been advanced, show that Moses is not yet understood; and here we will find the true cause of failure in every theory which may yet be advanced, that shall fail in reconciling the account given by Moses with the acknowledged teachings of geology.

We may, therefore, still inquire, What does Moses teach? What does he intend to communicate to us in his history of creation? It must be remembered that Moses wrote this history some twenty-five hundred years after man was created. At that time much had been developed in man's history. The overthrow and destruction of the world by the deluge of Noah had carried every human being from the face of the earth, with the exception of eight souls. The new world had been largely peopled by the family of Noah. The Israelites at the time of this writing, were but a small fraction of the inhabitants of the earth, and they numbered, when they left Egypt, about three millions. Abraham had lived and died, and made a name as imperishable as eternity. God had made covenants with this man, the fulfilment of which lay centuries in the future. But much of God's purposes had already been developed. Melchizidek had lived and died, and left to the world an order of priesthood which was to find no representative among his children until Shiloh should come. Many steps had been taken in the development of a remedial system;

and man had had clear and unmistakeable promises that he should find a Redeemer to deliver him from sin. This thought now became prominent, and pervaded, and shaped, and gave color to all the events of man's eventful history. The history of man from his fall and expulsion from Eden, to the enslavement of the descendants of Abraham in the land of Egypt, was before the mind of the writer of Genesis. The great and leading events in this history stood out prominently above the rest; and the thoughts which were developed by these events, were those which especially engaged the mind of the writer. The history of man *as involved in sin*, was that which chiefly, if not solely, interested the author of Genesis. Other events in his history, not connected with this thought, are passed over in silence, or but casually mentioned. The great chain-thought of his history is that which connects the events which relate to man's ruin by sin, and his recovery by a remedial system.

Standing, then, with Moses, on an elevation of more than twenty centuries, and looking down on the past, let us see how he commences man's most eventful history.

The creation of the material universe from nothing, and the vast ages that elapsed before man came upon the earth, during which the organic world was created and perfected, is described in a few words, and detains him but a moment. The ages that passed away from the time that matter was created and molded into worlds, to the period when the earth became fitted for the existence of living creatures, are represented by one word, and their history told in a few lines: "In the beginning, God created the heaven and the earth, And the earth was without form and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep." And the history of the vast ages, that had expired, and been buried in the tomb of eternity, from the time that the spirit of God moved over the face of the waters, and God said "Light be, and light was," to the time that man came upon the earth, the grand master-piece of creation, the

"Lord of the fowl and the brute,"

is comprised in fewer words than the centuries that composed those ages. And in this brief and graphic sketch, what does he propose to tell us? First, and most prominent of all, that *man was created by God, placed in Eden, became an associate of God, and fell by transgression*. And as prefatory to man's creation, he tells of the creation of the world, and the plants and animals, that are upon it, and of the creation of the sun, and moon, and stars, that man might most assuredly know that God was the creator of all that he saw above, beneath, and around him. To do this, would require but a moment's time and but a few sentences. To do more, would swell his history to useless and unnecessary dimensions, and encumber it with subjects altogether foreign to his purpose. He, therefore, proceeds to say, in general terms, that God created the heaven and the earth; the

sun, the moon, and stars; that he brought light upon the earth, and enveloped the world with an air-ocean, in which all air-breathing creatures should live; that he made the world of plants, and all the animals that swim in the seas, and rivers, and lakes, and that live upon the land; and, last of all, that he made man, after his own image, and according to his own likeness; and then ceased from his work. All this is said to have been done in six days; and that God rested on the seventh, and made it sacred and holy, to be observed as a day of rest and religious meditation in time to come.

In this fact we have the foundation and reason for that division of time termed a week. The natural divisions of time are the day and the year, the one being based on the fact that the earth makes a complete revolution on its axis in a day, and the other on the fact that it makes its complete circuit around the sun in a year. But the week is a divine institution, based on the fact that God made the world, and all things that are in it in six days, and rested on the seventh. The institution of the week shows that the term day is used in its ordinary signification, to indicate a period of twenty-four hours. Seven natural days stood before the mind of Moses in the institution of the week; hence we must understand the six days of creation as being six natural days.

The institution of the week is a singular and interesting fact. It has primal and special reference to man, and especially to his spiritual nature. It was designed to conform to the physical and moral constitution of man; and to these elements of his nature is the institution of the week perfectly adapted. It is also singular in the fact that it consists of seven days. The last day of the week, being made a day of rest and of religious meditation, shows that his physical nature demands this rest from labor, and that his spiritual nature demands a day, when the cares of life shall be thrown aside, and the mind directed to the Giver of all his blessings, and his heart made to realize that the great God is ever present with him, and is the author of all his enjoyments.

With God the end is seen from the beginning. Man being the great thought and purpose of this world, it, and all things in it, are and were created with sole and special reference to him. Hence the week was seen from the beginning, and was instituted, in the designs of God, in perfect conformity to man's nature. In the great system, to which man belongs, and whose purpose and object he fulfills and completes, all the elements that constitute the system are in perfect harmony and adaptation to each other and to the whole; and the first step in the establishment of that system has as much reference to the last as to the one immediately succeeding it; and the last, in the mind of the designer, is as much, and as intimately connected with the first, as the first is with the last. While, therefore, the week is a divine institution, it has also a natural foundation, so far as it depends on the fact that God created the world in six days and rested on the seventh.

God is represented as creating the world in this number of days, in order that man might have a solid foundation for the institution of the week, and for the duties which grow out of it.

But when we come to examine the work which God has done in the earth, we find that, not only was this work *not* done in six literal days, but that it *could not* have been done in that time. Here is a startling fact which has surprised and confounded the believer in the Mosaic account of creation. But this surprise and confusion have resulted from the fact that we have not understood Moses.

We must endeavor first to understand Moses, and when we have attained to this, we may then see whether or not there is really any discrepancy between his account and that which we have in the science of geology.

Looking, then, at both accounts, and regarding each as equally worthy of credit, and equally true, can we find that Moses uses the word day symbolically, and represents by them some features in the creation which are as distinct from each other as one day is from another? and that the number of these features correspond to the number of the days in a week? If this be true, a day will then represent or symbolize one of the features. A literal meaning is demanded for day by the fact of the week; and a metaphorical or symbolical, by the facts of creation.

We have said that the week has a natural foundation. It must conform to some great facts in the creation. No such foundation is found for the week in any of the theories yet advanced for the purpose of reconciling the facts of creation as revealed by geology, with the account given by Moses. If we can discover any great, and leading, and distinct facts in the history of creation as revealed in the works of God, so isolated and separated as days are from each other, we may be able to perceive the fitness and propriety of the institution of the week, the days of which shall represent fitly these facts.

The theory we now propose, by which to reconcile the account of Moses with the facts of creation, discovers the foundation of the week in nature; and shows why there are but seven, and could have been but seven days in the week, founded as it is on the facts of creation. In the view which we propose to take of the subject, we regard the days as symbolizing the *departments* of creation, or the separate and distinct *divisions* which Moses has made in his account. These are, 1st. Light. 2d. The expanse, or heaven, the atmosphere, which envelopes the earth. 3d. The creation of the Vegetable Kingdom. 4th. The creation of aquatic animals. 5th. The creation of land animals. 6th. The creation of the heavenly bodies, the sun, moon, and stars. And 7th. The completion of his work, and the resting from his labors.

It will be observed that these divisions of creation, embracing the material and organic worlds, are complete and distinct, and

as much isolated from one another as the days are, that constitute the week. Each division, or department, is a complete circle in itself, and may be well and properly represented, or symbolized by a circle of time, equally complete, such as the day. Such a representation conforms to the principle that governs symbols, which requires that the thing symbolized shall be as perfect, distinct, and complete in itself, as the symbol which is used to represent it,

That the day is used in the sacred scriptures as a symbol is universally admitted; and it is always the symbol of an object as complete and distinct as itself. Many other things are used as symbols, and some of them for the period, year; but the same principle governs them all. In the vision which was granted to Pharaoh, and which disclosed events soon to happen, events of the most important character and interest to his kingdom, we find that years are represented by symbols very appropriate in their character. The seven full, fat ears of corn (heads of wheat) that he saw growing vigorously from the earth, and the seven blasted and withered ears that sprang up after the good ears, and devoured them, were beautiful symbols of the seven years of plenty, and the seven years of famine, that came upon the land of Egypt. The same beautiful symbolization is seen in the "seven fat and well-favored cattle," and the "seven lean and ill-favored cattle," which represented the same events soon to occur.

The interpreter of these dreams himself had dreams, in which symbols equally admirable and appropriate as those in Pharaoh's dreams were used. The events which were to occur in the history of Joseph, were clearly foreshadowed in his two remarkable dreams. In his first, he saw, when he and his brethren were binding sheaves in the field, his own stand up, and those of his brethren stand around his, and make obeisance to it. How literally this dream was fulfilled may be seen in the events of his surpassingly interesting history. In his second dream, he saw the sun, and moon, and eleven stars make obeisance to him. The purport of these symbols was too clear not to be seen by the venerable patriarch, who had, himself, some knowledge of the significance of symbols, and said, "Shall I and thy mother, and thy brethren indeed come to bow down ourselves to thee to the earth?" We have in these dreams, sheaves of grain and the heavenly bodies representing men; and the symbols are just as distinct and complete entities, as the persons symbolized. There are no more beautiful symbols in the scriptures than these, by which Joseph was foreshadowed as governor of Egypt, and his brethren as paying homage to him when they went down into Egypt to buy provisions. The Bible is a book of symbols; and these examples are sufficient to show the peculiar language in which God seems to take pleasure in speaking to men; and that here, in the first chapter of the first book of the Divine Volume, there is no forced construction of the language of Moses, when

we regard his days of creation as symbolizing the grand divisions of the Kingdom of Nature, which he has made in his history, and which conform so perfectly to the natural divisions, or departments of creation.

Regarding, then, the six days of creation as symbolical of the grand divisions of one great system, we may include every creation, occurring in these divisions, from the earliest to the latest periods, under the one symbol; and whether there have been but one, or many creations, it matters not, since the department to which it belongs is represented by one symbol. We know that light and air must have existed before any living creature was made; since there is no life in the absence of these. Now, finding that both plants and animals existed innumerable ages in the past, we know that light and air must have existed, not only then, but before their creation. And through all the ages of the past they have existed, and during these ages have witnessed many creations as complete and distinct as the first, or the last. We know also that vegetable and animal organisms existed in the same remote period, and have existed from that period to the present, and that there have been many creations in these kingdoms during the long interval between the paleozoic and alluvial ages. But all the creations of plants and animals were only different species belonging to the great kingdoms of the organic worlds; and whether they were introduced in this, or that age, it matters not, since the day does not symbolize the different and various *creations* of the kingdoms, but the *kingdom itself, and the kingdom alone*; so that, whether light and air existed, or whether plants and animals were created, in the paleozoic, secondary, tertiary, or present age, it is altogether immaterial, since all are represented or symbolized in the department of creation to which each belongs.

The sun, moon, and stars are included in the six days' work, because they are materially connected with this world. Moses does not say that these bodies were created on the fourth day, or that they were made "light bearers" on that day. But we presume to say that he simply intended to show their connection and relation to the earth; and that God made them for the purposes therein stated, that they "should divide the day from the night," and be for "signs, and for seasons, and for days, and for years," and that they should "give light upon the earth, the greater light to rule the day, and the lesser light to rule the night."

The light of the sun, was the light of the first day; for the phenomenon of day and night was the result of its creation, or existence. This is too evident to require any argument. The facts and principles of astronomy demonstrate it. It is attested by the facts of geology, and the laws which govern the organic kingdom. When those heavenly bodies were created we know not; nor do we know when the earth was created. Moses says it was "in the beginning;" and as these heavenly bodies are com-

posed of the same kind of matter as that of the earth,¹ we may reasonably conclude that they and the earth were all made "in the beginning." It can not be, then, that Moses intended to say that these bodies were not created until after the creation of the vegetable kingdom; nor, that *they* were created in *one* day, while the earth required more. The facts of geology prove that the same light which exists now, existed in the earliest ages of the earth. There is no other light known to us that could have given rise to the phenomena described by Moses, or have answered the ends and wants of the organic world, but that which proceeds from the sun, and moon, and stars.

The divisions of the material and organic worlds, which Moses has made, are complete. We can conceive of no others. There are but six, and hence we have in the week a corresponding number of days. If there were any reason, in the plan of God, why there should have been this number of days, and no more than this number, in which it is said he created the world and all things that are in it, that reason must be in the fact here stated. These days represent the *work* of creation. Another was added to those, on which it is said God rested from his work. A day being assigned for this rest, the number is seven, and completes the full week.

In regard to the rest of God, the day is evidently used symbolically. It symbolizes an *event*; and we have presumptive evidence in this fact, to say the least, that the other days of the week are used in a similar sense. The rest of God still continues; and we know not that he will ever again renew his work; and the seventh day, therefore, must, beyond all question, *symbolize the fact*, that he had then completed his work.

This view is made still more evident by the fact that the seventh day or sabbath, also symbolizes another rest, which rest, is heaven. So the apostle reasons in the 4th chapter of his letter to the Hebrews; and concludes: "There remaineth, therefore, a sabbath—an eternal rest—for the people of God." We, therefore, see that the seventh day does not only symbolize the rest which God made from his works, but also through it the rest which he has promised the people of God. This is a significant and interesting fact. When man rested from the labor and toil of the week, according to the example and command of God, he found in this day of rest, a repose for his weary frame, the more appreciated because of his labor and toil. His mind relieved from the immediate cares and duties of life, he could then turn his thoughts to God, and meditate upon his works, and the providences which he had manifested in behalf of the interest and welfare of man. He could then meditate upon the judgments of God against sin, and lament his own lost and ruined condition; and then turning to the promises of God, then but feebly marked out, and espe-

¹ Plurality of Worlds, p. 130. Spectroscopic Analysis has demonstrated this since Whewell wrote his work.

cially to that which gave hope of a rest from the toils and cares of life, he could look forward with hope and resignation to the redemption, foreshadowed in these promises. The day thus becomes a pledge and foretaste of that sabbath, which shall be given to the weary and sin-bound prisoner of earth; a redemption from the vicissitudes of a sinful state, and a rest which shall be broken no more by toil and sin.

The theory we have now proposed, by which to reconcile the history of creation, as given by Moses, with the facts of geology, meets all the difficulties of the case. The interpretation here given of the Mosaic account does no violence to the language of the Sacred Volume. It conforms to the language of symbols as used in the scriptures, and fully reconciles the account as given by the sacred historian with the facts of creation as developed by geology. If the days of creation are used by Moses as symbols—and that the seventh is, we know—I imagine that we can find no more appropriate object for these symbols than those presented in this theory. However that may be, the justness and correctness of the view here presented, are left to the decision of those who have thought and meditated on these subjects.

CHAPTER V.

INTRODUCTION OF SIN INTO THIS WORLD.

SECTION I. EDEN.

Eastward, in the land of Eden, the Lord God planted a garden, in which he caused "to grow every tree which is pleasant to the sight, and good for food; the tree of life also in the midst of the garden, and the tree of knowledge of good and evil." * * * "And the Lord God took the man, and put him into the garden of Eden to dress and to keep it," and gave him permission to eat of *every* tree of the garden, but "the tree of the knowledge of good and evil." In this delightful garden the Lord was accustomed to walk, and commune with Adam, and to impart to him a knowledge of the works he had made, and of the duties and obligations he owed to God as his creator. For this association and communion Adam was qualified by the spiritual nature of his being; for these was he created in the image of God.¹ The beasts of the field, however intelligent, were not admitted to such a privilege, nor qualified for such a communion and association. *They were made* to subserve man's interests while on the earth, and to complete the organic system with which man is essentially connected; but *man was made* for the society and communion of God.

Eden was the natural or normal state of man, as heaven is of angels. The communion of the pure and holy angels was his communion in Eden. Eden was a place selected by God, and in the choicest spot of that country was the garden planted. This garden was cut off from the world around by an inclosure,² and made a peculiar and sacred spot in this world of change and disas-

¹ There has been much speculation as to *what* constitutes this image. Some suppose it to be the *moral nature* of man, and this, I believe, is the generally received opinion. Whatever it is, this much is certain: that it is something that distinguishes man categorically from animals. (Gen. 1: 26). Something must be found in him, which is not found in animals. Animals possess mind. Of this there is now no doubt. We have also seen, in a previous chapter, that they have a *moral nature*. Man possesses every attribute that an animal has, and something more, and this, whatever it is, must be the image. What this is, nature can not inform us; but revelation tells us that man is a spirit-being; that *the man*—the *Ego*, is a spirit-being, capable of existing independent of, and isolated from, the body. This spirit-being is the image, since God is essentially a spirit-being.

² Gen. 3: 24.

ter. It was a place made appropriate for the presence of God, and there man enjoyed all that his nature is capable of receiving. Beyond were darkness and distress; within were the light and happiness of the presence of God. There he had all that was necessary to preserve his body from death, and his spirit in the enjoyment of the highest happiness. There he had all that God could give him, or his nature enjoy. The world gave him food, and God made his home Eden. Communion between congenial spiritual natures is the highest condition of happiness, and the society arising from such association and communion is the highest possible to created beings, and these man possessed and enjoyed in Eden.

But man is a psychical as well as a spiritual being; and if he had in Eden all that this two-fold nature demanded, he had also a society that met the wants of his psychical and spiritual natures. The being who constituted the essential element of this society, was woman, made *of* man, and *for* man. Her creation was peculiar. It differed from the creation of every other being. Sexes among the animals made no distinction as to the mode of their creation. Each was created separately and distinctly, with no kind of connection or dependence between them, except that which connects them as essential and integral members of the Reproductive System. And it is reasonable to suppose that the sexes of the animals were created at the same time, as well as in the same manner, as separately and distinctly, indeed, as sexes among Plants. But *man*, we are told, was *first* made, then the woman,¹ and "the woman *of* the man." This is a strange and singular fact, the import of which must be truly significant. It seems to indicate that something more is to exist among men than is found among animals; that out of this shall arise a *social* state, a state now found to distinguish the human species from all others on the earth. It would seem that this mode of creation was designed to indicate the foundation on which society among men was to rest, and the means by which man's social feelings were to be rendered durable and permanent through all the vicissitudes through which he might have to pass. Had woman not been derived from man in the way she was, there is much reason to believe that no higher grade of society could exist among men, than exists among animals. But, being derived from the man, connections were thereby formed, so intimate and strong as, in the language of Paul, to "make the two one flesh." This unity is founded, not only on the existence of the social feelings, but especially on the strength, and permanency, and nature of their attachments. Animals possess like moral passions with men, such as love and hatred; but the passions which bring them together in herds or flocks, are too feeble and evanescent to establish among them, what we call *society*. That among them, which resembles society among men, is but

¹ Tim. 2: 13.

gregarious association, depending on a feeling too feeble and indistinct to be classed among the *social* affections. But man is essentially a *social* being. Social passions are peculiar to him. These passions rest both on his psychical and spiritual natures. So far as they are *psychical*, they are common to all animals; but so far as they are spiritual, they are peculiar to man. The *nature* of these affections seems to rest on the *psychical* nature; their *strength and permanency* in man wholly on the *spiritual*. These natures meeting and coalescing in man, obscure in him the line of demarkation between the psychical and spiritual emotions, affections, and passions.

It was a singular means that God adopted to establish and render permanent the social state among men. This fact, in contrast with what we suppose was the case in the creation of the lower animals, would seem designed to assure us that this was the only means by which a *social* state could be established for and among men, and the only means by which that state could be rendered stable and permanent. By such a derivation, peculiar links and connections were formed, which so bind and connect two souls as to unitize two spiritual and congenial natures. On the part of man, there is a variety of emotions excited, which bind him firmly and strongly to the woman as the object of his whole heart's affection. So peculiar is this psychical passion, love, when placed on her as its object, that it excludes all other objects, and makes her the only idol of his heart. In addition to the feelings of the heart, there is one of the mind, equally strong and durable, the conviction of a *charge*, similar to that which the father feels in regard to his children, and this feeling strengthens, deepens, and renders durable all the emotions and feelings of his mind and heart, which bind him to woman, who, through these, "becomes bone of his bone and flesh of his flesh." On her part, there are the same feelings and emotions, the same love and affection, and even a more permanent and unflinching devotion, strengthened by an opposite feeling of the mind and heart, that of *dependence* on him. This feeling of dependence is manifested in every relation of life; it is written on her very nature. It is a part of her being, separable only in an abnormal condition of the soul. It is the most beautiful and lovely trait of her character, or feeling of her nature. It is in exact antithesis to the opposite or correlative feeling in man, and like two material objects, having a proper affinity, meet, coalesce, and form one body, or soul. From these emotions and passions of the psychical and spiritual natures of man arises this union of hearts, which constitutes the *connubial* relation, known only among men, on which the whole fabric of human society rests. Permanency is one of the essential features of this union or relation. It continues from the day it is formed until closed by death, cementing and solidifying two congenial spiritual natures, and linking the heart by numerous cords to the objects of its deepest and purest affection. Love is

this great binding power, originating in God, and permeating and controlling every pure and holy being. It is known among animals, since they possess an intellectual and a moral nature; but in them it is as evanescent as youth, and with its death, perishes the relation that existed between parent and offspring. But not so with mankind. They were intimately connected in their creation, and they are indissolubly united through life.

Besides, the affections of men, being more spiritual than psychical, are aroused by means and objects not appreciable by merely psychical creatures. He is moved and influenced by the "true, the beautiful, and the good," subjects which lie entirely beyond the psychical faculties of animals. Beauty, goodness, and loveliness exist not for them; but these are the powers which excite man's emotions and mold his character. When that beautiful and charming creature, Eve, who was created *from and for* him, probably the most beautiful and fascinating woman that ever stirred man's affections to their profoundest depths,—when she stood before Adam, fresh from the hands of God, robed in all her womanly loveliness and sweetness, we may easily imagine the emotions and amazement of his mind, and the electric flash that made his heart bound and glow with inexpressible love. Charmed by her surpassing loveliness, he felt his soul drawn to her by the strongest affections of his exalted nature. She was to him the most endeared object of his heart, for whom he instinctively felt ready and willing to sacrifice all, and to adhere to her firmly, closely, and solely, and to give to her all the strength of his heart, to devote to her welfare all the energies of his being, and last of all, if need be, life itself, if by these he might preserve her from suffering or harm.

On her part, as we have said, there is the feeling of dependence and unreserved reliance on his strength and wisdom, excited by the highest and purest interests and feeling of her nature, inwrought into her very being, and manifested in every impulse and attachment of her heart, evoking the deepest and tenderest sympathies and love, and the greatest devotion and self-sacrifice that man is capable of exhibiting.

In the command which God gave them, when he placed them in the garden, he regarded them as connected, on the somatic side of their being, with the organic kingdom of this world.¹ From the provisions that were made for him in the garden, it is evident that God regarded these as necessary for the perpetuation of his animal life. That he needed food for this purpose *in the garden*, is a necessary conclusion from his connection with the organic world. As to his body, he was as much a part of the organic kingdom, as were the fruits of the garden, which were provided for his daily sustenance. For no other object was he commanded "to dress and keep it."

¹ Gen. 1: 29; 2: 9.

Some men, however, have imagined, notwithstanding these facts, that he was created *immortal*; and that he did not become mortal until he sinned; that it was, indeed, the *act* of transgression that made him *mortal* as well as a sinner. Some are such firm believers in his primitive immortality, that they believe that his sin brought *death in the world at large*, not only to himself, but to the animals with which he is associated in the organic kingdom; that death was unknown in the world before his transgression.¹

It is difficult to understand how such an opinion could ever have found a lodgment in a reflecting and well informed mind. It has not the slightest foundation either in nature or in revelation. The facts of nature fully demonstrate that death has been the lot of all animals from the remotest period of the world's long history; that all animals are essentially and necessarily mortal, and must eventually die. Of this fact there is not the shadow of a doubt. The proofs of it are really and actually piled mountains high. Evidences of this fact are seen in the remains of animals now imbedded in the strata of the earth's crust. The skeletons of animals that once roamed over the earth, and swarmed in the seas, ages before man was placed in Eden, are to be found in the Zoological Museums of almost every country. The principles of Physiology also prove, beyond all questioning, that *all animals are necessarily mortal*. All that is organic will and must perish; and if man is an organized being, as he is, he, too, is essentially and necessarily mortal. If he was immortal in Eden, the scriptures do not state it, nor can it be clearly inferred from them. That he was, is wholly an inference, based on a misconception of the consequences of his transgression, an inference not warranted by the facts of the scriptures. These tell us that *food* was provided for man while in the garden; and of the uses of food we know nothing except from the principles of Physiology, and this informs us that food is demanded on account of the perishable nature of man's body. It is, therefore, positively certain that man was as mortal in Eden as he is out of it; and that he would as certainly have died in Eden as he does out of it, if it had not been for the provision of the Tree of Life. Because of his mortal nature both the ordinary and extraordinary food of the garden were provided. There is no other conceivable reason for their provision.

The only kind of immortality that man enjoyed in Eden, was the immortality secured by the fruit of the tree of life. But this immortality was provisional, not inherent, as in the bodies of angels and immortalized men. It was merely derivative, depending solely on the use of the life *perpetuating* fruit. Its virtues consisted in its powers to resist and prevent the wasting or disintegration of the body, and to renew and invigorate constantly the vital force, and thus perpetuate life by counteracting the ten-

¹ Kitto Encyclop. Art. Sacrifice.

dency to decay and death in the same manner, but to a far greater extent, as the ordinary food does in man's extra-Eden state. The use of man's faculties, as he lives from day to day, naturally tends to the destruction of the body. This is a fact now well established. And it is equally as well established that food is necessary to the preservation of the life of the body. The ordinary food on which we live, gives us a partial immunity from death. The fruit of the tree of life gave this immunity longer and more certainly; for it not only prolonged life, but preserved the body from disease and degeneration. It perpetuated whilst the ordinary food only prolonged. The tree of life, therefore, was designed to afford Adam a fruit which would give him immunity from disease and death just so long as he had access to it, and would use it. This was all the immortality that Adam enjoyed or possessed while in Eden. This conclusion is made still more certain by the fact that, when he was denied access to this fruit, he wasted and died.

It has been supposed by some that if Adam had tasted this fruit but once, he would have lived forever; that once eating would have planted immortality in his body. This supposition is on the other extreme, and discovers as little attention to the facts of the case as the other. The fruit of this tree was not interdicted. They were granted the privilege of eating of *every* tree of the garden, but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. If Adam would have become immortal by eating of this fruit once, then *it* also ought to have been forbidden. For, in the event of his sinning, a contingency which ought to have been provided for, he would have lived forever in a state of sin, and this would have made his salvation impossible. This conclusion is made clear by the provisions of the Remedial System; for by it *death* is shown to be an indispensable means of salvation.

The provisions of the garden looked to man's continued presence and communion with God. They contemplated only the relations of Eden, not those beyond its sacred inclosure. This relation was one of favor with God, in which God and man communed personally and directly. It was essentially the relation of the angels in heaven. To preserve him in this relation the tree of life was provided, whose fruit had the power of preserving his life so long as he had access to it. Without this fruit the presence and communion of God would have been lost to him through the death of his body, perishing from its inherent mortality. The relation of favor and communion required the existence of the fruit of the tree of life. This relation lost, it was of no more use to man.

That the object of the tree of life was what we have conceived it to be, is further evident from the fact that, when the sinning pair were expelled from the garden, the tree of life was guarded by an angel, and access to it denied them, lest they should continue to eat, and live forever in a state of sin. Had this tree

gone with them in their banishment, death of the body would never have overtaken them, and they would have lived forever; and their condition then would have been the same essentially as that of the lost angels.

In a state of sin, death is a blessing to the race, a greater blessing, indeed, than life itself; for by death, man may again reach his Eden relations with God. Immortality in a state of sin would make every man a sinner; and then the earth, which God had been so many ages in fitting up for man, would have presented the state and condition of Tartarus, where the lost angels are "suffering the vengeance of eternal life." The scenes of Gehenna would be witnessed on earth, which neither floods, nor flame; neither famine, nor pestilence, nor war, could obliterate.

The dresser and the keeper gone, the garden went to decay. Rank weeds grew where flowers once bloomed, and thorns sprang up where fruit trees once flourished and yielded their perennial food. The tree of life withered and perished, and left no seed to preserve it on the earth. But that tree, like man, will live again, and bloom in an Eden of perpetual life and bliss, where sin shall no more insinuate its hateful form, and carry its blighting curse; and from which there shall be no more banishment. There man shall again eat of that fruit, and live forever.

SECTION 2. THE FALL.

A large majority of mankind believe that man is now in a preternatural state. All who believe the Bible to be a revelation from God, and an authentic history of the events which it relates, believe that man once enjoyed the personal communion and favor of God, and that he lost these by transgression. They believe further, that that act of transgression brought sin in the world, and the consequences which have followed that transgression, and man's expulsion from Eden. They also believe that there was a *sinful* quality attaching to that act of transgression, which is a graver quality of an act than the word *moral* describes. They believe that this quality of an act arises from the fact that God has spoken his will to man, and given him certain and specific commands. They, in a word, believe the Mosaic account of the history of creation, and of the introduction of sin among men, and the reality of that quality which the Bible ascribes to the actions of men. This is now the general belief and sentiment of mankind, wherever the light of the Bible has enlightened the minds of men. Hence the general conscience, based on this general conviction, feels and realizes the fact that the actions of men have a *sinful* character.

Believing that man once enjoyed in Eden the favor of God, and that that favor and communion were lost by transgression, to the loss of these blessings men have applied the term Fall. The term is used by some as embracing more than the loss of the blessings and privileges of Eden, believing that man's *moral nature* was *degraded* by that act of sin, and to that degree, as to have impaired the natural strength and vigor of his spiritual faculties. In these pages the term will be used in its more general sense, embracing only the loss of the favor and communion of God.¹

There are some men, however, who, pretending to believe in the Bible as a revelation from God, do yet, indeed, deny many of the most important facts recorded in it. Others there are, who, more bold and consistent, deny the great facts recorded by Moses in regard to man's Eden relation with God, and the events which are said to have occurred in that hallowed spot. They deny that man was ever in a state higher, or different from that in which we now find him; and say that the story of the Fall is a myth, and the existence of sin the creature of a superstitious imagination. Hence they do not believe that the actions of men have a *sinful* character. Crime, with these men, is only an offense against the rights of society or of individuals, not a *sin against God*. They do not, indeed, deny that the actions of men have a *moral* character. This they can not deny. But *morality* with them has reference solely to *men*, none whatever to *God*. In denying the *existence of sin*, they of course deny that the actions of men have a *sinful* character, however criminal the actions may be. They look upon criminal actions as no more than simple violations of moral laws, which men have wrought out and ordained for the government of men. These laws have not a foreign origin, as the revelation of God, but are the simple and untaught expressions of the human soul, impressed upon it by God in its creation. They believe that this is all the moral law that man has or needs, and that man's actions are but the expressions of this natural law. With these men, every thing in the moral world happens according to invariable and well established laws; every thing is governed by law, and that natural and necessary results follow its violation. They affect to believe that the laws of the moral world are as invariable and rigid as the laws of the physical world, and that the results or consequences, in the way of blessings and punishments, are just as certain and unavoidable, as effects following causes in the physical world. Man, with these men, is as much under the control of law as the dead matter of the physical world. The actions of men are but the inevitable effects of causes, and hence can no more be the objects of praise or blame than the effects of physical causes.

Hence, with these philosophers, the existence of sin and the events of Eden, are all fables, which originated in the days of darkness and superstition, but which the light of civilization

¹Gal. v:4. Heb. xii:15.

will finally and wholly dispel from the mind and banish from the world. They tell us also that revelation is not only a myth, but an impossibility;¹ that man of himself, by his own inherent powers of mind, is capable of discovering every truth, and of determining every question, which involves his interests in any of the relations of life. The great guides of these men are Reason and Intuition, which determine the quality of the actions of men; and their teaching constitutes all that we know or believe of *religion*.² This is the crudest Deism, seeing nothing more in God than simply the originating cause of the universe, having no other participation in its management and government than what he effects by the laws, physical and moral, which he established in the beginning.

But a simple denial of the facts of Eden and of the existence of sin is not alone sufficient to drive a belief of them from the human mind. They are firmly believed by a majority of the best minds that have ever adorned our nature, and we may crowd these philosophers with the question, Whence this belief? It will not do to say, that these notions originated in the days of ignorance and superstition, before man had emerged from a state of barbarism; that civilization found these notions existing among a mass of equally superstitious notions and beliefs, and that the existence of the one class is no more difficult to be accounted for than the other; and that their present existence is no proof that they had a rational origin. They would thus push the difficulty from them. But the believer in revelation must be excused if he still prefers to believe that the Bible gives, not only the most, but the only rational, account of the origin of those ideas which relate to facts and beliefs which he finds now so prevalent in the world, especially when this account is supported by the deductions of the soundest philosophy, and stands uncontradicted by any fact in nature.

That the universal conviction as to the *sinful* character of the actions of men is a deduction of the human reason, we are justified by these philosophers of Reason and Intuition in denying. They maintain that neither Reason nor Intuition has ever suggested such a thought, and that it can not, therefore, be true. This conclusion could not be questioned if man had been left to these sources of knowledge. Enlightened Reason has never made so immodest a claim. It knows nothing of the unseen world, nor of the attributes of God which have been developed by the Remedial System; and the believer in Revelation is not at all surprised to hear Reason say that it knows nothing of such matters. He knows that sin is the quality of an act, that has reference to a being of whose judgment respecting it we can know nothing beyond what he has made known. If he has never made known to man this judgment, then this knowledge is be-

¹ Eclipse of Faith.

² Buckle's History of Civilization, p. 468, vol. 2.

yond the possible reach of man. But the human mind has a knowledge of sin. It believes that some actions are *sinful*; and since man could not have originated this idea himself, it must have been imparted to him by some one who knew the fact. As God is the only being in the universe, who knew this fact, this knowledge must have been derived from him. This conclusion being incontrovertible, we can readily perceive the force and drift of the logic of these philosophers: No sin, no revelation. They reason sometimes on one line, and sometimes on another; but the end and the design are always the same, to eject Revelation from the world, or drive the belief in the divine authenticity of the Bible from the human mind.

But let us press the universal conviction of mankind in regard to the sinful character of the actions of men; for this conviction contradicts their conclusion, and shows the fallacy of their reasoning. The statute book of every nation recognizes the existence of this quality in human actions. Crime is everywhere regarded as *worthy of punishment*, not simply a deed the repetition of which ought to be *prevented*. Society has ordained *punishments* for crimes, not simply means of *preventing* a further repetition. So long as men ordain punishments for crimes, so long will they regard crime as possessing a *sinful* character, and hence worthy of *punishment*, and not only *worthy* of it, but imperatively demanding it. But when such deeds as men now regard as crimes, shall lose their *sinful* character, and come to be regarded as possessing merely a *moral* quality, as merely *offenses* against the *rights* of individuals, or of society, then will they cease to ordain punishments, and only institute means that will secure society against their repetition. In proportion as we shall see this false philosophy—the philosophy that denies the existence of sin,—prevail, in that proportion will we see the effort made to govern men by the laws of their moral and intellectual being, which laws, these philosophers say, inhere as truly in the souls of men, as do the physical forces in the inorganic world. This delusion leaves men to the full play of their passions, with no restraint upon their indulgence other than that which the laws of their organism exercise, all foreign aid, such as the revelation of God has made known, being impatiently spurned and rejected. To this state would this vain philosophy bring the world, and to these laws leave it to work out its own development, just as the physical agents have developed the physical world, bringing it from a rude and disordered state to its present condition, in which we find it well suited and adapted to the existence of the highest grades of plants and animals. To leave man to these agents and powers alone, and to make his moral and spiritual development depend solely on the agency of the laws of his organism, as the physical world is dependent on physical agents for its improvement, is to reduce him to the level of dead matter, and make him as much a subject of inexorable and invariable

law, as is the matter of the inorganic world, and to deny him any agency or will in the determination of his own actions.¹ Being thus a subject of laws which he can not determine or control, he can not be regarded as responsible for his actions; no sinful character can be ascribed to them. They are no more the objects of praise or blame than are the physical effects of physical causes. To such straits are infidels driven in their opposition to revelation, in order to impair its influence over the minds and hearts of the great mass of mankind; or to hush the monitions of conscience in regard to the destiny which the human mind instinctively fears may follow death, or the account which men may have to give in another world of their life on the earth. Under the threatenings and restraints of the Bible, there is a feeling of unrest, dread, and uncertainty; and they feel, if the Bible could be banished from the world, that the mind would be relieved of this unnecessary, yet irrepressible, anxiety in regard to a future life.

Fortunately for the world of mankind, Infidelity is never consistent. Error is always, and of necessity must be, contradictory. Hence it can give nothing that is permanent or satisfactory. A line of argument pursued by one writer will be certain to run counter to a line pursued by another. It is never steady nor consistent, always changing, but never improving, although it boasts much of progress. Since such is its character, we are justified by the soundest reason and wisdom in adhering to our belief and confidence in the divine authenticity of the Holy Scriptures, and consequently in the correctness and truthfulness of its statements, especially when this record accounts satisfactorily for facts which no human philosophy has ever been able to understand or explain. We therefore turn with confidence, and with a feeling of certainty, to the history of the Bible, to find there a full and satisfactory solution of all the moral phenomena that have given human philosophers so much trouble.

There can be no more rational, or authoritative account of the origin, or occurrence of sin in this world, than that given by Moses. His account is fully endorsed by all the inspired writers of the Jewish and Christian Scriptures. It is also endorsed by the Lord himself; by him who made the universe, and who was, therefore, fully competent to speak advisedly and authoritatively. On the truth of the Mosaic account of the introduction of sin among men, rest the Jewish and Christian Dispensations. If that account be false, these religions are false; if these be true, that account is true. Moses, David, the Prophets, Christ and his apostles all stand or fall together.

Moses represents man as having been created pure and sinless, and placed in Eden where he enjoyed the favor and communion of God. His relations to God in Eden were identical with those of the angels in heaven; for all spirit-beings are created for the

¹ Buckles' History of Civilization, vol. 1, p. 13.

society of God, and all enjoy his favor and communion. He tells us that man lost this relation by transgression; that he became a sinner and an outcast, obnoxious to the displeasure of God, and subject to death; that the earth, which in Eden, yielded its fruits spontaneously, and furnished him food without labor, was thenceforth to yield it only after the severest toil. This state contrasted sadly and mournfully with that in Eden; the contrast of sin and shame with that of innocence and purity.

He further represents that man's ruin was effected by the agency of a being he calls a serpent, the most intelligent creature that God had made except man. A little reflection will assure us, however, that a mere animal, however intelligent and crafty, could not have done what is here represented, and this conclusion is fully corroborated by what is elsewhere said of this transaction, and what is clearly implied in the curse pronounced upon the serpent.

Moses says nothing of the existence of sin at this time in any other part of the universe, yet we know from other sources that it had broken out in heaven, and was raging in Gehenna before it was introduced among men. Indeed, its existence elsewhere is clearly implied in the agency employed in effecting man's ruin. Its existence among men is due to its existence elsewhere.

From a consideration of all the facts relating to the existence of sin here and elsewhere, as revealed in the inspired volume, we are led to the conclusion that its introduction among men differed in one important particular from the manner in which it was introduced among angels. In their case, it arose from and of themselves. It seems to have arisen from the excitement of a dormant power of their nature, aroused by uncurbed desires and aspirations, these being stimulated and carried beyond their natural and lawful limits by circumstances external. Satan, who was the leader, was not led into sin, or induced to sin through the deception of another, either his equal or his superior. It originated in his own will. This was not the case with man. Though man possesses a nature capable of sinning, the same as angels, indeed, yet sin did not arise from him alone. It was not by the workings of his sinful nature alone that he sinned. This dormant power of his nature was excited and aroused by the influence of another, who seduced an innocent and confiding heart, and imposed upon a pure and unsuspecting nature. A wicked and condemned angel, involved irretrievably in ruin, with the lowest and most malignant designs, deceived a guileless and confiding being, and induced her to believe that God did not mean what she understood him to say. He so reasoned with her that she at last began to doubt, and in doubting sinned. The deception and its fearful consequences she discovered when it was too late. The joy of the malignant spirit was complete when he saw the success of his deception, and the once innocent pair involved in the same ruin as himself. Thus was man involved

in sin and its fearful consequences. His deception by such a wily foe pleads for mercy and compassion; but calls for the severest punishment to be visited upon the deceiver. Nothing could be added to the miserable fate of Satan; but to show man God's estimate of the deception, he degraded the animal whom the devil selected as his instrument, to the vilest and most repulsive of animals.

We thus see that man was not wholly and alone to blame for his sin, and this fact makes the occurrence of sin among men differ widely and materially, as to the manner and means, from its introduction among angels.

But we must not fail to observe that the fact of deception did not lessen the guilt and the terrible consequences which follow, naturally and necessarily, the act of sin. The penalty denounced was visited upon them, notwithstanding the fact of deception. God's honor and majesty demanded the infliction of the penalty; for his law had been broken. This is all that law sees. It does not take into consideration man's ignorance, or the fact of his deception. Law must have its demands satisfied, or the honor and majesty of the lawgiver will be despised. Though such is the nature and government of law, yet it is an essential means of man's government. It is necessary that all spirit-beings be placed under law, that they may know and realize the absolute and real state of their will and affections. No means so thoroughly and clearly reveals this as law. In the case of man, so much under the sway of external objects and influences, because of his relation to, and connection with, the physical and organic worlds of this system, it was necessary that he should have developed before him the nature, strength, and inclination of his will and passions, that, as a rational being, knowing their power and range, he might realize the importance of subjecting these to the higher and more permanent interests of his being—interests which are involved in his obedience to God.

As sin arises from the will yielding to influences capable of exciting to sin, it was important that the law, which was designed to test the obedience and subjection of the will, should be of that character which involves in its obedience no other consideration than the will of the law giver; no incidental or foreign motive, nor any motive springing from his own will or wishes, should be allowed to intervene that might cloud the act of obedience. There ought to be but *one motive* for obedience, and that motive the will of the lawgiver.

These things being true, it is easy to see that nothing can be a true and reliable test of obedience but a *positive* command. No *moral* law can make the test, because such a law involves other considerations for obedience than the will of the lawgiver. Obedience might be secured by such a command as readily and as certainly as by a positive law, and indeed more so; but then it could not be positively known by others, nor by the person him-

self, from what motive the obedience sprung. In order, therefore, to make the test positive and certain, beyond all doubt, God gave Adam a *positive* command, and one which presented no other consideration for obedience than the will and authority of the lawgiver. Moral laws present a propriety which may be readily seen; and this propriety may be the reason why the law is obeyed; but *positive* laws, having no such perceptible propriety, present the will and authority of the lawgiver as the sole motive for obedience.

There is another fact connected with positive laws, which adds to their importance and value as tests of obedience. This fact is that the strength and vigor of the mind, and its power of readily perceiving and apprehending truth, depend more on the cultivation of the mind than on its native powers. Its growth depends entirely on knowledge and experience. These Adam¹ did not have to any great extent while in Eden, and consequently his mind did not act with the vigor and decision of a matured mind. Positive laws, indeed, are the only kind that were adapted to his government in Eden, so far as that government was designed to test the submission of his will to the authority of God; for this is the only kind of government that is adapted to children. Without knowledge and experience they need a guide to direct them in the paths of safety.

Such having been the state and condition of Adam, we see how well designed, to secure the desired end, was the command given. Under positive interdiction, the only restraining influence acting on his mind and will, was the authority of God, and hence, if he obeyed, no doubt could obscure, or render uncertain the motive of his obedience.

Thus was human nature tried in Eden, as angelic nature had been tried in heaven. In both cases, the temptations were yielded to, and sin became a fact, in heaven among angels, and on earth among men. The two cases differ materially, and in one important particular, viz: angels sinning through pride and vanity; man through the excitement of these by falsehood and deception. The means and manner of this deception demand more than a passing remark.

In the account which Moses gives of the transgression of Adam, we find that another being is as much censured and cursed as the parties transgressing. In the curse pronounced on the serpent, we discover that the animal was but an agent in the hands of another who used him for his purposes of deception. It is just as evident that "the head of the serpent" is the Devil, as that the "seed of woman" is Christ. This conclusion is fully sustained by other portions of the sacred writings, so that there is really no doubt that the Devil was the real tempter, and the animal merely the agent employed by him.

As to the species of this animal, it is simply folly to suppose

¹ We use the word generically, as including Eve.

that it was what is now known as the serpent. The idea has grown out of the fact that Moses calls the animal a serpent; and because he speaks of it as a serpent, it is supposed that it really was a serpent. But this conclusion is illogical, and not warranted by the facts. It is more reasonable to suppose that he speaks of it in its cursed or degraded condition; for the curse pronounced upon it, degraded it to the *condition* of a serpent.¹ The curse made it crawl thenceforth on the ground just as the serpent now does. But as to what the animal was before it was cursed, we are not informed; we can only conjecture. If the animal was that which we now call the serpent, we think that the Tempter was not very wise in the selection of his agent. He certainly could not have selected one more repulsive, and better calculated to defeat his purposes. However much fable may represent the serpent as capable of charming, we, nevertheless, believe that no one of the present day could be so easily charmed and captivated by such an exceedingly repulsive creature. We think that this conclusion will be approved by every non-infatuated daughter of our mother Eve. A more careful study of the scriptures, and a little attention to some general, and very common and well understood facts and principles, would have saved the mind from this delusion, and enabled it to recognize in Moses a more rational historian. We must not forget that Moses wrote his history some twenty-five hundred years after the events of Eden are said to have occurred. At that time, we may suppose, that this animal, from the fact of its degradation to a serpent's state and condition, was generally spoken of as a serpent. But a consideration of a few facts will be sufficient to show that the animal was not a serpent before the temptation.

In the first place we know that the serpent is *not the most intelligent*² of the lower animals. On the contrary, his intelligence is of a very low order. It is below the intelligence of birds which he is said to charm so successfully. The serpent is even the lowest of his class, with not even the sprightliness of the dull and stupid turtle.³ Yet Moses says that this animal was the most intelligent of all the animals which God had made. This statement places him next in rank to man, which we know is not now the case. If he was originally so high in the scale of being, then it is certain that he was not a serpent; and we must look to his degraded state and condition to find the reason for his being called a serpent. We may, therefore, dismiss from our minds the idea that the animal which was used by Satan in deceiving Eve was originally a serpent.

In the second place, this animal possessed the power of speech and the use of human language, and, consequently, a very high

¹ It is not at all probable that the animal was changed to the *species* and organism of the serpent; but simply to the condition of a serpent.

² φρονιμωτατος (most intelligent; discerning), is the word of the version of the LXX. ³ Contribution to the Nat. History of the U. S., vol. i, pp. 296-7.

order of mind. This conclusion is justified by the fact of its conversing with Eve. Now, this power over an articulate language was either inherent, or it was bestowed on the animal by the Devil, or the Devil spoke in and by him.

In regard to the first supposition, that its speech was inherent, it may be observed, that the naturalness of the narrative suggests and supports this conclusion. We are not shocked at the idea of the "serpent" speaking; and yet we must not forget that such a thing now would startle and alarm us. But we observe that, when Eve was addressed by the animal, speaking in her own language, she expressed no surprise nor fear. This certainly would not have been the case had she heard then, for the first time, the animal speaking so intelligibly and intelligently in her own language. It is very reasonable to suppose that she was very familiar with this animal; that she had often talked with it, and found it an agreeable and pleasant companion in the solitude and quiet of her Eden home; that it had frequently attended the innocent pair in their morning and evening walks; and that it had often taken food from their hands. It does no violence to the narrative to suppose that it was on very intimate and familiar terms with Adam and Eve, and that it had become to them a source of much pleasure and delight. Indeed, the naturalness of the narrative demands such a supposition. The supposition appears still more reasonable when we reflect what an excellent means and opportunity this afforded the Tempter to deceive the unsuspecting pair. Such a friendly and familiar association could not have passed unobserved and unimproved by their wily enemy, intent upon their destruction. He saw in their fondness for this lovely and charming animal, an excellent opportunity for accomplishing his long cherished object, and he was too intent on that purpose to allow so favorable an opportunity to pass unimproved. He saw in the powers of the animal a most excellent means of realizing his object; and not the least or the most insignificant of these powers was the animal's command and use of the human language. We therefore conclude that its power of speech was inherent.

As regards the second supposition, that it was bestowed on the animal by Satan for the time being and for this special object, it is sufficient to observe that it is not possible for any creature, however exalted in the scale of being, to confer on another creature an organic power it did not possess by virtue of its creation. An organ, or a part of a being, is just as much a work of creation as the entire being; and this we know is possible only with God. It can not, therefore, be supposed that the power of speech was bestowed by Satan, and that, too, only until he could effect his object.

The last supposition is that *Satan spoke* by it. This supposition is as inadmissible as the last; for angels can not speak in human language unless possessed of the human organism, or

some other organism by means of which an articulate language can be spoken. They seem to have the power of assuming the human form, and, while thus invested, to speak and act like men.¹ But, unless in this form, angels are not visible, nor able to communicate with men in human language. Whenever they have spoken to men, they have appeared in the human form. Since then, Satan, who was the real tempter, is an angel, and did not appear in the *human form* at the time of the temptation, we conclude *he* did not speak.

Knowing that angels can and have assumed the human form, it is not unreasonable to suppose that they may also assume, or possess the body of an *animal*, and use that animal as an agent of their purpose or object. This being admitted, all difficulty in this case vanishes. It is then easy to perceive the Devil acting and speaking in and by the animal, the animal possessing every power and faculty necessary for the deception.

In addition to these facts, we may gather some light from the curse that was pronounced on the "serpent." That curse degraded the animal to the state and condition of the serpent. It is not necessary to suppose that its organism was changed into that of the serpent. It is not probable that more was done than to consign it to a prone, or serpent-like condition the remainder of its life.² If it was a serpent before it was cursed, what was the nature of the curse? It was doomed to crawl thenceforth on the ground, just as serpents do now; it must, therefore, have once stood and walked erect. It was doomed to feed on the dust of the earth; it must, at first, have lived on the fruits of the garden. It was "cursed above all cattle;" it must, at first, have been the most favored and honored. It was made the most inveterate of enemies; it must have been before the most friendly and familiar of friends. It became the most degraded of creatures; it must have been, at first, the most exalted, intelligent, and fascinating of the lower animals.

We may thus conjecture from the curse pronounced on this animal, something of its original dignity and rank among animals. It must have been a beautiful and attractive creature. Its power of speech added immeasurably to the beauty of its form, and its fascinating and easy manners. Its intelligence threw a halo over all these, and clothed it with charms which soon attracted the attention and won the fondness of Adam and his companion. We imagine that its form approached closely the human; that its eyes were bright and expressive; that its voice was sweet and charming; its intelligence sprightly and attractive; and its language fluent and captivating.³ Such an animal was a suitable agent for the Deceiver; and his success is not at all surprising.

From these facts and considerations we conclude that the ani-

¹ Gen. 18: 19. ² This supposition is made the more probable by the case of the King of Babylon.

³ Comparative Anatomy and Physiology justify this view.

mal by which Satan beguiled Eve, could not have been the offensive and repulsive creature now known as the serpent. The curse left it in ruins. It was despoiled of its glory, and left to perish from the earth. No representative or offspring now lives, or has lived since its degradation and ruin, to tell us of its parent's primal rank and dignity. The species had but one representative; and its memory lives only in the hateful and despised form of the serpent.

Such a being as we have conceived that animal to have been, was well calculated to serve the purposes of Satan. He is too wise and intelligent a being to use inappropriate means in the accomplishment of his designs. Perhaps no greater mind is to be found among created beings. He is certainly, as to his native powers, no insignificant being; and his devices are not to be despised by the wisest and best of our race. Those who knew his character and powers best, have warned men to be on their guard. He sometimes appears as an angel of light, and will take any form, or use any device, if by these means he may be able to deceive and ruin some. In the present case, he watched closely the powers of this animal, and its familiar association with the innocent pair; and when a suitable opportunity presented itself, he began his work. How long he watched and waited we can not even conjecture; but we may be confident that sufficient time elapsed to allow Eve to become much attached to the animal.

In one of those morning walks which we conceive that Eve sometimes took alone, to enjoy the beauties of her delightful abode, she saw, as she drew near the forbidden tree, this beautiful animal sitting, it may be, among its branches, or standing under its shady boughs, and eating of its fruit. We have no reason to suppose that *it* was prohibited this fruit; but every reason to believe that it was not. The command which interdicted this fruit was given to Adam and Eve, not to the animals of the garden. When Adam was placed in the garden, he was permitted to eat of the fruit of *every* tree of the garden but one. This he was forbidden even to *touch*, on pain of immediate death: "The day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die."

It is likely that the innocent pair had often spoken to each other of this fruit, and of the fact that it was forbidden them. It is also very natural to suppose that they had often looked on this fruit, and asked themselves the reason why *it alone* was forbidden. It must, therefore, have become an object of much curiosity and reflection. If, as we have supposed, this animal was frequently their companion in their walks, we may also suppose that it had heard them speak of this fruit and of the fact that they were not permitted to eat of it. These suppositions are necessary in order that the temptation may appear natural in any aspect in which we may view it.

When she had approached the tree, we imagine that the

Tempter, finding the occasion every way favorable, then began his work by inducing, in some way which we do not pretend to describe or understand, the animal to ask the question: "Did God say that you should not eat of every tree of the garden? Did he say that you should not eat of the fruit of *this* tree?" In the simplicity and innocency of her heart, she replied: "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, you shall not eat of it, neither shall you touch it, lest you die." The Tempter replied: "You will not surely die: for God doth know that in the day you eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and you shall be as gods, knowing good and evil." Now, here was a direct conflict between the word of God and the word of the Tempter; and to convince Eve that she misunderstood what God had said, and that he was correct in what he said, and in his understanding of the command of God, he ate of the fruit before her eyes, and told her that this fruit would give her knowledge, and make her wise; that it had made him wise and given him all the knowledge he possessed. He spoke warmly and fluently in praise of the qualities of the fruit; that it was beautiful and delicious, and made any one wise who should eat of it, and would give her powers which she did not then possess. And to convince her of the truth of all he said, he ate of the fruit, and presented himself as a proof of what it was capable of doing. It was necessary that the Tempter should convince Eve of the *truth* of what he said, before she could begin to doubt the truth of what God had commanded, or her own judgment respecting its meaning. Hence he *reasoned* with her, and finally induced her to believe what he said, and to disregard what God had commanded. Then "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 to her husband with her, and he did eat. And the eyes of them both were opened."

The purpose of the Tempter was now effected; and he left them to their fate, and retired to enjoy his success. He had made Eve first doubt, and then disbelieve the word of God, and then believe his word. There was some truth in what he said, but even that truth was a lie, because it deceived. That little truth was not the truth of God. Their eyes were indeed opened, but only on their nakedness and shame. It gave them knowledge, but it was the knowledge of their shame. They were made wise, but only to see and know what they had done. But this knowledge and wisdom related to sin. It was a knowledge that brings shame, and grief, and anguish of heart; and a wisdom that allows of no rest to the soul.

It would appear from what the apostle Paul says in reference to this event, that Adam was not with Eve at the time she par-

took of the fruit. Paul says that "Adam was not deceived; but the woman, being deceived, was in the transgression."¹ He seems to have been persuaded by his wife to eat of the fruit. At least, some consideration for her seems to have been the main motive that induced him to eat. He seems to have acted intelligently, and with some conception of the consequences before him. If he was not deceived, he certainly ate from motives which differed much from those which influenced Eve. These motives must have had reference to her. He ate after her—after she had transgressed, when she was fully exposed to all the consequences which God had threatened. The urgent motive with him was likely his love for his wife. If this supposition be reasonable, then we must also suppose that he was not with her when she was persuaded to eat of the fruit. For, had he been, we must again suppose that, as he was not deceived, he would have saved her from transgression. He could not have stood by an idle or indifferent spectator. He certainly would have interposed and saved her from deception, and exposed the design of the Tempter, and induced her to hold fast her confidence in the word of God, just as they had from the first understood it. We must, therefore, conclude that Eve was alone when the Tempter succeeded in persuading her to take, and eat of the fruit.

When Adam came up, and saw what Eve had done, the alternative was fairly presented to his mind, of leaving his wife to her fate, or of sharing that fate with her. This was a severe trial, and one which proved too strong for him. On the one hand stood God, on the other Eve; and we can never know how long he pondered, and how well he weighed the consequences of his eating, on the one hand, and of the loss of his beloved Eve on the other. The conflict in his mind between duty and love must have been severe and tempestuous. His whole soul was bound up in Eve; she was inwrought into his very being, and how could he give her up, and leave her to her terrible fate? How could he see her go away from him forever, and leave him the only dweller of Eden? What would Eden be without her? What would life be if she were lost? The contest was more than his mind could bear. His love blinded his reason, confused his thoughts, and clouded his judgment. Grief and anguish wrung his heart, indecision made his purpose waver, and ignorance of what was really in the future turned the balance, and he gave way. The trial to which Eve yielded bore no comparison to his. Hers was feeble in the extreme when viewed in the light of his. She was thoughtless and unguarded, and acted without reflection. She inconsiderately placed her confidence in the word of the deceiver, and ate without reflecting sufficiently on what she was doing. But who can imagine the struggles in the mind of Adam? What torture he suffered; what a tempest swept over his soul; what hesitation and misgivings swayed his

¹ 1 Tim. 2: 14.

mind; or what anguish wrung his heart before he gave way? The trial of Abraham was great when God required him to offer his only son as a burnt offering. But he knew more of God, and more of the nature and consequences of sin. The story of the flood was yet fresh in his mind from the lips of Shem. The smoke of the submerged cities of the Plain was yet visible on his eastern horizon. He had been schooled by a long and severe trial of his faith. He had history on which to lean for support, and a long experience to strengthen his heart; so that he was, to no small extent, prepared for the trial. His trial was indeed great and severe; and his faith has been held up as a model to future generations. But great and severe as his trial was, it was feeble when compared with Adam's. Eve was as dear to Adam as Isaac could have been to Abraham; and Adam had no thought or conception of a resurrection to life. He stood alone, without experience, without a knowledge of the nature and consequences of sin, with but little knowledge of God, and with no support but his confidence in God, unstrengthened by the means which Abraham, and all other men have enjoyed under their trials. Besides, the facts visible to his sight stood opposed to the declaration of God. Eve had eaten of the fruit, and yet lived. His mind became clouded, his purpose began to waver, and his wife continued to persuade. His love for her clouded his reason, warped his judgment, and obscured his perceptions. He remembered only that God threatened death, and yet Eve was still alive; so he wavered, tottered, and fell!

Thus was sin introduced into this world. Then the dark cloud began to grow. From its dark folds began to thunder the judgments of the Almighty; from them to flash the lightnings of God's wrath. It swept over Eden, and its fruits and its flowers perished forever. The unhappy pair were driven out into the world, all dark and dreary, bereft of all that once made them happy and contented. So utter a desolation no human heart has ever felt; nor have so dreadful forebodings ever wrung a human soul. But one ray of light peered through all that dreadful gloom and darkness. That light came from the fires of the sacrificial altar. Grief, deep and heavy, settled down on their hearts, and they wept floods of bitter tears. Sad and terrible effects are these of transgression; but, alas! the lightest that sin inflicts!

SECTION III. ITS CONSEQUENCES.

The consequences of the sin of Adam and Eve were to themselves both immediate and remote; both necessary and contingent; primary and secondary. To the first category, the immediate and necessary, belong the *penalty* denounced, the suffering of it, and the *guilt* with which sin stains the soul. These are the immediate and necessary consequences of sin in every instance. To the second category in the case of the first pair, the remote, contingent, and secondary, belong their expulsion from Eden with the loss of all that they enjoyed in that blissful home, and the ills and sufferings that overtook them in their extra-Eden life. Among these consequences, two deserve particular mention because of their connection with each other as cause and effect. These were the loss of the fruit of the tree of life, and the consequences following that loss.

The tree of life, there is much reason for believing, was placed in the garden with the special purpose of making man in that state virtually immortal by continually rejuvenating his organism. It had the power of doing more for his body than ordinary food; and when its power was added to this, and continued, death from the wear and waste of the body was then wholly prevented. So that we can only say of that state, that he was immortal only by virtue of his ordinary food and of the fruit of the tree of life.

His transgression depriving him of this fruit, he was left to the support of ordinary food, which can not, in the nature of the case, prevent the race from dying. Natural death, therefore, may be regarded as the *genetic* effect of the loss of this fruit, and not of Adam's transgression.

It is not probable—indeed, it is quite improbable—that disease would have attacked the body or mind while man remained in Eden; for the fruit of the tree of life would, by counteracting all wear and waste of the body such as induce a tendency to death, have also prevented disease. Hence, we may regard all the physical sufferings which the race has endured, as consequences of the loss of this fruit.

At present we have more concern with the immediate or direct effects of his transgression. These are, in all cases, limited to the transgressor, and were the same with Adam as with any of his children. These effects are: 1st, the infliction of the *penalty* denounced, and 2d, the *guilt* with which sin stains the soul, and which is not erasable by the infliction of the penalty. The soul is still guilty after the sinner has suffered the penalty denounced.

There has been no little discussion as to what this penalty was,

whether spiritual or physical death. But we think there are sufficient data to put the matter in question beyond any reasonable doubt.

We shall assume that it was not only *physical* death, but an *immediate and violent death*, inflicted as a penalty for the transgression, the same as that which is inflicted as a punishment for a capital crime. The proof of this view is ample and satisfactory—we may say positively conclusive.

It will be proper, in the first place, to examine the language of the law in which the penalty is expressed. It reads thus: "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.*"¹ That these words mean, and are intended to express the thought, that the death here denounced is a violent and immediate physical death, we have ample proof in the language of laws denouncing the same penalty against other and different sins. A few of these must suffice.

In the penalty of death denounced against the cursing of father or mother we have almost the same language. We have the same words with but the unimportant difference in the mood of the verb and the absence of the intensive preposition. "He that curseth father or mother shall be surely put to death."² We have another instance in which the language is still nearer that of Gen. 2:17. In Numbers, chap. 28:65, we have these words: "For the Lord had said of them, *They shall surely die* in the wilderness."³

In the first case there can be no doubt that the death threatened was a violent one; in the other it was a punishment for their unbelief and disobedience. In each it is clearly distinguishable from natural death.

The meaning of the words is made still clearer by the threat that Saul denounced against the man who should take food on a certain occasion when he was pressed by his enemies. (1 Samuel 14:24, 38, 39). And he said: "As the Lord liveth who saveth Israel, though it be Jonathan my son, *he shall surely die.*"⁴ Here we have the difference of only the personal pronoun, and the person of the verb; and no doubt can exist as to the death that was here intended. It was a death to be inflicted because of disobedience to his command, that no one should take food that day. And again, in the case of the child of David by Bathsheba, the wife of Uriah: "The child that is born to thee *shall surely die.*"⁵ * * * "And *the Lord struck* the child that Uriah's wife bore to David, and it was very sick, * * * and the child died."

Still further: When Moses desired to see God, the Lord re-

¹ The LXX version of the italicized words reads: "ἡ δ' αὖν ἡμέρα φάγητε ἅπ' αὐτοῦ θανάτῳ ἀποθανείσθε."

² Lev. xx:9. Version of the LXX gives θανάτῳ θανατούσθω. See also ch. 24:16. ³ LXX, θινατω ἀποθάνονται. ⁴ θανάτῳ ἀποθανεῖται. ⁵ θανάτῳ ἀποθάνειτ ι.

plied: "No man shall see my face and live." When, therefore, Manoah and his wife had seen an angel of the Lord at their sacrifice, he was terrified and exclaimed; "*We shall surely die, because we have seen God.*"¹

These passages of the sacred scriptures are sufficient to show that the death penalty threatened in the case of Adam was a premature, unnatural, or violent death, such as is inflicted for crime by men. No other meaning can be given these words.

Were stronger testimony needed, or could stronger be given, we have it in the institution of sacrifice, which was ordained to save man from the immediate and legitimate, or genetic effects of sin—of his *act* of transgression. As this subject will be considered in a future chapter, it will be sufficient here to state only the elements of sacrifice, and show the application of these as a remedy for salvation from the consequences of transgression.

A sin-offering was an animal without blemish in its body, or spot on its surface. It, therefore, as such presented two elements in its person: 1, its *life*, and 2, its *innocence* symbolized by the perfection of its body in the particulars mentioned.

In direct antithesis to these we have in the sinner the *forfeit* of his life and the *ruin* of his character, resulting from the nature of the penalty and the guilt from sin. By transgression he became guilty and must die as an atonement for his sin. If no means be interposed by which he can be saved from these consequences of his transgression, he must die, or the government of God would suffer dishonor; for it positively demands that "the soul that sins shall die." There is no escape from this but through sacrifice. How, then, does sacrifice save him? Let us apply it, and see.

The *life* of the animal taken and offered in the form of blood as a sacrifice, is *substituted* for the *life* of the sinner, and he lives. But he is yet guilty. The *character* of the victim is substituted for his *character*, and the guilt disappears, and the sinner is saved. The victim becomes the substitute before the law for the sinner, and the sinner then stands before the law as though he had never sinned. This is *plenary* pardon, the purpose for which sacrifice was instituted.

It has been objected to the view that the death threatened Adam was immediate and violent, that he did not actually die the day he sinned as it is stated he should; and hence the view of the *spiritual* nature of the death threatened. Such a view ignores important facts and principles. Has any sinner ever died for his sin when an atonement was provided, and when he offered that atonement? Not one instance can be found. But in every instance for which no atonement was allowed, the sinner has died a violent death, as in the case of him who blasphemed the name of the Lord. He was stoned until dead by the congregation.² This sin was classed with murder, against which a

¹ LXX. θανάτῳ ἀποθανομεθα. ² Lev. 24: 16: 23.

violent death was denounced, and the same form of expression, essentially, is used.¹

Why, then, did not Adam *actually* die on the day he sinned? This is fully and satisfactorily accounted for by the fact that he *virtually* died in the person of the victim which was taken in his place. In this way every sinner atones, or dies, for his sin. Were not some life taken; were not death inflicted upon his substitute, no sinner could live beyond the time of his transgression. Adam, therefore, did die on the day he sinned; death was inflicted upon him in the person of his substitute. The law was honored by his *virtual* death in the *actual* death of his substitute.

It may be again objected that we assume the existence of sacrifice at this time, since the divine record makes no mention of the institution until many years after the expulsion from Eden, when Cain and Abel were grown men. This objection will be disposed of when we come to speak more fully of the institution of sacrifice.

It is again objected that Adam could have had no conception of such a death, since death had not yet come into the world. As to his conceptions, such an objection applies with much greater force against the view that the death threatened was spiritual. We might ask with far more reason, what conception could he have had of spiritual death?

If he did not know the nature of the death threatened, he could not have understood the meaning of the penalty, and what influence could the threat have had on his mind? He had as well been addressed in an unknown tongue; and really was, if he did not understand the meaning of the words. We are, therefore, obliged to assume that he did understand the nature of the penalty.

It is altogether a mistake to suppose that Adam's transgression brought death into the world. It was the remote or incidental cause of death to man; but death had been among animals from the earliest geological periods of the earth. No one has ever been so wild as to dream that the animals created with man were immortal, and have since suffered death because of his sin. Death already existed in the world, and it was a very easy matter for him to have been taught the meaning of it. He had but to see animals die, and observe their condition after death, to have had a sufficient knowledge of it to know the meaning of the words of the law. That Adam had a pretty good knowledge of animals is evident from the fact that he gave names to such as were associated with him in his abode in Eden. We have, therefore, abundant reason to believe that he had seen dead animals, and very probably had seen them die.

But how could a conception of spiritual death have been imparted to his mind? There is nothing so phenomenal in it or about it, as to make "it an object perceptible by the senses." It

¹ Lev. 24: 17, *Θανάτω θανάτουαθω*.

is language applied to a state or relation of disfavor from God; and how was this to be explained to the apprehension of one who had yet no conception of sin, the cause of spiritual death? The conception belongs to the christian dispensation; or at least to such advancement in the knowledge of revealed religion as was enjoyed by the pious and cultivated Jew. But the knowledge of sin, and all that has grown out of its irruption among men, was a sealed book to Adam; and he could not, therefore, have had any conception of spiritual death.

Spiritual death is a state of disfavor as respects God, or separation from him, of which Adam could have formed no conception whatever. But let us, for the sake of the argument, admit that he could, and that spiritual death was the penalty or punishment denounced. The question then comes up from the institution of sacrifice, Where is *its* meaning, propriety, or fitness? Why the violent death of an innocent victim? What connection has it with transgression, and how does it apply? No man can say, who thinks that the punishment denounced was *spiritual* death. This theory makes discord where there should be divine harmony, and confusion where there are order and beauty. It makes the Atonement an insoluble enigma, and Christ's death on the cross a fact without reason, design, or effect, and, hence, it must be untrue. The conclusion then is clear, that the death which Adam apprehended was the loss of life the day he should sin.

The infliction of the penalty prescribed by the law is all that law can do. But this does not reach the *guilt*. The man who suffers the extreme penalty of the law, dies as guilty as before. In the case of Adam his *legal* or *virtual* death in the *actual* death of the victim left him guilty. Though alive and freed from the punishment of his transgression, he was yet in a state of disfavor—was yet in a state of spiritual death, and, hence, was banished from the Garden, and saw the face of God no more, nor ever again heard his voice. Had the sacrifice offered for his sin, and by which his life was preserved, effectually removed the *guilt* of his sin, he would never have left Eden. But the blood of animals can never take away sin; and guilty still, Eden could no longer be his home.

Out of Eden appeared the evidences of God's displeasure following Adam and his children wherever they wandered. Consequences befell him there, which were inseparable from his lone and desolate condition. The tree of life no longer accessible, labor and toil began to show their influence on his life. Wearied in mind and body, the anguish that still pained his heart from the memory of what was lost, and the labor necessary to sustain life, wasted the body, and wore life gradually away, and death finally put an end to all his earthly sufferings. He died because life could be sustained no longer; a death without merit and without blame. A death natural and inevitable was beyond the limits of the garden.

Disease is also the fortune of man's extra-Eden life; a consequence of being cut off from the tree of life. The fruit of that tree would not only have continued his life indefinitely, but have kept it free from the influences of causes producing disease. It so invigorated all the vital organs and functions as to give the organism the strength to repel disease-producing causes. This, to some extent, does man's ordinary food now do. The fruit of that tree did it effectually. But cut off from this, he suffered the common fate of all animals. Man flourishes for a while in vigor and strength, then falters, lingers, and dies.

Such consequences as these which befell man beyond the limits of Eden are of a negative character. They are not the positive effects, or the immediate results of Adam's transgression. They come upon the race only mediately through the loss of the tree of life. Cut off from this, these come as a natural and necessary consequence. Had Adam continued in Eden, he would have had access to the tree of life, and have lived forever.¹

The race, since the catastrophe of Eden, has shown an aptitude to sin; and man, for hundreds of years following, continued to degenerate rapidly as it respects righteousness, until the earth groaned with violence. This aptitude to sin, and the degeneracy to which the race so rapidly descended, have given rise to human speculations or doctrines, whose influence is felt in this age of the christian era. This doctrine is, that man's moral nature was depraved by the sin of Adam; that this act of the progenitor of the race deprived it of the moral image of God.

That Adam's moral nature was so thoroughly and organically depraved as to become transmissible to his offspring, is an assertion which no man can prove by fact or argument. That men may and do become depraved by sin, can not be questioned; for it is a matter of daily observation. But that this depravity, produced by a life of sin, is transmitted to offspring, is not true, never was true, never will be true, and can never be proved to be true. *What sins?* The body that is transmitted? Is the soul born of the soul, as the body is of the body? No. The body only is derived. The body may be the "instrument of unrighteousness;" but *it is not the sinner*. We can not predicate this character of an animal's action. We repeat, then, *what sins?* and answer, the *spirit* of man; that being that will live after the death of the animal body, and appear elsewhere to render an account of the deeds it did while in the body. Is this spirit transmissible? Who will affirm as much? If so, then is man wholly an organic being, differing in no essential particular, as to his nature and being, from the animals that utterly and forever perish. This is materialism, and makes a resurrection as impossible for man as for animals. Until it can be demonstrated that the spirit of man is created with the body, and so organically united to it as to become as verily transmissible as any feature, form, or

¹Gen. 3: 22, 23.

idiosyncrasy of the animal organism, the spirit must be regarded as a separate and distinct creation, but united with the body so long as the body lives. Created distinctly and separately, and living after the body has perished, and being again *invested* with a body—then immortal and imperishable—its virtues and vices can not, in the very nature of the case, be reproduced as are those of the body, and transmitted with it. These things being true, the moral depravity of a father, admitting it to exist, can not be transmitted to his offspring.

This theory of the transmitted depravity of the parent, assumes, of course, the depravity of Adam, for which there is no more reason than for the other assumption. It assumes as a fact what can not be proved to have been a fact, and which, moreover, is really disproved by facts taking place before our eyes every day. Did any one ever know a man to become depraved by one act of disobedience?¹ Never. The thing is simply impossible; and hence the assumption, that Adam's moral nature was so degraded by the one act of disobedience as to be characterized as depraved, is without reason, and contrary to what is observed of the influence of one sin (and that not of the moral class), on the moral nature of an innocent and guileless person.

As a theory, it is positively contradicted by two important facts, one of which is a matter of history, and the other of daily observation. The first is the character of Christ. He was without sin. But if the doctrine of the transmissibility of constitutional depravity be true, and it also be true that one sin depraved the moral nature of Adam to such a degree that his depravity was constitutional, or organic, and, therefore, transmissible, then the statement that Christ was without sin can not be true. Hence, if Christ was without sin, the theory must be false.

The theory is also proved to be false by the character of children. They are also without sin; for "of such is the kingdom of heaven." If they become depraved in adult life, who can say that the depravity is, in any degree, connected, as cause and effect, with the one transgression of Adam, and not *wholly* the result of their own individual sins? If there were any such connection, it was certainly broken and interrupted during the innocency of childhood; and if so, by what means was the fracture adjusted, and the connection re-established?

Some seek to evade the force of these objections to the theory in question by another assumption, viz: that the sinless character of Christ is to be ascribed to the power and influence his divine nature exerted over his human, by which he was kept from sinning. But this assumption is contradicted by the plainest statements of the inspired scriptures. The apostle who affirms that Christ was without sin—"holy, harmless, undefiled, separate

¹ Cain was a wicked man, and Abel a good man. The doctrine might account for the character of Cain; but would be contradicted by that of Abel.

from sinners, and made higher than the heavens"—affirms also that he was "tempted in all points like as we are."¹ What nature in him was tempted, the human or the divine? James says God can not be tempted, and so says our common sense. Then it was his human nature that was tempted, and his human nature was awarded the merit. Under his temptations and sufferings, whence did he obtain strength? In the main, if not entirely, where his faithful disciples have obtained it: "who in the days of his flesh offered up both prayers and supplications to him who was able to save him from death, and was heard in that he feared; *who*, though a son, yet learned obedience by the things he suffered." While he prayed and suffered in Gethsemane, an angel was sent to strengthen him. In all his trials and sufferings he met them as "the *man* Christ Jesus," overcame them as a man, and showed to the world that human nature *can* keep the law.

Contradicted by the sinless character of children, the theory then assumes that they are sinners because they are human, and the descendants of Adam; sinners because of, and through, the one transgression of Adam, as the representative head. But the scriptures expressly declare in the very words of God, that children are not sinners because their fathers were. "Doth the son bear the iniquity of the father?" By no means. "The son shall not bear the iniquity of his father; neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son. The righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him. *The soul that sins shall die.*"²

The scriptures, therefore, attest that the notion that the moral nature of the race was depraved, or influenced in any way or in any degree, by the transgression of Adam, is wholly and entirely false, and consequently insulting to the government of God.

The moral nature of man, as the moral nature of angels, is peccable by creation; and his capacity to sin is not developed or created by an act of sin. The power, as we have already seen,³ inheres in his very being; a fault in his being, if it be so considered, for which he is in no way responsible or reprehensible. This moral nature is susceptible of degradation and exaltation to an indefinite extent; the first by a life of sin, and the latter by a life of righteousness. The *moral nature* of the race is no more depraved now than at the first; for children now are just as sinless in character, and ever will be, as were the children of Adam and Eve—Cain, Abel, Seth, and the rest.

Once more: If the moral nature of the race was depraved by the transgression of Adam, then the moral nature of all Christians should be made sinless, or incapable of sinning by the obedience of Christ, the second Adam. But this is not true; consequently, the act of one man, though he be a representative head, can not effect the nature of the race either favorably or unfavorably. There is, and can be, no genetic connection be-

¹ Heb. 4: 15.

² Ezek. 18 chap.

³ Chap. 2, sec. 2.

tween the act of one man or a million, and the moral nature of the race.

The *remote or incidental* consequences of Adam's transgression are such as have befallen the race in its preternatural state. Among these are disease, pain, sorrow, anguish, and death, following their natural and legitimate causes, most of which causes may be found in the life and circumstances of the individual, and in some instances arising from germs derived from parents or ancestors. But there is no moral quality attachable to these effects, even though they result from sin in the individual. All these consequences the christian suffers as much as the sinner. The virtues of the Atonement do not reach them. Christians, the best the world ever saw, suffer from poverty, disease, and pain, and die as all men die. The atonement does not affect them, because there is no sin in them. It has reference only to sin, and can not remove what is not sin. For man's salvation from these, other means are provided; means in the enjoyment of which he will be perfectly passive. As men are born now into a preternatural state, without any will or act of their own; as they were brought into this state of suffering and death by the act of another; so by the act of another will the whole race be taken out of this state, and placed in another, where the body shall be immortal and free from all physical suffering. So far as the sufferings of the soul are connected with sin, these will continue after the resurrection, as they were not affected by the atonement. If the atonement be applied to these in this world, they will disappear in the world to come; if not, they will continue forever. There will be no more death to free them from mental suffering. "As the tree falls, so will it lie" forever.

CHAPTER VI.

THE REMEDIAL SYSTEM.

SECTION I. ITS OCCASION AND PURPOSE.

“Every cloud has its silver lining.” The darkest cloud that casts its shadow on the earth, is beautiful and bright on the side that looks toward heaven. No cloud in nature is so dark, so fearful, and terrible as that of sin in the moral world. As it frowns on man with dark and terrible aspect, filling his soul with dread and dismay, faith points to the other side with joy and hope.

What God will do, in view of the difficulties presented by the occurrence of sin among men, is a question whose solution lies beyond the powers of the creature. It presents apparently innumerable difficulties; but this appears only on the human side of the cloud. On the other side all is clear, and bright, and beautiful.

The difficulties presented in the case of man grow out of the peculiarities of his being. He is unlike angels in one important particular, and this unlikeness makes all the difference between God’s treatment of sinning angels and sinning men. The question of sin among angels was easily settled; but, in the case of men, the punishment which Justice demanded was such as to produce discord and confusion in other directions. On the supposition that the penalty denounced against sin in the case of Adam, was spiritual death, that is, separation from the presence of God forever, this would have left the race to multiply in the earth, and die without any provision for uniting man’s spirit, disembodied by his death, to his body again; and hence, we would have had the anomaly in the universe of a half-created being, a spirit-being existing without a body. This would have been a sad termination of the work of infinite wisdom.

On the more correct and rational supposition that the penalty of sin was an unnatural or violent death, the result would have been no better than on the other supposition. For the punishment inflicted would have produced the same separation of body and spirit, leaving the soul guilty and isolated in the universe,

where and as it would continue forever, thus ever testifying to a miscarriage in the work of an infinite being.

Since such a result as this would have inevitably followed had sinning men been treated as were the sinning angels, there was a necessity that some plan should be devised by which sin could be punished, and yet the virtual destruction of man's being prevented. Such a termination of man's creation, and of the great work which preceded him, could have added no glory to the character of Jehovah. The dilemma was therefore presented, to permit this termination, or to provide a plan by which such a termination could be honorably and rationally avoided and prevented.

Two alternatives seemed to have presented themselves when the original pair transgressed: 1, either the utter annihilation of man (admitting that to be possible), and stopping his work there; or 2, the creation of another pair, in all respects like the first, in whom the experiment might be again tried.

The first would have been a confession of failure, and the latter could have offered no better hope of success. So neither of these terminations could have been chosen. Only one other course was left open; the annihilation of the whole material and organic systems, and the inauguration of some other totally different plan or method.

Such difficulties as these are presented when we take but a partial view of God's great work in the creation of man. If man's being and history have no connection with the great event of heaven, the occurrence of sin among angels; if the treatment of the question of sin among men, has no bearing on its treatment among angels, then must the event of Eden be isolated and distinct, and man's subsequent history have no logical bearing on, or connection with, that wonderful catastrophe. But with such bearings and connections, the occurrence of sin among men, and the provision of the system for man's recovery from all the consequences of sin, both direct and remote, or contingent, appear but as parts of a great whole; as successive and dependent processes in the solution of a great problem, which engages the consideration and attention of the whole intelligent universe.

The treatment of sin is a question of government, not one of dynamics. To inflict the punishment denounced as a satisfaction to infracted law, was a requirement of government. If this produced an anomaly as to man's being; if it took his body to the dust whence it was taken, and cast his spirit into the unseen world, naked and isolated, there could be found no remedy for this in the exercise of arbitrary will or physical power, but in a measure of the same government, so rational and just as to justify the government in the exercise of the measure chosen. The body could not be called back from the dust, and the spirit from the unseen world, and the two united, unless the punishment which occasioned this result, were an ample atonement for the

sin, or, the punishment not being a satisfactory atonement, and the *guilt* of the transgression still clinging to the spirit, the soul were purified of the stain while in a disembodied state. But this could not have been done, because the sin was committed by the spirit while in the body. Hence, whatever was to be done, had to be done while man was the same as to the entirety of his being, as when he transgressed. The peculiar nature of the being of man was, therefore, one ground of the Remedial System which was found necessary.

There was another, and equally important fact, which appears as a reason and a necessity for a remedial system, and this is the mode of the creation of the individuals of the race. In this man is especially distinguished from all other spirit-beings of whom we have any knowledge. Angels were all created as individuals, as we have already seen, each individual requiring the same creative act as all others. But the race of man has this creation only as it respects the first pair. All other individuals are reproduced from these.

The consequence of this mode of creation has been that the race has been placed in a state and under circumstances, which differ materially from those of the original pair. The race is born in a state of sin, and reared from the innocency and irresponsibility of childhood, to the self-determination of manhood, under surroundings and influences which have a tendency to develop sin in the individual, and give it the mastery of his actions. Growing up under such influences, continually exposed to the contamination of vice and iniquity, the youthful heart is gradually undermined, and the spotlessness of childhood almost imperceptibly stained, so that men become sinners almost unawares. As, therefore, the race was placed in a state of sin and death by no act of its own, but by that of the progenitor; and becoming sinners under circumstances which rather plead for mercy, there would seem to be much reason why some provision should be made for their salvation from both sin and the state of sin and death.

The state and condition in which the race has been placed by the transgression of its progenitor, and the influences to which men are continually exposed, will appear as strong and urgent considerations why sin among men should meet with a treatment different from that meted out to angels, if we will imagine the condition and circumstances of the fallen angels to be similar to those of men. If angels were derived beings, like men, and children were born in that world of unrest and woe, we could easily appreciate their condition, and feel how urgently the misfortunes of such children would plead for consideration and mercy.

Allied to these considerations there is another, arising from another difference which widely distinguishes men from angels. This is the strength and power of will in the two orders of beings. Angels, at the time of their creation, were fully organized and

matured individuals. They possessed the fullness of the native vigor of their minds. Men, on the other hand, approach this maturity gradually, and after much trial and experience. What is more helpless than an infant, or more feeble than its will? Its actions can scarcely be called individual. They are automatic rather than determined; and years of trial and experience pass away before their will becomes so self-determining as to constitute the actors responsible beings. Place such beings among the lost angels, and would not their state and condition plead loudly for mercy?

In some such differences and distinctions between angels and men do we find a reason why a remedial system was provided for men, and none for angels.

The Remedial System, as its name implies, proposes to save man from the consequences of his transgression. It is a remedy to save the sinner from the punishment and guilt of sin, and as it regards these consequences, does no more for the children than it did for the progenitors. It does not propose to save the race from the evils which have overtaken it in the world. Every remote and indirect consequence which has followed Adam's expulsion from Eden, comes on the saint and the sinner alike, and simply because these are not affected by the atonement. It applies to nothing but the punishment and guilt of sin. But there are indirect consequences of the atonement, flowing as benefits therefrom; and these consequential blessings meet and remove the consequential evils coming on man through the sin of Adam. As, therefore, the expulsion of the first Adam from the garden of Eden, brought pain, and misery, disease, and death on his children; so the resurrection of the second Adam brings about the resurrection of the race from the dead, and places it in an immortal state, where disease and death are no more possible. The resurrection of Jesus does not connect with *sin* at any point; since it accomplishes the salvation (which is from the grave) of those who never sinned; and hence it is not an element of the Remedial System. And this ought to be so, since the consequences to which it does apply, are in no way sinful. Infants suffer all the evils to which the body is heir, that adults suffer. Hence, there is no demerit in these consequential evils, nor merit in being the subjects of the consequential blessings of the Atonement. These things will appear much clearer when we come to apply the remedy to the disease, and adapt the elements of the **one to the elements of the other.**

SECTION II. ITS ELEMENTS.

I. SACRIFICE.

In the curse pronounced on the serpent, the recovery of man from the consequences of sin is faintly foreshadowed. The enmity which God then put between the offspring of the woman and the serpent, it was declared, should ultimate in a contest, in which the serpent—Satan—should be completely despoiled of his power and utterly subjugated by one of woman born. This event was potentially and symbolically in the sacrifice which Adam offered as an atonement for his sin; and the curse of the serpent is the first intimation we have of the deep purpose of God in regard to the race now involved in sin. The contest excited by this enmity looked beyond the results accomplished by the death of the offspring of the woman, and contemplated the destruction of the last citadel of the power of Satan, the grave, by his resurrection from the dead. Hence, this promise to the woman and through her to the race, embraced that which the “offspring of the woman” has made possible and enjoyable by man, including not only man’s salvation from his *sins*, but from all the remote and contingent consequences which he has suffered because of the sin of the representatives of the race, in the way and manner heretofore indicated.

The elements of the Remedial System are only such as accomplish salvation from the direct and immediate effects of transgression. These effects are, as we have seen, the punishment and guilt of sin; and the means to meet these, we have in the institution of sacrifice. But the efficacy of sacrifice depends upon two important facts, without which the death of a victim can avail nothing as an atonement for sin. These facts relate to the place where, and the person by whom, the sacrifice is offered, which are found to be equally essential with the life of the victim itself. Hence, we have as elements of the Remedial System three separate and distinct things, yet all inseparably connected and united, viz.: 1, Sacrifice; 2, The Altar, and 3, The Priest. These are the *essential elements*, around which all others cluster, and from which all others radiate.

The nature of the death which was denounced as the punishment of transgression, required that the Remedial System should have its beginning on the day Adam sinned, in order that the pair might be saved from the punishment of their sin, and still be allowed to live. If the death denounced was really what

we have here insisted on, viz.: the immediate loss of animal life, then we are positively certain, from the results accomplished by sacrifice, that sacrifice was instituted on the day of his transgression, and that the initial point of the Remedial System is to be placed on the day he was banished from Eden.

But it was instituted only as it respects its elements, and these of a nature positively defective in every particular, and consequently inadequate to the actual remission of sin. *Had these elements been perfect and adequate, Adam would never have left Eden.*

The question may arise in the minds of some, why were not these elements perfect and adequate in the beginning, and why was the world to wait so long before a perfect atonement was brought in? Why is it that Christ did not appear then instead of coming in the end of the ages?

There were, no doubt, wise and profound reasons why the Remedial System was introduced by types and symbols, and why it was necessary that it should be gradually developed before the world by these means. There were purposes to be accomplished on the part of God, which required time and means, and which were necessary to the success of the Remedial System and especially to its appreciation by man involved in sin.

Possibly chief among the reasons requiring this mode of procedure we may place Adam's ignorance of the nature and consequences of sin, and the impossibility of fully and properly impressing his mind in regard to these without a long and painful experience with sin and its fearful consequences. No man, even now, can form any just and adequate conception of sin by one transgression, unless that be of a fearful character. But even under such a sin, Adam's mind was not capable of appreciating and feeling its turpitude; for he had no knowledge of sin in others, nor of the remorse which it engenders. It was, therefore, necessary that he and all his children should be so taught by experience that they would the more readily appreciate the nature of sin, and feel its wasting agony and consuming remorse, and be influenced by these to take a more eager hold on the remedy provided for their salvation from its power and guilt. There was, therefore, much to be done for and with man before his mind could be brought to realize the ruin and disaster which sin had wrought on his destiny.

There was much besides to be learned of God. Adam lost Eden before he had learned much of the character of the creator. Indeed, in Eden he could have learned but little comparatively of him; for he sustained to God then only the relation of creature and subject. In this relation of man to God, as we have seen, the Jehovah is revealed but partially. Only those attributes that appear in the work of creation could have been known to Adam, since none others were yet revealed. But now, when Adam's relation to God was changed by his transgression, and

man was a sinner, and God an offended governor, his attitude and relation were wholly changed, and other attributes of God's being flashed out like lightning from the dark cloud of sin, carrying terror and dismay to man's heart and making him tremble before offended majesty.

The attributes now to be revealed stand related to sin, and the questions growing out of its occurrence, as these bear on the government of God. Sin changed the existing relations, and introduced a new administration in his government, under which the new attributes appear. These are Justice, Truthfulness, and Holiness.

Now, of these attributes Adam knew nothing; and as the human mind can not be impressed immediately and fully with the significance of any truth or fact, and especially with the deep significance of the relations and attributes of the Divinity, as these are developed in time, so was it necessary that time should be taken, in order that the race might learn enough, to say the least, of the nature and effects of sin, and of the attributes and relations of God, to secure some adequate appreciation of man's condition under sin, and of the means which God might institute for his salvation from it.

The nature and effects of sin can not be duly impressed on the human mind by verbal statements, or formal disquisitions. The facts of history, as it regards God's treatment of sin and sinners, are alone able to show man what sin is. In the terrible judgments which God has visited upon mankind on account of sin, men may see something of the ruin which sin can bring on the world.

As, therefore, time and history were necessary to develop the newly revealed attributes of God, and the nature and effects of sin; and to reveal man by these means to himself, in order that this knowledge might give him a clear appreciation of all that God might do in his behalf, it was necessary and unavoidable that the Remedial System should begin in shadow and symbol, in type and figure, and reach its completion only at "the end of the ages." Hence, the Atonement, of whom those shadows and symbols, those types and figures, were prophetic, did not appear until "the fulness of time,"—at the beginning of the fifth millennium of man's existence on the earth.

Instituted in the beginning in type and symbol, as it was, the system embraced then every element found in it at the close, and in the end differed from the beginning only as to the nature or personality of these elements. Hence, these elements were the same under Patriarchal, Jewish, and Christian Dispensations; and are distinguished as

1. Sacrifice;
2. The Altar;
3. The Priest or Priesthood.

Sacrifice stands the most conspicuous among these, since its

purpose and design seem to be the more easily and readily understood and appreciated. Men seem to feel and realize that the victim offered is accepted by the Deity they worship in place of themselves, and that, by the victim, they placate the offended god, or secure his favor. They also feel the necessity that a priest offer the victim, since they believe that he can intercede for them, and secure the pardon or favor desired. But they see no peculiar or special necessity for, or propriety in, an altar. The priest and the offering stand most conspicuous; but the latter takes precedence of the former. Such is the general sentiment of all nations who have not the light of revelation.

Under the Remedial System, and in every Dispensation, these elements are all equally important, so far as we can discern by the light we have, as it respects the efficacy of an atonement; but this equality does not forbid or prevent the special conspicuity of sacrifice; and hence we begin with it.

Sacrifice has in it two essential elements, which act as the remedy for sin, and correspond exactly with the two effects of sin. These elements are, 1, the *life* of the victim offered; and, 2, the *character* of the victim. Sin, as we have seen, has two consequences flowing *directly* from it, and affecting the sinner, which are directly met by the two elements of the sacrifice. Sin forfeits the life of the sinner, and stains his soul with guilt; sacrifice grants him his own life by giving the life of the victim instead, and restores him his character, lost by guilt, by giving the character of the offering for the character of the sinner. Thus, on the principle of substitution, the victim being taken for the sinner, the forfeited life is restored, and the guilt removed, by the perfect satisfaction which the accepted offering affords.

Substitution is a principle fundamental in the Remedial System; and not only fundamental, but absolutely essential and imperatively necessary, without which the remission of sin is an impossibility. For, if the penalty be inflicted on the sinner, his being lies in ruin, with the spirit still stained with sin, and no possible means existing for his recovery. But a victim interposing, and the law accepting its life in place of the sinner's, the sinner lives while the victim dies; and this is substitution. On no other ground can the sinner live, and Justice be not defrauded of its rights.

The central thought of substitution is that of *transference*. The victim whose life is made a substitute for that of the sinner, does not become a sin-offering—an atonement, *until it is made the sinner*. The guilt of the sinner, which calls for the infliction of the prescribed punishment, must be transferred to the victim before it can be accepted as a sin-offering, or, indeed, as ~~the~~ the actual transgressor himself. The sinner, by the act of transference, removes the guilt from himself, and places it upon the sin-offering, and the animal then becomes an adequate substitute for the sinner, and a true and legal sin-offering.

The mode of transferring the sin of the transgressor to an innocent animal, and thus constituting it the sinner before the law, is pointed out in the law of Moses. The sinner was required to bring his victim to the priest at the altar of burnt-offerings, and there, laying his hands upon the head of the animal, and confessing his sin over it, to deliver it up to the priest to be offered for his sin; and the sacrifice of the animal atoned for the sin committed.

While in this there is an actual substitution of the life of the victim for the life of the sinner; yet there is no actual transference of guilt to the animal. This is impossible. But the victim must be *regarded and treated* as the sinner before it can become a substitute. Hence, while there is, and can be, no transference of guilt; yet the victim can be *treated* as though it were the sinner, and really is so treated, when accepted as a substitute. Then the life and character of the victim is *virtually transferred to the sinner, and his life and character virtually transferred to the victim*, so that the sinner virtually becomes the innocent sin-offering, and it the sinner. It then, on being put to death, atones for sin, according to the fundamental, eternal, and irrevocable law of the government of God—“*The soul that sins shall die;*”¹ and the law is honored and justice satisfied!

The primary and essential virtue of sacrifice is, that it is a *sin-offering*. If the victim is to benefit the sinner, it must atone for his *sin*, and must be presented with this view and purpose, and no other. The sinner must know and realize that such is its design, and feel its worth to him as saving him from the condemnation and ruin which his sin had brought on him. It must take hold on his heart, and draw from him, the confession that he is a sinner, lying under a fearful condemnation, and that his only hope of life and pardon is in the offering which he presents. A feeling of thankfulness is not enough. His soul must be stirred to its profoundest depths, and his gratitude made virtuous by contrition on account of sin. He must recognize his ruin, and by his sin-offering plead for mercy. This granted, then gratitude may flow in a swelling stream, and add to the acceptability of the offering.

The sentiments which should actuate the sinner when presenting a sin-offering, are no where more clearly nor more beautifully illustrated than in the first instance of sacrifice recorded in the Sacred Volume.

“And in process of time, it came to pass, that Cain brought of the fruit of the ground an offering unto the Lord. And Abel, he also brought of the firstlings of his flock and of the fat thereof. And the Lord had respect unto Abel and to his offering; but unto Cain and his offering he had not respect.”²

These two brothers came at the same time to make an offering to the Lord, very probably the annual sacrifice, offered as an ex-

¹ Ezekiel 18: 4. ² Gen. 4: 3-5.

pression of gratitude, and as an acknowledgment of the blessing of God on their labors. The narrative itself gives no intimation that such was the case, and were this all we know of the transaction, and of sacrificial offerings, we could find no satisfactory reason for the acceptance of the one and the rejection of the other. There can be no doubt that the difference between their offerings on which this distinction was made, lay in the fact that Cain brought only a thank-offering, whilst Abel brought both a thank-offering and a sin-offering. That Abel brought both of these kinds is clearly intimated by the statement that he brought of "*the firstlings*" of his sheep, and also "*of the fat thereof.*" Cain brought no animal offering—only of the products of the soil; and these belong to the class of thank-offerings, as is fully detailed in the subsequent books of the Pentateuch. But animal offerings alone are sin-offerings, since they alone possess the essential feature or element of sacrifice, which can give life to the transgressor, viz: life.

Now, Abel was as much bound to offer the *firstlings* of his flocks, as was Cain to offer of the first fruits of the ground, and had he done no more, he could not have had the preference. But Abel did more than this, as Paul has most clearly stated, whatever meaning we may give to the word that makes the distinction between the offerings of the two brothers. His statement is that by faith Abel offered *more*, as it respects number, or more excellent, as it respects the character of the sacrifice, than did Cain. In either view we have Abel offering a sacrifice which was very distinct from that of a thank-offering, and this difference is found no where but in a sin-offering, which, in the case before us, is very clearly implied in the words, "*and of the fat thereof,*" since the fat of an animal is always used in a sin-offering.¹ Therefore, Abel, in sacrificing a sin-offering, and by this acknowledging his sins and consequent condemnation, found his offering acceptable to the Lord, and had the assurance that his sins were thereby forgiven.² The sentiment which inspired this double offering was faith in God, a consciousness of unworthiness and dependence on God, not only for the blessings of life, but for life itself.

Moses gives no account of the institution of sacrifice. The instance above mentioned gives the first knowledge we have of its existence, and this must have been many years after Adam had left Eden. When Moses wrote, about twenty-five hundred years after the creation of man, sacrifice was prevalent among all nations, and had been from the days of Adam. It was certainly known and practiced in his family.

It is also a fact beyond question, that it is of divine appointment; and, if we may reason from the intent and purpose of the institution, we may be confident that it was instituted on the day

¹ Lev. 3d and 4th chap. ² Heb 11: 4.

of Adam's transgression; otherwise he must have perished, or the law of God been dishonored.

There is one fact, however, which would seem sufficient to settle any doubt that may exist as to the time when sacrifice was first ordained, and this fact is, that God spoke no more audibly to man, nor gave him any ordinance or institution after he left Eden, until he gave the law from Mount Sinai, unless we regard him as having spoken audibly to Noah, when he commanded him to prepare the ark.¹ But this case can not be regarded as forming an exception, since the great commentator, the apostle Paul, intimates that it was by dream, vision, or revelation, that the command was given, and that Noah obeyed through *faith*. Had God spoken to him face to face, as with Adam in Eden, his act of obedience would not have been characterized as an act of *faith*. Such being the fact, sacrifice must have been ordained in Eden, before God had separated himself visibly and personally from Adam, and ceased to hold audible converse with him.

For four thousand years animal sacrifices continued to be offered. Day by day the dark smoke leaping up from a thousand altars, testified to man's preternatural state, and helpless and ruined condition. Innocent animals without number perished year by year, that sinners might live. By them man lived day by day, and by them the race continued from generation to generation, and from age to age. The race had lost the tree of life through the sin of its progenitor; but it had found another in the institution of sacrifice. Though it did not renew the wasting energies of his body, nor prevent his natural death; yet it averted the blow that would have laid the body instantly in death. When sin struck him a fatal blow, and poisoned his life, he found life and health again in sacrifice. And so, as man could have lived forever in Eden by virtue of the fruit of the tree of life, so beyond Eden, though in a state of sin and death, the race lives on from age to age by the life of that other tree from which flows continually the blood that bears away sin—his spirit's mortality.

Though the race continued to live by the institution of sacrifice, yet during all the long centuries through which man rested his hopes on the life of animals, no comer to that altar was ever made perfect.² No guilt of sin was, through all those centuries, ever *actually* put away. Sins, as it respects their guilt, were only *passed by*³ for the time being, to be called up at some future time, to receive eternal condemnation, or a plenary remission.⁴ It was impossible for the blood of animals to procure for man *actual* remission. Yet man lived by them; and as he lived, though a sinner, the law could not have been honored by the sacrifice, if the offering had not procured for him *virtual* remis-

¹ Gen. 6: 13-22. ² Heb. 10: 1-4. ³ Heb. 9: 15. ⁴ Rom. 3: 25.

sion—if his sin had not been *passed by*.¹ Yet *virtual* remission did no more for man than to allow him to live. His guilt was untouched by these sacrifices, only so far as they, because of their typical character, could reach this. The guilt was simply passed over until the time of the perfect atonement, when the blood of that sin-offering would reach, embrace, and redeem “the transgressions which were under the first covenant,”—until this blood could be applied to those transgressions; at which time, and by which sacrifice, God would demonstrate his righteousness in passing by those sins for that time.

The nature and necessity of sacrifice, or, in a word, its philosophy, is founded on the nature of man’s complex being, which is in itself a microcosm. On one side of his being he is connected with a world of death. His body rests on the material and organic worlds as its support, and depends on the latter as its means of life. As to his body he is an integral part of this organic system, and lives as all other members of that system live. This system is a series, one member resting and depending on the other; the one living and growing by the death of the other. Animals are maintained by the life of plants and other animals; and the many *live*, because the many *die*. Thus we see that the principle of substitution pervades the whole mundane creation, of which man is the conspicuous and important purpose and reason; and that his life and well-being find their support in the lives of others.

As, therefore, animals have been found, in their *actual* existence, to supply a want of man’s physical nature; a want so great and pressing that he can not exist without them; so we may regard animals as designed to subserve a still higher purpose in the counsels of Infinite Wisdom, and to meet a want of man’s spiritual nature, which has overtaken him in his preternatural state; a want which none but the great Designer of the universe could have conceived or foreseen. This great want of man has grown out of sin, and is supplied by animals as sacrificial offerings. Finding, therefore, this use in their actual existence, we are justified in believing that this was one of the purposes of their creation. Hence, in point of fact, animals have subserved the highest interests of man, and thus demonstrated their existence as absolutely essential to man’s temporal and eternal well-being.

Thus we see how all things in God’s creation gather around one central thought, and find a rational explanation of their existence in the Remedial System.

¹This was the effect of the blood of animals on sin under the Patriarchal and Jewish Dispensations, as stated by Paul, Rom. 3: 25.

SECTION III. THE ALTAR.

The altar is essentially and inseparably connected with sacrifice. The blood that atones for sin must be offered on an altar. Blood has no power to cleanse from sin until consecrated and made efficacious by the altar. Without it the victim dies in vain.

The altar is of divine conception and appointment; and certainly has significance and importance beyond the convenience it may afford for offering sacrifice. Christ says it is the altar that sanctifies the gift.¹ It must, therefore, occupy an important position, and constitute an essential element in the plan of pardon. The altar, consequently, is as old as sacrifice.

As the law of Moses gives us fuller and clearer views of the nature and purpose of sacrifice; so we derive from the same source all the knowledge we have of the altar. Under the Jewish Economy it occupied an important position in the tabernacle service. Moses was as specifically instructed as to the construction and consecration of the Altar as of any thing else connected with the tabernacle or its worship, and from these divine instructions we learn what was the design and intent of the altar in the worship of God, as then ordained so specifically and minutely.

There was no special consecration of the altar during that period, beyond what was implied in the fact of its being elevated above the surrounding surface, and of its being made of stones as they were found in the field, or of earth thrown in a heap, which stones and earth were holy by creation.

Under the law of Moses, however, the elements of the Remedial System are brought out much more conspicuously, and their significance, importance, and relation to each other, and to the system itself, made much more distinct and appreciable. Under the Jewish religion every thing and person concerned in worship was consecrated and made holy by prescribed ceremonies. Those concerning the altar were the same as were used in making an atonement for sin. The altar was regarded as contaminated by sin, and before it could be used for sacrificial purposes, it had to be purified and made holy. Hence, Moses was commanded to cleanse the altar by making an atonement for it, and then to anoint and sanctify it. "Seven days thou shalt make an atonement for the altar, and sanctify it; and it shall be an altar most holy; *whatsoever toucheth the altar shall be holy.*"²

¹ Matt. 23: 19. ² Ex. 29: 36, 37.

These things concerning the effect of blood in purifying, and of the altar in sanctifying, are curious and significant. The blood of a sin-offering is without power to remit sin, without the sanctification derived from its contact with the altar; and the altar is without holiness until sanctified by blood and anointed with oil. And yet it is evident that none of these things—nor all of them together, had the power to cleanse one spot, or blot out one sin. Still, they served a great purpose; but even in this service they derived all their efficacy from the fact that they were types of one perfect sacrifice and of one divine altar.

SECTION IV. THE PRIEST, OR PRIESTHOOD.

Having a suitable sin-offering and a consecrated altar, the question then arises, Who is to offer the sacrifice? Can any one do it? It is necessary that the victim shall be slain and its blood offered on the altar, but who is to do it?

From Adam to Moses the person and functions of the priesthood were not so well defined as under the Jewish institution. During this period of more than two thousand years, religious worship was confined to the individual and the family. At the first, the father necessarily discharged the functions of the priesthood, and was consequently the priest of the family. After him came the first born, or eldest son,¹ and so it continued until the priesthood of Aaron. As the priesthood was also of divine appointment, there is as much reason for believing that God ordained that the father and eldest son should discharge the duties of priest, as there is that he ordained the altar and its sacrifice. Hence, these were divinely appointed priests, and so regarded and treated both by the people and by the Lord himself. We have no account, however, of any special ordination and consecration of the person to the office. But when we come to the priesthood of Aaron, and read of separation, consecration, and ordination of specially designated persons to the office of the priesthood, we discover some reason why designated individuals are appointed to this work, and why separation, consecration, and ordination are necessary to the individual's fitness to discharge the duties of the office.

But a primary question arises, Why a priest at all? Why can not the sinner offer his own victim? Why should a second party be necessary? And still more, Why should this party be especially consecrated and ordained to the work?

¹ See Kitto, Art. Birthright.

The reason and necessity for a priesthood are found in the character of the relations which subsist between the parties concerned and interested in sacrifice. Sin has given rise to an offended and an offending party, and to consequences to the latter which involve his eternal ruin. If the sinner is to be saved from the consequences of his transgression, there is a necessity that some one not involved in the same trouble shall interpose in his behalf, and present a consideration for his pardon. The sinner has nothing in himself, and nothing within his reach or power to offer as this consideration; and hence, he is without hope, if some one else does not take compassion upon him, and interpose for his salvation.

Who can conceive of a means adequate to such a purpose? The sinner sees nothing but "indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish" as his merited portion; and what can he conceive of or do, that will remove his offense, undo his transgression, and restore him to favor?

The conception of the proper remedy and its provision belong alone to God, the offended party, since he alone knows what can atone for sin and give back to the sinner his innocency and the favor of God. Hence, he ordained sacrifice, and provided the priesthood. in anticipation of one far distant in the future, who would himself undertake the work of salvation, and present himself as the atoning sacrifice, the sanctifying altar, and the interceding priest.

Intercession is the prime and essential function of the priesthood.¹ The priest is ordained to make intercession for sinners by means of sacrifice.² For this he was consecrated, and made free from sin and holy. Being himself "encompassed with infirmity," he had need to offer up sacrifices first for his own sins, before he could offer those appointed for the sins of the people.³ This fact shows that a sinner can not acceptably present his offering in his own person, and that an intercessor, who is himself free from sin, is absolutely necessary in the offering of sacrifices.

These facts are significant, because of their typical and symbolical character. In them we read, as by letters and words, the character of the antitype, and they served to train the mind to the contemplation and expectation of a person who was, at some future day, to present himself in the triple character of sacrifice, altar, and priest; as the great intercessor, who would effectually plead man's cause before the throne in the heavens, and compass the great want and need of man involved in sin. These types and symbols served to show his entire dependence on foreign aid, if he were to find redemption from sin. As he led the victim to the priest, he saw in it the life that was to save his; and in the priest the intercessor who was to plead with that sacrifice for his pardon. So year by year, and generation after

¹ Heb. 7: 25; 9: 23-26. Isa. 53: 12. ² Heb. 5: 1; 8: 3. ³ Heb. 7: 27.

generation, was man taught to look to another than himself for help. Thus was his mind constantly and deeply impressed with his own utter helplessness; and such were the means employed to arouse his love and excite his gratitude to him who interceded in his behalf, and won for him the blessing of pardon, and the hope of life.

There were but two orders of priests under the former dispensations, and there are but two under the christian; and these are essential agencies of the Remedial System. These orders are the high priest and the common priest. The first belongs to the *provisionary* department of the Remedial System, and the other to the department of worship and secondary intercession. Under the Patriarchal age these two orders were represented by the father and the eldest son of the family for the common priesthood, and by Melchizedek for the high priesthood; under Judaism, by the high priest and common priests of the family of Aaron; and under the christian, by the Lord Jesus Christ and his disciples.

The functions of these two orders are more clearly and fully developed under Judaism, because presented to the mind by means which the senses recognize and appreciate. They are conspicuously displayed in the two distinct services of the tabernacle, which pertained to the two distinct apartments of that edifice. The duties of the high priest were really confined to the most holy place, though at first he officiated in the sanctuary, whose service was afterwards given into the hands of the common priests alone. Such is the case under the christian, and such it was under the patriarchal, and in the end, under the Jewish dispensation.

The service or function of the high priest, as we have said, pertained to the provisionary department of the Remedial System, and it was, consequently, limited to the most holy place. Thither the high priest went with the blood of the annual atonement, which had sole and primary reference to the procurement of remission. It was not properly worship. It was wholly intercessory. Not so the service of the common priest. His was partly intercessory and partly worship; intercessory in that he offered sacrifices for sin; and worship, in that he burnt incense on the golden altar that stood before the vail. This order of priests was the type of christians, as the sanctuary was the type of the church. This being so, the service of the church or of christians should be, and is, both intercessory and devotional; intercessory, in that christians are authorized and directed to intercede and pray for all men—as the apostle commanded Timothy: “I exhort, therefore, that first of all supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks be made for all men; for kings and all that are in authority,”—and devotional, in that christians worship God in the service of the church. The type found in the common priests who officiated in the sanctuary, affords us a

larger view of the purpose and duty of the church, and places christians before the world as the world's intercessors.

The patriarchal age afforded a grand type of the high priesthood of the Messiah in the person of Melchizedek, and in some respects a different one from that found in the Aaronic. Melchizedek was priest of the whole world, and not of a part of it. He had no predecessor nor successor. The high priesthood began and ended with him. He came over from the antediluvian world, where a high priesthood was unknown; and hence, he was in this respect like Christ. He was high priest during life, and hence, forever; and so is Christ; and as Christ is eternal, his priesthood will be eternal—will continue so long as intercession is necessary. The priesthood of neither is actually and really eternal; that of Melchizedek not, because he was mortal; and that of Christ, though eternal and immortal as to his being, will continue only so long as intercession shall be necessary—only so long as the blessings of the Remedial System are open to man.¹ When he abdicates the throne of universal authority, he will cease to be mediator and intercessor. Then his high priesthood will end.

The special and distinct type which Melchizedek presented of Christ, had respect to the *continuance* of his priesthood; and it had reference, consequently, to the eternity of Christ's being; that of Aaron had respect to the majesty and dignity of his priesthood, and pointed particularly to the divinity of Christ's person. With this idea comported the structure of the tabernacle, and the service of the high priest in the most holy place, where God received his offering for sin, and his intercession for transgression. The Aaronic high priest was in this brought nearer to God, and admitted to a more personal intercourse than was Melchizedek, and hence, he was, in this respect, a higher and fuller type of the priesthood of Christ. We have, then, in these two orders of high priesthood, just two elements or types of Christ's high priesthood, and both of these pertained wholly to his divine nature. Christ's humanity placed him in sympathy with man; his divinity in sympathy with God; and the latter is the ground of his acceptable intercession. Only a divine being can intercede for the procurement of remission on the basis of

¹ The Greek word translated forever is used to express both a limited and an unlimited continuance or duration of the person, thing, state, or purpose of which it affirms this quality, and as in all such cases it exhausts the duration of the person, thing, state, or purpose, it is properly translated *forever*. As examples, I cite Ps. 89: 1—"I will sing of thy mercies *forever*"; that is, as long as he should live. Again: "*Everlasting* covenant" and "*everlasting* possession," (Gen. 17: 7, 8,) means their continuance so long as God's purposes with the people continue, and so long as this world lasts. Hence, the word *ainoonios* here has not its unlimited, but its limited meaning. When used with respect to the being of God, or the life, death, and state of the world to come—that state being necessarily eternal—the word has the signification of unlimited duration. Hence, the *duration* of the person, thing, state, or purpose, which this word describes, is to be determined by what is otherwise affirmed of the person, thing, state, or purpose.

sacrifice. Hence, as the functions of the high priest pertain alone to the procurement of remission, or to the *provisionary* department of the Remedial System, the types in the priesthood of both Melchizedek and Aaron had sole reference to his divine nature, on which depended the continuance and success of intercession.

CHAPTER VII.

THE FLOOD.

To such a view as we propose to take of the Remedial System, by which God has solved the problem of sin, and made salvation possible to the sinner, no great event in man's history, which exhibits or illustrates his judgments against sin, can be considered foreign or irrelevant. So important and prominent an event in man's history as the deluge of Noah; one so terrible and wide-spread in its destruction; one so fearful as an exhibition of God's hatred of sin; and such a *proof of his* determination to punish this evil to the uttermost, ought not to be passed over in silence. Sin is the great evil and dark blot on the otherwise fair and beautiful universe, from which, as a threatening cloud, flash the lightnings of God's wrath, and gleam the terror, grandeur, and majesty of his attributes; and whenever in the history of sinning intelligences, he has executed his judgments on sin, he has exhibited thereby the heinousness of sin, and the majesty and glory of his own wonderful character.

The history of man is the development of the nature and consequences of sin, and the occasion of the development of certain attributes of the divine Being. In it appear the terrible judgments which God has denounced and executed on sin; and these are designed, and serve as forewarnings of a more terrible judgment to come, and make certain the destiny which awaits sin in the world to come. They are important facts in the administration of the government of God among men, and show the method of his treatment of this great evil. They place beyond all rational doubt the ultimate fate of the finally impenitent, and demonstrate the certainty of a future and final judgment.¹

The Remedial System contemplates as much the destruction of sin and the impenitent sinner, as it does the salvation of the penitent and faithful believer. While it provides amply for man's deliverance from sin, it sanctions the judgments denounced against it; and it would seem just as necessary and important to exhibit in man's history these judgments, and by these the cer-

¹ Jude, 7.

tainty of sin's final doom, as to open the way, and develop the plan by which man can be saved from all the consequences of transgression.

Among the judgments which God has visited on the world because of sin, none ranks with the deluge of Noah. It was an event appalling and terrible. The destruction by fire of "the cities of the Plain" was grand and awful, but a very small fraction of the race was involved in that overthrow. The deluge of Noah swept a world away! Only eight escaped! and they by the hand of God, because of their faith in him. It is without a parallel in the history of God's judgments on sin, and will find no parallel until the wicked and ungodly shall be destroyed

"In that new deluge whelmed,
But not of waters."

Cities have gone down in eternal night; nations have perished from the earth, and live only in history and their buried remains; ruthless war has run its plow-share through the earth, and lands lie waste, desolate, and unpeopled; and "earthquakes have smacked their mumbling lips" over thickly peopled cities; but the overthrow of a world, the simultaneous destruction by a deluge of millions of human beings, is without a parallel. Such judgments is sin capable of bringing on the world; and such are the shadows of events that lie beyond the limits of the present life.

Judgments come not as mere warnings. They are demanded by the nature and gravity of the evil that brings them. The expulsion of the sinning angels from heaven was demanded by their sin, and not simply as a warning to others. Sin demands its merited punishment, independent of all other considerations. The flood came because sin demanded it, and it was as much a necessity as the condemnation of the sinning angels in Tartarus. The wickedness of men had become great in the earth. Every crime known to mortals—crimes of the baser kind—filled the earth with violence. No power could restrain the passions of men. They raged with unbridled fury. They swept over the community as the terrific storm sweeps over the ocean; and reason and virtue went down in the general ruin. There was no hope from prophetic warning. Enoch threatened them with future judgment,¹ and Noah preached an immediate destruction by water; but they met with naught but derision and contempt, and the deluge came as an imperative necessity.

Adam lived to see much of the evil his act of transgression had inaugurated in the world. He saw what men were capable of doing when enslaved by sin. He saw much of the fruit of that tree of the knowledge of good and evil, and what ruin, misery, and woe he had precipitated upon the world. He saw passions of his nature rampant, riotous, and ruinous, of which he had never dreamed. He saw the first link in that great chain

¹ Jude, 14.

of crimes that brought down the unmitigated vengeance of God upon the antediluvian world, arise in his own family. He saw in the death of his beloved Abel the deed of a passion of his own nature of which he was wholly unconscious. It is necessary that man shall see much of himself before he can know himself. Adam had never known hatred, envy, or jealousy. Who were with him against whom these passions could be excited? Surely not his wife, for whom he had deliberately given up God and Eden; and certainly not his children. Yet there, in the person of Abel, lay the proofs of their existence. Cain had done the deed, and he was "bone of his bone, and flesh of his flesh," and the nature of the son must have been derived from the father. Therefore, the passions which were eruptive in the son, were certainly, though dormant, in the father.

The violent death of the good, and pure, and lovely Abel, at the hands of his envious and malicious brother, is full of the saddest reflections. Had God so utterly forsaken Adam and his family as to be wholly indifferent to their welfare? Was he no longer interested in their well-being, and had he turned away his face from them forever? Was he indifferent to an impending calamity, and when an arm was raised to inflict a blow, was he regardless of how, when, and on whom it fell? Did he care no more for the good, and pure, and lovely, than for the cruel and wicked? Was there no help or protection from him for the innocent and righteous, than for the violent and brutal?

"My ways are not as your ways, nor my thoughts as your thoughts," says the Almighty to men. The end will remove many doubts, and solve many mysteries. The great problem of sin with which God grapples in the person of his sinning creatures, is too mighty and intricate for man's feeble powers to appreciate. Its management lies on a plane and range infinitely above and beyond man's finite capacities. In the deep designs of God, and in the grand solution which he proposes to give of this great evil, such events as the death of Abel, and all others like it, are but figures in the computation to be considered and understood in the light of the entire demonstration. They serve to exhibit and illustrate the principle upon which the solution of the problem proceeds, without some appreciation of which neither the nature, effects, nor destiny of sin can be appreciated or understood. If wickedness were cut short on the earth, and men were restrained from sin by an irresistible force over their will, and prevented from acting in accordance with the promptings and spontaneity of their nature; or if sin were punished as soon as committed, man would never know sin, nor himself, nor God; and a Remedial System would be neither possible nor necessary.

But since sin must be developed, and made to appear in all its native hideousness and turpitude, before men can be influenced to hate, abhor, and shun it, there can be no interference on the part of God to prevent it, or punish it at once, and men must be

left to the determinations of their own will, unrestrained and uninfluenced by any power, or any means beyond such as are calculated to determine or influence the choice of their will. Hence, we need express no surprise that men commit crimes under the very eye of God, and that he does not interfere to prevent them. Whatever power or influence he does or may exert in order to deter men from sin, or incite them to righteousness, is exerted in perfect harmony with the nature and laws of their being. If the influences and powers which molded the holy and righteous character of Abel, and which were equally enjoyed by Cain, failed to make him as good as his brother, no special exertion of the power of God could be exercised to prevent him from committing the crime. No act of the Sovereign Will, acting as a dynamic force or power, can prevent sin. It may prevent a rational being from doing a wrong act; but the power exercised destroys at the same time the moral agent, and the sinful character of the act. The permission of sin on the part of God, in the sense of allowing it to occur for any reason, does not lie within the power, or under the will of God. Sin occurs independent of, and contrary to, his will; and hence he is in no way responsible for it, and can not be charged with indifference to the welfare of man. The crime of Cain was the work of his own will and passions, which he possessed in common with his brother; and its occurrence just on the threshold of the earth, shows to what dreadful deeds sin is capable of exciting the human heart. On the other hand, the character of Abel is a beautiful and striking example of the power of love, truth, and faith to mold the life, and of the ability of the heart to resist and subdue the passions within.

It is wonderful how rapidly the world sank in sin, while yet the story of Eden was fresh in the mind. Adam lived nine hundred and thirty years, and to within seven hundred and twenty six years of the flood, and was contemporary with Lamech for fifty-six years. Methuselah died in the year of the flood, and was, consequently, cotemporary with Noah for six hundred years. Adam could have given the story to Methuselah, and he to Noah, and these to all the antediluvian world. But naught could do them good. The entreaties of patriarchs, and the warnings and threatenings of prophets, availed nothing. Onward rushed the tide of sin, continually swelling and gathering force and strength as it flowed, carrying before it all ages and sexes, and whelming all in one common ruin.

Enoch, who was cotemporary with Adam for more than three hundred years, and who was the great light of that ancient world, thundered the judgments of God against the wickedness of men, and warned them of the great day when God would execute his vengeance upon the ungodly, and consign them to eternal ruin.¹ Then came Noah, less than a century after Enoch's translation,

¹ Jude, 14, 15.

a preacher of righteousness, and warned the people of immediate judgment and ruin by a flood of water. But all to no purpose. The earth groaned under the violence and crime that raged every where, and implored relief from heaven. "And God saw that the wickedness of man was great on the earth, and that every thought, and desire, and purpose of his heart was continually evil; and it repented the Lord that he had made man on the earth, and it grieved him at his heart; and the Lord said, I will destroy man whom I have created from the face of the earth."¹

The wickedness of that world must have been exceedingly great and wide-spread and incurable, to have evoked so strong and plaintive language from the Creator. There was no other cause for the flood but the wickedness of the people, and no other immediate object but the utter and total destruction of the race from the face of the earth.

We have in this fact a marked and striking example of the principle on which God proceeds in reference to communities, large and small. When a people have fully shown themselves so given up to sin as to resist all appeals and efforts to reform them, he then destroys them.² The destruction of the antediluvian world was a stupendous example of this principle of his government. So was the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, of Babylon and Nineveh.

The object of the flood determines its extent. That object being the destruction of mankind because of sin, the extent of the deluge was limited to that part of the earth then inhabited. The destruction of the animals associated with him was incidental and unavoidable; but was no part of the object of the overflow. Such as were useful to man were preserved from the deluge by being taken into the ark. All others perished. We are not to presume that representatives of every species of animals, insect, reptile, bird, or mammal, were preserved in order to replenish the new world. Such destructions were nothing new in the animal world. Local deluges, with similar results, have been frequent during the long geological ages of the past. Hence, there was no special object or necessity for making the deluge of Noah an exception, only so far as those animals were concerned which were useful and necessary to man. The extent of the deluge was, therefore, confined to that region of the earth then inhabited by the human race.

The proofs that it was local in extent, and not a universal overflow of the whole earth, are too numerous and forcible to admit of any doubt on the subject. The language of Moses, however, favors the view of its universality; yet it is not inconsistent with the idea that it was local. His language is not so definite and exact as a scientific description would require. It makes no pretensions to scientific definiteness and accuracy; but speaks the language of the phenomenal. He knew not the extent of the

¹ Gen. 6: 5-7. ² Isaiah 60: 12; Jer. 12: 17.

earth's surface, and wrote as if the then inhabited portion were all. Hence, "the whole earth," and "under the whole heaven," really include and mean no more than what was then known of the world's surface.

As Moses wrote under the direction of the inspiring Spirit, his account can not contradict any cotemporaneous fact, or imply impossibilities. Certain facts being now known, which forbid the idea of universality, we are compelled to regard that overflow as of local extent. The language and statements of Moses must not involve any absurdities or impossibilities, and we must therefore interpret him in the light of known facts and possibilities.

In the first place, it was absolutely impossible for the ark to contain representatives of all the species of animals now inhabiting the earth, which it must have done, if the flood was universal. It is doubtful whether its capacity was great enough to accommodate representatives of all the species that inhabited the district of country that was subjected to the overflow. But admitting its capacity to be ample for all, it would still be absurd to suppose that the deluge was universal. It was simply impossible for representatives of all the species of animals now known to have inhabited the earth at that time, to have reached the ark without the most wonderful and even absurd miracles. To have called, by divine interposition of physical power, all the land animals that then filled the different continents to the western portion of Asia, and housed them in the ark, until the flood was over, when the design of the overflow was simply the destruction of mankind, would have been a work so unnecessary, if not positively foolish, that we can not for a moment think of it as an act of infinite intelligence and wisdom. It would have

"Resembled ocean into tempest wrought,
To waft a feather or drown a fly."

How was it possible for the animals of the western continent and the islands of the ocean to reach western Asia? Could they have crossed the Atlantic? Could any animal that was carried over in the ark have done this? The supposition is absurd and impossible, and consequently the theory that makes it necessary must be untrue in whole and in part.

It will not do to say that the animals which are now found in every part of the world are the representatives of those carried over in the ark; that, for instance, the animal kingdom was created and placed in the western part of Asia, and thence distributed, after the flood, over the earth. The facts in contradiction of such a supposition are too numerous and weighty to be questioned. These facts show that each great division of the earth—and, indeed, smaller divisions also—has species so peculiar to it, that we must concede that they were created where they are now found.¹ Where they are now found, their progenitors lived

¹ Essay on Classification, pp. 48, 49.

before the flood of Noah—before even Adam. These statements can not be questioned, and the conclusion, therefore, must follow irresistibly, that the deluge of Noah could not have been universal.

The question as to its extent being settled, the limits of the deluge may be approximated. The means employed to produce it show that it was confined to a comparatively small portion of the earth's surface, and limited to the western portion of Asia, and adjacent parts northward and southward. It is not possible that such a flood could be the result of rain-fall alone. This is evident on the slightest reflection. If the land remained stationary during the rain, the flood could not have risen beyond a certain height, for at that point the drainage would have equalled the fall, and then there could have been no further rise. This depth of water would not have covered the ordinary hills of the country. The "flood gates of heaven" could not, therefore, have possibly submerged the land.

Another means was essentially necessary, and this was ample, and alone would have been sufficient, had God not thought proper, at the same time, to distress and discomfort by means of rain. This means was the gradual subsidence of the land intended to be overflowed below the level of the surrounding seas. This would have given the appearance as if the fountains of the great deep "were broken up," of which Moses speaks.

There is nothing strange in such a phenomenon. The rise and fall of land, and the consequent on-flow and off-flow of water from adjacent seas or oceans, is a phenomenon as "ancient as the sun," and as old as the earth. The phenomenon is witnessed at the present day in different parts of the earth, and occasions no surprise to those familiar with the geological history of the earth.

It is not difficult to imagine the terror and consternation of the men, women, and children when they saw their houses and fields gradually sinking under the rising waters. The torrents that fell from the clouds, and the floods that swept along and through the beds of streams, and ravines, continually rising, and constantly encroaching on every new place of safety to which the fugitives successively clambered, brought to their minds, but too late, the warning voice of "the preacher of righteousness." The deluge had come, and the ark was closed, and naught was left the impenitent and disobedient, but to await their doom.

The surging torrents as they swept wildly among the hills, and over field and plain, carried devastation and ruin to every home and household. Everywhere there appeared flocks and herds, and debris of home, struggling for life, and floating on the surface of the waters. Every hill-top was covered, and every place that afforded temporary safety was occupied by distressed men, women, and children, drenched with rain, and perishing with hunger. All the passions of the human heart, that ennoble or debase human character, were wild with excitement, or torpid

with dread and despair. Men raged and blasphemed; women prayed and implored; and children appealed with pitying looks and cries. Distress and anguish wrung the hearts of thousands, and blasted hope fixed haggard looks on every face. Still the rain continued to fall and the flood-gates of heaven to empty their reservoirs of water; still "the fountains of the great deep" continued to pour their exhaustless waves over the land, until the last hill and mountain was lost to the view, and those who sought safety upon their summits were swept away forever. Everywhere, on the surface of that wide, and wild, and raging sea, floated the dead of man and of beast. The last man, as he sat on the highest mountain, looking out over the dismal waste of waters, and saw the wreck of a ruined world floating on every side, was a picture of distress, anguish, and mental torture, which the world will never see again until it undergoes its second great baptism.

Such are the fruits of sin; such the ruin and devastation it has brought on this fair world; and similar the end it will eventually bring on the ungodly. Though a deluge like that of Noah has never visited, and will never again visit the earth, as a fearful exhibition of God's wrath against sin, and of his unalterable determination to punish and crush it; yet a greater, and a far more terrible one, will come upon the impenitent, when the drama of human life shall close, and the race shall enter upon its eternal destiny.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE NEW WORLD.

SECTION I. THE NEW RACE.

There is no principle of the Divine Government more clearly or firmly established and settled, than that God will certainly and adequately punish sin. The judgments which he has denounced and executed against it in this world, were evidently designed to give man a correct, though but an imperfect, idea of the evil as it appeared to him, and to remove from man's mind any lingering doubt that God will continue to punish sinners, not only in this world, but also in the world to come. The terrible lessons which he has read to man in the calamities which he has, in his providence, brought upon him, are designed to teach, not only him, but all intelligent beings in the spiritual realm of the Universe, the nature, effects, and consequences of sin. Sin can only be properly known, and seen in its true light by finite beings, by the developments which it makes of itself; nor can men understand and appreciate the judgments inflicted upon it, but through the events by which the punishments are shown.

The whole history of man is but a series of events by which are shown the workings of this evil on the mind, and heart, and character of man, and the method of God in dealing with it. And it is man's highest wisdom, and most important attainment, to read correctly the lessons taught in this history. The most conspicuous and terrible of these events was that by which an entire world was destroyed by water.

The bow of Promise, painted on clouds by sunlight and shower, now gives assurance to man that no such destruction shall ever again overtake the race. But has sin become less offensive to God? Has it lost any of its hideousness in his sight? Was God so satisfied with the punishment he then inflicted on sin, as henceforth to regard it with less aversion? Is he less relentless in his hate of it now than before? The bow of Promise gives no such pledge, nor inspires any such hope. The world will no more be destroyed by a deluge of water; nor will man be allowed

to increase in sin to the same extent as before the flood. Crime shall never again gather strength, and prevail as then. We have no reason to believe that man is less wicked since than before that terrible overthrow. His subsequent history shows that God has cut him off by other judgments before he had reached that high of wickedness. He is now scattered over the face of the earth, his power for evil dissipated, and thereby weakened; intercourse between communities cut off by the confusion of language; and thus isolated, the giant powers of the antediluvian world are shorn of much of their strength.

The New World began with the eight souls that were saved; and from that four pair, all of one family, has every human being sprung, that now lives on the face of the earth, of every diversity and color. This is an unavoidable and necessary conclusion from the fact of the flood. We have seen that the object of the flood was the total and complete destruction of the race, with the exception named. The fact and object of the deluge being admitted, we are forced to the conclusion that Noah was the second progenitor of the race; that he and his family were the only human beings who were preserved alive to continue the race.

The scriptural account of the common origin of the human race has been discredited, because it does not seem to harmonize with existing facts. If the sacred writings be of divine inspiration, they must, when properly understood, contradict no well established fact. While the advocates of a diversity of origin of the human race, assume that existing facts contradict the Mosaic account of the origin of man, they do not care to know that any other view contradicts some of the plainest facts in man's history, and nullifies a most important one, which is an object of daily observation and experience. They must deny the fact and object of the Flood, and especially the existence of sin among men. For these admitted, the common origin of the race is established beyond all rational doubt. If the destruction by the Deluge be admitted, the present living races could have had no other progenitor than Noah. And if the existence of sin be admitted; if sin exists among all mankind now living on the earth, the fact of sin confirms the story of the fall and the fact of the flood, and unites all men into one common brotherhood. For, if it be contended that other centres of creation existed for man, besides that described by Moses, and that these were not included in the destruction which befell the Asiatic centre, then we are involved in greater difficulties than those implied by a common origin. If we admit different centres of creation for man—as we may for many of the inferior animals—and, therefore, the origin of the race from different pairs, created as distinct and separate races, we are involved in a serious difficulty as regards sin. We will be compelled to suppose that sin did not occur among all the races of men, or, if it did, that all mankind was not destroyed by the deluge of Noah. Sin has existed from time immemorial, and

exhibits the same features among all the varieties of the human race; and if it was not introduced into this world in the manner recorded by Moses, then we have no means of accounting for its universal existence. The disbelievers, therefore, in the scriptural history of the creation of man, and the introduction of sin, are compelled to reject (as they do) these two most important events in man's history. They must deny, not only the origin of man, as given by Moses, but also the destruction of the race on account of sin by the Flood, and the still more awful fact of sin. If the account which claims to be by inspiration, be not true; if man originated from more than one pair, Adam and Eve, then the flood is a fable, and that which mankind has been accustomed to regard and punish as sin, is not sin, but only a natural phenomenon in man's character, resulting naturally and causally from some defect in the development of the powers of his being, in no sense differing from the actions of animals, of whose actions no moral character can be predicated.

We do not propose here to enter upon an extended consideration of the subject of the origin of the human race, but only to notice it so far as it lies in our way in considering the existence, development, and punishment of sin among men. We believe that sin is the common and universal lot of man, and that it alone is quite sufficient to establish the identity of nature, and unity of origin, of the race; and that no other hypothesis, the Bible account being rejected, can reconcile existing facts with each other. But receiving implicitly the truthfulness of the Divine Record, we look to other causes to explain phenomena which have been supposed to point to a diversity of origin for the human race. Sin, dark and terrible as it is in its nature and in its destructive influences over the heart and mind of man; gloomy as it has made this once beautiful world; and maculate as it has made the once spotless character of man, is yet capable of making luminous many obscure, and, without it, many unintelligible and inexplicable phenomena in man's nature and history. On a common nature and a common origin for man, it throws a flood of light; and confirms, in the strongest and most indubitable manner, these scriptural facts in man's history.

The great diversity observed between the different races of mankind, is the foundation of the supposition that the human species had its origin in several distinct pairs, radiating from different and widely separated centres of creation. The attempt has been made to establish the truth of this supposition by a large and broad induction of facts, drawn from the organic world, in the geographical distribution of plants and animals.¹ It is unnecessary to deny the statement, that plants and animals have originated in different and widely-separated centres of creation; and we may admit that "facts now point distinctly to an independent origin of individuals of the same species in remote

¹ *Essays on Classification*, chap. 1, sec 9.

regions, or of closely allied species representing one another in different parts of the world;" but we can not draw from these premises the conclusion, that the same is true as regards the origin of man. It does not follow because, in the case of the lower animals, individuals of the same species have been created in different parts of the world at the same time, that the same is true in regard to the origin of man. It may be true as regards the first, but not true as regards the latter, so far as the argument is concerned. This is because there is no logical connection between the premises and conclusion. It can not be inferred, because the species is continued on the earth in the same manner, and according to the laws of the same great system, as the lower animals, that man is no more than an animal. Yet we can as readily infer this from this premise, as we can that his original creation took place according to the laws observed in the creation of the inferior animals. His *spiritual* nature, which removes him so far above and beyond the organism of animals, constitutes him a species more distinct and specific than any of the species of the inferior animals; so that what may be predicated of animals, can not, *therefore*, be predicated of man. This broad distinction between him and the animals below him, leads us to conclude at once, that there is some specific peculiarity about man. This being so, we can not conclude that what is true of animals, as respects their origin, must also be true of him.

Out of his spiritual nature comes the existence of sin, which makes his history a category of itself. We do not predicate of animals either sin or a spirit-being capable of an existence independent of the body. Man, because of his spiritual nature, differs categorically from animals, though really an animal. We ought, therefore, to expect to find an essential difference between them in their creation. The purposes to be accomplished in the creation of man, differ, *toto celo*, from those determining the creation of animals. He was adapted to live in any part of the habitable earth, and the present day finds him in every latitude and longitude. He possesses powers which enable him to traverse the whole earth, to cross oceans, seas, and lakes, to pass over mountains and through deserts, and live in any zone. Not so animals. They are scattered everywhere, that man may have them for his uses wherever he goes. As they can not follow him, nor be carried by him; and as the same species can not live everywhere, different species of the same genus, and varieties of the same species are provided for man in every part or division of the earth. Hence the geographical distribution of plants and animals in creation.

Since man, therefore, differs so materially and widely from animals as to his nature and the purposes of his creation, we can not logically infer from the fact that there were different and various centres of creation for plants and animals, that man originated in the same way. On the contrary, the argument for a

plurality of origin, based on the geographical distribution of animals, is just as strong and convincing for the *unity* of his origin, since the distribution of the useful and necessary animals over the earth, contemplated his residence in every part of it. From whatever stand point, therefore, we may view the subject, we find that the Mosaic account is the most rational.

It can not be denied that there is a great and marked difference between some of the races or families of mankind. The difference is so great as to be readily recognized. There is no difficulty in distinguishing a Caucasian from a Mongolian or an African; and but little sometimes in distinguishing between some of the varieties of these races. The English, Scotch, and Irish, and the German, French, and Spaniard, are easily recognized; and yet it may be as difficult to account for this diversity as for the greater that marks the different races.

We do not propose to discuss the causes that have been suggested or assigned for the diversity observed between the several races and families of the human species. That of physical agents has been the one most generally received; but it is questionable whether these agents have any more or greater power to form such races of a species, as we find in the case of man, than they have of originating the differences observed among the species of the inferior animals. It may be admitted that there are facts which look in this direction; but they are too few to be conclusive. A better and more adequate cause can be found; and not only better, but perfectly conclusive and satisfactory. This cause lies within the field of our investigation, and along the line of our argument.

If we look at man only on the somatic side of his being, and only regard him as a being under the dominion of physical nature, we ignore the greater and more important part of his nature, and that, too, which gives him a history and constitutes the chief interest of his existence. Without a history he would not be distinguished from animals; but with this he rises infinitely above the plane of their being and nature. If we deny to man the superior excellence of an individual spirit-nature, the subject of causes, influences, and powers beyond the domain of this world; if we deny to him a special superintending providence, by which his history and destiny in this world and the next are molded, shaped, and determined, we involve him in a confusion, contradiction, and mystery, from which it will be impossible to extricate him. If we deny that he is a *subject of a special superintending providence, and an object of a superior and continued attention and regard on the part of the Divine Author of his being*, we shall have no power to understand his history, nor means of removing the mystery that environs him in every age of his history. But if man be the special object of consideration on the part of God (and that he is, man's history fully demonstrates), then we have, in the special providence of

God, a cause that will account for all the facts in his history. If God sets bounds to the habitations of men, and prescribes the limits to which they shall be confined;¹ if he extirpates a people from their land and homes, and plants another in their stead;² if he subjects one part of the race to the rule and dominion of another;³ it is no great task to believe that he also has given rise to the differences which appear in the various races and families of mankind. In all the providences of his government he has purposes to accomplish, and they are sent upon mankind with the purpose and end in view; and when he purposes to visit a people with blessings or afflictions, he uses means which will accomplish the purpose. Of this we have an instance in the case of the twin-brothers, Esau and Jacob.

The Caucasian and the African present the extremes of the diversity that exists between the races, and in the strongest and broadest contrast. The diversity is felt to be too great to be accounted for on the ground of the influence of physical agents, and hence the theory as to the plurality of origin. But if the comparatively slight difference which existed between the descendants of Esau and Jacob, was of such importance as to justify the interposition of God in order to fulfill his purposes, much more is his interposition required when greater purposes are in view. This fact is at least sufficient to justify the presumption that God may be the potential cause of the differences observed between the great divisions of the human family; and if the interpretation which we give of the fact be correct, then the presumption borders on certainty.

Some years after the deluge, and whilst Noah was a husbandman, an event occurred of strange and mysterious import and significance, and followed by consequences on persons having no connection with the transaction, and bearing no seeming proportion to what appears in the event. Noah, on becoming intoxicated, lay uncovered and exposed in his tent. Ham seeing the condition of his father, and recognizing the cause of it, felt, possibly, amused and diverted, and communicated the fact to his two brothers. They, regarding the matter with a more serious and reverential feeling, and not showing the levity of Ham, protected their father from exposure, and allowed him to rest until the effects of his drinking had passed away.

When Noah awoke, he knew by vision, dream, or inspiration, what his sons had done. In this knowledge we recognize the hand of God. On the threshold of the New World, and standing at the second origin of the human race. God looked down the ages, and saw before him the history of man as he spread over the world, and deemed it proper and necessary to indicate in outline the history and destiny of the descendants of these three sons.

The intoxication of Noah and the act of his sons served as the

¹ Acts 17: 26.

² Deut. 4: 37, 38.

³ Gen. 9: 25; 25: 23.

occasion for a prophetic declaration. In the conduct of his sons lay the seeds of the degradation or exaltation of the human race involved in sin, and God deemed it wise and necessary to signalize the conduct of the brothers with marks of his pleasure and disapprobation, and to fix upon the conduct of Ham his estimation of the sin of disrespect to parents.

When God intervenes in the affairs of men, we may know that the occasion is worthy of his intervention, and if we fail to view the event in the light of his intervention, we will fail to discern and appreciate the true character of the event. There was something in the conduct of Ham too heinous and base to pass unobserved and unrebuked by God, and so deeply criminal as to call down his wrath and curse. If we may measure the sin by the curse pronounced, it was great in the extreme, and full of the saddest and most terrible consequences to mankind; and so, to arrest the attention of the world, to fix the mind on the deed, and to measure to mankind its true nature, character, and tendency God laid a terrible curse upon one line of the children of Ham. The sin was disrespect to parents, and it was cursed because it is akin to impiety, the groundwork of all sin among men, and a forecast of the utter ruin of the race.

The fact that a branch of the family of Ham was cursed for what the father did, and not Ham in person, shows that God intended by this curse upon a posterity to make that curse an eternal monument for all coming ages, that mankind in all time might read on it God's estimate of disrespect to parents.

This event assures us that sin was not eradicated from the earth by the Flood, and that God does not look on it with any more allowance now than before; that the magnitude of that punishment did not dispose him to look on sin with any more leniency and forbearance than he did before the days of Noah's preaching. On the contrary, it proves that he is irreconcilably opposed to it in every form, and will continue to punish it whenever occasion requires. The Deluge, whose monument is seen in the bow of heaven, is no greater proof of his hatred of sin, and of his settled purpose to punish it, than the curse that fell on Canaan because of the sin of his father. The Flood passed away with the destruction of a world; but the curse on Canaan was designed to continue down to ages, and to exist contemporaneously with the blessings pronounced on Shem and Japheth. "And he said, Cursed be Canaan; a servant of servants shall he be to his brethren. And he said, Blessed be the Lord God of Shem; and Canaan shall be his servant. *God shall enlarge Japheth, and he shall dwell in the tents of Shem; and Canaan shall be his servant.*"¹

God works by means in his providences. When he has purposes to accomplish, whether near, or far distant in the future, he sets agents to work which will effect the desired result. The

¹ Gen. 9: 25-27.

blessings which were promised to Shem, the "enlargement" vouchsafed to Japheth, and the curse invoked on Canaan, may be effected, and possibly are, by natural agencies; but it is fair to presume, when natural agencies produce results so dissimilar and extreme as are observed in the characteristics of the different races of the human family, that these agencies have been directed, concentrated, or disposed as occasion required, so as to work different results even under similar circumstances. Sin has been the great occasion for God's intervention in the affairs of men, and in no little degree the cause of the various destinies which have overtaken nations, peoples, and races. God's work in the Remedial System, which threads its way through the history of man from the fall to the close of time, throws its broad light over the phenomena of the world, and makes events otherwise dark, obscure, or mysterious, clear, consistent, and harmonious with the leading purpose and design of God's government among men.

In the purposes of his government among men lie his providences over the whole human family, and in these is to be found the explanation of the phenomena observed in the diversity existing between the races. Just what these purposes are, and how and by what means the phenomena are produced, it is impossible for man to discover; but of one thing we may be fully assured, that we have in the providence of God the true and adequate cause of all that we see on the earth, however strange, mysterious, and inexplicable the observed phenomena may appear to man's finite powers and circumscribed vision.

SECTION II. MELCHIZEDEK.

The religious institutions of the old world were preserved for the new in the family of Noah. They were continued without change or modification. When Noah came forth from the ark, and stood on the earth again, he signalized the event by offering a burnt-offering to the Lord, on an altar constructed by himself. As the father and priest he officiated at the altar, and the offering was accepted. The altar, sacrifice, and priest, in the person of the father or first born, continued in the line of Shem until the giving of the law at Mt. Sinai, about nine hundred years after the Flood; and among other peoples, other branches of the family of Noah, they continued until lost in Paganism.

The flood was followed by an event which marked a change in the affairs of mankind. One language had kept the descendants of Noah united as one people, as was the race before the

Deluge. But now the world was to be occupied, and the race spread over its surface, which would necessitate the rise of communities and nations. The field of God's government among men began to widen, and his administration of its affairs to become more specialized. Hence, in order to inaugurate new designs and places of operation, and to prevent evils which are inseparable from a united and consolidated people, he scattered the race by confounding their language, in the days of Peleg, about one hundred and thirty years after the flood.¹ This was the first step toward the specialization of the Remedial System, since it led to the isolation of Abraham, and the erection of his descendants into a nation, which became the treasury of divine revelation, and to which "pertained the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service, and the promises,"² and from which Christ, the last hope of the world, came, as the end, conclusion, and finisher of all God's plans and designs concerning the present and future welfare of the race.

The blessings pronounced on Shem by his father Noah, confined the developments of the Remedial System to his family. Such must be the intent and meaning of the words of the blessing: "*Blessed be the Lord God of Shem.*" It was an indirect blessing. The direct object is the *Lord God* of Shem, indirectly prophetic of the Messiah, and the blessing coming on Shem as the progenitor of the Christ. There was no promise pertaining to religion ever given to Japheth, or the uncursed sons of Ham. All of God's dealings with mankind in the New World have been confined to the line of Shem. Of this fact there can not be the slightest doubt after the calling of Abraham, and this forms the strongest presumptive evidence, when taken in connection with the words of the blessing invoked upon him by his father, that such was the case before Abraham.

The specialization initiated by the confusion of tongues, and the consequent dispersion of the race in the year Peleg was born, Anno Mundi 1787, was followed in the course of a century or so by the appearance of the grandest and earliest prophetic type of the Christ that we have on record. This was Melchizedek; and since he was the type, as to his priesthood, of the Messiah in his priesthood, he was the first differentiation of the Remedial System, so far as the element of the priesthood is concerned.

This priesthood differed very materially from the common priesthood already existing in the father and the oldest son of the family. It ranked above this in every particular, and differed from it in the manner of its institution. It possessed functions of a deeper import and wider range, and was on a plane of intercession far above that of the existing or common priesthood.

All the elements and distinctive features of the priesthood of Melchizedek, as well as the importance and significance of these,

¹ Gen. 10: 25. ² Rom. 9: 4

lay in the fact that it was a prophetic type of the priesthood of Christ, whose wonderful being gave to this priesthood its peculiar complexity and apparent incongruities and contradictions.

To the apostle Paul we are alone indebted for all that we know of Melchizedek, beyond the fact that he gave Abraham his official blessing when he met him returning from the discomfiture of the five confederate kings. But for Paul we would have known nothing of the significance of his priesthood. As a type of Christ, he furnished the apostle with a strong argument against the permanency of the Aaronic priesthood, and for the superiority of the priesthood of Christ; and when we understand the true nature and peculiarities of the priesthood of Christ, we can appreciate more fully the beauty, strength, and significance of the type.

Melchizedek was a king as well as a high priest. The crown and the mitre were united in his person, just as they are in Christ. The regal and sacerdotal character of his person constituted him a grand and magnificent type of the Prince Messiah; and although the apostle dwells particularly and chiefly on his priestly character, yet the type presented by Melchizedek embraced also the regal element.

The description of this person, as given by the apostle, is very strange and singular, and gives to him a wonderful and mysterious character. He was without father or mother; without a pedigree or genealogy; without beginning of days or end of life; he was a priest continually. The force and strength of this language are drawn from the ordinance of the Aaronic priesthood, and the language is to be interpreted in the light of the regulations pertaining to the Jewish priesthood, which provided for an assumption and abdication on the part of the priest of the office he filled. Hence, there was succession, parentage, and pedigree in the Aaronic priesthood, in regard to which Melchizedek differed essentially and particularly from Aaron.

Before the time of Melchizedek there was no high priest. He was the first of that order, as well as the last and only one during the interval between Adam and Moses. It was a new office; and from the description given of him, a strange, remarkable, and distinguished man filled it. At the time he is introduced to the reader, he dwelt in the land of Canaan, and must have been a person of acknowledged pre-eminence, both as to position and character.

As to who Melchizedek was, different views obtain. The name is rather official than personal.¹ "The best founded opinion seems to be that of Carpzov, and the most judicious moderns, who, after Josephus, allege that Melchizedek was a principal person among the Canaanites and posterity of Noah, and eminent for holiness and justice, and therefore discharged the priestly as well as regal functions among the people."²

¹ Heb. 7: 2. ² Kitto's Encyclopedia, Art. Melchizedek.

This view of the "most judicious moderns" is not very definite. It does not state *who* he was, but *where* he was—"among the Canaanites," and "a principal person." If they intend to say that he was a Canaanite—a descendant of Canaan, who was so bitterly cursed, then they ignore the important fact that of the Canaanites "Moses spoke nothing concerning the priesthood," or of any other divine calling or appointment. The fact that Canaan was cursed by God forbids the supposition that any of his descendants were ever appointed to any important religious office, and much less made a type of the Messiah. If such be the "view of Carpzov and the most judicious moderns," it must be discarded for this reason alone. If they mean to say that he was not a Canaanite, but only dwelt among them, then they do not tell us anything that Moses does not state.

A more reasonable view, as it seems to us, is that Melchizedek was Shem. In favor of this view we may cite (¹) the blessing pronounced upon him. Japheth is generally regarded as the eldest brother.² As such he was the successor of his father in the priesthood, and was given his portion of the inheritance. Japheth was enlarged as to his dominions. The blessings to Shem, the second brother, were of a spiritual character, and he was chosen as the line through whom should flow all God's blessings to the race. From the line which ran through Arphaxad, Salah, Eber, and Abraham, came the Jewish nation, the giving of the law, the covenants, and the promises, and finally the Messiah, the Prince of the house of David. This much would, therefore, seem certain, that so great a character as the high priest of humanity on the threshold of the New World, would be selected from the family of Shem, and not from the family of Ham.

In the next place, the description given of Melchizedek would seem to apply with more propriety to Shem than to any other person. While the apostle may have had before his mind the usages of the Aaronic priesthood when speaking of Melchizedek as being "without father and without mother, and without genealogy," and "without beginning of days or end of life," thereby meaning that he had no predecessor or successor in his office; yet, when we remember that Shem came over from the old world, and lived until after the calling of Abraham, and the promises made to him, which was the initial point of the Jewish institution, we observe that the language may have a more literal signification. To the new world he was like the creation of Adam. He appeared in the maturity of manhood, and lived to see the race scattered from Babel in all directions; followed a part to the westward, in the land known to Moses as being possessed by the Canaanites; and witnessed the commencement of that series of providences, which finally culminated in the introduction of that great personage, of whom Melchizedek was

¹ Encyclop. of Religious knowledge, Art. Melchizedek. ² Gen. 10: 21.

the first and greatest type. He occupied the whole of the interval between the flood in 1656, and the calling of Abraham in the year 2083 Anno Mundi, and lived to see Isaac fifty years of age.

As the high priesthood embraced the whole people, who so fitting as Shem to be called to that high position? And as he was also king of Salem, who so well fitted to be made king? As Shem was alive in the days when Melchizedek was made high priest of the New World; and as he was eminently fitted by character, and enjoyed spiritual blessings and promises from God of no ordinary nature, it would seem that no other person could have been thought of for the office. Had he been dead, then the opinion of "Carpzov and the most judicious moderns" might be as probable as any; but since he was yet alive, and was the greatest personage of that age, the view that regards him as the person officially called Melchizedek, seems much the more probable.

CHAPTER IX.

THE ABRAHAMIC COVENANTS.

The calling of Abraham marks an important era in the history of God's government among men. From it we date the beginning of that series of events which ended with the introduction of the Christian dispensation, and from it mark the beginning of that isolation and separation which culminated in the deliverance of the people of Israel from Egypt. From Abraham arises that stream of wonderful providences which distinguish the history of the Jews. He stands out as conspicuous in the history of the race, as does Adam. He also is the beginning of a creation marked by as vivid a display of God's work as that which ended with the creation of Adam. Distinguished by a life of faith which staggered at nothing, however apparently impossible, he has lived through the ages, and will live, as the grandest specimen of faith the world has ever seen. He was the worthy sire of a new creation—of a two-fold people, great and glorious, whose institutions have shaped, and civilized, and will ultimately christianize the world.

In the land of Ur in Chaldea, the home of his youth, and while his parents were yet living, God said to him: "Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, into a land that I will show thee; and I will make of thee a great nation. * * Then he came out of the land of the Chaldeans, and dwelt in Haran; and from thence, when his father was dead, he removed" into the land of Canaan.¹ He was then seventy-five years old.

The promise given to Abraham was of a two-fold character. It was, firstly, that God would make of him who was then childless, and far advanced in years,² a great nation, and would bless him and make his name great in the world; and, secondly, that through him he would bless all the families of the earth. This promise was made him while he was yet in Ur of the Chaldeans. When he reached the land some years afterwards, and had gone as far as the plain of Moreh, the Lord appeared to him again, and made him another promise, saying: "Unto thy seed will I give this land." We have, then, three promises made to Abraham

¹ Gen. 12: 2; Acts 7: 4. ² Heb. 11: 12.

up to this time: 1. That God would make of him a great nation; 2. That he would bless the world through his seed; and 3. That he would give the land of Canaan to his offspring. Between the first two promises and the third there was an interval of but a few years. Twenty-four years after the third promise was made, God appeared to him and made him another, after renewing the former promises. This promise was, that he would be the God of his children in a special and peculiar manner.

Abraham enjoyed the fulfillment of none of these promises. He saw only the beginning of the first—the birth of children—and the ratification of the last by circumcision. But he believed in God, and was fully assured that he would do all he had promised, and this faith made Abraham the friend of God. These promises were a great trial of his faith; but he staggered not at God's delays. He wandered as a pilgrim and stranger in the land of promise for twenty-five years, before either promise had a beginning of fulfillment. He lived only to see his grandson, Jacob, fifteen years of age;—only two of that vast number comprised in the promise. He died, "not having received the promises;" but he saw them afar off, and was fully persuaded that God would fulfill them all. This faith came of God's promise, and the ratification which he made of his promises. God covenanted with Abraham in person in regard to two of these: the promise that he would give his offspring the land of Canaan, and the promise that he would be to them a God, whilst they should be to him a peculiar people.

In order of time the promise relating to the land was first ratified or covenanted. When Abraham had returned with his nephew Lot, who had been taken a prisoner by one of the confederate kings, the Lord again spoke to him, and said: "I am the Lord that brought thee out of Ur of the Chaldees, *to give thee this land to inherit.* And Abraham said: "Lord God, *whereby shall I know that I shall inherit it?*" The Lord then directed him to take a heifer, a ram, and a she-goat, each three years old, and to divide them in the middle, and then to place the pieces apart and opposite to each other. Abraham did so: and when the sun had gone down, and it had become dark, God, as a smoking furnace or a burning lamp, passed between the pieces, and thus ratified or covenanted this promise concerning the land of Canaan.

The promise that he would be the God of his people, was made to Abraham when he was ninety-nine years old. The promise that he would make of him a great nation was made twenty-four years before, and now we have the promise which was of much greater importance, that he would be the God of that nation. The greater includes the less; and hence, in the ratification or covenanting of this greater promise, we have the ratification of the other. Only the greater was covenanted. The ratification of this was circumcision, which was for this reason

ever after called the *covenant* of circumcision. This covenant was made one year before the birth of Isaac, through whom this great nation was to come. This covenant *sealed* the descendants of Abraham through Isaac as the peculiar and covenanted people of God, and cut them off from the rest of the race. It served to define and confine the blessings of God within the limits marked out by it, so that the world should recognize in them the special and chosen people of God. It was the pledge of God to that people that he would do all for them that he had promised Abraham. Whatever blessings, therefore, were embraced in these promises, the covenant of circumcision was the pledge of their fulfillment. As the nature and objects of these promises were wholly temporal, so were all the blessings. The promise to Abraham, out of which these blessings proceed, was: "I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee, and make thy name great; and thou shalt be a blessing. And I will bless them that bless thee, and curse them that curse thee;" all of which blessings are wholly of a temporal character.

The promise that God would bless the whole world through him had reference to what God would ultimately do for the world through his family. This ultimate purpose was God's first and chief purpose in the calling of Abraham, by which he intended to close all other purposes he had with the Jewish people.

This promise had sole reference to spiritual blessings, because it had sole reference to Christ, the son of Abraham, through whom God would fulfill his promise of blessing the whole world through the offspring of Abraham. Whilst it was the first and chief promise made to Abraham, it was the last in fulfillment. Nearly two thousand years intervened. It was ratified and covenanted by the blood of Christ, and looked to the possession of the heavenly Canaan, and to a circumcision that cut off the heart from all that is wordly and sensual, and to a seal that became the pledge of the purchased possession, and its settlement in the heavenly Canaan, by the resurrection from the dead, when the spiritual people of God cross the Jordan of death, and take possession of the land of promise, for which even Abraham looked, when he sought "a city whose maker and builder is God."

This promise and its blessings have no connection with the others made to Abraham. They differ as widely as flesh and spirit, and as earth and heaven. They connect or coalesce nowhere. The first were but preparatory and necessary to the last. When the last appeared, the first had served their chief, if not all their, purpose. The first had chief reference to man's body, while the last has chief reference to man's spirit. And as the spirit of man is superimposed, as it were, upon the body, and is capable of a separate and independent existence, so was the last promise superimposed upon the first, and is capable of existing, and does exist, independently of it. Hence, the promises and the

covenants by which they were ratified, connect with each other only as the flesh connects with the spirit. Between them lies an impassable gulf. There is no possible passage from the first to the last. The Jew has no rights and privileges under Christ by virtue of his being the son of Abraham according to the flesh; for the promise was: "In *Isaac* shall thy seed be called," and he was the child of promise and of faith. The christian is the child of promise and of faith, and hence is reckoned through Isaac as a special creation of God, and is, therefore, himself a new creation. The last creation supersedes all former ones, and by this supersession abrogates them. The adoption of the children of Abraham as the special and peculiar people of God, set aside the adoption by creation, and during the time of their adoption, the natural adoption was set aside, and the rest of mankind ignored, and treated as an uncovenanted people. So when the christian adoption came in, the Jewish was set aside, and all the rest of mankind, not embraced in the new adoption, were ignored and treated as uncovenanted. Hence, under christianity there is neither Jew nor Greek; neither circumcision nor uncircumcision; but all the families, nations, and races of mankind are *one in Christ*, in perfect fulfillment of the promise: "*In thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed.*"

All this is necessarily true. The Remedial System is developed by differentiations which mark the boundaries of the development. The patriarch had no privileges, special and peculiar, after the calling of Abraham. By that call God isolated a part from the whole, and made this part his special care. By the new creation through Christ another isolation was made, which placed Jew and Greek on the same plane before God, and abrogated all special and peculiar rights or privileges claimed by the Jew.

This is necessarily true from another consideration. The claim of the Jew rested on an explicit covenant. That covenant recognized him as the chosen of God, through a means wholly different from that by which he had recognized the patriarch, and does now recognize the christian. This consideration or means was his *birth*. He was the son of Abraham according to the flesh, and entitled, consequently, only to the rights and privileges guaranteed by the covenant ordained to grant and secure these. He could claim only under the stipulated grants of his covenant. Under other and different covenants, and made with another people, he could, of course, have no claim or right whatever. His circumcision effected all it was designed to effect, and meant more than the Jew was willing to accept. It cut him off from all the rest of the world, and also from all other covenants of God, but that under which he claimed to be the child of Abraham according to the flesh. His circumcision bound him down to the provisions and obligations of that covenant, and confined him within its prescribed limits. What claim,

therefore, can a Jew have to the grants and blessings of a covenant that has no special reference to him whatever, and that was not made with him as a Jew? The European had as well claim equal rights with the American under the constitution of the United States. The Jew was the chosen of God only according to the flesh, and entitled only to blessings of his covenant. He is not the chosen of God according to the spirit, or the seed of Isaac according to the promise, and hence he can have no right with those who are.

There are four things necessary to make a nation the peculiar and chosen people of God, and all these obtained in the case of the descendants of Abraham according to the flesh. These things are, 1. A creation. This we have in the birth of Isaac. His conception was a miracle, and hence a creation. 2. A seal. This we have in circumcision. 3. A purchase. This we have in the deliverance of this people from Egypt. And 4. A covenant. And this we have in the covenant made before Mt. Sinai. All these are peculiar and consistent, and perfectly harmonious with all that God has promised, or has done for, the Jews. They were all equally necessary, and they follow each other as necessary results one of the other. The seal came to ratify the creation, the purchase, in demonstration of the fulfillment of the promise, and the covenant, in order that the people might also pledge themselves by covenant. By this the people became cemented and organized into a nation. As such they needed laws and institutions for their government and welfare as a people; and as the people of God, religious institutions for the various purposes which God had in view with that people.

It will be observed that this covenant made with Abraham's descendants arose under that which covenanted them as the peculiar people of God, and was, consequently, entirely Jewish. The covenant of Mt. Sinai was made with that people, and the institutions subsequently given, were given to that people, and to no other. The Jewish institution, in all its entirety, was as verily circumcised as were the people for whose benefit it was ordained. It was as completely isolated from all other religions and peoples, as were that people. Hence, it had no connection with any other, nor relation, except that of opposition.

The covenant stipulated and embraced no more than did the promise under which it was made. It was a ratification, or acceptance on their part, of the stipulations of the promise. It was the covenant by which God renewed his promise to be their God, and by it the people accepted the offer, and covenanted to be the people of God. This covenant bound both parties to their pledge—God to be their God, and them to be his obedient people. It did not, and could not, stipulate and grant more than did the promise; hence, all these were temporal in their nature. This completed all that God had to provide for that people: Henceforth there was naught for either party to do, but to

carry out the provisions of the covenant which formulated the promise.

But this covenant was not only temporary as respects the rights, privileges, and blessings which it secured to that people; but it was also temporary in its duration. The people broke that covenant; and "a covenant broken on one side, is broken on both." It was faulty in that it only contemplated and provided for man's temporal wants. Indeed, this was the fault of the whole Jewish fabric, from the inception to the close. This was foreseen; and not only foreseen, but the whole structure was but a means to an end; a measure to give time for the preparation and institution of a better. The promise of God under which the whole Jewish structure arose, was not the first and chief promise that God made to Abraham, nor his chief purpose in calling him. This chief and greatest promise was that through him he would bless the whole human family. This promise the apostle interprets as having reference to Christ, and, consequently, to spiritual and eternal blessings. It was made first, and consequently, it was, sooner or later, to take precedence of all others. It could not be annulled by any subsequent promise, unless that promise annulled, at the same time, all former ones. But this the subsequent promises did not do, as is affirmed by the apostle.

The promise which had reference to Christ, preceded the ratification of that concerning the land several years, and antedated the covenant of circumcision twenty-four years. The covenant at Mt. Sinai followed the latter four hundred and six thereafter. So that nothing which transpired under the later promises could annul the first.

The first and chief promise which contemplated spiritual blessings and a spiritual offspring through Isaac, was not ratified, fulfilled, or covenanted, for nearly two thousand years. All that has grown out of this promise has no connection with what arose under the others. It differs from them in every respect. It differed from them in the beginning. It came into the world through a different line. There were two lines of descendants in Isaac, as two promises were fulfilled in his descendants. The one line was "the seed of Abraham according to the flesh," and the other "the seed according to the spirit," the latter of which is reckoned the true line under the covenant of the first promise. This excludes the children according to the flesh from all rights and privileges pertaining to the children according to the spirit. As respects, therefore, their nature, rights, and privileges, the Jewish and Christian institutions differ radically and entirely; to that degree as to exclude the one wholly from the other. The creation, the circumcision or seal, the purchase, and the covenant, that made the descendants of Abraham according to the flesh the people of God, have no place nor value under the Christian institution. The latter has its own creation, seal, purchase, and covenant, all of which are spiritual and eternal, and

these give the christian no rights or privileges under the former. Hence, as respects institutions differing so completely and widely, there can be no community of rights and privileges; nor can the one flow out of the other so as to establish any genetic connection between them.

As the spiritual and the eternal necessarily supersede the fleshly and temporal, so does the Jewish institution, in whole and in part, give way to the christian. Under the latter arises a people of God as distinct from the former as spirit is from flesh. The christian is a new creation, and all that pertains to his creation is new. Before it the Jew and Gentile stand on the same ground. Both must become the subjects of this new creation before they can be regarded as belonging to the people of God. All the claim which the Jew once preferred, goes for naught under the operation of the new creation. A new birth is just as essential for the Jew as for the Gentile. Hence, the Jew's creation, seal, purchase, and covenant are all naught when he stands before the christian's. His birth of the flesh avails nothing, and neither does his circumcision. Nothing is now acceptable to God but the new creation in Christ.

These things being true, all that is Jewish has passed away. The Jews are no longer the people of God. Their whole religious service has perished; and what purpose God has now with that people remains to be seen. That he has no further purpose with them in regard to the fulfillment of his promise of blessing the world through them by Christ, is evident from the fact that christianity has superseded Judaism, and that the whole religious service of that people perished with the total destruction of their temple. Christ is the end of the law, and of all that pertained to it. It was but a pedagogue to lead the Jews to Christ; so that when he came all that was Jewish was set aside, and the pedagogue was dismissed. All now become "the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus," in whom "there is neither Jew nor Greek; neither bond nor free; neither male nor female; but all are one in Christ Jesus." And all who are Christ's by virtue of the new creation, the spiritual seal, the eternal purchase, and the everlasting covenant, are "the seed of Abraham, and heirs according to the promise": "In thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed."

CHAPTER X.

THE JEWISH THEOCRACY.

SECTION I.

THE DELIVERANCE OF ISRAEL FROM EGYPT.

The adoption of the descendants of Abraham as the special and peculiar people of God, was an important step in the development of the Remedial System. Up to that time all the families of the earth stood in the same relation to God, based on the fact of creation and of community of origin. The whole race enjoyed equal privileges, and the same religious institutions.

But the isolation of Abraham and his family from the rest of mankind by the covenant of circumcision, by which they became the special and peculiar people of God, opened the way for a higher and nearer relation to God, and the consequent introduction of more specialized ordinances of religion, which comported with this higher relation.

The calling of Abraham virtually ended the Patriarchal Age. The new relation introduced a new and higher grade of sonship. The rest of mankind were, for the time being, ignored so far as God's purposes with the race were concerned. Only as they were connected with, or related to, his adopted people, were they afterward noticed. Hence, the remote nations of the earth are never mentioned during the history of the Jews.

Abraham, when he was called, was childless. This was proper, since he was to become the progenitor of a new race. From him dates the phenomenon of a peculiar people of God, a religious race among men. He was the chosen father of all the true and acceptable worshipers of God, that should henceforth live on the earth. Beyond him and his family there was no divine light; no special and peculiar providential care and oversight; no divine ordinance, nor promise, nor hope.

At the time Abraham was called, the race was fast falling away

from God. The true worship had been corrupted. Idolatry was appearing everywhere, and was constantly spreading. The religion of faith was giving way to that of sight; and fear and want were looking after visible gods. Noah had been dead about 80 years; yet Shem was still alive, as a beacon light in the rapidly growing and spreading darkness. But that light did not arrest the darkness. The time seemed to demand the intervention of God. Families had begun to gather into communities; communities into tribes; and tribes into nations. Hence we now read of Canaanites, Hittites, Amorites, &c.; and the kings of Shinar, Elam, and Sodom. Egypt was also a nation. The time had come for God to have a nation in the world, so Abraham was isolated, and to his children was given the land to which he was sent.

Man is naturally and essentially a social being. The family is inseparable from his nature, the substratum of society and of the nation. Out of society he is not man, but an animal. A man's powers are never so great and beneficent as when combined and exercised with those of another. It is his nature and instinct to unite with other individuals for mutual protection and benefit. This feeling lies at the foundation of all society, and is the cause and power of its existence, whether the society be social, civil, or religious. Hence, as mankind has increased in numbers, families have combined into communities, and these into tribes, peoples, and nations.

With the advancement of mankind from the family to the larger societies, there was a similar change in the government; and with the change in the range and extent of the government, there was also a change in the range and extent of the priesthood. It passed from the father and eldest son to the priest chosen for the community or tribe. Special persons were selected or appointed to this duty, whose functions were bounded only by the limits of the society for which they officiated. Hence, there were not only priests for the family, but also for the community, and possibly for the nation.¹

At an early day of the post-diluvian world, men had their household gods.² These were regarded as the special deities of the family, to whom they looked for oversight, protection, and special blessings. Soon peoples and nations had their gods; and such was the general conception in regard to the oversight and protection exercised by the gods over their adopted people, that the greatness of the god was estimated by the greatness and power of the people. Such, in general, was the state or condition of the world at the time God was preparing and molding a people for himself, through and by whom his name and character were to be made known to the world.

But a more important and specific object than this was in his view when he adopted the people of Israel as his first-born—as his peculiar and special people. This object lay along the line

¹ Gen. 47: 22. ² Gen. 31: 19; 35: 2.

of the development of the great thought towards which he was gradually working. The problem of sin was ever before his mind, and all that he did, or laid out to be done, looked to its solution. The erection of the children of Israel into a nation was as necessary to this, as were the laws, ordinances, and ceremonies given them after they became a nation. With it began that great system of types and symbols which delineated in shadows and outlines the essential features and principles of the true and real, and which found their reason and purpose in the Christian System. These types and symbols are to be found both in the history and in the religious institutions of this people.

Among the events of their history there were some which seem to have had no special significance at the time; but afterward, when illuminated by other events, were found to be true and important types of that from which they derived their light and significance. Among their ordinances and ceremonies there were types and symbols which foreshadowed other and essential features of the Christian System, which were never made clear until the substance and reality, to which all these pointed, appeared in the author of the Christian institution.

At the time when God made the first covenant with Abraham—the covenant by which he was granted the land of Canaan, “from the river of Egypt to the great river, the river Euphrates,”—God foreshadowed by vision an important event in the history of that people. The “horror of great darkness” that came over the spirit of Abraham symbolized the degradation and enslavement of his posterity in the land of Egypt. This was in the line of God’s providences, and necessary to the development of the great scheme he had inaugurated for the salvation of the race. It was necessary that the people should feel and realize the power of slavery in order that they might appreciate the blessing of freedom; that they should witness the visible power of God in their salvation, and his triumph over their enemy, that they might realize his greatness, power, and majesty. Such a deliverance as theirs at the Red Sea would never have impressed their minds with the felt presence of God among them, had they never suffered slavery in Egypt; and thither their forefathers would never have gone but by the directing hand of God.

The events which led to the sojourn of the children of Israel in the land of Egypt seem most natural, and outside of this wonderful Book, and in the absence of the belief in a special superintending Providence, they would never have struck the mind as means necessary to an end. Yet such is the fact. The providence that separated Abraham from his kindred, watched over his descendants to the end. Neither he nor they were ever lost sight of. The vision vouchsafed to Abraham opened to him his children in a foreign land, maltreated, oppressed, and enslaved; and thither they were in time to wend their way.

To this end means were necessary. These were found in the fond and demonstrative love of an aged father for the son of a beloved wife, and in the consequent hatred of that son by his brothers. How simple, yet how powerful these means! Love, hatred, and envy are mighty forces of our nature for good or evil.

Rachel was the loved wife, and her children, Joseph and Benjamin, the loved sons. They were young at the time the history opens. Joseph was but seventeen, and fondly and tenderly loved and cared for by his father. His affection was manifested in various ways; and the marks of special love and favor shown him, excited the envy and hatred of his older brothers. "And when his brethren saw that their father loved him more than all his brethren, they hated him, and could not speak peaceably to him."¹ God was then and there working out his purposes by that fond and doting father's love, and the envy and hatred of Joseph's brethren. Future events, replete with interest and importance, and which were to shape and mold the fortunes and destinies of millions of the race of man, were potentially in the passions of the father and his sons. These were the forces which were to put in motion the machinery of his providence.

Joseph himself added to the violence and bitterness of the feeling which the favoritism of the father had excited in their hearts. God granted this boy two very remarkable dreams, the purport of which was readily apprehended and appreciated by his father and his brethren. The latter could not endure the thought which was the evident import of his dreams. It was more than they could contemplate with patience and composure. To say that they were to bow down to him, and thus acknowledge his superiority, was too much for their fraternal affection, and they hated him. The second dream increased the intensity of their feelings. It was more insulting and insufferable than the first. In the sun, moon, and eleven stars, they read the persons of their father, mother, and themselves. Even the doting father was startled by this dream. But he knew something of the origin, significance, and design of dreams, and he pondered well the thought conveyed by them. The brothers were too much exasperated to see anything beyond their own implied degradation.

How wonderful, mysterious, and yet simple, the ways of God! "How unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out"! "Who has been his counselor?" Great and important events lay in the future, and how were they to be brought about? Nothing was then more improbable, and apparently impossible, than the events which these dreams foreshadowed. They placed Joseph on the throne of Egypt, the master in fact of the greatest empire then existing. How was he to reach it? How was that boy of seventeen to be placed on the throne of Egypt, second only to the king himself? No human mind could have sug-

¹ Gen. 37: 4.

gested. To it nothing could have appeared more preposterous and absurd.

The story is too well known to require more than an allusion. Envy and hatred sold him to merchantmen trading in Egypt, and there he became the servant of Potiphar, an officer of the king. The Lord attended him on his way, and continued with him in Egypt. The boy was governed by good principles. He was faithful to his master, and righteous before God. He was a worthy subject of providence, and a good and proper instrument with which to work out God's purposes. His purity of life made him an inmate of the prison, which he left, in time, to become the governor of Egypt. When he was brought before Pharaoh he was still a young man. His wisdom was beyond his years. It was inspired by the same power that gave him the interpretation of dreams. Egypt never had such a prime minister, and it was well for that land at that time that its king had the wisdom to place the young man in supreme authority.

The seven years of plenty passed, and left the land filled with their abundant crops. The years of famine were coming on, and want began to press the neighboring countries. The time had come for the dreams of the boy, which he had dreamed in the land of Canaan, to be fulfilled. He was now in the possession and enjoyment of the greatest power and affluence, while his father's family in the land of Canaan were feeling the pressure of the famine. His sheaf was standing erect on the throne of Egypt, and their's were ready to bow down and pay his homage. The sun and stars of his family were about to render his star that respect which expresses itself in the act of homage. The family of Jacob, then numbering seventy souls, went down into Egypt during the third year of the famine.

Within the lifetime of the little ones who were carried into Egypt, a king ascended the throne, who disregarded the memory of Joseph, and the services he had rendered the nation in the days of his predecessor, and began to oppress and afflict the children of Israel, then settled in the land of Goshen. The "horror of great darkness," that oppressed the soul of Abraham at the time of his vision, was now falling on his descendants in a foreign land.

Alarmed at their rapid increase, and fearful of the future on account of their growing power, this king began to practice the most cruel oppression.¹ Their little ones were slain in cold blood. The fathers and sons were oppressed with cruel burdens and impossible tasks; and so great and heavy were their sufferings that their lives were made bitter with their hard bondage. For one hundred years did their afflictions continue;² yet the people increased in numbers. The eyes of their God were upon them, and his hand bountiful in mercies. They were not forgotten,

¹ Ex. 1: 7-22. ² Moses was born 80 years before the Exodus, and it is probable that this state of things existed several years before he was born.

though to them the time seemed long when the God of their fathers was to regard their cries. The development of the purposes of God depends much on the actions of men, and on these the Lord must wait. Without oppression and afflictions, the people of Israel could not have been made willing to leave Egypt. The land of Goshen was a fair and productive land; and had the same kindness and consideration been shown them by the subsequent kings; had Joseph's memory and services continued to be revered and acknowledged, and his people treated kindly for his sake, that people could hardly have been persuaded to leave that country. Hence, their afflictions and sufferings were remedial in character and design. The action and operation of means require time to insure success.

Forty-five years after the death of Joseph a Redeemer was born. By a singular and interesting providence he was reared and educated at the court of Pharaoh, and supposed himself the son of Pharaoh's daughter. There he was in a position to learn much of the designs and purposes of the government toward his people, and to make himself fully acquainted with their afflictions and oppressive bondage. He became acquainted with his own origin, and reflection led him to the conviction that he was destined to deliver his people. There was something in him that told him that he was to break their yoke of bondage, and free them from Egypt.¹

As to their worship at this time, it is reasonable to suppose that it was still of the family, and patriarchal in character, though to some extent corrupted by idolatry.² The institution of the Passover is evidence that sacrifice and the priesthood continued in the family, and differed in no essential respect from that which obtained before their sojourn in Egypt. The people lived in families and tribes,³ and hence the worship was still that of the family. Their condition as bond-men forbids the thought that their religious institutions had any wider range.

The time when the promise of deliverance made to Abraham was to be fulfilled, had now arrived, and Moses and Aaron, duly appointed by God, made their appearance among the people of Israel, and at the court of Pharaoh. The Israelites now numbered about three millions, and were recognized as being divided into twelve tribes, represented by the twelve sons of Jacob. They were enslaved by a powerful kingdom, and there was no power on earth that could plead their cause. And even had there been, that people had not the spirit and courage to seek such aid. Much less were they capable of asserting freedom for themselves. Even when Moses and Aaron appeared among them, and told them what the God of their fathers proposed to do for them; that he was about to fulfill the promises he made to their fathers, and lead them into the land of Canaan; though at first believing what Moses and Aaron announced to them,

¹ Heb. 11: 24-26. ² Ex. 32: 1-6; Josh. 24: 14. ³ Ex. 6: 14-22.

they afterward refused to hearken to the message, because of "anguish of spirit, and for cruel bondage."¹

There is no event in all the history of the Jews that presents a clearer case of divine interposition than the deliverance of the Israelites from Egypt. The means employed to effect their deliverance, to break the hold of Pharaoh, and make him willing that they should leave his country, were all most signal displays of divine power, such as the world had never seen. Here were, on the one hand, an enslaved people, without the spirit of resistance or means of offense or defense; and on the other, a powerful people with all the means necessary to prevent any effort at insurrection, and to crush it, if attempted. The Israelites were wholly without ability to help themselves. Hence, their only hope was in the "God of the Hebrews." No other power appeared in their behalf. No human agencies were used. No human power intervened. Moses and Aaron did nothing but when and as directed by God. So there was nothing to cloud the nature of the true power that saved them. Pharaoh could not be mistaken as to the being that fought for Israel. He was conscious that their deliverer was a great God; greater far than the gods of Egypt. The terrible plagues which he sent upon that land and people, were too heavy and appalling to allow Pharaoh to mistake their author and source. Thus did the "God of the Hebrews" array himself before the world, and place himself in direct antagonism to all the power of Egypt, civil and spiritual. To make himself known, and his power felt, not only by Pharaoh, but by the children of Israel, and all other peoples who should hear of these great events,² and to place himself before the world as the God of the whole earth—the God of all go is—were the important objects and purposes of the dreadful judgments sent upon the land and people of Egypt. Hence, he said to Pharaoh: "For this purpose have I raised you up that I may show in you my power; and that my name may be declared throughout all the earth."³

The last and heaviest stroke, and that which loosed the grasp of Pharaoh for the time, gave rise to one of the most important and significant institutions of the Jewish religion. This was the Passover, and so called from the great and thrilling event which attended its institution. The angel of death, sweeping over the land of Egypt, and carrying death into every household, *passed over* the people of Israel, because of the blood sprinkled on the door posts of the houses of that people. The lamb whose blood was thus used, was hence called the Passover lamb, and the feast ever afterward commemorated this event.

This people, although the people of God by a solemn covenant with their great progenitor, was now, when numerous and consolidated as one nation, to be recognized as such before the whole

¹ Ex. 4: 31; 6: 9. ² Josh. 9: 9. ³ Ex. 9: 16; 14: 18.

world, and by a signal deliverance made his people by *redemption*; and thenceforth his people by purchase.

This is an important and significant fact, and the first intimation we have of the true intent, and purpose, and meaning of sacrifice. In the deliverance of the Israelites from the yoke of Pharaoh, we have in type the leading and primary thought of the Remedial System. Redemption is the great work accomplished by it, and Redeemer is the name given to its author. By that redemption the people of Israel came into a closer and more specific relation with "the God of the Hebrews," and he with them. The covenant made them his people by circumcision, but this deliverance from Egypt made them his people by *purchase*; the first making them his people according to the flesh the latter looking more, since it was the type, to a people according to the spirit. Hence, under the covenant we have no ordinance but circumcision, and no institution of religion but what was common to all mankind at that time. But when the same people became his by *redemption*, the Jewish institution came in as a consequence, elevating them to a higher plane of sonship, where character comes into view, and where worship is to distinguish them and to illustrate the character of God. The covenant contemplated nothing but a natural birth, or descent from one particular individual, which birth, or sonship, was sealed and confirmed by the ordinance of circumcision. It was a sonship of passivity and non-consent, and in no way involving character. If circumcised, he was the covenanted child of God, whatever his character. There was no moral quality in this sonship, and its immunities and blessings were confined to the limits contemplated by the covenant. This covenant pertained to, and was connected with, that by which this people were made the owners of the land of promise. The covenant contemplated no spiritual blessings, and had no connection whatever with sin at any point or in any way. As such, the children of Abraham according to the flesh, were not the true type of the children of God according to the spirit; for these were children by different means, standing on a higher plane, and springing from a parentage that made them children by redemption and salvation from the power, dominion, and slavery of sin, typified by the bondage of the children of Israel in Egypt.

Redemption is the true and radical thought of the Remedial System, and is first brought into view by the deliverance of Israel from Egypt. Hence, here begins that great system of types and symbols, which was designed to prepare the way for the true and real. Redemption is the great thought to which all types and symbols point, and which gives them their importance and significance. This thought is the inspiration of the Passover, the passage through the Red Sea, and the events of the journey through the wilderness. By types and symbols it is connected with sin, and with sin only. It has no connection with the cove-

nants granting temporal blessings. It is supplemental to these, but no part of them. For this reason it is along this line of thought that we are to place all types and shadows, and anti-type and substance, which point or belong to the Christian System.

The Passover, therefore, is the beginning of types, and the first clear expression we have of the redemptive character of the institutions and ordinances which God henceforth established and ordained. By it God *purchased* the children of Israel, and by this made them his peculiar people. They were bought with a price, and were his therefore by right of purchase. He bought them with the first-born of Egypt;¹ and the Passover by which they were saved from that destruction, became the symbol of their redemption.

The Passover supplements sacrifice, and opens to our view a broader and larger field. It is a fuller type of the perfect redemption than is sacrifice, embracing by its victim all that is significant in sacrifice, and adding to its individual character the import of universality. Thus, while ordinary sacrifice is intended and limited to the individual, the Passover sacrifice is designed to cover and embrace the nation, thus preparing the way for the still more comprehensive Annual Atonement, which comes in as a further development of the great remedial thought, central and radical in the Christian System.

The Passover was preparatory to the passage of the Red Sea. It served its purpose in saving the people from the death-dealing wing of the destroying angel; but it had no power to save them from the enraged Pharaoh. They were therefore hurried forward toward the place of passage, and passed the sea by a special and wonderful intervention of Jehovah.

This is the second typical event in the history of this people, and it develops another thought of the Remedial System. It brings out in full relief the *Redeemer*, and the relation which the redeemed sustains to him. Passing through the bed of the sea, the ground dried by the strong wind that blew all night, with the water restrained on either side, and standing like walls, while the cloud hovered over them, they were completely enveloped by the cloud and sea; and following the leadership of Moses, they were thus *immersed into Moses, in the cloud and in the sea.*¹

On the other side of the sea, they sang the song of deliverance. That immersion saved them, but destroyed their enemies. On that side of the sea they stood the purchased and redeemed people of the Lord Jehovah,² and rejoiced in their deliverance from the power of Pharaoh, and the destruction he threatened. Egypt they had left forever, and their faces were now turned toward the land promised their fathers, and made theirs by an everlast-

¹ Ex. 4: 22; 13: 12, 13; 22: 29; 34: 19.

² 1 Ccr. 10: 1, 2. ³ Ex. 15: 13-16.

ing covenant. They then entered on a journey unparalleled in history, replete with interest, and attended by miracles and interpositions of divine power, which startled the nations around, and made them dread their approach. Overshadowed by day, and guided by night; protected from the scorching sun by the pillar of cloud by day, and directed by its light through the darkness of night, they passed through "the great and terrible wilderness," and reached at last the stream that separated them from the land of promise. While thus journeying, they were gradually molded and fitted for government, and disciplined for the great purposes of their isolation, by the laws and religious institutions given them by God, which were to render them conspicuous in the world, and form the great types and shadows of another institution, which was to mold and form all the nations of the earth into a people as peculiar as themselves, and far more distinguished for those excellencies of character, which become a people among whom the Almighty deigns to dwell.

SECTION. II. THE LAW.

The land of Goshen in which the children of Israel dwelt during their sojourn in the land of Egypt, lay east of the Delta, and along the isthmus of Suez, and was the nearest part of Egypt to the land of promise. Between Goshen and Canaan lay the desert of Shur, occupied by the Amalekites, a warlike people, "inhabiting the country south of Palestine, and between Idumea and Egypt." The land of promise, for which the Israelites set out under Moses when they left Egypt, was not, therefore, very distant from Goshen. The direct and nearest route led to the northeast, over the isthmus, and through the desert of Shur, along the coast of the Mediterranean. By this route they could have reached Canaan in as many days as they were years in reaching the land of Moab, east of the Jordan.

But this was not their route, though they set out in this direction. When that vast horde were approaching Pihahiroth, which lay to the northeast of Raamses, their place of rendezvous and starting, they were ordered by the Lord to turn to the right and camp before it, "between Migdol and the sea, over against Baalzephon," thus leaving the direct route, and taking one at right angles, which led down to the Red Sea, on the western side, and towards the peninsula formed by the gulfs of Suez and Elath.

There were, doubtless, other reasons than that indicated in the scriptures why this course was taken, and not the direct one.

There must have been some of much more importance than the fact that a desert and a warlike people lay on that route, by which their journey might have been obstructed, or the people dismayed or discouraged; for there were deserts on the other route, and a warlike nation on their flank. No such difficulties and trials would have beset their way on the shorter as they met and endured on the longer route. On the latter lay a "great and terrible wilderness, wherein were fiery serpents, and scorpions, and drought, where there was no water; a land of drought, and of the shadow of death; a land that no man passed through, and where no man dwelt."¹

The nature and extent of these difficulties seem to suggest that they constituted a part of the reasons that determined this route. The people needed such experience and discipline as the trials were calculated to afford.² In Egypt they were a plain and simple people, wholly engaged in their own immediate pursuits, until a king "arose who knew not Joseph," and showed no favor to his people. By this king they were diverted from their herds and flocks, and made to serve the government in the building of cities. They were enslaved and oppressed, and reduced to a most abject condition. Egypt extended over them her laws and institutions.³ Officers of the crown were their task-masters; and their heavy and cruel burdens gave them no rest. They had become the slaves of Egypt, and suffered all the degradation and ignorance, the loss of pride and ambition, that invariably attend so abject a state. Years of such a life took away their spirit, crushed out their sense of freedom, and made them utterly incapable of self-assertion. Long years of suffering and oppression had rendered them wholly unfit for self-government; and had that vast and ignorant horde, with so universal unfitness to become an independent people, been suddenly transferred from Egypt to the land of Canaan, greater miracles would have been required to save them from themselves, and fit them for the affairs of government, than were displayed during their forty years pilgrimage. Their intellectual, moral, social, and religious condition, therefore, forbade the idea of taking such a people, in such a condition, and placing them among hostile nations, and then expecting anything to result but disaster, ruin, and renewed slavery. It would have been unwise to attempt such a thing, and impossible to effect it. It was imperatively and absolutely necessary that they should be trained and schooled by a long experience and discipline, before they could become proper and respectable representatives of the God of the whole earth. This experience they could only acquire by the means employed. and the fact shows that even the "great and terrible wilderness, the scorpions and serpents, the drought and shadow of death," with which their journey was beset, were unable to bring that people up to the necessary standard, until one generation had

¹ Deut. 8: 15; Jer. 2: 6. ² Deut. 8: 3, 4. ³ Ex. 2: 11-15.

entirely passed away. We therefore find in the events of that long and arduous pilgrimage, ample and satisfactory reasons for diverting them from the direct and nearest course, and causing them to undergo such terrible trials and sufferings. In order, then, that God might train them by discipline, and instruct them by laws and institutions, and lead them up to the condition of freemen, that they might be prepared for the enjoyment of the inheritance they had seen afar off so long, he led them through rocky and sandy deserts, through mountain gorges and over arid plains; gave them evidences of his continual presence among them; made known his will by laws for their social and political government, and gave them religious ordinances and service, through which they could find rest for the sin-weary soul, and by which they might make known the name of Jehovah throughout the earth.

The character of God is more fully and conspicuously displayed by the institutions of the Jews than by the events of their history, however wonderful and awe-inspiring we may regard the latter. Their laws and ceremonies unfold the moral character of God; and this is of the first importance to a spiritual being involved in sin. Out of the moral attributes of God, and the moral nature of man, proceeds a moral government for man, and under this come all the means calculated and intended to secure the ends of a moral government. Government is essential to the well-being of all intelligent and responsible beings; an indispensable agency in the amelioration of man's social condition, and a mighty lever in the elevation and direction of his intellectual powers, since, in its true and proper sense, it is the synonym for all the agencies employed in the development of man.

The Israelties had been without any civil code while in Egypt beyond what an oppressive king extended over them, and no religious institutions, beyond what they had from their fathers;¹ and now that they had been freed from that yoke, and become an individual and independent people, the first and most essential thing their condition called for, was a code of laws for their national and individual government; and as they were emphatically a religious people, and as such intended to be the depository of all that God designed for the race, it was equally necessary that they should have religious institutions. In point of fact no people ever needed them more, and their condition at the time admitted of no delay. We therefore find that they had not proceeded far before preparations were made for the giving of that law which has distinguished them as a people from that day to the present.

In the third month after they had left Egypt, they encamped before Mt. Sinai, and the Lord said to them: "*If you will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then shall you be a peculiar treasure to me above all people: for all the earth*

¹ Kurtz' Hist. of the Old Cov., vol. 2, pp. 133-181.

is mine; and you shall be to me a kingdom of priests and a holy nation."

On the third day after their arrival before Sinai, the Lord descended upon the Mount, and gave evidence of his presence by "thunderings and lightnings, and a thick cloud upon the Mount, and the voice of a trumpet exceeding loud." Mount Sinai was enveloped in smoke, "because the Lord descended upon it in fire; and the smoke thereof ascended as the smoke of a furnace, and the whole Mount trembled greatly." These were symbols of the divine presence.

From the summit of this mount Jehovah in person spoke, in the hearing of the whole people, only the Decalogue, or "ten commandments." All else that he ordained and commanded was given through Moses, since these were the details of the separate categories embraced in the Decalogue. These "ten words" constitute the religious and civil constitution of the Jewish people, embracing all that piety toward God and humanity to men require at the hands of man. Whatever else we find among the laws and commandments given in detail to this people, all are to be regarded as enactments which have for their object the enforcement of the requirements of the organic law. The "commandments, statutes, and judgments," which were subsequently given through Moses, are but the details of legislation under this constitution. In these we have all that pertains to piety and humanity as respects man's life, and all that was symbolic and adumbrative of something more permanent and substantial. All may be embraced under the terms law and ceremonies.

The word law has several significations in the sacred scriptures; but whenever used with reference to the Jewish religion, it means either the decalogue, or "the commandments, statutes, and judgments," or the ceremonial part of that religion, or the Jewish system as a whole. It is also used to designate the *moral law* of this religion; that part which concerns piety toward God, and humanity toward our fellow creatures; those "commandments, statutes, and judgments," which, if a man keep, he shall live; that law by which men under that dispensation were "justified," or held as righteous. It is in this last acceptance that we propose to consider it here, because it is this aspect of law which is contrasted with the gospel, which presents another mode or ground of justification. The great object and desire of man under sin is to become free from it; that the soul may be relieved of the remorse and mental anguish which guilt produces, and may escape the consequences of transgression here and hereafter.

There are but two methods presented in the scriptures by which men can stand before God uncondemned; but *there is only one by which a sinner can live and enjoy the pardon of his sins*. There is but *one* plan or ground of *pardon*, though there are *two of justification*. Justification is the state or condition of

standing before God *sinless*, and this state, or relation, may be attained in two ways: 1. By never sinning, as in the case of Christ, which is expressed by Moses, as follows: "The man who doeth these things shall live by them."¹ This is the justification by *law*. 2. By being pardoned or freed from sin through an act of mercy on the ground of an atonement. This is the justification of the Gospel, and the *only plan of pardon*. There is and can be no pardon by *law*. It requires and demands perfect obedience, and it denounces a curse on all who become sinners by *transgression*, or *non-obedience*: "Cursed be every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the law to do them."² Hence, if one sin, he becomes thereby a transgressor of law, and is henceforth under its curse or condemnation; and that which curses or condemns can not, in the very nature of the case, pardon.

The design of law is two-fold: 1. To secure perfect obedience to the law-giver; and 2. To punish in case of transgression or non-obedience. All of God's intelligent and responsible creatures were put under law at the time of their creation for the purpose of testing their obedience. This procedure consulted their highest interests, and was in perfect harmony with the nature of their being. Without it they could have had no knowledge of God; for God could not have revealed himself to these creatures, capable as they were of acting contrary to the design and purposes of their creation, without making known his will, which was inseparable from their highest and continued happiness. In making known his will, he gave them law, since law is the expression of will in intelligible language. Indeed, God has never had anything to make known to his intelligent creatures but what concerned, and was necessary to, their well-being. If he reveals his attributes and character, this knowledge is necessary to their happiness. If he makes known his will, this knowledge is also necessary to their happiness, since it gives them the light whereby they can render him an intelligent and cordial obedience. Without it men have groped in darkness, and felt after God, and knew not whether they were obedient or disobedient to his will. Such were the Gentiles when enjoying no light from the Jewish revelation.³

As law is the expression of will, so is it also the exponent of justice, since it is a rule of right which is the aim of justice. What is due God from the creature is a matter of right, and what should obtain equally among equals is also a matter of right. Hence, justice, in expressing its demands through law, asks what is due from the creature to the creator; and demands that right shall obtain between equals among creatures. Its behests obeyed, we have reverence and obedience to God, and the prevalence of right among the creatures.

A government of law is the government of heaven. There is

¹Rom. 10: 5; Lev. 18: 5. ²Deut. 27: 26; Gal. 3: 10. ³Rom. 2: 14, 15.

no mercy there, nor provision of mercy for the transgressor. There inexorable law prevails. "The soul that sins must die." The angels who kept not their first estate because of transgression, were banished from the presence of God, and bound in everlasting chains under darkness. They violated law, and thereby became disobedient, and the justice, holiness, and truthfulness of God demanded that they should be punished for their transgression; his justice, because they refused to render the homage due God as creator; his holiness, because this can not tolerate sin; and his truthfulness, because God can not lie. What he denounces against sin, he executes; and what he promises, he fulfills. A government of law, therefore, is a government of these attributes; and conversely, these attributes existing in the being of God, there must be a government of law where there are intelligent beings. As, therefore, Judaism was essentially a system of government of which law was the ruling sentiment, energy, and power, that system was consequently a manifestation, or development of these attributes of God.

Law not only requires certain things to be done, but forbids others. It urges obedience to what is commanded, and restrains from what is forbidden. Its commandments are both mandatory and prohibitory. Such was law to angels, and such is law to men; and in perfect conformity to all that is required is found the highest happiness of intelligent beings.

The nature and consequences of sin, as well as the well-being and happiness of angels and men, make these attributes of God, justice, truthfulness, and holiness, the foundation of a moral government. These attributes are revealed in and by a moral government; and as intelligent beings were placed under law at their creation, they were made acquainted with these attributes by the administration of such a government. When angels witnessed transgression in the person of their peers, and saw the judgment inflicted upon them because of their transgression, they witnessed for the first time an exhibition of God's justice, and in that punishment saw the evidence of his truthfulness and holiness. In order, then, that law may be a full and adequate expression of these attributes of God, it must command perfect obedience to its positive behests, restrain from all things prohibited, and execute punishments on the transgressor and non-obedient. It provides only for its own honor and integrity, and considers nothing but the authority and honor of the law-giver, and the preservation of the dignity and majesty of the government, through the perfect obedience of the subject, and the punishment of the disobedient. This is the purpose of law among all responsible beings. It is therefore evident that law works wrath on the transgressor, and can do nothing to save him from the consequences of his transgression.

These things being true, the inquiry arises, in view of the facts in man's history, Why was not this the case with Adam's trans-

gression? Such would have been the consequence had not the hand of justice been stayed by the hand of mercy, through the interposition of sacrifice. Justice required that he should die because of his sin; but grave and important consequences were involved in such an issue, on account of which it became necessary that he should live, and his transgression be dealt with in some other way, and the exigences of the case met by some procedure which would sanction his pardon, and at the same time do no violence to the claims of justice, nor to the character of the law-giver. This procedure involved the treatment of the whole question of sin, with a view to man's pardon, and the subsequent development of a religious character, in which would be realized all the purposes of law under the government of God.

In the treatment of this greatest of all the questions which have interested the moral government of God, law appears as an important governmental measure. The great object in view, in all that is proposed or done, is JUSTIFICATION; and this includes the justification of God as well as the justification or salvation of the sinner.

In making law an important element of the Jewish dispensation, it was God's purpose to exhibit its workings practically, as a means of justification under a remedial system; to show what it can or can not do for man in a state of sin. It was also intended to exhibit the nature and tendency of those attributes of God, of which it is the fair and natural exponent, and to show what these demand when they are the prominent and regnant principles of his government over men as sinners.

The attributes already mentioned stand out prominently in the Jewish institution, and give tone and form to that dispensation, so that whatever potentialities there are in these attributes, the same we may expect in the dispensation which is their development or exponent; and what is absent in the one, we may expect to be also absent in the other. The development, therefore, of the Jewish institution, which is inseparably connected with law, as a phase or stage of the development of the Remedial System, can extend no farther, nor exhibit more of God than the manifestation of these attributes; so that whatever we find in these attributes we shall also find in their exponent, the Jewish institution.

But the Jewish institution, though resting in law, *embraced* more than law provides, since the institution of sacrifice was equally prominent with law, and much older. It came in as already existing, and was intended to stay the hand of justice in law, to divert the punishment denounced from the head of the sinner to that of his victim, and thus to satisfy the demands of justice, and at the same time save the sinner.

This feature of the Jewish institution brings to view another attribute of Jehovah, and places this attribute in bold and marked contrast, and seeming antagonism, to that of justice, truthful-

ness, and holiness. This attribute is mercy, and is the motive power or active energy of the Remedial System. Transgressors could not have lived beyond the moment of their transgression, had not mercy interposed between the law and the sinner, to honor the law and save the disobedient. Sacrifice, or an atonement, was the governmental measure proposed by mercy; and if God's character for impartial justice, unquestionable truthfulness, and immaculate holiness could be maintained by this measure of mercy, then could its intervention be allowed, and all effected for the transgressor that his condition under sin could require.

A remedial system is grounded on the attribute of mercy, and law comes in under such a system, not as a remedial measure, but as a conservative one. It is designed to hold the soul in perfect obedience, and preserve the sinlessness of man's creation, but it has no remedial power. It is grounded on other attributes, as we have seen, and contemplates only their honor and integrity, and has no concern with any other. What part it plays, therefore, under a remedial system, it plays in the interest of these attributes alone. What, then, is the purpose of law under a remedial system?

The first object of law is to give the subject a knowledge of his duty to the law-giver in all the relations which the subject sustains to him; to express the will of the law-giver in all matters that pertain to the duties and responsibilities of the subject; and to point out to him what is pleasing or displeasing to the law-giver. The next object is to attach proper, suitable, and adequate punishments to infringed laws. Hence, "by the law is the knowledge of sin," and "where there is no law, there is no transgression." Only law makes any act of an intelligent being sinful; for a subject can not know that any act he may do is sinful, that is, contrary to the will of his Lord, unless the law-giver so declares. With this view "the law entered that sin might abound,"¹ and by its light gave a knowledge of sin. "The entrance of thy words giveth light." Man can have no knowledge of sin but through law. "I would not have known," says the apostle, "that lust was sinful, had not the law said, Thou shall not lust." So that there is no sin where there is no law, nor power of sin where there is no punishment denounced.²

Such is the purpose and nature of law. It demands positive and perfect obedience to its mandates and prohibitory enactments and requirements, and can not tolerate transgression in the one case, nor non-obedience in the other; and when either transgression or non-obedience occurs, it then demands the punishment denounced, and "works wrath" to the sinner, and condemnation and death to the transgressor. Law is the power

¹ As sin was in the world before the law (Rom. 5: 15), the law was brought forward that it might *display* sin—declare what is sinful. This seems to be the thought in the words quoted above.

² Rom. 7: 7, 8.

or instrument of sin to work these results on the sinner; for "without the law sin is dead—For I was alive once without the law; but when the commandment came, sin revived, but I died," so that "sin taking occasion by the commandment, deceived me, and by it slew me."¹

By the knowledge which law gives of the consequences of sin, and by the fear of these consequences, the soul is placed and kept in bondage, so that men stand before the law with fear and trembling. Its positive demands and fearful threatenings keep the soul in constant dread, and it hears continually the terrible decree: "Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them." The sinner stands in dread lest by one offense he be forever undone. The curse hangs above him as a suspended sword, whose thread will part at one act of transgression. His life, present and eternal, is suspended on his absolute and perfect obedience, and his heart trembles at the prospect. Under such a continued and dreadful fear of death, life is a burden, and law an oppressive bondage.² The heart can have no peace or rest under such suspense. The infracted law allows of no mitigating circumstances to palliate the offense, and provides for no commutation of punishment: "Life for life, an eye for an eye, tooth for tooth, and foot for foot," are its positive and inexorable demands.

This is the nature of law, whether divine or human. Its principles are eternal and immutable, and its decrees beyond repeal. The honor and stability of the government rest on these, and under no circumstances can they be ignored or set aside. Whatever else a governor may do, these cannot be disregarded or dishonored, except at the peril of his throne. Sin is destructive in its nature and action, and transgression and disobedience must be adequately and promptly punished. The universal conscience responds affirmatively to the demands of justice, and sanctions the decrees of law. The sense of right and wrong is deep-laid in the human soul; and however perverted or blunted this sense may become by sentimentalism or selfishness, yet will it right itself, and assert its power, when freed for the moment from the sway of those unhealthy feelings.

A government of *law alone* appears conspicuous in the realm of dead matter, and pertains particularly to the domain of cause and effect. There it is seen in its true nature. It works perfect obedience, or terrible destruction. If the laws of nature are broken, disaster must follow, otherwise effects are not dependent on their causes, as is invariably the case in the domain of matter. Under a moral government the results of law are essentially the same. The results may not be so closely connected with their

¹ The thought in this passage seems to be this: "Sin taking advantage of the opportunity which law afforded to ruin me, deceived me by the commandment uttered by the law, and by this commandment slew me."

² Heb. 2: 15.

causes, yet in the end they must appear, or else the law will prove ineffective, or the government weak and imbecile. The results of law under a moral government are the punishments prescribed by the law for its infractions. These must appear immediately or ultimately, or the government must fall. Law here, therefore, as in the physical world, works destruction to him who breaks or violates its enactments, and grants a legal blessing to him who renders perfect obedience; a blessing belonging to the *state of creation, or natural innocency*; but one to which the obedient is legally entitled, and of which he can not be legally deprived. If the law denounces death to the transgressor, the obedient subject is legally entitled to live. The righteousness or justification which he enjoys before the law is one of merit, and legally his due. Hence, the righteousness which is by or through law is one of debt. "To him that worketh, the reward is not reckoned as a favor, but as a debt." The work of obedience earns the reward promised by the law: "They that do these things shall live by them;" and all that the obedient receives he receives as justly his due. The law is, therefore, conservative to the obedient, but punitive to the disobedient and the transgressor. There is no place for favor, and nothing remedial in anything it proposes or effects.

As, therefore, there is nothing remedial in law, it can not be *fully* adapted to intelligent beings involved in sin; for their great and pressing need is remission, that they may have a further opportunity to recover their impaired strength, and to attain a higher excellence of character by continued efforts to overcome the power of sin, and become obedient in all things. Connected with principles and measures of government, which allow this, law is essentially necessary in the government of intelligent creatures involved in sin; for the wills of such beings need the stimulus of law, and their proclivity to sin requires its threatenings to deter and restrain, that reason and conscience may at length acquire and maintain the full mastery of the powers of their being. But under a system of government inspired by justice, truthfulness, and holiness *alone*; where proper and adequate punishments are meted out to transgressors; where "every transgression and disobedience receives a just recompense of reward;" where no provision exists by which the past may be covered up and passed over; and where no encouragement as a spur to a better life is held out, the transgressor must "wax worse and worse," and live continually as if in the presence of that judgment, though righteous, and of that "fiery indignation which shall devour the adversary." With this denied him, however anxious for a better life, he must sink in despair. The continued and unmerciful infliction of punishment will banish all the divine from man, and enthrone the fiend. This is the result which has followed inexorable law in the Tartarus of fallen angels, and the same results would follow it among sinning men. If there were

no door open to repentance, and no opportunity granted by which the transgressor might recover himself; nor the merit of a better life allowed to obscure (not atone for) the past,¹ then must men meet and suffer the fate of the sinning angels.

The principles on which the administration of the government of God among men is conducted, flow from the nature and variety of his attributes, and are designed to develop these to the intelligence of men. In the government of dead matter, we see his infinite knowledge, wisdom, power, and goodness. Much as men know of the laws of nature, they see but a very small part of that complicated whole, which we call nature. Of the knowledge that planned, of the wisdom that adapted, of the power that executed, and of the goodness that pervades the whole, men see but the outlines and shadows; and the life and powers granted man will not enable him to see more than these.

But men involved in sin are placed in a different relation to God than that which results from their creation, and different attributes of God come out under this relation. These attributes have primary reference to sin; and all that God does in reference to this great evil in his government, develops these attributes. The attributes which stand first in relation to sin, are those which denounce and punish it, and in this way show to his intelligent creatures its nature and fearful consequences. Law is the expression of these attributes, and essentially necessary in his government as a conservative and punitive measure. A knowledge of sin by means of law, and of the law's working, is necessary to its conservative power, and to an appreciation of its punitive measures on the part of man.

As this knowledge is so necessary to man's well-being, sin must be *developed* before him, since he learns mostly objectively. This is done under the Remedial System as a whole, each dispensation of which is marked by some distinctive peculiarity. Under Judaism the opportunity was afforded for the manifestation of those attributes (as respects this development of sin) which are primarily related to sin through their expression or exponent, law. This opportunity was afforded by the existence of the elements of the Remedial System under Judaism, and of their equal importance with the law. They did for man what the law could not do; allowed him to live, though a transgressor, and to aim at, and strive for, a better life, that, by the gradual development of his powers, he might at length attain the mastery of himself, and render an acceptable obedience to law in such a way² as to satisfy the demands of justice, and honor the attributes of truthfulness and holiness.

It is only by the presence and co-ordination of remedial elements with law that an opportunity can be afforded man to learn the nature and consequences of sin, and of the workings of law with reference to it. It is only by virtue of these that he can live

¹ Isa. 55: 7; Ezc. 33: 14-16. ² Rom. 8: 4.

after the condemnation of law, and enjoy a further trial of his strength and disposition to render a satisfactory obedience. For this reason the *joint action* of these principles of government was provided under the Jewish institution.

There were two sources of justification under Judaism, and these must be carefully distinguished, if we would understand the nature of that institution. These were, 1. The justification of law, or by law, as already mentioned; and, 2. The justification arising from an atonement. Had the first been practically possible, the second would never have been ordained. But Adam had settled the question, and by transgression rendered imperatively necessary the second. In point of time the second takes precedence, since the law came in long after, with the view of showing more fully than sacrifice had done, "the exceeding sinfulness of sin," and demonstrating, by a long and elaborate experiment, the impossibility of salvation by law. "For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh," was attained by an atonement.

The utter insufficiency of law as a remedial measure, and the absolute and imperative necessity for an atonement, puts aside forever any claim, on the part of man, for a righteousness by law; for being once a sinner, he will remain forever under the condemnation of law, unless redeemed by an atonement. His subsequent righteousness, however complete and perfect, can not atone for the one sin that made him a sinner; so that, however valuable in the sight of God a future obedience to law may be, it does not and can not possess the merit of atoning for one sin; but it does and has done this much: it pleads for mercy, and mercy interposes through an atonement. Because of the existence of an atonement, God has proclaimed that he will, on repentance and reformation of life, pardon the past, and count the present obedient life as that which shall determine his destiny: "When I say to the wicked, Thou shalt surely die; if he turn from his sin, and do that which is lawful and right, * * * without committing iniquity; he shall surely live, he shall not die; * * * * * none of the things which he hath committed shall be mentioned unto him."¹ This procedure on the part of God is not one of *justice*, but one of *mercy*; and hence, under an administration of which mercy is a ruling principle, a present obedient life may be allowed to cover up and hide the past. Under a system of government where law alone rules, this is of necessity impossible; and hence, by law "no flesh" shall be or can be justified.

Although law can not procure justification for the sinner; yet it is of infinite value to him as a means and aid in recovering himself from the mastery of sin. David speaks of its benefits thus: "The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul; the testimony of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple; the statutes

¹ Eze. 33: 14-16.

of the Lord are right, rejoicing the heart; the commandment of the Lord is pure, enlightening the eyes; the fear of the Lord is clean, enduring forever; the judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether." Results so important as these aggrandize the means immeasurably, and place their importance in the formation of an upright and godly character, beyond all question. An atonement can not do for man all that his preternatural condition requires, if unconnected with law which gives man the knowledge of sin, and aims to restrain him from its commission. Their co-operation is necessary. After pardon, men need instruction and direction as much as before, and law, therefore, is just as essential to their well-being then as before. It was the design of the atonement to free men from law only as the latter was a plan of justification. Men can not sin with impunity after they have obtained pardon, nor feel any more license to sin than before.¹ On the contrary, a new set of feelings are aroused by the interposition, of which love and gratitude are the most prominent and powerful, and the exercise of these holds the soul of one of high spiritual culture more steadily and firmly to the requirements of its new relations than do the threatenings of law. Man is then obedient to law from a pure and proper motive, and not from any consideration of self; and should he fail to attain perfect obedience to law, as he surely will so long as he is beset by the fierce and persistent temptations of this world, he finds that the atonement has provided that his ardent wish and sincere effort to do what is required of him, shall be counted to him for perfect obedience to law.² Thus bolstered by the atonement, and energized by two of the strongest feelings of the human soul, love and gratitude, man feels that he is panoplied to work out his salvation, though with fear and trembling. The assurance that he is freed from the curse of the law, gives him renewed strength and a firmer determination to honor and glorify God. Thenceforth he obeys law from a feeling of love and gratitude, and not from the fear of punishment.

¹ Rom. 6: 1. ² Rom. 8: 4.

SECTION III. THE TABERNACLE.

The position of the Jewish institution in the Remedial System, and the part it plays in the development of this system, is that of type and symbol, and the relation it sustains to the christian institution is that of the shadow to the substance. All its appointments and ordinances were made according to the pattern of things in the heaven. When Moses was with God on Mt. Sinai, he was shown this pattern in all its details, and there commanded to make all things according to the pattern shown him in the mount. This "pattern" appeared in the tabernacle and its worship; and the things in the heavens of which they were the model, were those things which constitute the christian institution. Hence we have in this pattern or model, the types and symbols of that which was real and permanent in the christian system, the shadow of those things which were substance under Christ.

The tabernacle and its worship being types of the christian institution, we have in the structure of that building, and the worship connected with it, the type of the church of Christ and of the worship connected with it. The position and relation of the departments of that building, and the services of worship that pertained to each, show, in a very clear and tangible manner, the relations which the church of Christ and its worship sustain to the world around and to heaven above. These relations could not appear so distinct and defined as they do, had they not been so clearly defined by the structure and worship of the tabernacle. The model, so well and distinctly arranged in all its parts, has given us a better appreciation of these same things in the substance, and painted to the eye what is now mostly seen by the mind. Indeed, it may be affirmed that the christian institution can not be understood and appreciated without this model which we have in the tabernacle and its worship. The arrangements which pertained to this worship show, in a clear and conspicuous manner, the relations which exist between the several elements of the christian system, and the part that each plays in the scheme of redemption.

The tabernacle and its worship completed the Jewish system, and closed the revelation of God's will by means of types and symbols. We have in these the last thought of the Remedial System that could be developed by such means; the most complete differentiation prior to that perfect form which we have in chris-

tianity. Hence we find no additional thought developed between the institution given to the Jews and that which was left to us by the apostles of the Lord Jesus Christ.

We have use only for the general outline of the structure of the tabernacle. It was a building thirty cubits in length, ten cubits wide, and ten cubits high, and divided into two separate and very distinct apartments, the first and largest of which was twenty cubits long, and the other ten. The larger one was called the Sanctuary; the smaller, the Holy of Holies, or the Most Holy place. They were completely separated from each other by a thick veil, made of "blue and purple and scarlet, and fine-twined linen of cunning work," with the figures of cherubim wrought in its fabric.

Each of these apartments contained certain articles of furniture, which were used in the worship, and, like the apartments themselves, were types of the true, real, and permanent.

This building was placed at the west end of what was called an "outer court," a rectangular enclosure measuring one hundred cubits in length, and fifty cubits in width. This enclosure had but one entrance, and this at the eastern end. In this "outer court," between its gate and the tabernacle, there were articles of furniture used in the worship.

Entering the gate which allowed access to the outer court, and approaching the tabernacle lying before us, we meet first with the brazen altar, or altar of burnt-offerings, on which were offered the chief sacrifices.¹ This altar was placed near the door of the tabernacle,² but at sufficient distance to allow space for the brazen laver, which was kept filled with water for the use of the priests while officiating at the altar of burnt-offerings and in the sanctuary.³ At this laver the priests were to wash their hands and feet before passing into the sanctuary to complete the service begun at the altar.

Passing thence into the sanctuary, there appeared on the right, or north side of this apartment, the table of shewbread, on which were placed twelve loaves of bread every first day of the week, the same in number as the tribes of Israel. Opposite this, on the left or south side, stood the golden candle stick, with a shaft and six branches, bearing seven lights (the number of perfection), which were always kept burning.⁴ Beyond these, and immediately in front of the veil, and midway the room, stood the golden altar on which incense was burnt morning and evening. The flame that ignited this incense came from God. Common fire was not to be used on this altar.

Beyond the veil, and within the most holy place, stood the ark of the covenant, whose lid, or covering, was the mercy seat, and over which arose two cherubim, facing each other, but looking down on the mercy seat, their wings forming an arch over it. The ark was designed to hold the two tables of the law; hence

¹ Lev. 7: 37; Ex. 40: 28. ² Ex. 40: 28. ³ Ex. 30: 18-20. ⁴ Ex. 30: 7-9.

its name. But the mercy seat was the most important piece of furniture in this apartment, since it was before it, and on it, that the blood of the annual atonement was sprinkled by the high priest, when he entered once a year the most holy place. At that time the Lord appeared to the high priest in a cloud which stood over the mercy seat, and was the symbol of his presence.¹ "And there I will meet with thee, and I will commune with thee from above the mercy seat, from between the cherubim which are upon the ark of the testimony."²

Such were the structure of the tabernacle and the ordinances of its service. The building and its furniture, and all that was connected with its service and worship, were typical of the true and permanent, fully developed and perfected only under the christian dispensation, whose elements, appointments, and service these types and symbols serve to explain and illustrate. The building or tabernacle itself was a type of the church and of heaven; the sanctuary typifying the church, and the most holy place symbolizing heaven. The furniture, or vessels of service, of the outer court, the sanctuary, and of the holy of holies have their anti-types under the christian system; and the arrangement of these articles of furniture serves to show the relation which the anti-types hold to each other as elements of the perfectly differentiated Remedial System under the reign of Christ.

The altar of burnt-offering stands first, since there can be no acceptable worship offered by the sinner until his sin has been pardoned through sacrifice. *The first act of the sinner is to offer an atonement for his sin.*

But the sinner did not make the offering. This was the duty of the legally ordained priest, and his service was necessary to the acceptance of the sin-offering. The duty of the sinner was to provide his sin-offering, and to take it to the priest, and at the altar lay his hands on the head of the victim, and confess his sin, and thus constitute the animal his sin-offering. These were details necessary to be observed; for they were essential to the efficacy of the offering.

The altar of burnt-offerings and the sacrifices offered upon it, as well as the officiating priest, have their anti-type in the person of the Lord Jesus Christ; the altar finding its anti-type in his divine nature, the sacrifices in his humanity, and the priest in him as the high priest of the New Institution.³ In him are found

¹ Lev. 16: 2. ² Ex. 25: 22.

³ Jesus was not an ordinary priest as were those who officiated daily at the brazen altar, and could not have been, in the very nature of the case. The anti-types of these priests are christians, and not Christ. They were subordinate to the high priest, and their official work was daily and only temporary. It served the urgent necessity, but was imperfect and incomplete. These sins were revived at the end of the year, at the time of the annual atonement, when they were disposed of forever, so far as the Jewish sacrifices were concerned. The sacrifice of the annual atonement was the fuller and more particular type of Christ, since this was an offering of the high priest alone;

the altar, the sacrifice, and the priest who makes the one offering for sin.

The brazen laver stood next, between the altar and the door of the tabernacle. This laver served two purposes: 1, that of washing the hands and feet before officiating at the altar of burnt-offering; and, 2, that of washing before passing into the sanctuary with the blood of sacrifices. A neglect of this was punished with death; a fact which shows the importance of the laver in the service and worship of the tabernacle. This vessel has its anti-type in christian immersion.¹ In allusion to this part of the service the apostle speaks of its anti-type thus: "Having our *hearts sprinkled* from an evil conscience, and our *bodies washed* with pure water, let us draw near," &c. In the case of the officiating priests, their hands and feet being stained with the blood of the sacrifices, and being ceremonially unclean before officiating, they washed at the laver. In the case of christians, their *hearts* are *sprinkled with the blood* of the atonement, and their *bodies washed with pure water*. They are then permitted to enter the sanctuary, and engage in the worship which belongs to it, and to enjoy the light of the golden candle stick, and feed on the bread that preserves the life of the worshipers.

The sanctuary has its anti-type in the church of the christian institution. The light of the world was shut out from it by its coverings. The eastern end was closed by a veil or hanging curtain, which allowed access to the sanctuary. Into it only the ordained and consecrated priests, the sons of Aaron, were permitted to enter, and offer divine service. So into the church only those who have had "their hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience" by the blood of the atonement, and their "bodies washed in pure water," have the privilege of entering, and offering the worship ordained for the church, and of enjoying the blessings and privileges that are found in it.

The articles of furniture placed in the sanctuary of the tabernacle have also their anti-types in the church. The light given by the burning oil in the lamps of the golden candlestick was typical of the light which we have in the church. This light is the Holy Spirit, since it is he who is the source of the light of the christian institution; for it was he who spoke the whole christian revelation by the apostles. Thus Christ spoke of what the Spirit would do when he came to the apostles; "Howbeit, when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, *he will guide you into all truth*: for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, *that shall he speak*; * * * he shall receive of mine, and show it unto you." This the Holy Spirit has done in the revelation which he has spoken through the apostles. The little band who were

but as all sacrifices for sin were typical of his offering; the daily sin-offerings, as well as the special offerings for transgressors, were also typical of his sin-offering. But as all these were included in the annual atonement, that was the true, proper, and perfect type of Christ's atonement.

¹ Titus 3: 5.

assembled in an appointed place, on the day of Pentecost, constituted the nucleus of the future church, among whom were the apostles. To the latter the Holy Spirit came on that day, and made his presence manifest by miracle; and since that time he has continued with, and in the church, directing its agencies, and laboring in behalf of the crucified Christ.

The table of shewbread, or "the loaves of the presence," have their anti-type in the twelve apostles, who have dispensed to the world the bread of life. There were just twelve of these loaves, one for each tribe, and they were limited to this number, because this was the number of the tribes of Israel. The number of apostles was limited to twelve for the same reason; "You also, in the regeneration, * * shall sit upon twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel."

The usual interpretation of this type is that it typifies the Lord's supper in the church; but the points of resemblance are too few to constitute this institution the anti-type of the shewbread. There are, indeed, but two points of resemblance; *bread*, and the fact that fresh loaves were supplied every week. But the greatest difference exists as to the number, there being twelve in one case and but one in the other. Besides, there was no wine on the table of shewbread, whereas, in the Lord's supper wine is as essential as bread. Moreover, the object and purpose of the Lord's supper were too dissimilar to that of the shewbread to allow the relation of type and anti-type between them. The loaves were representative of the twelve tribes of Israel; but the bread and wine represent the body and blood of the Lord Jesus. The loaves had no connection with the atonement, whereas the Lord's supper derives all its importance and significance from such connection. The shewbread did not, therefore, typify the Lord's supper.

Since it is beyond question that, in some way, they are representative of the twelve tribes of Israel, the purport of this bread must be connected, in some particular, with the mission of that people; and this particular I conceive to be the fact that the Jewish people, by their law, ceremonies, and worship, were the depository of God's revelation to the race,¹ and in this way were the food and life of the world, which are fitly represented by bread. And since the number of the apostles of Jesus Christ was the same, and also represented the twelve tribes; and since, moreover, they have been the medium of communication of the christian revelation, and have furnished the world with that "bread which came down from heaven, of which if a man eat, he shall never die," we would more rationally conclude that the twelve apostles were the true anti-types of the loaves on the table of shewbread.

The other piece of furniture in the sanctuary was the golden altar of incense, the anti-type of which is generally conceded

¹ Röm. 9: 4.

to be the altar of prayer in the church, on which supplications, prayers, intercessions, thanksgiving, and praise are offered by the priests, or saints of the christian institution.¹

Incense was kept burning continually on this altar;² and in every case of sin-offering, made for an anointed priest or the congregation, the blood of the sacrifice was sprinkled before the vail and on the horns of this altar, thus connecting the perpetual incense with the blood of the atoning sacrifices.³ In the anti-type the same connection obtains, since all prayers and supplications, all praise and thanksgiving, are acceptable to God now only in the name and through the mediation and intercession of the Lord Jesus, who is the atonement of the christian institution.

The vail which separated the sanctuary from the most holy place, shut out all light from the place of the mercy seat, making all beyond it to the worshipers an unseen world. Neither the light of the sanctuary, nor the light of the world found any entrance through it. It was as effectual in cutting off the seen from the unseen as is the grave in separating this life from the one beyond. Its anti-type, therefore, is the grave, or death. At the death of Jesus this "vail was rent in twain," thus throwing into one the sanctuary and the holy of holies. Rent at the death of Jesus, it anticipated a moment the rending of the grave by his resurrection from the dead, which opened forever the passage from this life to that beyond its dismal gloom. Hence, it was a new and living way, which opened life to man again. So the apostle speaks: "Having therefore, boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way which he hath made new for us, through the vail, that is to say, his flesh, * * * let us draw near," etc.

The most holy place was the type of heaven, into which the high priest alone was permitted to enter, "while as yet the first tabernacle was standing." In this apartment of the tabernacle there were only the ark of the covenant and the mercy seat with the cherubim overshadowing it, the anti-types of which are found in heaven, and not in the church. Into the most holy place the high priest entered once every year with the blood of the annual atonement. This sacrifice was repeated annually, because there was a remembrance of sins every year.

The anti-types of the most holy place, its furniture and worship, are in the heavens. The mercy seat is there, and thither must the high priest go with his atonement. Christ's atonement, therefore, was not finished and completed until he sprinkled his blood on, and before, the mercy seat in the heavens; "for Christ has 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." He meets God at the mercy seat, as did the high priest of the Jewish tabernacle, and there God accepts the blood of the atonement.

¹ Rev. 5: 8; 8: 3, 4; Ps. 141: 2.

² Ex. 30: 8.

³ Lev. 4: 7-18.

These types mark out very clearly and distinctly the outlines of the christian system, and show how its several parts are adjusted and related to each other, and the course the sinner has to pursue in order to enjoy its blessings and privileges. No Jew thought of approaching God in any other way than that prescribed in the law, or of meeting God in any other place than where he said he would record his name. And these types show that the same principles obtain under the new dispensation. The altar of burnt-offerings is to be approached with our sacrificial victim, the Lord Jesus, and the body is to be washed at "the laver of regeneration," immersion, before we can enter the sanctuary, the church, to enjoy the light of the Holy Spirit, to feed on the loaves of the presence, the word of God delivered by the twelve apostles, and to offer our sacrifice of incense on the golden altar of prayer, praise, and thanksgiving.

The priests who officiated at the altar and in the sanctuary, were of the family of Aaron. Other branches of the family of Levi had charge of the material of the tabernacle, pitching it when the people camped, and gathering it up and carrying it when they journeyed. The former only were types. They were ordained and consecrated for the religious service of the tabernacle, and alone offered the gifts and sacrifices ordained by God, and brought to them by the people. These were the types of the christian priesthood, of which every disciple of the Lord Jesus is a member, all equally and fully authorized to worship in the sanctuary, and enjoy its blessings and privileges. So the apostle Peter addresses his christian brethren: "You are a chosen generation, A ROYAL PRIESTHOOD, a holy nation, a peculiar (or purchased) people, that you should show forth the virtues of him who hath called you out of darkness into his marvellous light." ¹

The high priesthood of Aaron was but a partial type of the high priesthood of Jesus. To fully typify his priesthood, and represent all of its essential elements, an additional one was required, which was represented by Melchizedek. These two orders, so distinct in some particulars, embraced all the possible types of the priesthood of the Lord Jesus; that of Melchizedek its non-derivation, perpetuity, and universality; and the Aaronic, the minuter details of the atonement, represented in the service performed on the great day of the annual atonement.

The altar, the sacrifices, and the high priesthood of the tabernacle service do not fully portray the person of the Lord Jesus; all these types do not exhaust all the elements that are present in the anti-type. Nor were these all the leading and important types connected with the tabernacle. There was the office of the mediator and law-giver as represented by Moses. An office and a person so important as we find in Moses could not fail to bear a typical relation to the Mediator of the New Covenant. There-

¹ Pet. 2: 9

fore, as Moses was the mediator and the law-giver under the tabernacle, so was he a type of Jesus, the mediator and law-giver under the anti-type of the tabernacle.

A mediator is a higher functionary than a high priest. This is evident from what is to be observed in the case of Moses and Aaron. The official relation which existed between them, shows the relation which exists between a mediator and a high priest; and the work to which Moses was called brought him into greater nearness with God, and placed him on more intimate terms with the prime source of authority. The function of a mediator is mediation. The highest function of a high priest is intercession, which admits, indeed, the intercessor into the presence of the offended party, but does not permit him to judge of the sufficiency of the grounds of intercession. But a mediator may judge of these, and express his judgment on their sufficiency, and his judgment is to be treated with consideration. But only an equal can claim this for his mediation, and only an equal can be permitted to mediate. But an inferior may *intercede*, and this fact determines the relative standing of a mediator and an intercessor before the offended party.¹

We have now mentioned the leading and most important types of the christian system which are the more immediately connected with the tabernacle. These types are elements of the Remedial System, which find perfection and completeness in the christian institution. They are prophetic symbols of what appears permanent and substantial in that perfectly differentiated state of the Remedial System which obtains under the reign of Christ, who is at once the EXPIATOR, INTERCESSOR, and MEDIATOR of the New Institution, under which all that man's condition under sin calls for, is fully realized, and all that the government of God requires to sustain its honor and integrity, is secured.

¹This relative standing of the mediator and intercessor is made still more evident by the fact that the high priest saw only the symbol of God's presence, and communed with him only in the darkness of the Holy of Holies, and in the midst of the cloud of incense; whereas, God spoke to Moses "face to face, as a man speaketh unto his friend." Ex. 35: 11.

SECTION IV. THE CEREMONIES.

The religious ceremonies of the Jewish institution were numerous and significant, and some of them strange and mysterious; but all were pervaded by the same spirit and purpose, and were prophetic of future events. They looked to one and the same great purpose in the mind of God, which lay deep in the darkness of the future, and wrote in figure and symbol what God was to realize in and for man in the last days. By these he was teaching man what he would do for him in the end, and what he would expect of him when he had fully completed his work in his behalf. They derived their importance and significance from the existence of sin, and from that great atonement by which God proposed to deliver man from its guilt and power. Sin had stained the soul with guilt, and marred its beauty, and man was impure and defiled in his mind and character. From these consequences the atonement was designed to free him, and hence the ceremonies of the Jewish religion, looking off in their design to the atonement and its results, had their significance in the fact that they symbolically accomplished what was to be actually realized by the atonement of the Lord Jesus Christ.

These ceremonies had special and particular reference to two of the consequences of sin, viz: the guilt and impurity with which it stains the soul; and hence they may be divided into two categories: those which have reference to guilt, and those which have reference to impurity; the first embracing all blood-offerings, and the second, the ceremonies of purification.¹ Of the first class the most important and comprehensive was the annual atonement, which more fully and completely developed and differentiated the Remedial System than any other ordinance, offering, or ceremony found among the types and symbols of the Jewish system. That was an offering which pertained to the office of high priest alone; and as Jesus was a high priest, and not a common one, the offering of the annual atonement, and the ceremonies pertaining to it, were the fullest and most comprehensive of the types of the atonement of the Lord Jesus.

The features of the Remedial System, which this atonement developes, are, 1. the blood of the sin-offering; 2. the presentation of this blood to God over and upon the mercy seat in the most holy place, in the immediate presence of God, where it

¹ Heb. 9: 9-14.

became effectual as the atonement for the sins of the past year. Here the sin-offering, accomplished at the altar of burnt-offerings standing outside of the sanctuary, and in the outer court, as the representative of justice, more palpably meets, and is more visibly connected, with mercy than in any other instance. For this reason it accomplished a fuller and more effectual pardon than did the ordinary and daily offerings of the tabernacle service. 3. The third feature of this ordinance was the scape-goat. The details of this ordinance will be found in the 16th chapter of Leviticus. Here we have only to do with the thought which it developes, and to show to what extent it developed an elementary feature of the atonement of Christ.

I. THE ANNUAL ATONEMENT.

In the first place, the high priest was required to make an offering for himself, in order to fit and qualify him as high priest to offer the atonement for the whole people, which fact shows that the high priest, who was to offer the perfect and adequate atonement, was to be wholly free from sin. In the case of men who were high priests under the tabernacle and temple service, the only way to fit them for this offering was prescribed by the law enacting the ordinance. Those high priests were sinners, and could not, for this reason, become intercessors for other sinners until their own sins were removed. Hence the imperative necessity that these high priests should first free themselves from sin by the proper offerings, before they could be permitted to make expiation for the sins of others. So the apostle Paul reasons: "For every high priest taken from among men is ordained for men in things pertaining to God, that he may offer both gifts and sacrifices for sins; who can have compassion on the ignorant, and on them that are out of the way; for that he himself also is encompassed with infirmity. And for this reason he ought, as for the people, so also for himself, to offer for sins." It was indeed necessary that the high priest should first make an atonement for himself, before he could be fitted to offer the atonement ordained for the people. And not only was it necessary that he should make an atonement for himself, but also for the altar, that it might give its efficacy to the sin-offering of the annual atonement.

But Christ, who was without sin, "needed not, as those high priests," to offer sacrifice for himself. His "holy, harmless, and undefiled" character, the result of his own will and energy, placed him where the atonement placed the high priests under the law, and he was by character what those priests became by their offering. This ceremonial purity of character and freedom from sin, were types of Christ's personal character, and showed the necessity and importance of such a character in the person of the high priest of "the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, and not man."

In the second place, the blood of the annual atonement accomplished remission for the sins of the whole year in the mass, and for the whole people. The morning and evening sacrifices of the tabernacle and temple were designed for the sins of the people, and not for any special individual or congregational sin.¹ For the latter special offerings were prescribed. But at the annual atonement all sins were called up, both individual and congregational, and for the remission of these, the sins of the whole year, was the annual atonement designed. We hence see that the annual atonement differed from all others in two important particulars, the first of which was that the blood of this offering was carried into the most holy place, and there sprinkled on and before the mercy seat, which gave it an efficacy which it could not otherwise have had, an efficacy that procured positive and plenary remission, since those sins were never again brought up for remembrance and for an atonement. This quality of forgetfulness constitutes the second difference.

This fact was signalized by a distinct and very appropriate ceremony, which constituted an essential element of the annual atonement, since the quality of forgetfulness is an essential element of plenary and actual remission. The animals used in this atonement were two goats, one for a sin-offering, and the other to bear the sins away into a region of forgetfulness. These were distinguished by lot, and that on which the Lord's lot fell, was offered as the sin-offering, while the one on which the people's lot fell, was used for the "scape-goat." The ceremony is thus described: "And Aaron shall lay both his hands on the head of the live goat, and confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions in all their sins, putting them upon the head of the goat; and shall send the goat away by the hand of a fit man into the wilderness; and the goat shall bear upon him all their iniquities into a land not inhabited, and he shall let go the goat into the wilderness."² No ceremony could have been more appropriate, or taught more clearly and distinctly the quality of forgetfulness as essential to plenary remission. This is the distinctive quality of pardon under the New Covenant, which provides that in its remission there shall be no more remembrance of sin.³

This quality of remission flowing from the annual atonement gave to it all the essential elements of a full and effectual atonement, on account of which it falls behind the atonement of Christ in only one particular, which arises solely from the imperfection of animal sacrifices and the "infirmity" of the high priests offering them. But in the fulness of the remission which this atonement procured it approached so nearly in its results to those of the christian atonement as to be the fullest and most complete and comprehensive type of that sacrifice, and therefore the most important and significant type found among the ordinances and

¹ Lev. 4: 13.² Lev. 16: 20-22.³ Heb. 8: 12.

ceremonies of the Jewish institution. But what it teaches pertains only to the fulness and extent of the remission which it procured. There are other ceremonies which develop a different thought, and unfold other features which are essential in an adequate atonement, the anti-types of which are found fully realized and present in the person and character of the Lord Jesus Christ. Chief among these is the ceremony of

II. CLEANSING THE LEPER.

Leprosy seems to have been a disease beyond the reach of human remedies—contagious, and dreadful in its nature, for which a strange and mysterious sacrificial offering was presented to signify to the people that the leper was healed. Moses directed that “the priest shall command to take for him that is to be cleansed, two birds alive and clean, and cedar wood, and scarlet, and hyssop, and the priest shall command that one of the birds be killed in an earthen vessel over running water. As for the living bird, he shall take it, and the cedar wood, and the scarlet, and the hyssop, and shall dip them and the living bird in the blood of the bird that was killed over the running water; and he shall sprinkle upon him that is to be cleansed from the leprosy seven times, and shall pronounce him clean, and shall let the living bird loose in the open field.”¹

This ceremony resembles that of the annual atonement in the fact that two animals were used as necessary to the completeness and perfection of the sacrifice, and that two distinct ideas of the Remedial System were developed by these ceremonies, though the ideas are very distinct, and refer to two distinct elements of the true atonement. Their purposes were not so dissimilar as appears at first sight. The annual atonement had evident reference to the pardon of sin, and what is essential to plenary remission. The ceremony of cleansing the leper was a sacrificial offering, bloody in character, to cleanse from the defilement of a disease which was a proper and suitable representative of sin, which may be considered as a disease beyond the reach of human remedies. That leprosy had some such symbolical import, and was designed to represent sin, may be well and reasonably supposed from the fact that such a ceremony was prescribed for it, whose symbolical import finds its solution in the two-fold nature of the christian atonement. Diseases which contaminated and defiled the body, and thus unfitted it for religious worship or holy association, required for their cleansing certain sacrifices; but none had that strange and mysterious ceremony which belongs to leprosy.

If we are justified in the hypothesis that leprosy was designed to represent sin in its malignancy, inveteracy, and incurableness; or if the supposition that the leprosy is the symbol of sin be true and correct, then we should expect to find in this cere-

¹ Lev. 14: 4-7.

mony true and fitting types of the true atonement. Was there anything, then, in the atonement of Christ of which the sacrificial offerings prescribed in this ceremony could have been true and real types?

For this sacrifice the priest was directed, as we have seen, to take two birds, clean and alive, one of which was to be killed over running or living water, and in an earthen vessel. The blood of the slain bird was caught in the earthen vessel, and the living bird was dipped into this blood, and then let loose in the open field. What could such a ceremony have signified? What, as types, did these birds typify? The scape-goat showed that forgetfulness is an essential quality of remission; and the living bird, let loose in the open field, after having been dipped in the blood of the other bird, typified, as we conceive, a nature in the person of the true atonement.

These two birds were essential to this sacrifice, and each accomplished a necessary work, as parts of a unit. Of one part of this unit, the slain bird was the representative; and of the other, the living; but united into one by the living bird being dipped into the blood of the bird that was killed.

If we regard this sacrifice as a type of the atonement of Christ, then we inquire what features or elements of that atonement could these two birds have been designed to represent? It should be observed that this is the only sacrifice, in that large volume of types, that required two animals so closely and intimately connected. The scape-goat of the annual atonement was not so connected with the goat of the sin-offering as was the living with the escaped bird. The goats represented, as we have seen, two very distinct elements of *pardon*; whilst the two birds represented two features or elements in the *atonement*. As pardon was represented, as it respects its elements, by the annual atonement, so we should expect to find the *procuring cause* of pardon also represented by appropriate types. That is to say, if the full *effects* of the atonement of Christ had their types under Judaism, the full *nature* of his atonement should also have had its types. And this we conceive we have in the two birds of this ceremony. Of the true and real nature of the christian atonement we have no types in the Jewish system, if these birds be not such types. And yet, evidently, there should have been. If we have its *effects* represented in types, confessedly the *cause* should have been.

In the being who became the true atonement there were two distinct persons, both of whom were necessary to the perfection or completeness of the atonement, each discharging a function peculiar to himself. This is the fact, whether these two persons in the christian atonement were typified by the two birds or not.

But let us see how the two integral elements of the ceremony correspond with the two integral elements of the atonement. If

the correspondence between them be real and complete, we may rationally conclude that the relation of type and anti-type did obtain between them.

It is not difficult to see the almost exact correspondence, when we know that the christian atonement embraced two distinct persons, one of whom corresponded to the slain bird, as *his* blood became an offering for sin; that he was killed in a human body, which is an earthen vessel, and over running water (an emblem of eternity,) which fitly represented the divinity of his being. The living bird was not injured in the least; it was only dipped in the blood of the slain bird. Thus was it with the divine *Logos* in the person of Jesus of Nazareth. He suffered nothing in the sacrifice of Jesus; only he was dipped, as it were, in his shed blood.

A being so complex as was the Christian atonement, who was the incarnate *Logos*; a divine and human being in one person, whose official and personal relations to the Godhead and to humanity were so numerous and manifold, and apparently contradictory and impossible; such a being it seems impossible to have fully represented by any one type or symbol, or any number of types or symbols, however complex and multiform. A perfect atonement embraces so many essential qualities or attributes, and so many widely different elements and adjuncts, that it is simply impossible to have that atonement in all its fulness represented or portrayed by means of types and symbols. Yet to throw that picture on the canvas, in outline and detail, was the purpose and object of all the shadows and types and symbols which seem to have burdened the Jewish institution, and given it the appearance of being naught but a religion of meaningless ceremonies. But when we have this singular institution illumined by the personal and official relations of Christ to the government of God, to the being of the Godhead, and to the human race involved in sin, these strange and mysterious ceremonies are robbed of much of their mystery, and made to appear as intelligible signs, which reveal to the world the grand mysteries and sublime accomplishments of the Atonement of Christ, around which, as a centre, gather all the wisdom and power of the infinite Godhead.

From the numerous and multiform types of the atonement of Christ, which we have in the Jewish institution, and from all the ceremonies connected with sin and its atonement under Judaism, we discover that a perfect and adequate atonement embraces these essential and integral elements: 1. the life of the sin-offering, as represented by the blood of the victim; 2. spotlessness of character; 3. a consecrated altar, representing the ground or basis of the efficacy of the sin-offering; 4. the work of the high priest in presenting the blood on the mercy seat; 5. a mercy seat; 6. a divine nature in the person of the mediator and high priest, as typified by his consecrations. All these

qualities meet in the person of Jesus of Nazareth, and were typified by various types and symbols, so that all these shadows taken as a unit, represent what is found in the person and offices of Christ.

III. INTERCESSION AND MEDIATION.

Sin has raised such a barrier between God and the sinner as to produce complete separation, and to forbid access on the part of the offender into the presence of him against whom the offense and indignity were committed. The institution of sacrifice, and the things connected with it, were introduced by God without co-operation on the part of the sinner, and in anticipation of the action of a third party who should make intercession and mediation between the separated parties. It would be an act of mercy and condescension on the part of the party offended, were he, unsolicited and of his own prompting, to propose terms of reconciliation without petition on the part of the offender; and but an act of the deepest contrition, and most plaintive appeal on the part of the sinner, were he to plead for mercy. But his utter ignorance would forbid any suggestion from him as to what could secure pardon.

In this state of the case, intercession and mediation became absolutely necessary to the proposal of terms honorable to the party offended, and within the ability of the offender. This intervention was made, and full and complete reconciliation effected, so far as the settlement of the terms of reconciliation were concerned, by the Lord Jesus Christ, the incarnate *Logos*, in his mission to this world in the manifold capacity of Mediator, Intercessor, and Expiator.

Since, therefore, he is the fulness of the Godhead, as well as the fulness of humanity, and, as man and God, meets all the demands of a plan or system of reconciliation, all the functions pertaining to these three offices—Mediation, Intercession, and Expiation—meet in him, and are discharged by him in person. His dignity and majesty of person qualify him as a fit person to approach the Divinity, to represent the case of man involved in sin, to urge the acceptance of the terms of reconciliation proposed by him, and to suggest the manner in which the reconciliation shall take place. The same glorious majesty of being fits him as high priest to present the sin-offering, one of the agreed terms of reconciliation, and to enter into the immediate presence of God.

The functions of mediation and intercession are quite distinct from that of expiation, and are essentially and absolutely necessary to the completeness and perfection of a Remedial System. They exist in all their fulness and completeness in the christian system, and had their types under that great typical and symbolical institution given to the children of Abraham at Mt. Sinai.

Moses was the mediator of that institution,¹ and as such stood between God and the people, with the people representing God, and with God representing the people. His relations with God were more intimate, and his approach into his presence much closer, than were those of the high priest or intercessor.² It was through him that the whole institution of the Jews was given, and by him that Aaron and his sons were consecrated for the priest's office, and qualified to offer the daily atonement. While Moses lived, his superiority to Aaron appeared conspicuous, and this superiority arose from the difference in distinction that exists between a mediator and an intercessor. Mediation is the sole function of a mediator, and intercession of an intercessor, and the distinction between these is well marked and clearly drawn by the fact that a sin-offering is inseparable from intercession, but is not connected with mediation. This is shown by one fact in the history of the Jews while in the wilderness, a fact connected with the rebellion of Korah. On the day following the disaster which befell those rebels, "the whole congregation of the children of Israel murmured against Moses and Aaron," on account of which the Lord appeared in their presence, and fell upon the people with a plague. Then Moses commanded Aaron to "take a censer, and put fire therein from off the altar, and put on incense, and go quickly into the congregation, and make an atonement for them."³ In this event we have an exhibition of the peculiar functions of Moses and Aaron, one the mediator and the other the high priest, or intercessor; one directs, and the other executes; one determines what will appease God, and arrest the plague, and the other offers the means of reconciliation.

Moses, as mediator of the old covenant, was a type of the mediator of the new. Because of this he was admitted into the personal presence of God, and was permitted to look on the "similitude" of God. By this nearness did he fill the office of mediation, and became a type of Christ, who, by virtue of his personal dignity and majesty, was fitted to present himself before God, to lay before him the terms of reconciliation, and to introduce to his presence the intercessor who brought with him the means of pardon.

Aaron was not a full and perfect type of Christ. His priesthood was typical in all that pertained to the service of the annual atonement; but not as to the continuance and duration of Christ's priesthood. By reason of death he could not continue a priest. Hence another type was necessary, and this we have in the priesthood of Melchizedek, who had no predecessor nor successor as high priest, and continued such during the whole of the life of his priesthood. Therefore, as this priest continued during the whole time of the existence of his priesthood, so

¹ Heb. 3: 2-5; Gal. 3: 19; Ex. 20: 19, 20.

² Ex. 33: 11; Num. 12: 8; Deut. 34: 10.

³ Num. 16: 46.

Christ, having become a priest after his resurrection, continues a priest forever by virtue of his immortality.

It was the province of Aaron to offer sacrifices for sin, and in this he was the type of Christ; and because the type was ordained to offer sacrifices for sin, so was it also necessary that the anti-type should offer sacrifice for sin; and this Christ did, when he offered himself, and when, as the high priest, he presented that offering before the mercy seat in the heavens, interceding with this offering for the pardon of the sinner, and pleading as mediator that the terms were adequate, honorable to the insulted government, and sufficient on the part of the transgressor.

Here we close the enumeration of the types which mark out and define the elements of the Remedial System, and the relations and dependence which these elements sustain to the whole and to each other. We find that these elements are, 1. sacrifice or blood-offerings; 2. an altar, consecrated, and made holy so as to sanctify and make holy all the sin-offerings that were offered on it; 3. a high priest to present the atonement for sin; and 4. a mediator who pleads the sufficiency and adequacy of the atonement offered. These types find their anti-types or substance in the person and office of Jesus Christ, who is both offering and altar, both priest and mediator, thus fulfilling in himself all the essential types which pointed out, in shadows, all that pertains to the Great Atonement for sin.

PAR'T II.

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTION OF THE GOSPEL.

SECTION I.

THE MISSION OF JOHN THE IMMERSER.

The Jewish Age virtually closed with the mission of John the Baptist; actually, with the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus, A. D. 70. The gospel of Jesus Christ virtually began with the mission of John;¹ actually, on the day of Pentecost.² The mission of John virtually set aside the Jewish institution as effete and ready to vanish; and introduced the gospel, as the reign of the New Covenant, so long promised the Jewish people. The law of Moses provided and demanded that transgressors could enjoy remission only on the actual offering of animal sacrifices. John came preaching remission of sins on the terms of repentance and baptism by the authority of God. Such a proclamation, wholly unknown to the law, and so widely different from its provisions, virtually closed the Jewish Age, and introduced the Christian. This conclusion will appear evident as we proceed in our consideration of the principles and practice which characterized the mission of the Baptist.

The law or covenant made with the Jewish nation at Mt. Sinai was temporal, not only as to its provisions, but particularly as to its duration, because of the existence of a promise which antedated by several hundred years that on which the Jewish covenant was founded. This promise held priority of claim, and no subsequent promise, though covenanted, could set it aside. The Jewish institution, not being grounded on this promise, and having no essential connection with it, could continue only for a time, until that period in the history of the chosen people, at

¹ Mark 1: 1. ² Acts, chap, 1 and 2.

which God deemed it proper to covenant the first promise made to the father of this people. So long, therefore, as this promise remained uncovenanted, no institution founded on any other promise, could continue beyond the fulness of its own time.

There are frequent allusions in the Jewish scriptures to the end of that institution and the abrogation of the covenant made at Mt. Sinai, and some definite promises and prophecies that God would make a *new* covenant with the house of Israel, unlike that which he made with them when he delivered them from Egypt. Hence, the Jews had no reason for believing that the covenant which recognized them as the peculiar and chosen people of God, and the religious institutions founded on that covenant, would continue forever. In their scriptures it was very plainly stated that the Gentiles were to become fellow-heirs with them under the reign of a new and different covenant, which canceled all the peculiar privileges granted by the old covenant, and broke down "the middle wall of partition," and made of the two, one new man. Statements so surprising as those which related to the events and peculiarities of the promised new covenant, ought to have arrested their attention, and suggested to their minds the possible termination of that which so highly exalted them; and thus have prepared their minds for understanding and appreciating any proposed change in their relations and privileges, and for crediting any message assured to them by proper and sufficient testimony.

But the glory and power of this world absorbed their attention and diverted their thoughts. They had lost sight of the great burden of the human soul, and were restive under the oppression of Rome. Hence, they looked more anxiously and eagerly for a deliverer from this bondage than for one who would free them from their sins. The promised son of David, as a great temporal prince, was their ideal of the promises and prophecies; not one who would deliver them from a far greater bondage, and introduce them into a liberty where the soul is free from sin, and the reason and conscience dominate passion and the desires of the flesh. They contemplated no change in their religious institutions, or of their relations as the peculiar people of God; but rather a confirmation and firmer establishment of these. They were the children of Abraham, which with them meant superlative greatness and power, and unchangeableness as to their relation to the favor of God; and they could not, therefore, look, with any degree of favor, on anything or any man that proposed a change in any of these particulars.

When John the Baptist appeared, preaching the "baptism of repentance for the remission of sins," he found the nation in expectation, indeed, of their promised Deliverer, but full of conceit and prejudice in regard to their own favors and privileges in the sight of God. They were disposed to hear him patiently, and they regarded him as a prophet sent by God. In this state were

the ruling minds of the nation. The common people flocked to his baptism by thousands, and yet among those who sought his baptism, there were many who saw in it only a further ratification of the privileges and supremacy of the Jew. "Who hath warned you to flee from the impending wrath?" Fruit worthy of repentance is now demanded. Lineal descent from Abraham is no longer a passport to the favor of God, or a proof of acceptance with him. God can make of stones children of Abraham. No; the axe is now laid at the root of the trees, and every tree, though it be of the seed of Abraham, is to be cut down and burned up, if it produce not good fruit. Here was a leveling of all the pretensions of the Jew; an obliteration of the distinction in which he gloried; and a revocation of his exclusive privileges; and so the proud ruler turned away in disgust.¹

If such were the beginning of the work of the COMING ONE, and the preparation necessary to receive him; if such were the initial fruits of the kingdom of heaven, announced as near at hand, the lawyers and scribes saw nothing in all this to recommend the King or the kingdom to them. John stated very clearly that his preaching was with the view of "making ready a people prepared for the Lord," whose greatness and majesty he expressed by declaring himself unworthy to loose the sandals from his feet.

The nature and intent of the proclamation of the Baptist, imply a great degree of degeneracy on the part of the people in regard to religious life. The people of Israel had wandered from God in heart and life, and their rabbis had obscured and made void the word of God by their interpretations and traditions. Religion had degenerated into empty ceremonies; and a formal observance of these had taken the place of piety and humanity. Sin was not an evil so deeply felt and realized as to be looked on as staining and ruining the soul; only a defilement from markets, civil courts, and dead men's bones.² Sin and holiness were things of ceremony and external forms, and piety, that which cheated the parent by robbing God.³ Without, they were as beautiful as whited sepulchres; but within, they were as rapacious as wolves, and as corrupt and polluting as the contents of their graves. Before men they wore the garments of righteousness; but their hearts were full of deceit and iniquity.⁴ A generation of vipers had they become, full of hypocrisy, hatred, envy, violence, murder, and worthy of the condemnation of hell; upon whom could be justly visited the merited punishment for all the crimes committed by the nation, from the murder of Abel to the murder of Zacharias.⁵ Such was the terrible picture of their wickedness drawn by the Lord himself. How appropriate, then, the proclamation of John of a turning again to God, in order to a preparation of the mind and heart for such a great

¹ Luke 7: 30. ² Mark 7: 4; John 18: 28.

³ Math. 15: 4-6. ⁴ Math. 23: 28. ⁵ Math. 23: 33-35.

spiritual teacher as the Messiah, so graphically and forcibly described by the Harbinger: "Whose fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly cleanse his floor, and gather his wheat into the garner; but will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire." Malachi uses still stronger language in describing the work of the Coming One: "But who shall abide the day of his coming? and who shall stand when he appeareth? *for he is like a refiner's fire*, and like fuller's soap; and he shall sit as a refiner and purifier of silver; and he shall purify the sons of Levi, and purge them as gold and silver, that they may offer unto the Lord an offering in righteousness."¹ But those who rejected the counsel of God by refusing the preparation required, were reserved for "the day that shall burn as an oven, when all the proud, yea, and all who do wickedly, shall be stubble; and the day that cometh shall burn them up, saith the Lord of hosts, that it shall leave them neither root nor branch."²

Such was the work of the Coming One, described in the strong and forcible language of metaphor, and for which John came to prepare the Jewish people. His work, therefore, must have been germane to that of the Messiah, and as a means to an end, was well calculated to prepare the way for the refining of the refiner, or the teaching of him who was to accomplish so radical and thorough reformation of the people, that the worship of his saints might be as acceptable as in the days of old, as expressed by Malachi: "Then shall the offering of Judah and Jerusalem be pleasant unto the Lord, as in the days of old, and as in former years."³

The mission of the Baptist was in perfect harmony with the purposes expressed in these prophecies, and John's view of his own work was that it was only a preparation for the more thorough work of his Master. Hence, he said, referring to the prophecies of Isaiah and Malachi: "I am the voice of one crying in the wilderness, Make straight the way of the Lord. Every valley shall be filled up, and every mountain and hill be made low; and the crooked shall be made straight, and the rough places smooth."

The work of preparation is more specifically described by the prophet Malachi and by the angel who spoke to John's father Zacharias. The prophet says; "Behold I will send you Elijah the prophet, * * * and *he shall turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the hearts of the children to their fathers*, lest I come and smite the earth with a curse." What the prophet means by the reconciliation of parents and children has reference to the sincerity of the worship, and the purity of life that were to obtain under the reign of the Messiah, as in the days of old, when God had such worshipers as Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; Melchizedek and Job; Moses, and David, and Daniel, whose

¹ Mal. 3: 2, 3. ² Mal. 4: 1.

³ Mal. 3: 4.

offerings were pleasing and acceptable, and rose as a sweet incense to heaven.

The angel said to Zacharias: "He shall be great in the sight of the Lord, * * * and many of the children shall he turn to the Lord their God. And he shall go before him (the Messiah), in the spirit and power of Elijah, *to turn the hearts of the fathers to the children*, and the disobedient by the wisdom of the just, to make ready a people prepared for the Lord."¹ The angel refers to the prophecy of Malachi, identifies John the Baptist as the Elijah promised, and uses the same language in describing the work of his mission, so that the proclamation which John made—"the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins"—had in view, and was designed to effect that reformation in the people described as a "turning of the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the hearts of the children to the fathers." From the days of their fathers they had gone away from the ordinances of God, and had not kept them; and they were to be exhorted by this Elijah to return to God, that God might return to them.² Many of the children of Israel did turn to the Lord their God, when they accepted the counsel and exhortation of God by being baptized by John in the Jordan. There must, then, have been in that obedience a turning to God in such a way and to such a degree as to prepare a people for the Lord Messiah, and thus to realize the object of his mission as described by Malachi.³

The great object on the part of God in sending John to prepare the way, was to secure the reception of his son, that he might save the world from sin; and to make sure his reception, it was essential that the people should be called from their wandering, and turned in heart and mind to the Lord their God. This, Christ himself states as essentially necessary to the world's reception of him: "No man can come to me except the father who sent me, draw him;" and God draws men to Christ by instruction: "It is written in the prophets, 'And they shall all be taught of God.' Every one, therefore, that hath heard and hath learned of the father, cometh unto me."⁴

The prophetic announcements concerning the mission of John, give a very clear view of the import and object of his mission. The *preparation* of which Isaiah speaks, and the *turning* of Malachi and the angel have one and the same import, and refer to that state of the mind and heart before the mind of Christ, when he speaks of those whom he expects to receive him, as being drawn by God to him by being *taught* of God, and hearing and learning of him. Such being the necessary preparation for the reception of the Messiah, it was important that men be brought back again to God, to hear and learn from him. This was the purpose of John's mission, and this is what that mission accomplished. This being so, we should expect to find

¹ Luke 1: 16, 17. ² Mal. 3: 7. ³ Mal. 3: 4. ⁴ John 6: 44, 45.

this thought prominent in that peculiar and singular proclamation which he made to the Jews.

The peculiarity in John's proclamation, which first arrests our attention, is the fact that remission of sins is granted on conditions not mentioned or recognized in the law. Sacrifice was essential to the remission of sins; but in the repentance and baptism of John, the sacrifices of the law were ignored, and the essential law of pardon, to this extent, seemingly disregarded. From a people so long accustomed to an oppressive system of sacrifice and a laborious ritual, whose minds were daily directed to these services by the requirements of the law, such a proclamation ought to have received the most attentive consideration, and been accepted by them with cordial delight; and it would have been had they felt the full burden and oppressiveness of sin.

But though these terms of pardon seem to the truly penitent heart so joyous and acceptable, yet they are not so to hearts in love with sin. Whilst these conditions seem light and easy of compliance, and really are so to the heart that turns in all its fulness and sincerity to God; yet they are more rigorous and searching in their requirements than the formal offering of sacrifices, or compliance with prescribed ceremonies. It is much easier to wash the body after returning from the market, and make it ceremonially clean, than to cleanse the heart and keep it pure from evil thoughts and desires; much easier to worship God by ceremony and formal offerings than with a heart all aglow with love and deeply contrite on account of sin.

When we remember the relation which the Jewish people sustained to God, and the privileges that such relation grants, the conditions of pardon announced by John were not so inconsistent with the government of God under Judaism, or so novel to the Jewish mind, as might at first sight have appeared. Such a state of the mind and heart as was contemplated and required by the preaching of John, was always of a much higher value with God than was the offering of sacrifice. Samuel taught this lesson to Saul after his return from his war against the Amalekites: "Behold, to *obey* is better than sacrifice, and to *hearken* than the fat of rams." David, who followed Saul in the kingdom, and who was inspired by the Holy Spirit to utter his psalms, when deeply moved by repentance, says: "Have mercy upon me, O God, * * * wash me thoroughly from mine iniquity, and cleanse me from my sin; * * * *thou desirest truth in the inward parts*; * * * thou desirest not sacrifice, else would I give it: thou delightest not in burnt offerings. The sacrifices of God are a *broken spirit*; a *broken and contrite heart*, O God, thou will not despise."¹ To the same purport speak the prophets. Isaiah says: "I delight not in the blood of bullock or of lamb, or of he goats; * * * bring no more vain oblations;" but "Wash ye, make you clean; put away the evil of your do-

¹ Ps. 51: 1, 2, 6, 16, 17.

ings from before mine eyes; cease to do evil; learn to do well.”¹ And Hosea: “For I desire mercy and not sacrifice; and the knowledge of God more than burnt offerings.”² And Micah: “Wherewithal shall I come before the Lord, and bow myself before the high God? Shall I come before him with burnt offerings? * * * Will the Lord be pleased with thousands of rams, or with ten thousands of rivers of oil? Shall I give my firstborn for my transgression, and the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul? He hath shown thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?”³

These exhortations and instructions were addressed, it must be particularly observed, to a people who sustained toward God the relation of sonship by virtue of being the children of Israel. They were within the “the commonwealth of Israel,” subjects of “the covenants of promise,” and as a *people* enjoyed the favor of God; and hence they were expected and required to walk as became that relation, loving mercy, doing righteously, and walking humbly and obediently before God.

The proclamation of John the Baptist was addressed to the same people, with the view of calling them back to God, and of placing them in that attitude before God, on account of which he could return⁴ to them, and bless them. The returning which his preaching effected was the same as that of which their prophets spoke, and to which their fathers were so frequently exhorted. John was a prophet sent by God to “turn again the children of Israel to the Lord their God;” and if he accomplished this, he did it by preaching “*repentance*” in connection with immersion for the remission of sins.

This turning of the children of Israel had special reference to the change wrought in their minds and hearts by which they became obedient to God, willing to receive his reproofs and corrections, and to bring forth the fruits of righteousness and holiness. By such a change were the people prepared for the Messiah; and hence we ought to find in the command, “repent,” that turning of the mind and heart, which effects the desired preparation.

With this induction of facts and principles we may now turn to a more direct and special consideration of what is implied in, and intended by the command, “*Repent.*”

The word used by the Baptist is the present imperative of the verb *μετανοεω*, the primary and radical meaning of which is a change of mind, and such a change as to place it in direct opposition, and, indeed, in direct antagonism, to its former state or condition. Such is the force of the preposition *meta* in combination with a verb or noun. Its primary meaning, therefore, is a radical change in the mind; and such, in part, is its meaning in the proclamation of John.

¹ Is. 1: 11, 13, 16, 17. ² Hos. 6: 6. ³ Mic 6: 6-8. ⁴ Mal. 3: 7; Jer. 3: 22.

If we distinguish between an act of the mind and an act of the soul, then the act of the mind in the "repentance" which John preached, does not exhaust the meaning of the term. That there was also an act of the *soul* in that "repentance" is perfectly evident from the fact that a change in the soul was the chief object of his preaching. The angel had said that this Elijah would turn the *hearts* of the children to the fathers, and if this was done by his preaching, then is it clear that a change in *heart* was embraced in the repentance. We have then a definition of the word in fact, in the thing effected by the obedience which was rendered to the command, repent. It is also a definition in or by the purpose and intent of the mission of the Harbinger, as foretold by Malachi, and announced by the angel to his father. The act, then, intended to be expressed by the word *μετανοεω*, as used by John, was *a turning of the mind and heart to God in all honesty and sincerity, realizing that these had wandered from him, and had become disobedient to his will as expressed in the law and the prophets.*

Every science and art has its technicalities, and words acquire a meaning under their light, which they may not have in ordinary use. The subject in connection with which they are used, gives them a shade of meaning which is derived entirely from the nature of the subject, or the different aspects under which it is viewed. Thus the mission of John, having a certain great purpose in view, gives to the word, *μετανοεω*, a signification in perfect harmony with the purpose of that mission; so that we have only to know the intent and purpose of that mission to know what meaning to give the word. As that purpose was *to turn the hearts* of the people to God, and "the disobedient to the wisdom of the just;" so we know that in "repenting," they turned to God with the whole mind and heart. In the result, therefore, which his preaching accomplished, we have an exhaustive definition of the word translated "*repentance*" in the common version.

Immersion was connected with the change of mind to express in the outward man what had taken place in the inward; to corroborate and seal the change that the soul had undergone in repentance; so that when the entire change had been completed, and man had turned to God again, remission of sins followed as the blessing,¹ and God turned again to the obedient penitent. Immersion was the outward *act* of turning, and the proof of the peoples' reception of the counsel of God.²

The preparation effected by the "repentance and baptism" of John, was wholly spiritual. It took hold on the soul, and carried it back to God. It was based on no family or national pretension. It ignored every thing but the individual life. It was a preparation for an in-coming spiritual religion, which men were to embrace with the whole heart. It lay on the borders of the new

¹ Jer. 3: 22; Acts 3: 26. ² Luke 7: 30.

reign, and was the vestibule to the spiritual kingdom of the Messiah. It was the revival of the soul from spiritual death; an awakening to a life of righteousness and holiness. By it the soul was born anew, and entered into a new life. It prepared the soul to abide the day of the Messiah's coming, and to stand when he appeared.¹

In the midst of this work the Son of Mary appeared in the throng that crowded the banks of the Jordan. There was nothing about him to distinguish him particularly from other men, but his spotless character. An immersion for the remission of sins seemed wholly inappropriate for him. His cousin knew his blameless life and expressed surprise to find him applying for baptism: "I have need to be baptized by thee, and comest thou to me?" But men knew not his inner life, and he was not so presumptuous as to expose himself to the inquiry, why he did not obey God's command. So he replied: "Thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness." John knew not with certainty who Jesus was. "I did not know him," said he, "but that he might be made manifest to Israel, *for this reason* I have come baptizing in water;" for "he who sent me to baptize in water, said to me, 'Upon whom you shall see the spirit descending, and remaining upon him, the same is he who baptizes in the Holy Spirit.'"² Therefore, Jesus sought John's baptism, not for the remission of sins, as all others did; but that he might fulfill all righteousness, and be made known to the Jewish people; that God might point him out, and acknowledge him publicly as his Son. "And Jesus having been baptized, and while he was praying, the heaven was opened, and the Holy Spirit descended, in a bodily shape like a dove, upon him, and a voice came from heaven, which said: 'Thou art my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.'"³

Then was the mission of John completed. He recognized the fact that his work was ended, and that of Jesus begun, and said: "He must increase, but I must decrease." As Jesus arose, John went down. As the morning star fades before the morning sun, so John waned before the rising Sun of Righteousness.

¹ Mal. 3: 2. ² John 1: 31-33. ³ Luke 3: 21, 22.

SECTION II.

THE PERSONAL MINISTRY OF JESUS.

Jesus began his public ministry soon after he came from the wilderness where he was tempted by Satan. From the wilderness, it would seem, he returned to the Jordan, at which time the events recorded in John 1: 35-51, took place. Thence he went into Galilee,¹ and probably to Cana,² and thence to Capernaum.³ After this he went into the land of Judea, and remained there sometime baptizing.⁴ John was baptizing at the same time in Ænon, in order that the Samaritans might the more conveniently attend his baptism.⁵ Soon after this, it would appear that John was cast into prison. Hearing this, Jesus went again into Galilee. By this time his fame had spread far and wide, and multitudes followed him from all parts of the country. But we do not propose to follow the events of his life. The line of our investigation leads us to the consideration of what he proclaimed on entering upon his mission.

Having heard that John was imprisoned, Jesus left Judea, and "began from that time to preach, and say, 'Repent; for the kingdom of heaven is at hand;'⁶ * * * and he went about all Galilee, preaching the gospel of the kingdom, * * * and saying, 'Repent; and believe the gospel.'⁷"⁷ The time was fulfilled, the kingdom of heaven was at hand, the Messiah was among them as the object of their faith and acceptance, and the people were commanded to repent and believe on him. This proclamation was the same as that made by the Baptist. He, too, commanded that the people who flocked to his baptism, should believe on him who was to follow him.⁸ Therefore, in every essential particular, Jesus proclaimed the same message with which the Baptist was commissioned, and labored to prepare the people for the kingdom of heaven, which was so near at hand. This preparation was effected by repentance and baptism, *and faith in Jesus as the Messiah*. The repentance and baptism had reference to God, and secured to the obedient Jew the remission of sins; but these were not enough to give entrance into the kingdom of heaven. To this faith in the king of the kingdom was necessary—faith in Jesus of Nazareth as the Prince

¹ John 1: 43. ² Ib. 2: 1. ³ Ib. 2: 12. ⁴ Ib. 3: 22. ⁵ Bloomfield, *in loco*.

⁶ Math. 4: 17-23. ⁷ Mark 1: 14, 15. ⁸ Acts 19: 4.

Messiah. Nothing in his teaching is more insisted on than faith in him. It is, indeed, the theme and burden of all that he taught and demanded of the people. The great soul-change which took place in the obedience rendered to John's preaching, was but preparatory to implicit and unreserved faith in Jesus as the Messiah. Hence, he insisted on this as necessary to the completion of the preparation required for entrance into the kingdom of God, when it should fully appear. The preparation, therefore, which fitted persons for entrance into the kingdom of heaven, was that effected by the repentance and baptism of John, and faith in Jesus as the Messiah.

Since remission of sins was enjoyed by all who "repented" and were baptized by John and the Lord during their personal ministry, it is of interest to inquire whether this remission was the same in character and extent—whether as full and complete as that enjoyed under the reign of heaven after it was established; whether all who were baptized by them, and who became disciples of Jesus while he was on earth, enjoyed the same plenary remission as those who became obedient to the faith on and after the day of Pentecost? It is of interest to ascertain this, if possible, in order that we may discover how fully the principles of the New Reign were developed by the Lord Jesus in person on earth.

The Baptist indicated the extent to which such development would be realized by, and during, the personal ministry of the Messiah, when he spoke of the results of his teaching in these words: "Whose fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly clean his threshing-floor, and gather his wheat into the garner; but will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire." By the wheat he evidently means those who receive him and become his disciples; and by the chaff, those who reject him. But it is important for our purpose and argument, that we determine the time when he was to gather his wheat into his barn, and to burn up the chaff.

It may help us, in the determination of this point, if we recur to the passage in Malachi, already quoted. In chapter 3: 3, he says: "He shall sit as a refiner and purifier of silver; and he *shall purify the sons of Levi, and purge them as gold and silver, that they may offer unto the Lord an offering of righteousness.*" This metaphor evidently describes *his work on earth*; and as the other figure, drawn from farm-life, states the same thing, in different language, we are justified in concluding that the threshing-floor was the sons of Levi, and the sons of Levi the Jewish people. This work of the Messiah being limited to this life, and the wheat being those who received him during his personal ministry, the garner, or barn, must represent the church of the day of Pentecost, and subsequently.

This conclusion is made still more evident by the object for which this refining, and purifying, and fanning took place, viz: that those made his disciples, and constituting the church, might

offer to the Lord an offering of righteousness. To the sons of Levi belonged the priesthood. They were the ordained of God to offer sacrifices to the Lord. And so also, under the reign of Christ, and in the church, the disciples of the Lord Jesus "are a royal priesthood to offer spiritual sacrifices to God by Jesus Christ." This royal priesthood was *inaugurated* on the day of Pentecost. One hundred and twenty disciples formed the nucleus of the church established that day. These were, therefore, some of the wheat which he had gathered, and were at that time placed in the barn, or church.

"But the chaff he will burn up with unquenchable fire." The chaff, as we have said, represents those who did not receive him while on earth, nor after his coronation. When was that chaff burnt? Malachi will aid us in determining this also. He says: "Behold the day cometh that shall burn as an oven, and all the proud, yea, and all that do wickedly, shall be stubble; and the day that cometh shall burn them up, saith the Lord of hosts." This prophecy was fulfilled in the destruction of Jerusalem, "the impending vengeance," and "the wrath to come," that hung over the Jewish nation for rejecting their Messiah, as mentioned by the Baptist. As, therefore, the work of refining and purifying the sons of Levi, and fanning the wheat from the chaff was begun by the Lord Jesus while he was on earth, some of the refined metal and sifted wheat existed already when the kingdom of heaven was inaugurated on the day of Pentecost.

Now, as there is no reason for believing that the refined metal and sifted wheat which followed, as the fruit, the mission of John and the personal ministry of Jesus, differed, in any essential respect, from that which followed, in point of time, the day of Pentecost, we must conclude that the remission which was enjoyed by the disciples of Jesus before his coronation, was the same in character and fulness as that which was enjoyed after his exaltation.

This conclusion is not unsupported by fact. If it be not true that the disciples of Jesus, who recognized him as the Christ, and followed him while on earth, enjoyed plenary and actual remission before the day of Pentecost, how could the one hundred and twenty have constituted the nucleus of the church? How could the apostles have introduced obedient believers into the church on and after that day? They certainly were not the subjects of any other repentance and baptism, and faith in the Lord Jesus, than such as they experienced under John and the personal ministry of Christ. None of these were the subjects of *christian* baptism, for the first time announced and enjoined on the day of Pentecost. They must, therefore, have constituted the nucleus of the church, *to whom* were added the three thousand, and who, with the three thousand, constituted the church spoken of in Acts 2: 47. As, then, the one hundred and twenty, and the three thousand, with those daily added to the church, stood on the same

ground, and enjoyed the same relation with God, and the same blessings from him, there can be no doubt that the remission enjoyed by the one hundred and twenty differed in no degree or kind from that enjoyed by the three thousand. That little assembly who continued in prayer in Jerusalem after the ascension, and the five hundred brethren mentioned by Paul, were some of the wheat which the Lord then gathered into the church; some of the silver which was refined by repentance and baptism, and faith in him as the promised Messiah.

This conclusion is further strengthened by another fact mentioned by Luke. On a certain occasion when Paul came to Ephesus, he found there twelve disciples who had been baptized with John's baptism. On learning the fact, he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus. This is the only case recorded in the scriptures of re-immersion. It was not a case of re-immersing persons whom John had baptized, as appears very evident from the history of the transaction.

Apollos, an Alexandrian Jew, an eloquent man, and mighty in the scriptures, came to Ephesus. "This man was instructed in the way of the Lord, and being fervent in spirit, he spake and taught diligently the things of the Lord, *knowing only the baptism of John.*"¹ A few facts are to be noted here. 1. Apollos was mighty in the scriptures; 2. he was instructed in the way of the Lord; 3. he taught the things of the Lord; and 4. knowing only the baptism of John. These facts show how closely the mission of John was connected with the gospel; and that a gospel preacher might teach the way of the Lord, and the things of the Lord, while not knowing anything of the descent of the Holy Spirit, and of baptism being administered by the authority of Jesus Christ, and into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

Such only were the attainments of Apollos. It is, therefore, almost positively certain that it was he who baptized these twelve disciples by John's baptism.

Paul, in commanding them to be immersed in the name of the Lord Jesus, recognized the validity of John's baptism during the time it was authorized. But now, since Jesus was crowned Lord of all, and all authority in heaven and earth had been given into his hands, men were no longer to be baptized by John's baptism, but by christian baptism. Hence, these disciples having been immersed by John's baptism, *after the coronation of Christ*, and the ordination of baptism in the name of Christ, it was necessary that they should receive christian baptism, before they could receive and enjoy the blessings of God conveyed by that obedience.

As this is the only case in which John's baptism proved invalid, and not to be recognized as granting the blessings and privileges enjoyed under the reign of Christ; and since as many as six hun-

¹Acts 13: 25.

dred who were baptized by John's baptism became members of the church without re-immersion, there can be no other explanation of this apparent contradiction than that which we have here given. This conclusion will appear still more evident when we have looked further into Christ's teaching while he was on earth.

No more thorough, complete, and radical change was taught by the Holy Spirit through the apostles, than was taught by Christ in his interview with Nicodemus. If the subjects of the repentance and baptism which he taught, were also the subjects of this change, *then is it evident that the birth of water and Spirit is none other in fact than the repentance and baptism which John and Jesus taught and commanded during his personal ministry.* The only question that can arise in regard to the whole matter is, whether the "new birth" could have taken place before the coronation of Christ and the actual existence of the kingdom inaugurated by that coronation.

This question may be determined by the fact already mentioned, viz: that repentance and baptism, and faith in Jesus as the Messiah did admit their subjects into the kingdom of heaven, without any other birth of water and Spirit. If a birth of water and Spirit is necessary to an entrance into the kingdom of heaven, of which there can be no doubt, then we must conclude that the apostles, and the other brethren and sisters, who constituted the nucleus of the church on the day of Pentecost, had undergone that change in submitting to the command of John and of the Lord Jesus.

A consideration of the truth taught by the Lord in his conversation with Nicodemus will not be out of place here, since it may show still further to what extent, and with what fulness the principles of the New Reign were developed by the Lord, and obtained during his personal ministry.

There is, probably, no portion of the sacred scriptures concerning which a greater diversity of opinion has existed, and, indeed, still exists, than concerning this conversation of Christ with Nicodemus, in which he states the imperative necessity of a birth of water and Spirit to fit one for an entrance into the kingdom of heaven. No opinion or interpretation yet advanced has met with general acceptance. The passage has been subjected to much critical examination; yet a solution of its difficulties is still a desideratum. The incident is familiar to every reader of the New Testament. The mystery that has been thrown around it has attracted particular attention to it, as one portion of the scriptures which is not to be understood in this state of existence.

Nicodemus was a ruler of the Jews of some prominence and influence. He was a teacher in Israel, and ought to have been familiar with the writings of the Jewish prophets. He seems to have been a just man, and disposed toward the right. He had, very probably, attentively, though quietly, observed the life

and teaching of the Lord; and especially must he have been struck with the numerous and wonderful miracles which he had wrought. What he had seen and heard of Jesus had made an impression on his mind, and excited a desire in his heart to know more of him.

That his associate rulers might know nothing of the interview, he sought Jesus at night. He had not the moral courage to do this openly. He feared the odium and opposition, if not persecution, which the interview might bring upon him. In times when peoples' passions are aroused and embittered, and prejudices and opinions draw sharp lines of distinction; when persecution sharpens the asperity of feeling, and ignominy is to be encountered by an opposition to dominant and domineering opinions, it is no easy matter for one to openly take a course which will certainly bring down upon him all that is to be feared from the power and influence of parties yet in the ascendant. Nicodemus knew the state of feeling among his peers, and what the consequences would be if he should be found openly consorting with the hated Nazarene. It is not surprising, therefore, that he preferred the night for the interview. To do him justice, we are disposed to believe that he was honest, though timid, in his desire and object in seeking the Lord. There is no evidence of insincerity on his part.

His address to Jesus as he approached him was respectful and complimentary, and discovers the honest convictions of his mind: "Rabbi, 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." This was an honest, but fatal admission. He expressed too much to be where he was, and yet remain faithful to his convictions. All this the Lord knew, and more. He knew the heart of the man, and saw in it that which needed eradication. Nicodemus did not know his own heart. He knew not what pride and prejudices needed exposure and eradication. He had false views of Christ's mission and teaching; and was, in a word, altogether in that state of mind which required just such an answer as he received to his respectful address. To us the reply seems abrupt. But Jesus saw its appropriateness and necessity; and yet he uttered nothing new; nothing but what Nicodemus had heard in the proclamation of John.

A more unexpected answer he could not have received. It thoroughly bewildered him; and when he had recovered from his surprise, a feeling of disgust or contempt, perhaps, took possession of his mind, and he exclaimed with some feeling: "How can a man be born when he is old?" Jesus had said to him: "Except a man be born again he can not see the kingdom of heaven." This touched and withered his Jewish pride. This laid the axe at the root of the tree, and showed that Jewish extraction was no longer the basis of sonship with God.

The reply of our Lord could not have been so inappropriate

and foreign as it seems to be. There must have been a great necessity and propriety in his introducing such a subject at that time, and in such a manner. There must have been something in the mind of Nicodemus which urgently called for such a startling reply. It had application to some thought then prominent in his mind, of which he was fully conscious, and was not so mysterious but that it ought to have been understood by Nicodemus. "Are you a teacher in Israel, and, know not these things?" If it were such a mysterious and ambiguous remark as many have supposed it to be, we need not express surprise that Nicodemus failed to apprehend it. His mind was filled with thoughts and prejudices of Jewish prerogatives; but was opening to the wonderful character of the Nazarene, without being fully awake to the strength of these prejudices; and it needed only such a startling announcement as this to throw him off his balance. We may be surprised at his singular misapprehension of the Lord's meaning; but it was probably the very answer the Lord anticipated, and in which we find the true reason for the statement of the Lord: "You must be born again."

A little reflection would have assured Nicodemus that a man whom God had sent, and who evidently spoke by the inspiration of God, could not have been speaking of natural birth; could not have meant what was really impossible. Had Nicodemus been an earnest seeker for truth, and felt a strong desire to know the real purposes of Jesus, he would have humbly and modestly asked for an explanation of what to him seemed so strange and ambiguous. He ought to have known, and probably did know, something of what Jesus had been teaching throughout the land of Judea. He ought to have been well acquainted with the history of his own times, from the time that Herod issued his cruel edict to the preaching of John. An event so mournful to his people as that of Rachel weeping for her children, and the cause of that cruel edict, were certainly not unknown to him. And, beyond doubt, the preaching and baptism of John were too recent not to have been familiar to a "ruler of the Jews." John had aroused the attention of the whole nation; and Nicodemus could not have been ignorant of the fact that multitudes crowded the banks of the Jordan. The immersion which John proclaimed and administered was something sufficiently strange to have arrested his attention; for it indicated the inauguration of a new order of things. As a "teacher in Israel," he ought to have pondered over these things, and been better prepared in mind and heart to approach one who had been acknowledged on the banks of the Jordan as the Son of God. But because he was not mindful of all these events, the Lord awoke him to the realities about him by piercing him through with this arrow of truth.

Figures and metaphors of speech as well as plain statements of fact, are well nigh exhausted by the scriptures in depicting and portraying the great psychical revolution required by the

Lord Jesus as essential to an entrance into, and an enjoyment of the blessings and privileges of the kingdom of heaven. John the Baptist inaugurated the revolution by preaching the revolutionary change the soul must undergo in order to be prepared for the kingdom of heaven. This change was effected and completed by "repentance and baptism;" the first having reference to the soul, and the second to the person; the first doing for the soul what the second did for the person. This was the change contemplated by the New Covenant which God promised by the mouth of Jeremiah to make with the children of Israel in "the last days," by which he purposed "to put the law in their inward parts, and write it on their hearts."¹ and "give them a heart to know the Lord, and *return unto him with their whole heart.*"² It was a revolution which expressed itself in a *return to God with the whole heart*, and was announced by a word which has all the fulness of meaning found in and expressed by this fact. This was what John was sent to accomplish, and what he did accomplish by the preaching of "the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins."

Jesus taught the same great change when he proclaimed that the kingdom of heaven was at hand, and commanded the people to "Repent and believe the gospel." But he taught it much more forcibly and strikingly when he represented this "repentance and baptism," or the great change wrought by these means, as a *new birth*, as a *birth "of water and Spirit,"* which carries with it all the force of a new or second creation. To be born again is the same as being created again, an operation taking place with, and in, the soul, no less thorough and transforming than that which the body undergoes in passing from the present life to that beyond the grave. The resurrection of the body is the creation of a new body;³ no less great is the change which the soul undergoes when it "passes from death into life" again; when men turn away from the darkness and sin of disobedience and their wanderings, and come back into the light and joy of obedience. This is what the Lord meant when he told Nicodemus that he must be born again before he could enter into the kingdom of heaven. The revolution then inaugurated was the weeding out of all the impure and corrupt, and the gathering in of all the holy and righteous. The line of demarkation was henceforth to be one drawn between the good and the bad; between the holy and the unholy; between men who live after the Spirit and men who live after the flesh. It marked a difference as profound and radical as that which distinguishes heaven from earth, or spirit from flesh. It makes a *new creation*, in which the old perished in the regeneration, and by which comes the new life. This was the great end and purpose of John's mission, and of the Lord's preaching. This was the nature of that kingdom which he came to inaugurate and establish, a kingdom

¹ Jer. 31: 33.² Jer. 24: 7.³ 1 Cor. 15: 37, 38.

that had renovated or regenerated souls as its subjects, and righteousness and holiness as the inspiration of its life and power. "Except you turn [to God], and become as little children, you shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven."¹

When the Lord perceived that Nicodemus had misconceived the meaning of what he said, he repeated the thought, and expressed his meaning more fully, explaining the word *again* by the words *water and Spirit*, and said: "Except a man be born of water and Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of heaven. That which is born of the flesh, is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit, is spirit. Do not wonder that I said to you, You must be born again. The Spirit breathes where he wills, and you hear his voice, but you know not whence he comes and whither he goes: so is every one who is born of the Spirit."² In these words the Lord states most emphatically and positively that no man can enter into the kingdom of heaven, whose near approach he was every where proclaiming, unless through a birth of water and Spirit. As preparatory and necessary to this entrance, he had to every one else preached "repentance and baptism," and continued to preach the same during the greater part of his personal ministry. Now, if the "repentance and baptism" which he and John proclaimed, granted men entrance into the kingdom when it was established, then these must be identical with the birth of water and Spirit, or the latter must be additional to, and distinct from, that repentance and baptism. Which it is will appear in the sequel.

To determine this question we must first understand what the Lord had before his mind when he spoke of men being born of water and Spirit. He explains his meaning in the 8th verse of this connection; but the translation we have of his words in the received version, so obscures that meaning as to have occasioned a good deal of controversy, and given rise to various and contradictory translations. The word *pneuma* has formed the initial point in these diverging views, and led to very opposite conclusions. If we translate the word as meaning *wind*, then the statement of the Lord appears as an illustration. If, as meaning *spirit*, then it seems to be the simple statement of a fact. In the first case the translation would read as in the common version; and in the second case, as translated by others, thus: "The Spirit breathes where he pleases, and you hear his voice, but you know not whence he comes or whither he goes; so is every one who is born of the Spirit." The idea intended to be conveyed by this translation may be made a little clearer and more distinct by translating *πνεῦ*, breathes, by the word *inspires*; for *πνεῦ* is the verb which expresses the action of the noun; an action which it is the *nature* of the noun to do. In the work of Redemption the work of the Spirit of God has been to *inspire* men to utter the words of God, and to qualify them to do the work com-

¹ Math. 18: 3. ² John 3: 5-8.

mitted to their hands,—to give them knowledge which they did not possess of themselves. Hence, all that God has revealed to men, he has revealed by his Spirit, speaking in the persons of men, whose voice, when declaring the will of God, is the voice of the Spirit. This voice we hear when we read what the prophets of God have declared, and what the apostles of the Lord Jesus have spoken. When, therefore, Jesus says, “the Spirit inspires whom he pleases, and we hear his voice,” he states a fact with which Nicodemus ought to have been familiar. When the voice of the Spirit is heard and obeyed, then it is we are born of the Spirit and of water; and the act declarative of the heart’s obedience, is an immersion in water. Men heard and obeyed this voice when they submitted to the repentance and baptism proclaimed by the Harbinger and his Lord; because John was a prophet sent by God, and Jesus received the Spirit “without measure,” and both acted under immediate direction of God.

But the question arises, under this view of the passage, Why is “repentance” called a birth of the spirit, and immersion a birth of water?

We adopt the view without verbal argument, or critical exposition, that recognizes *pneuma* (πνευμα) as meaning *spirit*, and propose to prove that such is its meaning in this passage by a different course of argument; one that will show that the repentance proclaimed by John and our Lord, was the birth of Spirit, which the Lord had before his mind.

It will be well to observe particularly the force and scope of the statement of our Lord in this declaration to Nicodemus: “Except a man be born of water and Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of heaven.” It admits of no limitation or exception, and is of universal application. It excludes from the kingdom all who are not born of water and Spirit, and includes all who are. His statement is the assertion of a *principle*, a *fact*, and a *condition*. All, therefore, who are found in the kingdom of heaven, we know were born of water and Spirit. As a principle of government, and as a condition of entrance into the kingdom, this birth is declared to be imperative and indispensable; and as this birth gives entrance into the kingdom of heaven, it must embrace all other conditions necessary to this entrance, whether pronounced previously or subsequently to the actual establishment of that kingdom. It must embrace faith in God and repentance toward him, and faith in Jesus as the Messiah, and acceptance of him as such; otherwise it is but a partial statement of the terms and conditions of citizenship in the kingdom of heaven, and a limited requirement of the necessary conditions. We must, therefore, find in this birth of water and Spirit all the conditions or terms necessary to secure entrance into the kingdom of heaven when fully established.

This whole question may be reduced to one of *fact*, and

then determined by knowing what characters were found in the kingdom on the day of Pentecost, and on what conditions they entered. What, then, do we find to be the facts of the case?

In the first place, we find that some who were baptized by John, and possibly some who were baptized by the disciples of Jesus,¹ were recognized on the day of Pentecost as citizens or subjects of the kingdom of heaven, and as such were constituted the nucleus of the church formally and authoritatively inaugurated on that day. These were not again baptized; nor were they in a relation to God to require "repentance and baptism," and faith in the Lord Jesus, in order to place them in favor with God. They already enjoyed the relation of favor; and by what other means could they have been placed in the enjoyment of this but by the "repentance and baptism" of John's mission, or by the birth of water and Spirit, as preached by Jesus to Nicodemus? None appears in the record; and the conclusion, therefore, that the birth of water and Spirit was none other than the repentance and baptism of John's mission, is irresistibly forced upon us.

This conclusion is still further strengthened and confirmed when we come to know what conditions the apostle Peter announced on the day of Pentecost, when he opened one door of the kingdom of heaven, as necessary to pardon and citizenship in that kingdom. These conditions were *essentially* the same as those proclaimed by John, and by the Lord Jesus before he suffered. John's command to the Jews who believed in God was to repent, be immersed, and believe on him who was to come after him; and Jesus said, "Repent and believe the gospel." On their repentance toward God,² they were immersed by the authority of God, and then when they became the disciples of Jesus, and followed him to the end, all such were incorporated in the church inaugurated on the day of Pentecost. On this day, Jesus having been crowned Lord and Christ, and all authority in heaven and earth having been placed in his hands, the apostle Peter announced the birth of water and Spirit in these words: "Repent and be immersed every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." The three thousand who were obedient on that day, entered the kingdom of heaven. They were born of water and Spirit by repenting and being immersed. The fact that they were immersed by the authority of Christ, and on their faith in him, does not change or affect the nature or fact of the birth of water and Spirit. The birth is the same, whether predicated of the faith in God, and repentance toward him, and baptism by his authority, with faith in Jesus as the Messiah to follow, or of these more immediately connected with faith in Jesus, and submission to his authority. If then a birth of water and Spirit

¹ John 4: 2. ² Acts 20: 21.

is essential to an entrance into the kingdom of heaven, and an enjoyment of its blessings; and if the three thousand convicted and immersed on the day of Pentecost, did enter the kingdom and enjoy its blessings by faith in God and in Jesus as the Messiah, and repentance, and baptism in the name of Christ, then the conclusion is beyond question, that the change in the soul wrought by the operation of faith and repentance, is the birth of the Spirit, and the immersion in water is the birth of water; so that the "new birth" is only another form of expressing the organic law of the kingdom of heaven, as it respects the mode and means of becoming subjects of that kingdom.

There being no essential difference between the repentance and baptism proclaimed by the apostle Peter as the terms or conditions of pardon and citizenship in the kingdom, and the repentance and baptism proclaimed by the Baptist and by Jesus during his personal ministry, since the same words are used in both instances, there can be no rational doubt that the repentance and baptism of John can be as appropriately called a birth of Spirit and water as can the repentance and baptism announced by Peter. The appropriateness in both instances is seen in the great change or revolution which the soul undergoes in the psychological act of repentance as defined in these pages, and the similar great change which the person undergoes, or is the subject of, when it passes from the state of death into the state of life, through the symbolic grave of an immersion in water, by which men are buried in the likeness of Christ's burial, and raised in the likeness of his resurrection.

Although the remission of sins was enjoyed under the personal ministry of Christ, through "repentance and baptism"—essentially the same terms as under the gospel dispensation—yet the full thought of this dispensation was not developed until after the exaltation and coronation of Jesus as both Lord and Christ. That remission was anticipative, and, like the remission under the full reign of Judaism, was grounded on what would be, and not on what actually existed. All was in expectation of his coronation. While he was on earth he could not be an atonement, nor a priest, nor mediator, nor king, and no proclamation to sinners could be made in his name. He spake wholly in the name of his Father; and on his own authority did nothing. But on his coronation he then was proclaimed as the Atonement for sin, the high priest, and mediator of the New Institution, and King of the kingdom of heaven. Then remission was grounded on his atonement as already existing, and then were believing and repentant sinners immersed by his authority, and into the name of the entire Divinity, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, which places man in full and perfect relation with the whole Godhead—the relation which he enjoyed at the time, and by virtue, of his creation. To attain and maintain this relation for

man is the great purpose of the Remedial System, which patriarchs and prophets, and the godly of all ages earnestly desired, but saw only afar off; and for which God

“Has wak'd, and work'd, for ages: from the birth
Of Nature to this unbelieving hour.”

CHAPTER II.

THE ATONEMENT.

There is no subject connected with the religion of the Lord Jesus Christ which compares in interest and importance with the atonement which he offered for sin in his own person. Without the virtue of that atonement his religion has no power, and *he* is without value or interest to the world. If he be not the atonement for sin, he is practically nothing to man. Though a great teacher, excelling all who preceded him, or have followed him, the truths which he has spoken have no special interest to man involved as he is in sin, because they have no power to save the soul from the *guilt* of sin. It is not the province of truth to do this. It enlightens and saves from ignorance and mental darkness. It no where, or under any circumstances, touches the *guilt* of the soul. This only *blood* can do. "Without the shedding of blood there is no remission of sin." Sin kills. That which saves from sin must have life. "The life is in the blood." Therefore, only blood can procure remission of sin. As, therefore, Christ's chief mission was to save men from sin, his atonement is both primary and fundamental in his religion. It is the central thought and ground-work of the Remedial System, around which all else gathers, and on which the whole superstructure is built. It is the meaning and purpose of all that God has done for man, the reason and justification of his merciful interposition for the salvation of men; and his vindication in the creation of men and angels, and in the punishment of those who sinned. In its wonderful breadth and reach, it covers the whole question of sin, and presents the fullest vindication that can be given of God's wisdom, goodness, justice, truthfulness, holiness, love, and mercy, in all that he has done in creation and redemption. Hence, on the one hand, the atonement is related to God, and on the other, to man. For God, it is his vindication or justification in forgiving sin in man; and for man, it is the means of his salvation from all the consequences of sin.

Jehovah is concerned with sin as a great evil in his universe. Its existence, and the treatment with which he has met it, involve questions which reflect on his character as the infinite creator and ruler of the universe. Its existence seems to question his power and goodness, and its different treatment in the case of men and angels shows that opposite attributes determined that different treatment. In a former chapter we saw that these two classes of intelligent beings were treated differently, while involved in the same evil; that one was inexorably punished, and the other mercifully provided with an atonement for sin. Why such a difference? Why such seeming partiality? This great difference in the method of treating the evil as existing in the two order of beings seems reflective on the character of God, and calls for some explanation. The scriptures afford us no direct light, and but little of any kind. One fact, however, seems very evident, and yet this evident fact does not lessen the difficulty. In the one case, one class of attributes were the ruling principles of his government, and in the other, another class. And yet we can not believe that either class was ignored, or utterly disregarded in either case. In all this God may seem to a superficial observer to have acted inconsistently; and it is just here that God's attributes are involved in the treatment of sin, as this appears in the cases of angels and of men.

Under an administration of the attributes of justice, truthfulness, and holiness, an evil of the nature and consequences of sin, must and will be punished, and to that extent, as to degree and continuance, which the evil merits, and the honor of Jehovah and the well-being of his universe demand. When we assume, as we do, that God is infinite in all his attributes, we must also assume, as a corollary, that all that he does is absolutely right and proper, without flaw or defect in any particular. One of such a nature and attributes as is the Jehovah of the Bible, can not act *partially*, or imperfectly. We can not suppose that one class of attributes is active and demonstrative, while another is dormant, or their claim disregarded in matters which pertain to their nature, and belong to their domain. It is not, therefore, to be presumed that, even in the punishment of angels, in which his justice, truthfulness and holiness were active, God felt no emotions of pity or compassion, which are the sentiments of love and mercy, for those once glorious beings, on account of their sad and terrible fate. Love's natural impulses lead to the salvation of the sinner, and it must *feel*, although it may not *act*. Jehovah, when he acts, does so in all the fulness of his being. Every attribute concerned in the administration of affairs must sanction every administrative act; so that if, in any case, justice, truthfulness, and holiness seem alone to determine the action of God, it is not to be presumed that love and mercy did not give their sanction to the act. In the punishment of the sinning angels, their case must have been such as not to have allowed the

interposition of love and mercy, even in the judgment of Mercy; so that, in a fate so utterly beyond the reach of mercy, we must *presume* a reason which was an ample justification of the procedure.

In this view of the subject we find that God's character as a righteous governor and a wise creator is involved in the existence of sin, and in the treatment of it which he has seen proper to pursue, whether as respects angels or men; and the first aspect, consequently, in which we may view the atonement has respect to its bearing on the character of God as a wise, just, holy, righteous, and merciful being, who does nothing inconsistent with the nature and attributes of his being. The design, therefore, of the atonement, in this aspect, is to show the righteousness of God in all that he has done in regard to sin, both as it exists among men and among angels.

The justification of God in the estimation of his intelligent universe being secured by the atonement of Christ, he is then, as that atonement and all that is connected with it, which is essential to it as a remedial measure, set forth as the propitiation for sins and the consequent salvation of men. As a measure for the accomplishment of this two-fold purpose, it is most perfect and complete. If any number of men shall be saved in heaven, this will show that it was *capable* of saving men. That all the race will not be saved is no argument against it, or disparagement of it. It does not propose to save all men indiscriminately. It is the justification of God only as it respects certain characters. It does not honor and justify God in pardoning any but those who cordially accept it, and act consistently with that acceptance. It was designed to save only those who believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and does not, and will not, save any other. There is no truth in the scriptures more evident than this. The Holy Spirit so declares through the apostle in these words: "To declare, I say, at this time his righteousness; that he might be just while *justifying him who believeth on Jesus.*"¹ The Lord Jesus, as the atonement, is "set forth as the propitiation *through faith* in his blood." Its effects are limited to those who receive Jesus Christ by faith in his blood. Hence, if it saves not those who reject it, the failure lies with the unbeliever, and not with the atonement. There is nothing strange or unusual in this. The ordinary blessings of life are suspended upon similar conditions. No one blames food, as inefficient, if it does not preserve the life of those who will not, or do not, use it.

That God can be just and righteous in pardoning the man who receives the atonement by faith, and will be so recognized by the intelligent beings in the heavens, the scriptures very clearly declare. With christians this assurance is ample and satisfactory; but with unbelievers, it may be regarded as the mere assertion of the party involved in the difficulty, and, consequently, some-

¹ Rom. 3: 26.

what interested in having it so. It will, therefore, be necessary to bestow some attention on this part of our subject, and endeavor to show that the atonement will be the justification of God in forgiving sins, even on principles which the human reason recognizes as just and right.

There is much involved in the existence of sin. Whence and how came it in a universe conceived by an infinite mind, and created by an infinite power? Is it a fault that could have been, and consequently, ought to have been, avoided? Or is it an evidence of weakness or malevolence on the part of the creator? Such thoughts as these have found their way into the human mind, and disturbed its repose, or hardened it in unbelief. It is argued that, if he could not have created intelligent beings incapable of disobedience, then he ought not to punish them for doing what was certainly anticipated when creating them. These are thoughts not impossible of supposition. There are but few who have not heard such objections as these from unbelievers; and it is not improbable that the same or similar thoughts have crept into the minds of believers when sorely perplexed by the difficulties that environ this whole question of sin.

So long as such questions and difficulties as these trouble and perplex the mind, so long will any view of the atonement be considered imperfect and unsatisfactory, and possibly a *petitio principii*, that does not, at least, attempt to show that God is in no way to be blamed for the existence of sin, or condemned as unjust and unkind for punishing his creatures when they become involved in sin by an act of disobedience. Any view that does not show that God is just, and holy, and righteous in all that he has done in creation, and in all that has followed it, will not satisfy the earnest inquirer after truth, and honor the character of God in the estimation of his intelligent creatures. If we could see the atonement in all its bearings on God, angels, and men, we would then have a full and satisfactory solution of the whole problem of sin, and a complete vindication of the character of God, as an infinitely wise, just, and righteous creator and ruler.

If the atonement has no reference to, or bearing on, such questions as these; if it be not God's method and means of displaying the righteousness of his character, and the justification of all that he has done in regard to sin and sinners, then we must regard it as an arbitrary measure, resting on no other foundation than his will and authority, and consequently beyond the domain of discussion, and above and outside of all attempts at reasoning on the part of either angels or men. But such it is not. God has displayed it before the universe, invited to it the attention and scrutiny of all his intelligent creatures, and challenged the investigation of the highest intelligence. Into it angels have earnestly looked, and watched with sleepless assiduity the gradual development which God has given of it. It is worthy of their scrutiny and highest admiration. There is nothing in all the

universe of God more profoundly wise and rational; nothing more fully demonstrative of the infinitude of his attributes. It is not an expedient selected from the many which may have presented themselves to the mind of God, but a profound, grave, and imperious necessity, the only measure or means within the range of the knowledge and wisdom of God, that can meet all the requirements of the case in all its bearings on the government of Jehovah, and on the welfare of angels and men. An expedient it is not; for this implies that the existence of sin among men might have been ignored or not, just as the pleasure of God might have determined. An expedient, in so grave a matter as sin, is no compliment to the intelligence and wisdom of God, and could not be regarded as settling a matter in which so much principle is involved. The fact that the difficulties which have grown out of sin, and which environ the government of God in his efforts to adequately punish it while saving the sinner, and making him a useful and honorable member of the society of the pure and holy, required, in the judgment of God, the incarnation of the divine *Logos*, the "second person of the Trinity," and the consequent sufferings and death of the God-man, positively forbids so degrading a view of this procedure of the omniscient and infinitely wise Creator. He certainly would never have resorted to this "expedient," if any other means had been possible.¹ This being the only possible means of saving men from sin, and of justifying God for so doing, is sufficient proof that the incarnation of the *Logos* was not an expedient, but an imperative necessity. Even a pagan poet has said that God should never intervene unless the occasion be worthy of him.²

It is not a conception derogatory to any attribute of God, that the atonement is not an expedient, but a necessity, and that God is, under some circumstances, under the law of necessity, as this word is used in reference to moral obligations. He is under the necessity, or moral obligation, to act consistently with the attributes of his being; otherwise we could have no assurance of the certainty of anything he might promise or declare. Consistency in him is a supreme necessity, a characteristic inherent in his being, and natural to all his attributes. It is as impossible for him to act inconsistently as it is to lie. Truthfulness is one of his attributes, and consistency, though but a quality of character, is equally inherent in his nature and character. It is no disrespect, therefore, to say that there are necessities with him. Indeed, we can not know that there are any expedients with him. What he does *ought* to have been done, and is the best that could have been done, if not the *only* thing that could have been done, even in matters of a secondary character, such as the symbolical or typical means of developing the remedial system under the Jewish dispensation.

¹ Math. 26: 39.

² "Nec deus intersit, nisi dignus vindice nodus incidit." Ep. ad Pisones, line 191.

It has been seen¹ that the occurrence of sin, and the terrible punishment which was meted out to it in the person of the sinning angels, were clearly before the mind of God before he created them. He knew, moreover, how the whole matter would be viewed by his intelligent universe. He created all beings for *his* pleasure and glory, and *their* happiness and well-being. The nature of his attributes required of him that he should create the best possible universe with the best possible results to all, and this we must believe that he has done, or deny him the attributes exercised in the creation.

When sin cast its dark cloud over the universe, and obscured for the time the glory and majesty of God, it was simply a question of his pleasure whether he would do anything to remove that cloud, and dissipate that obscurity, or leave finite minds to struggle on with the difficulties which perplexed them, and solve them as best they could. This is the prerogative of infinite majesty and power. The creature can not say, with any show of reason or respect, to the creator, Why did you make me thus? or Why have you done this? The premises of infinity, on which all God's acts as creator and governor rest, oblige the conclusion with the finite mind that *all is just and right*.

But God has not acted thus majestically and arbitrarily. The atonement shows that he did not please so to do. It was not a thing of whim or caprice that made him punish the transgressing angels with such terrible severity, and close behind them forever the door of mercy. It was simply impossible for him to have done otherwise. That course was necessary and unavoidable. The attributes of justice, truthfulness, and holiness demanded it, even though love and mercy mourned and lamented their terrible fate.

But how was the infinite Jehovah to show in the presence of such a terrible exhibition of his wrath and indignation upon his once happy beings, that he possessed such attributes as love and mercy? What the angels had seen of God were but the manifestations of his power and wrath; power in the creation, and wrath in the punishment inflicted on their sinning companions. How was he to show that he felt any compassion for the *sinner*, or that he grieved over their fate? As the case then stood, Jehovah was but partially revealed. There was a character of God of which the angels had as yet no knowledge. The power of love and mercy in shaping the government of God was to them unknown. Without some great fact to reveal them, the angels could never have known them. They, like man, "can not find out the Almighty to perfection" by their own powers, nor conceive what attributes are still unrevealed. Had God done no more, then no more would, or could, have been known of him. Had he not opened the wonderful drama of the Atonement, nothing more would the intelligent universe have known of God,

¹ Chapter 2.

but what was revealed in creation, and in the acts of his moral government in regard to sin. Hence the atonement was necessary to the development of the attributes of love and mercy, in the light of which Jehovah appears in the most resplendent glory, and evokes from his intelligent creatures the profoundest admiration and homage.

It is evident, then, that the atonement has as much bearing on the question of sin among angels as among men, though confined in its beneficial operations to men. As it respects sin among angels, it is the justification of God as a wise and benevolent creator and ruler; and as it respects sin among men, it is God's justification in forgiving sin. Hence the atonement must be viewed in this two-fold aspect, if we are to attain a just and ample conception of it as the great measure of God, which he has devised and employed for the solution of the problem of sin, and all the questions which grow out of its existence; and a full and proper appreciation of the meaning and force of many terms that are used in connection with it, as expressing its bearing and results on God and on man. Some of these terms are used with special reference to the relations of the atonement to God, and some with special reference to its relations with man, and some again with reference to both; and it would be impossible to understand the meaning and force of these, if we should view the atonement from only one stand-point.

With all the light we may gather from the sacred scriptures; from the suggestions of human reason; and from the legal and social customs of mankind, we will still find our way beset and impeded by difficulties which the human mind may never surmount, and by perplexities which it may never unravel; so that, at last, and after human reason has done all that lies within the range and grasp of its powers, there will be much left which it can never understand and appreciate, and which must ever remain for our *faith*, which, after all, is our surest and safest guide through mysteries so profound, and difficulties so insurmountable, as environ the works and ways of the infinite Jehovah. There is a vast and crowded field of mysteries which the human mind can never explore; vast treasures of knowledge of which it can never become possessor; and a profound philosophy whose reasons it can never understand and appreciate. Here lies the dominion of faith, an empire greater than that within the horizon, or under the powers, of human reason. It is well for man that such is the case; that it can walk in the light where reason gropes its way; and feel the firmest confidence that things exist which the eye can not see. It is not best that we should understand the the reason of all that God has done, and perceive the beauty and propriety of all that he has ordained. The highest happiness for man lies in the line of faith. Without faith there can be no spiritual growth of the soul; no lifting up of man's great mental powers to the contemplation of things unseen and eternal. Rea-

son builds up the intelligence, and fosters the pride of the intellect. Faith does a better work for man than this; it enables the soul to feed on the manna from heaven; to look off and upward to that life which awaits it beyond the dark veil that throws its shadow on the present, and to contemplate a field of ineffable beauty and glory. It fosters those great powers of the soul that bind together the pure and holy of earth, and makes heroes under trials where reason falters and turns back. It swells the heart to its own utmost strength, delight, and happiness. It gives the troubled soul a repose which reason attempts in vain. Thus, if we would grow into that greatness which will be esteemed and honored in the world where shams are not seen or known, we must grow in faith and by faith, and not in the pride which human reason engenders, or in the ambition which it excites.

The atonement had its origin in the *existence* of sin among men, and in the love and mercy of God; its *possibility* in the nature of man, and its *necessity* in the imperative and inflexible demands of justice. Sin is of such a nature, and attended by such fearful consequences, that the best interests of the government of God, as well as the welfare of intelligent beings, demand that it be adequately and justly punished. And yet man's nature and condition are such as to plead for mercy. Hence the atonement. It is a measure designed to save men from the immediate and penal consequences of sin, and yet at the same time to satisfy all that the justice of God requires. In doing this it is related, on the one hand, to one class of attributes, and on the other, to another class, and by its action reconciles their apparent antagonism, and allows of their active co-operation in its work. Hence, as respects the various aspects in which the atonement may be viewed, different terms are employed by which to express its design and effects. In one view the atonement is a reconciliation, propitiation, and expiation; and in another a ransom, a purchase, and a redemption. As it respects God, it is called a reconciliation, propitiation, a justification, and a satisfaction—these words having reference to the operation of his attributes, and not to his disposition. As it respects man, it is called an expiation, a ransom, a purchase, a cleansing, and a purification—these words having reference to the effects of the atonement on man's condition under sin, and its effects on his character. The first show its effects on God, and the latter its effects on man, in making it *possible* for God to forgive sin—"to be just while pardoning him who believes on Jesus" as the atonement, and in placing in man's hands the means of remission.

The existence of sin among men, having a close connection with, and relation to, its existence among angels, the atonement must have some important bearing or reflex action on the treatment pursued toward the sinning angels. If two subjects of a government are found in open rebellion, and a difference of treatment is pursued toward them, one being condemned and

punished without hope, and the other offered pardon on conditions denied to the other, there *would be a ground of suspicion* that a discrimination is made in favor of one, and against the other, and without any apparently good reason. In such a case a charge of partiality would be made against the ruler or governor, and would so lie until a reasonable and satisfactory explanation had been given. So we may imagine that the angels in heaven were amazed when they saw an atonement provided for men, whilst the banished angels were left to their fate. That they looked intently upon God's dealings with men we are positively assured, and that they are interested in the atonement there is reason for believing from the following declaration of the apostle: "To me who am the least of all saints is this grace given, that I should preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ, and to make all see what is the fellowship of the mystery which, from the beginning of the world, hath been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ; *to the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places might be made known by Christ the manifold wisdom of God.*"¹ If we interpret these principalities and powers as referring to angels, and this interpretation is correct, then is it certain beyond question that the atonement has some interest for the angels in heaven, and some bearing on the question of sin among that order of beings.

The relation and bearing of the atonement on the eruption of sin among angels brought prominently into view the character of God as a wise and just creator and ruler. Those intelligent and upright beings of the spirit-realm had seen the consequences of sin among their peers, and while they looked on these, they may have been amazed and confounded. But how much greater must have been their interest, and deeper their feelings, when they saw the same evil break out among men while yet on the threshold of being? If they understood the nature and rank of man's being, as they probably did, they saw in him a being but little inferior to themselves; so that they could but expect the same fate for man as that which had befallen the angels. With such an expectation, what must have been their surprise and amazement when they saw the provision of an atonement for men! The question would very naturally have arisen, Why this difference of treatment? What merit in man that was not found in our peers? Hence the origin of the interest of angels in the atonement.

It is very evident that there were very grave difficulties lying in the way of providing an atonement for man. A sufficient proof of this is found in the fact that the incarnate *Logos* was the only one found competent for the work. The difficulties had their origin in the apparently conflicting and contradictory nature of certain attributes of God, which are operative in his administra-

¹ Eph. 3: 8-10. See Bloomfield's note on this passage.

tion, and especially in the provision and work of the atonement. In all that he does God must act in all the entirety of his being. One attribute can not act without the consent of another; nor can one be ignored or disregarded by another. Justice and mercy stand opposed to each other in the tendencies of their nature and the drift and results of their action, but they can not act antagonistically. In the atonement they must co-operate. God must be "just while justifying the ungodly." He can not act arbitrarily. The nature of his attributes forbid this. If, therefore, mercy is to intervene for salvation, that intervention can not be allowed *until justice has been fully satisfied*. Its intervention must not take place at the expense of justice. The difficulty lay in harmonizing these, and this reconciliation is effected by the atonement. How this is done we shall endeavor to show in the course of this discussion.

The reconciliation or propitiation effected by the atonement has no reference to the mind or heart of God as respects *his willingness* to save men from sin; but to the *claims of his attributes*. It proposes to adjust the claims of each, and to satisfy them to the full extent of their demands, and thus make it *possible* for God to save men. The atonement does not make God more loving and willing toward man; for the atonement had its origin in these feelings. On the contrary, it enables his love and willingness to become active in his salvation. There was no feeling of reluctance on the part of God; for he "*so loved the world that he gave his only Son to save it.*" Hence the atonement does not *propitiate him*. The true purpose is declared in the following statement of the apostle Paul: "Whom God has set forth as a propitiation through faith in his blood, *to declare his righteousness* in passing by the sins of the past through the forbearance of God: to declare *I say his righteousness at this time, that he might be just while justifying him who is of the faith of Jesus.*"¹ Hence, if he is just while forgiving the sinner who accepts the atonement, his justice is satisfied and his mercy is active. The propitiation has reference, therefore, not to God's disposition, but to the co-operative action of justice and mercy in the work of salvation.

The word ransom carries with it the same idea when applied to the work of the atonement. From whom or what is the sinner ransomed? He is not ransomed from the enemy of God; for God recognizes no such right of possession on his part as to require a ransom to be paid to him. Yet the sinner is ransomed. If not from *whom*, then from *what*? If from sin, then we must personify sin. But the ransom is not paid to sin, though the sinner is said to be ransomed *from it*. View the matter as we may or will, we must come at last to the idea that is involved in reconciliation and propitiation, and say that the ransom is a price paid by Mercy to Justice.

¹ Rom. 3: 25, 26.

The atonement being adapted to the end in view, and adjusted to the work of its purpose, with all conflicting interests reconciled, we may proceed to consider its application; and in order to do this we must have before our mind the nature and extent of the work to be done, and of the means which is to accomplish that work. It will, therefore, be necessary to recall to mind some things heretofore considered.

The object of the atonement is the salvation of man from sin. What, therefore, has sin brought on man? Two primary and immediate effects: 1. the punishment due sin; and, 2. its guilt, which the punishment inflicted can not remove. This punishment we have seen was a death inflicted for, and on account of, sin, as its merited reward. This death is an immediate and violent physical death, such as the murderer suffers on the gallows. This we have determined in a former chapter. We now assume this as the penalty contemplated by the law given to Adam. The guilt is the consciousness of sin, and places the sinner in a state of disfavor before God, with his soul stained, and his pristine character marred. From this state of disfavor the penalty assigned as the merited punishment of sin, can not deliver the sinner. The guilt remains after the penalty has been inflicted and suffered.

In order to exactly meet these two results of sin the atonement has two corresponding elements: 1. a life; and, 2. a character perfect before God. In the atonement of Christ there is a human life and a human character. These elements meet all the requirements of sin. Hence the atonement of Christ is a perfect and an adequate one so far as these elements are concerned, without defect or inefficiency in any particular. Animals were defective and inefficacious as sin-offerings on several accounts. What these were it is unnecessary to consider. Suffice it to say that the inspired apostle declares that it was "impossible for the blood of animals to take away sin." Yet they served an important and necessary purpose. They allowed man to live beyond the day of his transgression, and gave time for the development of sin and its remedy. They allowed the race to come to the fulness of time when God found all things ready for the introduction of the atonement of Christ. They afforded time to God to make a revelation of himself and of his purposes as respects sin, and his treatment of it among men, and thus to prepare the world for the acceptance of the atonement of Christ when offered.

The perfect fulness and efficacy of the atonement of Christ are found in his human nature and divinity. Whatever else an atonement is, or must be, a human life and a human character are indispensable. As it is human life and character that are lost and ruined by sin, the same grade of life and character is required in a perfect atonement. This is self-evident. There are many reasons why it should be so. The nature and work of the atonement require this. A common nature and sympathy must obtain

between the savior and the saved. The savior should know and realize by actual experience all that the sinner suffers on account of sin. He should experience the trials and temptations which beset the sinner, that he may appreciate the sinner's pain and suffering under these. Hence the atonement is a man in all his entirety. He has man's feelings and passions; his weaknesses and infirmities. He was capable of suffering all that man suffers, and was consequently fully human.

But yet he was without sin. This was required of him as the atonement. This gave him the requisite character. The character of Christ was human, as respects the atonement, and not divine. His *nature* was divine; but his *character* was wholly human. It came not of the impeccable *Logos*, but of the peccable "*man* Christ Jesus." It was not, however, the passive character of innocence, but that of a positive and actual righteousness, formed under the pressure of the severest trials, temptations, and sufferings. His character was made perfect by sufferings which were necessary to place him in full sympathy with man as he found him. There is no evidence that his divine nature aided him under these trials in the least. In the most trying hour of all an angel came to strengthen him. With this exception he was left to tread the wine press alone. He had only his own will and unflinching faith. It was the *man* that was tried, and the *man* that overcame. If his character were in any degree the work or result of his divine nature or power, to that extent the character was not human, and hence not a proper element of the atonement. Christ was "born under the law," and hence was under the same obligations, as respects obedience, as were all others under it. Whatever obedience, therefore, he gave, that obedience was human and not divine. The righteousness was, consequently, human. There could have been no human merit in an obedience made perfect by the aid of a divine power. Such an obedience would have availed nothing for the race. It could have been no argument with man, nor of interest to him. It would never have awakened man's heart and devotion to Christ. He who is invulnerable can make no common cause with the wounded and suffering. Hence, from whatever point of view we may regard the obedience of Christ, it must be considered as wholly human.

There is a profound reason and necessity for this. Christ's perfect obedience had a deep significance for the race under the law of God. If it was not in the *power of human nature to keep the law of God*, then the punishing of men for transgressing the law becomes a question of righteousness. The punishment of a person for a sin which he could not help committing, would reflect seriously and injuriously on the character of a wise and just creator. Man, in such a case, had as well be held for the actions of another person. If he can not but sin, the consequences of disobedience should not be visited upon him. This is

simple justice which can not be disregarded. But we have seen that intelligent beings, as men and angels, are not such weak creatures that they can not keep the law under which they are placed. *If they have a weakness through which they fall, they have also a power through which they can stand.* And hence their responsibility, and the justness of the punishment inflicted for disobedience. The sufficiency of this power is demonstrated by the obedience of Christ. He kept the law of God perfectly through the strength of his *human* powers, and thus evinced the possibility of all men doing the same. This conclusion must be true, or other conclusions would follow which would do more violence to the character of God and the earnest and sincere interposition of Christ than this conclusion can ever be imagined, or feared, to do.

Out of the fact of Christ's perfect obedience has arisen the question of his peccability. The fact that he was a divine being as well as human, has led some to regard him as wholly impeccable.¹ This would assign his perfect obedience, as to its cause, to the presence of divinity in him. If Christ was impeccable when on earth, and under the law, then there was no merit in his obedience, nor propriety or necessity of placing him under law. *If he could not sin, he could not obey;* yet the scriptures affirm that he "*learned obedience by the things he suffered.*" This being so, he was *capable of sinning*, and hence his obedience has all the merit that can be claimed for it, and settles the question as to man's ability to keep the law of God.

Again, the *nature* that was tempted and tried is the nature that obeyed. We know that the divine nature is above temptation, and can not be tempted. Yet Christ, the divine-man, was tempted and tried, and suffered. It must, therefore, have been his human nature that suffered and was tried. This being so, Jesus was unquestionably peccable, and hence, as a man, merits all that comes of perfect obedience. His perfect obedience came of trials and sufferings; for the scriptures declare that he was made perfect by sufferings. It was, therefore, the *man* in him that suffered, and not the divine *Logos*.

Whilst the sufferings of Christ were the instrumentalities used to perfect his character, and thus make him a proper and suitable atonement; yet his sufferings were no part of his character, and hence no part of the atonement. They were necessary and proper in order to place him in closer sympathy with the race he came to save, and to enable man to appreciate more fully the mercy and benevolence of his interposition in his behalf; *but they are no part of the atonement*, as most writers on the atonement seem to believe. They have no vicarious quality, and hence have not saved the sinner from such sufferings and trials under, and on account of, sin. We repeat: there are but two elements in the atonement, viz: *life* and *character*. These

¹ Hodge on the Atonement, p. 313.

alone are vicarious, and save the sinner from the consequences of his transgression.

The sufferings of Christ were both physical and mental, but chiefly the latter. None were poorer than he. He had not where to repose his head, and the charities of his friends supplied him with the necessaries of life. He who had made the worlds and all things in them, had not a shekel with which to pay his tax. He who in the fulness of his pristine glory supplied the wants of every living creature, was dependent upon the charities of others. Yet all these sufferings and privations have not saved one man of the whole race from the pinchings of poverty, or placed one poor man above the charities of his friends or neighbors. Hence such sufferings have no atoning or vicarious quality.

Nor did his mental sufferings which marked him out as the "man of sorrows and acquainted with grief," accomplish anything more for man than did his physical sufferings. Men yet suffer mentally on account of their sins. Anguish and remorse wring the heart of even the saint when he commits sin. What Christ suffered during life, in Gethsemane and on the cross, was, indeed, more than we can describe or imagine, and might have been ten-fold greater, without giving them a vicarious quality. While they came on account of sin, and were designed to perfect his character in its three-fold aspect, and make him dearer to man, yet they had no power to procure remission of sins. They stand in no causal relation to remission. They have a closer connection with his character as priest than as the sin-offering.¹ Here they were absolutely necessary, in order to make him fully appreciative of man's condition under sin, just as temptations were to test the obedience of his will and the strength of his human nature.

But *whence* his sufferings? They came *on account* of sin, but did they come *of* sin? Whence his sorrow and grief? Whence the mental agony of the garden and the cross? He was without sin, and yet he suffered *because* of sin. How are we to understand this? There was much of his suffering which came upon him in the natural way: He grieved over the sins and follies of men. His heart was oppressed by the selfishness of men, and the unfaithfulness of professed friends. He was touched by the sufferings of the poor and the afflicted, and mourned over the oppressions which the weak suffered from the strong, and the poor from the rich. All this was natural to the goodness of his heart, and has been to thousands since his day. These *were natural and* unavoidable sufferings, and have no special connection with his relation to man as his sin-offering. Hence such as these added nothing to his character as the *sin-offering of* the world.

The sufferings which he endured in Gethsemane and on the cross came upon him as the sin-offering, and because he was the

¹ Heb. 2: 17, 18.

sin-offering. God *then* "laid on him the iniquities of us all," and then his sufferings came of sin. He was then *treated* as though he were the sinner, and suffered accordingly. But they were not his own sins, but the sins of the world then laid on him, that he might bear them away in his own body on the cross. As the sin-offering, horror and dread settled down upon his soul when in Gethsemane, and forced the life current from its accustomed course. Before his mind arose the dread doom of the sinner, and he shrank back in unutterable agony, and fervently prayed that he might be spared the trial. In this appalling vision the physical sufferings could not have appeared. Could he not bear what the malefactors endured with as much fortitude as they? Had he died no other death than that, he could; but he was suffering death as the sin-offering of the world, and on him as such were laid the sins of the world, and his sufferings, consequently, came of *the prospect* of this dreadful death. It was the death due sin, which he, who knew no sin, was about to suffer, and his unstained heart shrank back in horror from so fearful a prospect.

Although the sufferings of Christ during the last hours of his life form no part of his atonement, and *have no atoning efficacy*; yet they are not without their use and influence in the *work* of the atonement. They are a mighty power to plead with the gratitude of mankind; a most persuasive means to win the heart to the innocent sufferer. A cold and stoical death might have awakened our admiration for its heroism, or excited our pity on account of its attendant sufferings; but it could never have stirred the soul to its profoundest depths, and evoked its highest energies in the service of the sufferer. It could never have made heroes of faith, or martyrs for the truth. But an *unselfish death*, a death so unselfish, sufferings so fearful, and attended with *fearful sufferings*, gives to his interposition a sincerity and devotion, a power and pathos, which can not fail to awaken and secure the love, gratitude, and devotion of the human heart. They link the soul in love and sympathy with him, so that "neither life nor death, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature shall separate" it from him who suffered so much in its behalf. In his humanity, therefore, Christ was a perfect atonement.

It would seem from the teaching of the types under the former dispensations that even the life and character of Christ, though fulfilling all the indications of a perfect atonement, were yet not of themselves sufficient for the remission of sins. The types gave us the altar whose special and peculiar function was the sanctification of the offerings made on it, or the making of them efficacious for the remission of sins; and hence its absolute importance to the atonement proper. It would, therefore, appear that even the life and character of Christ required the sanctification which was communicated to it by the altar of the christian dispensation before they could be regarded as fully efficacious.

This altar we have, as before intimated, in the divinity of the Lord Jesus Christ. As the altar was raised above the general surface to indicate its holy character, so did the divine nature of Jesus place him above the humanity of the man. The necessity of this altar under the christian dispensation, or for the intimate and inseparable connection of the divinity with the atonement proper, will be considered further along. In the mean time we simply note the fact that "it is the altar that sanctifies the gift."

We have, then, in the person of the Lord Jesus Christ a perfect and adequate atonement, and may now inquire how it is made available to the sinner. Remembering the two immediate and direct consequences of sin, and the two primary elements of the atonement, and knowing that a perfect correspondence and adaptation exist between the two, we have but to apply the elements of the atonement to the consequences of sin, while observing their perfect adaptation, in order to see that the atonement is substituted for the sinner before the law, and suffers what the law prescribes, while the sinner takes the place of the innocent victim before the law. By this substitution the life of Christ is given and accepted for the life of the sinner, which the law demanded because of sin, and the sinner lives and stands before the law as though he had not sinned. At the same time that the life of the atonement is substituted for the life of the sinner, the *character* of the victim is substituted for the character of the sinner; so that in all this the innocent sin-offering is treated as though it were really and in fact the sinner, and the sinner is treated and regarded thereafter as having no sin,—treated and regarded as the sinless victim deserved to be treated and regarded. There is nothing plainer or more easy of apprehension than this. When Adam sinned he stood before the law dead and guilty. The atonement came in the person of a sin-offering, with its life and character. It stepped in the place of Adam, and died for him—*died in his stead*—and Adam lived. If he lived it was because he was without sin. Therefore, in being saved from death, he was at the same time saved from the guilt of sin.¹ Then being without sin, he was entitled to live; and the victim becoming guilty by an imputation of the sin of the sinner to itself, died as

¹ While such was the purpose and effect of sacrifice, yet in its practical working, the remission of sins did not necessarily follow its offering. There were many sacrifices offered which did no more for the offerer than relieve him of the penalty; that is, saved his life. There were no conditions attached to the remission of the penalty beyond the offering of the sacrifice. The remission of guilt was conditioned on the psychical states of faith and repentance. Sacrifices were not always offered with these states of the soul. Hence, remission of guilt did not necessarily follow the offering. But in the design and purpose of sacrifice, it was contemplated that it should be offered in full assurance of faith, whether it were actually so offered or not. With this explanatory statement the assertion in the text will appear correct and necessary.

a necessary consequence. Thus is it seen that an atonement is essentially vicarious.

This procedure is conducted on two very distinct, and yet very closely allied principles, which have their origin in the difference that obtains between the two consequences of sin, on the one hand, and the two elements of the atonement on the other. As there can be no substitution, in the proper sense of this word, as respects character, the act of substitution proper is limited to the life of the sinner and his offering. The application of the righteousness or character of the sin-offering to the guilt of the sinner, in which the victim becomes, or is treated as, the sinner, and the sinner as the innocent victim, takes place on the principle of imputation. Guilt and righteousness are only *imputed*. They are not actually substituted or transferred, and can not be. Each party is simply regarded and treated in a way different from what he actually deserved. The two principles, then, on which the atonement is made available for the sinner, are *substitution and imputation*, the first having reference to the penalty denounced against sin and the life of the sin-offering, and the other to the guilt of sin and to the character of righteousness. In the first case it is pure substitution. One is taken for the other. Hence the character of the atonement as a ransom, purchase, or redemption. But since character cannot be separated and transferred, it must be *imputed*, so that the sinner and his offering, in changing their relations before the law, may be *treated* as their changed relations require. The atonement is, therefore, essentially and necessarily vicarious.

But on what grounds can the atonement be made vicarious? How can the life of the sin-offering be substituted for the life of the sinner, and his character, or righteousness be imputed to the sinner? On what principles of righteousness and justice can this be done?

The atonement, as we have shown, has a two-fold aspect. It is related to God and to man. On the part of God it is a *provision* for the remission of sins; on the part of man it is a condition, dependent on certain things which he must supply. God has done all in his power in *providing* the atonement. It simply renders man's salvation possible. The actual salvation which it effects depends on certain conditions which the sinner must supply. The sinner's salvation, therefore, is contingent upon what he shall do. If he supply not the necessary conditions, the atonement has no power to save him. As a *provision* it has all necessary power and efficacy. For the objects in view, nothing can be added to it. It is fully and perfectly efficacious. In this respect it is like all other provisions of God; and like them, too, in that their blessings are all made dependent on what man shall do in reference to them. Whether, therefore, the atonement will save a sinner or not, depends on his action. Its practical success, consequently, is contingent.

This contingency arises from the nature of the being it proposes to benefit, and the nature of the means employed. It is not a mechanical instrument designed to effect results in a physical body; but it is moral or spiritual force, acting on moral or spiritual agents, who can, as they will, accept or decline its blessings. If they accept, it is the power of God for salvation; if they reject, their salvation is as impossible as is the continuance of natural life without the use of the means provided therefor. It is not above, or different from, the general laws that govern the world of mind. It is not an arbitrary force or potential energy that breaks down everything before it, as does the tornado or the flood. It is addressed to the sinner as a rational and intelligent being, and it places before him motives and considerations, which relate to his highest and most enduring interests. In these motives and considerations lie its power and influence to move the heart. If these fail of their object, the failure is not to be attributed to their weakness or unsuitableness; but to the choice that man makes in refusing the overtures of mercy.

The co-operation of man, then, is absolutely necessary to the efficiency of the atonement. It is a law to man, inseparable from its provision, that the sinner shall *offer* the atonement ordained and provided by God. Such was the law from Adam to Moses, and from Moses to Christ, and from the crucifixion through all time. The act of offering is just as necessary as the atonement itself. Hence the sinner must *offer* the atonement, if he is to be saved by it.

The act of offering is two-fold. The offering is made by both the sinner and the priest. This is worthy of being especially noted. The sinner brought his sin-offering to the priest, and after confessing his sin with his hands laid upon the head of the victim, he gave his sin-offering to the priest. Here the action or co-operation of the sinner terminated. The priest then offered the victim upon the altar, and presented its blood before the Lord as an atonement for the sin committed and confessed. The recognition of the priest in his work was necessary. The sinner recognized him as his intercessor with God. It was also necessary on his part that he should make his offering in faith and on repentance; otherwise he enjoyed nothing but salvation from the temporal penalty due his sin.

Under christianity the atonement is also to be offered by the sinner through his high priest, and in the same psychical states. Although there is no visible sin-offering, altar, nor priest, yet the christian atonement must be offered by the sinner before he can enjoy the remission of his sins. All these he finds in the person of Christ, and he has but to accept Christ in the way he has pointed out and required in order that he may enjoy all that Christ is to him. In such acceptance the sinner comes to the altar and to the priest with his atonement, and offers it through his high priest, with faith in Christ as his atonement and high

priest, and in that acceptance he enjoys all that is in his atonement and priesthood. *When* this acceptance is made by the sinner, and *when* the blessings of the atonement of Christ flow to the sinner, we will consider hereafter. Here we will simply say that this acceptance consists in full faith in his atonement, and in a willing and loving obedience to Christ in the ordinance of immersion, in and by which the sinner is placed in Christ, where he is a new creature.

The atonement being offered by the sinner in the way pointed out, and with the necessary state of soul, God pardons his sins *in view of the atonement and this condition of the sinner's heart*. Remission, therefore, is based on two grounds, one having reference to God, and the other to man; one being supplied by God and the other by the sinner. When the sinner has placed himself in the proper attitude before the atonement, then the atonement is made available to him because of this attitude, its benefits and blessings flow to him on his formal and open acceptance of the atonement by his obedience to Christ.

We have said that the benefits of the atonement accrue to the sinner on two principles, viz: substitution and imputation. These two principles are quite different as to their nature and application, and as to the conditions precedent to their actual operation. The former is unconditional, by which we mean to say, that the psychical states so absolutely necessary in the case of imputation, are not absolutely necessary to the enjoyment of the blessing conferred on the sinner in the case of substitution. Under all the dispensations the penalty was fully remitted on the offering of sacrifice. The sinner lived when his sacrifice was slain and offered. The same is true under the christian dispensation. *No man has died for an act of sin since Christ was crucified. That death saved the race from the penalty of sin.* Christ then offered himself *once for all*, and, as respects the penalty of sin, saved the entire race. Salvation through his atonement thus far is, consequently, universal, because unconditional. But not so his salvation from the *guilt* of sin. Under all the dispensations this has been wholly conditional. Those who offered sacrifices during the patriarchal and Jewish ages, had no pardon granted them, as we have said, unless their offerings were made in faith and repentance. These psychical states are absolutely and indispensably necessary to the remission of the *guilt* of sin. Only such a remission of the guilt of sin under those dispensations was made actual by the atonement of Christ.¹ Thus, as we distinguish between the *penalty* and *guilt* of sin, and between *life* and *character* in the atonement, so we distinguish between the principles of application of the elements of the atonement to the results of transgression.

But *imputation* is necessarily conditional, because it has reference to character, which is not susceptible of substitution. The

¹ Rom. 3: 25.

character of the atonement can not be substituted for the character or guilt of the sinner, because it can not be alienated from the actual possessor; nor can the guilt of the sinner be actually alienated from him, and transferred to the atonement. The best that can be done in this case is to *treat* the parties in the manner indicated by the process of imputation; to *impute* to the sinner the righteousness of the sin-offering on account of the states of the soul which evince the most perfect submission of mind and heart to the will of God; and to *treat* the sin-offering as though he were the sinner in fact. Thus, when the sins of the world were laid upon Christ he was treated as though he were the sinner in fact, although actually he was sinless; and when the sinner accepts Christ as his atonement, God imputes or counts to him, or invests him with, the righteousness of Christ which becomes his character on account of his acceptance of Christ. Because the righteousness of Christ is imputed or counted to the sinner on account of his acceptance of Christ as his atonement, priest, and mediator, imputation is necessarily conditional. It makes the sinner's salvation from the guilt of sin contingent on his cordial obedience to Christ.

We may now inquire, on what ground or principle of justice or righteousness can the procedure of imputation be allowed, through the operation of which the actually innocent becomes the guilty party, and the actually guilty the innocent?

This is confessedly a strange and wonderful procedure, the philosophy of which finds but the faintest illustrations in human history. On just what principle of righteousness the procedure of imputation can be allowed by a just and righteous ruler, it is difficult, if not impossible, to determine. We must, however, concede its righteousness, as well as necessity, or charge God with folly and injustice. This can not be done. All of our conceptions of his being and character forbid this. Hence we unhesitatingly assume, not only its righteousness, but its necessity as a remedial measure.

The scriptures afford us but little light on this abstruse subject. God simply states the fact without vouchsafing an explanation. This is right and proper. It would be purely a matter of favor if he granted us any light by which to show us the character of his acts. He simply states in his scriptures that "*Christ died for the ungodly;*" that he "suffered, the just for the unjust;" and that he *imputes* righteousness to the sinner because of his faith in and obedience to Christ.

Some attempts have been made to explain this procedure by illustrations drawn from human history; but the best of them fail just where the real difficulty exists. The case of Zeleucus, the king of the Locrians, who suffered the loss of one eye that his son might not lose both of his, which was the punishment prescribed for the transgression, is not in point, and fails to throw any light on the subject, because it represents *God* as suffering a

part of the punishment, whereas the divinity did not, because he can not, suffer. God is above and incapable of suffering. He is above all influence of sin. The temptation and suffering of Christ were all on the side of his humanity. Therefore the illustration gives us no light on the subject.

Hodge¹ feels the weight of this objection, and attempts a solution of the difficulty on an hypothesis more repugnant to reason and conscience than the procedure he would explain. The truth is, that the atonement has so many phases, and the Remedial System so many points from which it may be viewed, that it is impossible for one, or even many, illustrations, to give us a full and consistent view of its work and its bearings on God, and Christ, and man.

The scriptures, as we have said, afford us but little light, but this little may help to some rational conclusion. In this light nothing appears more certain than that the interposition of Christ was wholly voluntary on his part. Though God *sent* him, yet did he come willingly. Though God is said to have *given* his son, yet it is also said that it was with Christ's consent. We hence read in the scriptures: "Lo! I come to do thy will, O God," and, "though he was in the form of God, * * * yet he divested himself, and took upon himself the form of a servant, and became obedient to death, even the death of the cross." His whole work was voluntary and unconstrained, and thus far justified his being treated as the sinner deserved—of having laid on him the sins of the world.

In thus offering himself as an atonement for sin, he is said to sustain the relation to man of *surety*. He is said by the apostle to be the "surety of a better covenant." This covenant has relation to the plenary and effectual remission. He guarantees all that the covenant requires and provides, and in this relation stands as a mediator between God and man, and represents both. So as surety, he is God's pledge that he will fulfill all the provisions of the covenant, and stands for man as his surety under the same. What is the meaning and extent of this suretyship for man?

This principle has been recognized by all nations and peoples in all ages of the world. It has been accepted as just and right, and the conscience has not revolted at its practical application. When Judah became surety to his father for the return of Benjamin, we are not shocked at its acceptance. We recognize the justness of the obligation assumed, and sanction its enforcement. When a man voluntarily assumes such an obligation as is involved in suretyship, and willingly incurs all the consequences that may follow, either certainly or contingently, the general judgment has agreed that it is both just and right that the party be held to all the consequences of his suretyship. The reason is obvious. Suretyship belongs to the category of covenants, and there are

¹ Hodge on the Atonement, p. 309.

no higher or more sacred obligations than those incurred by covenants. If, therefore, one voluntarily becomes surety for another, his own honor, and the interests of the parties affected by the suretyship all require that he shall endure all the consequences. The nature and extent of the obligations do not modify or alter the case. It is not the amount or extent of the consequences that determine the sacredness of the obligation, but personal honor and the sacredness of a pledged word.

In all cases of surety the innocent party may suffer, whilst the party really deserving to suffer comes off free. The surety stepping in between the principal and the claimant suffers what the principal ought to have suffered. The surety is *treated* as though he were the real debtor. A man may be condemned to death, and a friend may, for reasons which are sufficient with him, offer to suffer in his stead. In this he would show his love for the condemned man. Or one may be hopelessly involved in debt, and his friend, to aid him, becomes his surety, that he may make another effort. His effort fails, and his surety pays the debt. Human reason recognizes the justness of the procedure. Christ became surety when he knew that he would suffer, and when he *intended* the release of the sinner. He knew all that would befall him as the surety of man, or as the surety of the covenant by which it was intended that man should live; and knowing this, what he suffered was right and proper under the circumstances. The only question that can now arise is, Was God justified in *accepting* the voluntary offering of Christ, in visiting on him the punishment due the sinner, and in acquitting thereby the sinner?

Suretyship illustrates only one phase of the atonement. No one principle can do more. But one or more principles may be united, and, acting conjointly, present other and additional features of the atonement. The *purpose* the surety may have had in his interposition, and the purpose the government may have had in accepting the interposition, may serve to show the justification of such acceptance. In this purpose we may discover some facts which shall so illumine the procedure as to relieve it of all seeming injustice, and, on the other hand, invest it with the most admirable and glorious attributes. These facts ought not to be ignored or disregarded in a fair and honest investigation of a subject environed with difficulties so complex and perplexing. They have a very important bearing on its elucidation, and serve to dissipate a part of the difficulties investing it. We will enumerate the chief part of them.

In the first place, we should not forget the means by which man became involved in sin, and the manner and means of the perpetuation of the race. These, as we have seen, constituted one reason why a remedial system was provided for him. In the next place, we know that this provision arose out of God's love and compassion for the race involved in sin. "God so loved the

world as to give his only begotten Son" to save it. This gift was the consummation of his purpose which had its first development in the atonement provided for Adam. In the third place, God, because of his love for the world; provided the remedial plan with the view, not simply of saving man from the penalty and guilt of sin, but primarily and ultimately of making him what he was in his creation, and what he purposed by his creation, viz: a faithful, dutiful, and loving child. The Remedial System, in whole and in part, has this one grand object in view, and to this end did Christ interpose, and God accept that interposition. If Christ's interposition and God's acceptance of it do no palpable injustice, nor permanent injury to any one, and violate no principle of right or justice; and if at the same time a great and permanent good is done to one party, and matchless and ineffable glory and honor accrue to the others, and without the sanction of any injurious principle, then the whole procedure must receive the sanction of wisdom and of the conscience. We must, therefore, view the interposition of Christ, and its acceptance by God, in the light of their purposes.

In the case of the sinner God has certain demands upon him, which he can not discharge, because he has no means of doing so. But the Lord Jesus Christ, as his atonement or surety, has the means, and offers to *pay* the demands, not simply to become surety for them, on certain conditions, to be complied with by the sinner. We have in these necessary conditions a new element in the problem, which looks to the realization of the primary and ultimate *purpose* alluded to, and which are, consequently, indispensably necessary. If this element or feature be added to the suretyship known and practiced among men, the justice and righteousness of the principle of action will appear more evident and satisfactory, and make it as an illustration, a more perfect parallel to the interposition of Christ.

The fact that certain psychical states or conditions are required and made necessary and precedent to the sinner's participation in the benefits of Christ's surety, which psychical states are actually the realization of God's and Christ's purposes in the atonement, gives a new and different phase to the simple and unconditional fact of Christ's suretyship, and relieves the procedure of accepting an innocent life as an atonement for the guilty one, of much of its apparent injustice and unreasonableness. These required conditions show that the sinner is not discharged for naught; that he is not discharged of his debt except only as to *kind*. While he is not required to pay what he owes in kind; yet he is required to pay an *equivalent*, or what God accepts as an equivalent. His surety pays the debt of the sinner in kind, whilst the sinner pays in turn to his surety, what both God and Christ regard and teach as an equivalent. Hence, the sinner is not really and unconditionally acquitted of the debt except as to *kind*. In paying an equivalent to his surety, which he is able to do, and in

the surety paying the debt of the sinner in kind, which he is able to do, the law of God is honored. What the surety pays is *life* and *righteousness*. Hence, that required of the sinner is something equivalent to life and righteousness. The latter of these is called in the scriptures *Faith*, and this existing, a life of devotion follows as a compensation for the physical life secured by the life of the atonement. The fortunes of the body follow the state of the spirit, and express in its actions the relations of the soul.

Faith, as viewed in these relations, embraces that condition of the soul which is expressed by the most perfect confidence, the most unswerving fidelity, and the most unreserved love, as witnessed in the lives of such men as Abraham, Job, and Daniel, of the former dispensations, and the apostles in the christian dispensation. When faith is spoken of as a ground of justification, it means all this. Abraham's faith, which was counted to him for righteousness, was just such a faith. He believed the apparently most impossible things when promised by God, and he acted in accordance with his faith. The *willing* of his life was found in the disposition of his faith. The *obedience* of faith was indissolubly united to his faith. This is the extent and depth of the faith that is counted by God as an equivalent of perfect obedience to his law, such as Christ gave.

The only further question that can now arise is, *Can this faith* be justly regarded as a full equivalent of what the law requires of its subject? Is it of such a character as to justify the suretyship of Christ and its acceptance by God?

The determination of this question must be attempted in the light of facts already alluded to, viz: the origin of sin among men, man's nature and helpless condition, and God's purposes in his creation and salvation. Being a *sinner*, personal righteousness is simply impossible to him. He has failed of perfect obedience, though he may have committed but one sin. His salvation, consequently, is impossible without the remission of that one sin. Hence the necessity of an atonement with its personal righteousness. It comes to pardon that sin, and thereby place man in his normal spiritual relation with God, and to grant him time, opportunity, and means to attain what the law of God aims at, and what God chiefly desires. This end is that state or condition of soul which is expressed by faith. This state is otherwise expressed by the apostle as "the minding the Spirit," or "walking" after the Spirit. This "minding" and "walking" are esteemed by God as the equivalent of the righteousness of the law.¹

In the light of these facts and principles the psychical states or conditions spoken of as necessary to the enjoyment of the benefits of the atonement, assume an importance to the atonement, as respects its practical application, that can not be overestimated. They are seen to be necessary, not only to the sinner's

¹ Rom. 8: 4.

salvation, as conditions on his part, but also essential to the acceptance by God of Christ's interposition in his behalf. Were it otherwise the whole procedure for the salvation of men would be arbitrary, and the sinner's pardon would be declared without regard to the state of his mind and heart. Such a proceeding might save men from the punishment of sin; but it would work no reformation in his life, or even change in his affections, nor justify God. If the salvation of men be not conditional, there is no truth in the Bible, nor righteousness in God. If the atonement be wholly an arbitrary measure, it can be no justification of God. The pardon of sins, if it is to work any permanent and lasting benefit to the race, must be grounded on principles that will work in man, through his own volition, that life and character of which pardon is but the initial point and the type.

In the faith and obedience of the gospel we have all the righteousness that a sinner can possess, and even this righteousness is imputed, not actual and personal, because of the sinner's faith and obedience. But these acts on the part of the sinner are necessary to the enjoyment of the righteousness imputed, because they secure his co-operation with the atonement in the remission of sins, which co-operation is absolutely necessary to his enjoyment of the blessings of the atonement. Without the presence of these psychical states on his part in connection with the atonement of Christ, the latter can do him no good, and his recovery from sin is a matter of impossibility. Without the resultant character which comes of faith and obedience, at which the above scheme aims, the atonement of Christ would be useless, and his mission to the world without purpose and without fruit.

There is no problem that can be compared with that of sin, none whose solution is so difficult. It involves questions and considerations difficulties and perplexities, which lay under contribution all that God and man can do in co-operation. On the plane of the atonement, where and by which this solution is to be effected, the human and the divine natures meet and co-operate, not only as *natures*, but as individuals. It embraces man on the one side, and God on the other, and finds in both certain requisites absolutely essential to its efficacy. What these requisites are as respects man we have already considered; we have yet to consider those which pertain to the Divinity.

We have seen that no atonement is fully and completely efficacious for remission until sanctified by the altar. Such was the case under the Jewish, and such is certainly the case under the christian dispensation. This being so, it is necessary to determine what and where is the altar of the christian atonement. This we have determined in a former chapter, and now assuming the divinity of the Lord Jesus as the altar of the christian institution, we proceed to consider the relations of the divine nature of the Lord Jesus Christ to his atonement, and the part it plays in this great work.

The reason and necessity of the altar in the work of the atonement, or of the presence of the divinity in order to the consecration, sanctification, or efficaciousness of the atonement of Christ, are to be found in the nature of the work effected by the atonement. The work wrought by it, as manifested in the psychical states so necessary to the enjoyment of the blessings it has to confer, is called in the christian scriptures a *creation*. The pardoned sinner is a new creature. By faith his mind has undergone such a revolution as no longer to be the same in its dispositions, views, and feelings. The change is so radical as to be properly described by language which expresses the idea that the sinner is a new being in his mind. By "repentance" the heart or soul has undergone a like revolution. It has turned away from all that is of sin and opposed to the will of God, and gone back to God in all its strength, energy, and pathos. In these changes the soul of man has been born again, a description, when applied to the mind and heart, that paints a new creation. The pardoned sinner is therefore called, in the christian scriptures, a new creation, in whom the old man was put to death, and from whom the new creation has arisen.

Now, creation is such a work that no power less than the infinite God can effect it. It is possible only with him; so that, wherever we find a creation, there we must presume the presence of the divinity. There can be no creation without him; so that, if the atonement contemplate a work that is of the nature of a creation, because of the completeness and thoroughness of the changes wrought by it, it can not effect such a work unless the divinity be present and associated with it. Therefore, the nature of the work of the atonement being such, the presence of the divinity is indispensable; and it is here we find both the reason and the necessity for the divine altar on which the christian atonement was offered.

This creation comports with the great purpose of God in making all things new. The presence of sin in this part of God's creation has destroyed the primal creation. Death has come upon all things that belong to this world. They all grow old and perish at last. Death is the eternal destiny of all things, unless there be a new creation. Now, as life is the only normal condition of intelligent beings; and since sin has brought death upon them, a new creation must occur in order to give them life again. Since, then, the atonement destroys sin and gives life to the sinner, its peculiar work is of the nature of a creation; and this being so, the divinity must be the author of, and present in, that work.

Man was made a worshiping being, and his life was intended as a service to his creator. God made him such, and with such a purpose. Hence the race was primarily the people of God by creation. When sin entered, all were granted the same religious ordinances, and were still the people of God, but they were so

by an additional act on the part of God, viz: by purchase, by means of an atonement. When the Jews were chosen, and made the peculiar and special people of God, they were made such by similar means. Their origin was a creation. The birth of Isaac was a miracle. His existence was, therefore, an act of creative power, and his descendants were a new creation.

The christian is declared by inspiration to be a new creation. As God was present and active in the primary creation, and in the birth of Isaac, so is he present and active in the atonement of Christ, making by it a new creation. Hence the reason and necessity of the divine altar to make efficacious the atonement offered on it.

The blood of Christ thus sanctified and consecrated was then simply the means of procuring pardon. The work in connection with the atonement was not yet perfect. Had Jesus not risen from the dead, and presented his blood on the mercy seat in the heavens, the means of pardon would not have been perfect. Without this the shedding of his blood would have been in vain. It was only at the mercy seat that God met Christ as the high priest of the christian institution, and received his blood as an atonement for sin. His resurrection was, therefore, necessary to the perfection and acceptance of his atonement. These things are very clearly developed under the type of the annual atonement of the Jewish institution, which was a fuller and more perfect type of the atonement of Christ than were the daily sacrifices of the temple or the individual offerings for sin. None were allowed to pass the vail and approach the mercy seat but the high priest, and not even he, except when dressed in his robes of office, and with the blood of the annual atonement. This type shows the relation and importance of the priesthood of Christ to the completion of his atonement, and the absolute importance of his resurrection from the dead. It was, indeed, only after his resurrection that he was made the high priest of the new institution.¹ While on earth he perfected his atonement. After his resurrection, and as high priest, he presented that offering in the heavens. So that his death and resurrection were equally necessary to the pardon of sin. In the first he discharged the functions of the atonement, and in the second the functions of the high priest.

Intercession is the special and chief function of the High Priest; and when the intercession is all that the case requires, the intercessor stands upon the same plane as to personal rank, dignity, and character as the party to whom intercession is made. If a subject of a king be guilty of a serious insult or indignity to the regal authority and majesty, and be judged worthy of death therefor; and if one in the dominions of the king undertake to intercede for the offender, and to plead for pardon or mitigation of punishment on any ground or consideration whatever, it is

¹ Heb. 8: 4.

evident that such intercession should not be undertaken by one of less rank, dignity, and character than are accorded to the king and his family. Only such an one is a competent judge of what the king has a right to demand, or even to intimate what he ought to accept as an atonement for the offence committed. And should the intercessor lay any stress upon his own character and work as a peer of the reigning family, and suggest these as some consideration why the king should accept his intercession and the atonement he presented in behalf of the offender, it is further evident that his rank and character should be such as to justify the royal authority in making them considerations for the exercise of his clemency.

If we reason from the human to the divine, and are permitted to draw illustrations from the affairs of human life, we are justified in expecting that the high priest of the christian atonement shall be equal in rank, dignity, and character with God himself. And this we find to be the fact. Hence, in his high priesthood we have another reason and necessity for the presence of the divinity in the person of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Mediation is a still higher function than intercession. The mediator is above the intercessor. This is evident from the history of Moses and Aaron, and the relations they sustained to God, as well as to one another. The mediator directs the intercessor, and vouches with God for the character of the intercessor, and the sufficiency of the atonement which the intercessor presents. He is admitted to a greater degree of intimacy. Such was the case with Moses the mediator of the old covenant.¹ He approaches God with no adventitious aids. The intercessor is admitted because of the atonement which he brings in his hands, but the mediator comes relying simply on the rank, dignity, and character of his person. Such is Christ the mediator of the new covenant. As the *Logos* of God he is the equal of God in all respects.

The action and co-operation of all these functions are necessary to the procurement of remission. They are the three fundamental and indispensable elements of the Remedial System; and all unite in the person of Jesus of Nazareth. The specific functions of expiation, intercession, and mediation, all so essential in the work of the atonement, meet in Jesus of Nazareth, the Son of God and the Son of Mary, as the expiator, intercessor, and mediator of the completed dispensation of the Remedial System, for which three-fold work his two-fold being fully qualifies him.

¹Num. 12: 7, 8.

CHAPTER III.

THE KINGDOM OF GOD

SECTION I.

THE CORONATION OF THE MESSIAH.

The distinctive idea of a kingdom of God on earth had its origin at the time that God set his hand to deliver the children of Abraham from their bondage in Egypt. The descendants of that great man, so well fitted by his character to be the father of a nation which God would acknowledge as his peculiar and chosen people, had increased, during their sojourn in Egypt, to a large number. The descendants of the twelve sons of Jacob had become divided into as many tribes, called, respectively, by the names of these sons, and they were, at the time of the exodus, consolidated into one people, called the children of Israel. The strong family ties which bound the original twelve and their children together, and their isolated condition in the country where they dwelt, held them together when they went down into Egypt, and consolidated their descendants into one people. The sufferings and hardships which they endured in Egypt, also tended to cement the tribes into one nation or people; so that when God came to deliver them from their bondage, they had grown into a great people, wanting nothing but a recognized head, and the necessary civil institutions.

There is a seeming necessity for the fact that God chose a people to be the depository of his communications and revelations to the race, and the representations of his being and character in the world; and, as a consolidated people, to constitute his kingdom on earth. After the institution of a remedial system for the salvation of the race from sin, a kingdom of "peculiar" men became a necessary means to the success of that system. The means and instrumentalities which were essential to the success of such a scheme, embraced, as one of their integral categories,

just such an association of men as a kingdom of God on earth, over which he especially presided, and whose ordinances and institutions he prescribed and ordained. Men are to be saved from sin, and preserved in a life of holiness by means adapted to the nature of spiritual beings and to the circumstances in which they are found; and for the accomplishment of these great purposes, the association of the saved, in some form or other, is indispensably necessary. Such an association is the kingdom of God in this world.

When God redeemed the children of Israel from Egypt, they were redeemed as a *nation*. This was right and proper, because all the individuals stood on the same footing before God, all being equally the children of Abraham. They were his people by virtue of this relationship, but while in Egypt in a state of bondage, they were unrecognized by God, and not yet consolidated into a kingdom. So God, after bringing them out of Egypt, commanded Moses: "Say to the house of Jacob, and tell the children of Israel: You have seen what I did to the Egyptians, and how I bare you on eagle's wings, and brought you to myself. Now, therefore, if you will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then you shall be a peculiar treasure to me above all people, * * * and you shall be to me a kingdom of priests and a holy nation."¹

The character of the religious institutions which God gave to this people, still further shows the necessity that he should have a people on the earth, so marked and distinct as to be recognized as his by the other nations of the world. These institutions were given, not only for the good of that people themselves, but for the development of a great thought and purpose in the mind of God. Neither these institutions, nor the realities to which, as symbols and shadows, they pointed, could have been given to mankind in any other way. The work could not be accomplished by individual agency. The organism of a society was necessary, that individual force and agency might have power to move and direct, in the line of the great purpose in view.

The presence of Jehovah among the children of Israel was wonderfully striking and distinct. The grandest displays of divine power marked almost every step of their journey from Egypt to the land of promise. The pillar of cloud by day and of fire by night, which attended them throughout their whole journey, were the symbols and evidence of the continued presence of the Angel of the Lord. The parting of the waters of the sea to allow the passage of an army of six hundred thousand men, besides the old, the women and children, and their flocks and herds, showed that God was in their midst; the circumstances attending the proclamation of the Decalogue from the summit of Mt. Sinai were evidences of the same presence; but all these displays of infinite power pale before that stupendous miracle,

¹ Ex. 19: 3-5.

which caused water to gush from the arid rock in that desert land, and to flow as a stream of constant water in sufficient volume to supply the wants of that vast horde. "He opened the rock, and the waters gushed out; they ran in dry places like a river."¹

The displays of God's presence, which attended the people during their long and tedious journey, made the children of Israel a terror to the inhabitants of the land whither God was leading them, and made known the name of God to the nations and peoples who heard of these things.

Under such circumstances, and with such displays of his presence and power, did God plant his chosen people in the land promised to their fathers. He also gave them laws and institutions which distinguished them above all other people, and which have not yet been excelled by the civilized nations of the modern world. These made them a light in the midst of the universal darkness, and gave them the knowledge and worship of the true God in the midst of universal idolatry. But for this manifestation of the true God, the world would have groped its way in ignorance and idolatry, and the race would have perished eternally.

The reigns of David and Solomon marked a new and distinguished era in the history of the Jewish people. In those reigns the nation reached the zenith of its glory and power. But more important than any earthly glory and distinction was the consideration and favor with which David was regarded by the "God of the Hebrews." He was made the initial point of a line of kings that was finally to lose itself in the reign of one to whose kingdom there should be no limit, and to whose reign, no end. He was exalted by promises which make the hearts of kings rejoice more than their own personal glory, fame and power; he was distinguished by favors which exalted him above all the kings that ever sat on the throne of Israel. Because of the greatness of his piety, and the faithfulness and devotion of his life, the throne of Israel was granted to him and to his family forever. "Once have I sworn by my holiness that I will not lie unto David: His seed shall endure forever, and his throne as the sun before me. * * * I have made my covenant with my chosen; I have sworn unto David my servant: Thy seed will I establish forever, and build up thy throne to all generations. * * * My mercy will I keep for him forever more, and my covenant shall stand fast with him. His seed will I make *to endure* forever, and his throne as the days of heaven."²

These promises were fulfilled and these purposes realized in the coronation of Jesus of Nazareth, who was the son of David according to the flesh, and sat on the throne of David as an *eternal* king by virtue of the divinity of his being.

The kingdom of Israel did not realize the purposes of God.

¹ Ps. 105: 41. ² Ps. 89.

These were obstructed somewhat when the regal office was established in the person of Saul. The displeasure of God was manifested at the time, and he seems to have determined to set it aside by the promises he made to Saul's successor. After this time the Jewish nation seems to have fulfilled its mission, so greatly had it fallen short of what was designed by it; and God appears from the time of the anointing of David, to have set about the work of establishing another and better kingdom, and of setting in motion the agencies which were to effect it. Hence, besides the indications of such a purpose in the promises he made to David, he declared by Jeremiah, before the Babylonian Captivity, that the days would come when he would make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and set upon the throne of David the promised seed, the Messiah, the Prince; and during that captivity, the Lord declared by Daniel that, in the days of the fourth kingdom, the God of heaven would set up a kingdom which should never be destroyed; that it would break in pieces all other kingdoms, and stand forever.¹ "Finding fault" with the Jewish kingdom, he promised through David and the prophets that he would establish another, more fully adapted to the grand purpose he had in view, and to the needs and wants of man. Thus he said by Jeremiah: "Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will raise up to David a righteous Branch, and a king shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice in the earth. In his days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely: And this is his name whereby he shall be called: The Lord our Righteousness."²

The radical and remediless fault that attached to, and inhered in, the kingdom of Israel was, that none of its appointments, either singly or combined with others, was capable of realizing for man the great and pressing want of his being. By them Judah could not be saved, nor Israel dwell safely. By that kingdom righteousness could not be established in the earth, nor the saved admitted into the presence of their king. It was too narrow and exclusive; too much "clay mixed with iron"—flesh with spirit—to suit man's condition in the world, to free the spirit from the dominion and control of the animal nature, and to enthroned the reason and conscience. The kingdom under which man is to attain this mastery of himself, and to exhibit that spiritual life which is to transfer him to a higher plane and field of purity and holiness, is spiritual in all its elements, and enduring as the spirit itself.

This kingdom, which was the hope of all the pious of the patriarchal and Jewish ages, and the burden of prophetic vision, arose in the days of the last great Power or Empire: "In the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom." These were the Roman Emperors. The time mentioned for this event is limited to this period of human history, as declared by

¹ Danl. 2: 44. ² Jer. 23: 5, 6.

Gabriel through the same prophet: "Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy *holy city*, to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins [sin-offerings], and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in an everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the Most Holy. Know, therefore, and understand that, from the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem, to the Messiah the Prince, there shall be seventy weeks, and three score and two weeks, * * * and after three score and two weeks, the Messiah shall be cut off, but not for himself."

The "holy city," or Jerusalem, was destroyed by the Romans in the year A. D. 70, its people scattered, and many sold into slavery. From that day to the present they have been a people "scattered and peeled," having no country, no holy city, no temple, no priesthood, no worship, and no king. As a part of this prophecy was fulfilled by that terrible catastrophe, and the last part too, we ought to find the rest fulfilled in the events that happened prior to that overthrow. Messiah the Prince was to appear before the destruction of the holy city.

Other prophecies will aid us in fixing the time in which the Messiah was to appear. Malachi, the last of the prophets, who lived after the restoration from Babylon, alludes to the coming of the Messiah in the third chapter and the first four verses of his prophecy. The Messenger spoken of by him is the same spoken of by Isaiah; and these prophecies were fulfilled in the person of John the Baptist, the harbinger, or forerunner of the Messiah. The time of John's appearance Luke gives as in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberias Cæsar, A. D. 26, so that the Messiah must have appeared among his people about forty years before the destruction of the holy city.

The Messiah lived but a few years after he entered upon his public ministry. He was publicly crucified near Jerusalem, as a malefactor, being rejected by his people. In that day the Jewish people were subjects of Cæsar, with a Roman governor for their ruler. The throne of David had long been vacant. His people were governed by foreigners. If, therefore, Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah, the Prince promised to David and the Jewish people, he did not ascend that throne on earth. He was not a king while he lived here. If he is now king, and on the throne of David, that throne is in the heavens. Have we any knowledge, then, as to the time he was made king and invested with regal authority?

The prophecies which speak of the coronation of this son of David, do not contemplate his reign on earth. David himself says of this person: "The Lord said to my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool." This prophecy the apostle Peter applies to Christ, and says it was fulfilled in his resurrection and coronation: "Therefore being a

prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise Christ, [the Messiah, the Prince], to sit on his throne; he seeing this before, spake of the *resurrection* of Christ. * * * Therefore being at the right hand of God exalted," he is this day "made both Lord and Christ."¹

That his coronation and consequent ascension to the throne of David, took place in heaven, and not on earth, these scriptures place beyond question. The conditions of the promises made to David could never have been fulfilled by any earthly reign, or mortal son, and consequently Jesus, while he was mortal, could not have been crowned, nor his throne been established on this earth. His resurrection and ascension to heaven were necessarily preliminary and precedent to his coronation. It was in the heavens only that the throne of David could have been established *forever*; only there that Jesus, as his son, could reign forever. Accordingly, after his coronation on the day of Pentecost, Paul applies the language of David in the 45th Psalm to this throne and this promised son: "But to the *son*, *he says*, Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever."

The coronation of Jesus having taken place on the fiftieth day after his resurrection from the tomb, the Holy Spirit was dispatched to the earth to announce the fact, and, as Christ's Minister Plenipotentiary, to open the reign of Christ, and set up his kingdom. This was done on the day of Pentecost. The kingdom of heaven, the near approach of which John the Harbinger, and Jesus, in person and by his disciples, proclaimed along the Jordan and the sea of Galilee, was formally inaugurated on this feast day, and "repentance and remission of sins" were preached in the name of Jesus from that day forward.

¹ Acts 2: 30-36.

SECTION II.

THE MISSION OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

It was only a part of the great work of redemption that Jesus accomplished in person while on earth. The rest could be done only in heaven. His whole work was that of expiation, intercession, and mediation, requiring that he should be the sacrifice, the priest, and the mediator. Only the first of these functions could he discharge while on earth, and this he discharged when "he offered himself without spot to God" and "gave himself a ransom" for the sins of the world.

He was a *high* priest, not a common priest: and for two reasons he could not have discharged the functions of his high priesthood while on earth. First, he was not of the proper tribe; and second, the Most Holy Place and Mercy Seat in which and on which he had to present the blood of the atonement, were in heaven. His life-work was, therefore, limited, as far as these several functions are concerned, to the work of expiation.

He was also to be a king, as he himself plainly declares: "For this purpose was I born;" but he could not enter upon his reign as the son and Lord of David, until he had finished his work of expiation and intercession, because it was on account of his condescension in becoming the son of man and the expiatory sacrifice for the world, that he was exalted to the supreme authority.¹

But the world could have had no knowledge of this work of intercession and mediation, and of his acceptance and justification by God, had not the Holy Spirit been sent to inform it of what had taken place in heaven. Jesus had died as a malefactor; and though his resurrection from the dead by the power of God was a full vindication of his character, yet but few comparatively had knowledge of the fact. It was necessary that the world should be fully assured of this fact by the most indubitable testimony, and this furnished another reason for the mission of the Holy Spirit.

It was not the purpose of Christ to leave his name in the world without a vindicator, or his cause without an advocate, more powerful than men. His cause could not have succeeded if supported only by men, even though they were inspired. Inspiration of men was not enough. The personal presence of the

¹ John 5: 22; Matt. 28: 18; Heb. 1: 9; 2: 10; 5: 9.

Holy Spirit was indispensably necessary. Hence Christ said to his disciples: "It is expedient that I go away: for if I go not away, the Paraclete will not come; but if I depart, I will send him to you. And when he is come he will convince the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment; of sin, because they believe not on me; of righteousness, because I go to my father, and you see me no more; and of judgment, because the prince of this world is judged."

The mission of the Spirit embraces more than the mere statement of what Jesus did in the heavens in the completion of his work. It was necessary that men should be informed of the bearing of that work on them. The Lord, in the quotation made above, states but a part of the work of the Spirit, unless we regard these as categories which embrace all else he had to do; unless we regard the conviction of sin, for instance, as embracing every thing that is necessary to the enjoyment of the remission of sin. On the day of Pentecost the Spirit began his work. After stating that Jesus was made both Lord and Christ; that he was exalted to the right hand of God; and after convincing the three thousand of sin, he announced by what means their sins might be forgiven.

It must be observed that the Holy Spirit was sent, in this miraculous manner, to the apostles. Such was the promise which Christ made these disciples before he left them. He was sent to abide during life, to direct them into all truth, and by them to utter to the world the whole counsel of God as regards the salvation of men. But it is also true that he then came to the church, to abide with it forever, in which his presence is manifested only by the inspiration of "the apostles and prophets," and by the miracles which he gave them power to work. After miracles ceased we have no other evidence of his continued presence with the church of God than the promise that he should abide with the disciples forever. Had he not made his presence known by "signs and wonders," the world could never have known that he had indeed come.

Christ speaks of the Holy Spirit as a *person*. Though the word *Spirit* (pneuma), in the Greek is neuter; yet the pronoun applied to him is frequently masculine. All the attributes of personality are ascribed to him in the christian scriptures. He is represented as knowing, speaking, working, inspiring, convincing, and interceding. Hence he should now be spoken of as HE, and not as IT. The conception of the Holy Spirit as a person belongs to the christian dispensation, and is a revelation of it. The Jews had no such conception of him. Their ideas as to the *oneness* of their Jehovah forbade such a thought. With them the Spirit of God was but the breath of the Almighty, the power, energy, and life-giving force of the Jehovah, not a being or person of the Divinity. The revelation of the stupendous and mysterious fact of the trinity of being, or of persons in the God-

head, was left for the development of the Remedial Scheme as we find it in the christian scriptures. In these scriptures the *Logos* and *Pneuma* are as distinctly personal as the *Theos*; for under the christian scheme, men come into the same relation with the *Logos* and *Pneuma* as they do with the *Theos*, being "baptized into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit."

The advent of the Holy Spirit as a person, and the beginning of his work under the reign of Christ, as his advocate and the church's *Paraclete*, occurred on the day of Pentecost. The incidents attending this event demand some consideration, since they mark an important era in the work of redemption, and discover, to some extent, the nature of the work he came to perform.

When Jesus appeared among his people, and claimed to be the Jews' promised Messiah, the only question that could have arisen was: Is he that person? There was no doubt as to the *man* Jesus of Nazareth. He was clearly manifest to their senses. He was seen and felt, heard and spoken to. But when the Spirit made his advent into this world, and to the apostles and the church, there was no such sensible evidence of his presence. He was invisible. His presence could be known only by the evidences which he gave of it. It was necessary that men should be assured of this, otherwise nothing could be positively known of his advent, and no assurance could be had that Christ had fulfilled his promise. Accordingly his advent was attended with demonstrations of his personal presence.

On the day of Pentecost, about the second hour of the day, suddenly a sound was heard, like the noise of a tempest. It was heard sweeping over Jerusalem, and concentrating about the temple. There the apostles seem to have been gathered. It filled the place where they were assembled, and directed attention to them; and on their heads there immediately appeared fiery flames resembling tongues. From the head of each arose the lambent flame, the symbol of inspiration. They then began to speak in all the languages known in the chief provinces of the Roman Empire. The multitudes came thronging about the house, gazing and wondering at the strange phenomena. They were amazed and perplexed, and said among themselves, "What does this mean?"

The first object of these miracles was to call the people together, and excite just such an inquiry. The apostles could have been inspired, and have spoken as they did, without such miracles; but the people would not have gathered in such a multitude, nor become so excited by, and interested in, what the apostles afterwards uttered. The miracles had no other immediate effect on the multitude. They were calculated to prepare, and did prepare, the mind for what was said by the apostles. Three thousand were convicted of sin by Peter's speech, and became obedient to Christ.

The advent of the Spirit was in accordance with two distinct and widely separated promises, and in fulfillment of these, both of which promises are mentioned by the apostle in his address on this occasion. The first was made through Joel the prophet long before the time of the captivity in Babylon; and the second by the Lord himself to his disciples on the evening before he suffered, and on the eve of his ascension to heaven.

The prophecy of Joel was cited in explanation of the phenomena which so astonished and bewildered the people. "These men are not drunken, as you suppose," said Peter; "but this is that which was spoken by Joel the prophet: And it shall come to pass in the last days, says God, that I will pour out from my spirit (*απο του πνευματος μου*) upon all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophecy, and your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dreams; and on my servants and on my handmaidens I will pour out in those days from my Spirit, and they shall prophecy."¹ Then he proceeds to declare that Jesus of Nazareth, whom they had crucified, was indeed their promised Messiah; that God had raised him from the dead, and seated him at his own right hand in the heavens; and that, "having received from the father the promise of the Holy Spirit, he had shed forth (poured out²) this which you now see and hear."³

This *promise* of the Spirit had reference, not to any power or influence which the Spirit of God would exert over them; but to the Spirit himself. So the Lord spoke of this promise: "But the Paraclete, *who is* the Holy Spirit, whom the father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things;" and, "When the Paraclete is come, whom I will send from the father, the Spirit of truth, who proceedeth from the father, he will testify of me."

Conceiving of the Holy Spirit as a *person*, who was sent by the Father and the Son conjointly, we must regard the things spoken of by Joel, as the immediate work of the Spirit; what *he poured out after he came*. This is the only view that is consistent with what the apostle says, who was himself, by his inspiration, an evidence of the fulfillment of the prophecy. It was not the Holy Spirit that was poured out, as is so generally understood. The scriptures nowhere speak of the Spirit being poured out. As the scriptures were inspired by the Spirit, they could never have uttered language that would represent his nature or being different from what it is. In this prophecy of Joel, God seems to have guarded against such a misconception of the Spirit. He does not say that he will pour out his *Spirit*, but *from* his spirit, indicating that something should proceed from the Spirit. The blessing or gift promised was really the Spirit himself, as is evident from the application which the apostle makes of it. The things mentioned by Joel as being "poured out,"

¹ Acts 2: 15-18. ² The word translated *pour out* in verse 15, is the same as that translated *shed forth*, in verse 33. ³ Acts 2: 33.

embrace no more than inspiration; and such was the force of the fact on the minds of the multitude. The miracles were convincing proof that the apostle spoke by the inspiration of God; what he uttered under the guidance of this inspiration, was what convicted them of sin. They were convinced that Jesus was then exalted at the right hand of God, and had sent the Holy Spirit in this miraculous manner. They regarded what they saw and heard as the work of the Spirit, and as a fulfillment of the prophecies cited.

This misconception in regard to the nature or being of the Holy Spirit has been a fruitful source of error in doctrine and practice. A prophecy of John the Baptist in regard to the work of Christ, coupled with the misconception of what took place on the day of the Spirit's advent, has been the support of an error in respect to the institution of baptism. John said to the people: "I indeed baptize you in *water*; but he shall baptize you in the *Holy Spirit* and in fire." This baptism of the Holy Spirit took place on the day of Pentecost, according to the promise of Christ: "John truly baptized in water; but you shall be baptized in the Holy Spirit not many days hence." Now, misunderstanding *what* was poured out on the day of Pentecost, and conceiving that it was the Spirit, men have reached the conclusion that *pouring* is the proper and ordained mode of baptism; a conclusion based wholly on an inference, whilst the inference is based on an entire misconception and misunderstanding of the language of this portion of the scriptures. Had such persons not been in error in regard to the institution of baptism, they might have attained to a true knowledge of this scripture. The event of Pentecost is very appropriately called an immersion in the Holy Spirit. But the use of the word immersion in such a connection is evidently figurative. One can not be literally immersed in the Holy Spirit as in water, because the Spirit is a person. Men are said to be "immersed into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit," when they become obedient to the gospel in the ordinance of baptism; but no one understands this language in its literal sense. Neither can we so understand the immersion which Christ underwent in his sufferings and death. The figurative use of the word in these scriptures is evident, and easily and readily understood. We understand such language as meaning that, in such baptisms, the persons who are the subjects of them, are placed completely under the control and influence of that in which they are said to be immersed. When men are immersed, or baptized in water, they are for the time under the water, under its power and control. An important function of life is suspended by it. So when one is immersed in grief, or sorrow, or suffering, or the Holy Spirit. For the time, grief, or sorrow, or suffering, or the Holy Spirit, has entire possession of the mind, to the degree that the person does nothing that is not determined, directed, or controlled by these.

Therefore to be immersed in the Holy Spirit is to be placed entirely under the control of the Spirit, as were the apostles on the day of his advent, for the purposes which he had in view in using them. In this view of the subject, which is supported by the nature of the baptism in fire, *immersion in the Holy Spirit is nothing more nor less than the inspiration of the apostles, and their investment with miraculous power.*

The purposes of the Spirit's advent, and the work of his mission, were not exhausted or completed by what transpired on the day of Pentecost. His first work was, indeed, the inspiration of the apostles and their investment with miraculous power;¹ but this was only the beginning of his work, and looked to the proclamation of the gospel. When Jesus commissioned his apostles, after his resurrection, the work of the apostles included two categories: the first, the preaching of the gospel; the second, teaching the disciples all things which he had commanded them, or would command them.² These works were to be confirmed by miraculous power. Hence, the Spirit was to continue with them through life, that he might lead them into all truth as occasion required, or his purposes demanded.

But not only was the Spirit to continue with the apostles during their lives; not only during the time that inspired men were required for the establishment of Christ's cause in the world; he came also to continue with the disciples to the end of time. This assurance we have in the fact that believers are immersed into the name of the Holy Spirit, and receive him as a *gift*, consequent upon their obedience. As the advocate of Christ and of the disciples, he is to remain in and with the church to the close of time. The work which he does in this relation to the church and to individual christians, he does in ways unknown and unseen by the christian or the world. He works by agents invisible to us, it may be, and by instrumentalities which we can not perceive or detect at the time, if ever; yet we are as much assured of such a work of the Spirit as we are of God's superintending providence. This work is the Spirit's *providential* work, of which more hereafter.

In addition to all this, the Spirit is an intercessor for christians. The human soul, broken and oppressed by sin, and groaning under the consciousness of its own weakness and inability to utter all it feels, would often sink in despair had it not the assurance that "the Spirit himself makes intercession for the saints with groanings which can not be uttered;" taking the soul's earnest longings, and unutterable or inarticulate pleadings, and presenting them clearly before God, thus helping the christian's weakness and infirmities.

Such was the mission on which the Holy Spirit was sent by the Father and the Son, the *ADVOCATE of Christ*, and the *PARACLETE OF HIS PEOPLE*.

¹ Acts 1: 4-8; Luke 24: 49. ² Math. 28: 19, 20.

SECTION III.

THE ORGANIC LAW OF THE KINGDOM.

The primary work of the Holy Spirit in his advent into this world was the conviction of the world in regard to sin, righteousness, and judgment to come. Conviction as to these had special reference to the claims of the Lord Jesus. Sin, righteousness, and judgment gather around him as their centre, and have no significance except as they are related to him. Christ's work has reference to these. The remission of sins and the restoration of righteousness in the earth, with the close of man's life in the world by a general judgment, when all things in reference to sin and righteousness are finally and forever settled, constitute the great work of the Redeemer. In aid of this work the Spirit came.

There are no such questions in all the range of human thought and knowledge as those which grow out of the existence of sin in the human heart. There is nothing so dark as its stain, or so fearful as its consequences. There is no distress that so racks and crazes the mind; no anguish or remorse that so torture the soul and make life miserable, as that which sin engenders. It allows no peace or rest, nor surcease of sorrow and misery. Its plowshare breaks up all that is beautiful and lovely and innocent in the once unstained soul, and leaves this garden of Eden in utter ruin.

The world, with all its long and sad experience, has not yet learned what ruin and disaster sin has wrought, and is capable of working, in the world. The blood which flowed from Adam to Christ tells of the cost of sin to man. Every sin called for the sacrifice of life; and the sinner was made to feel that he lived because his sacrifice died. Yet all this flow of blood was not enough to impress the human soul with a realizing sense of the innate turpitude and direful consequences of sin. A greater demonstration of its baneful nature was needed, and a higher and stronger evidence of its natural deserts was required, before the fulness of its wretchedness, and misery, and ruin could be depicted to the human mind, and the soul won from its love and practice. These we have in the death of Christ.

The conviction of sin in its relations to Christ was the primary purpose, and logical course of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost. When the three thousand were convinced that they had aided in,

or consented to, the crucifixion of the Messiah, in the crucifixion of Jesus of Nazareth, they realized the fact that they had committed a crime of a deeper grade than murder; and then the conviction of sin, like a flood, was felt to sweep over the soul, and darken life with the most fearful apprehensions. Under the weight of this conviction, and such apprehensions, they cried out in agony, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?"

The multitude in the presence of the apostles were Jews and proselytes. They were worshipers of God according to the law of Moses, and had come up from all parts of the empire of Rome to Jerusalem to celebrate the feast of Pentecost. They were the people of God according to the covenant made with Abraham, and with the Israelites at Mt. Sinai, and therefore were believers in God. They did not believe that Jesus was the promised Messiah; they had rejected and crucified him as a pretender and imposter. This did not, however, destroy their faith in the God whom they worshiped. They thought they were serving God when they crucified the Lord. Peter says they would not have done so had they not believed he was an imposter. Evidently, then, there was but one point to make with that multitude. They needed conviction where there was unbelief, and faith in one whom they regarded as an evil-doer and a blasphemer. Peter addressed himself to that work; to convince them that, in crucifying *Jesus*, they had indeed crucified *the Messiah*, the Lord of glory. He convinced the three thousand that they had crucified one whom God had acknowledged, and approved, and glorified, and that in doing this they had committed a great sin. They were consequently pierced to their hearts. Anguish and remorse seized on their souls. They were not ignorant of sin and its terrible consequences. They knew that they were then under the condemnation of God; and in the bitterness of their remorse, they cried out, "what shall we do?" This cry was proof of their agony, and of their faith in Jesus as the Messiah. Peter understood this. He knew as well that they now believed in Jesus as he did that they believed in God. He answered their question accordingly. He had convinced them that Jesus was indeed the Messiah; that God testified his approval of all he had said and claimed by the signs and wonders which Jesus wrought in their presence; that God had raised him from the dead, and seated him at his own right hand; and had made him both Lord and Christ. They believed that Peter spoke by the direction of the Spirit. They were assured of this by the miracles which they saw. They were convinced of the truth of what he said, and their whole mind was changed toward Jesus whom they had crucified.

This conviction was wrought by the Spirit, not by Peter. The apostle was only the mouth-piece or instrument of the Spirit. What Peter said was what the Spirit controlled him in saying; what he uttered was the mind of the Spirit, and not his own.

This is plain from the narrative. The evidences of the Spirit's presence with the apostles convinced the multitude that the apostles spoke as they were moved by the Holy Spirit. The *truth* which the inspired men uttered concerning the glorification of Jesus, convinced them that he was their Messiah, and that they had committed a great crime in crucifying him. In this way the Spirit wrought the conviction of sin in their hearts, and in no other way. We have no evidence that he wrought this conviction in any other way, or employed any other means. The record gives no intimation of any other, and it is all assumption and imagination to suppose any other. Their faith in Jesus as the Messiah, rested on what they had heard from the Spirit through the apostles. It was divine testimony, of the same source as that on which their faith in God rested. There is no mystery about the method or means of their conversion. It is as plain and simple as a plain and simple narrative can make it; and no mystery would ever have hung about it, had not human doctrines and speculations obscured the teaching of God.

Conviction is precedent to intelligent action. The conviction of this multitude consisted of but one element—the assurance that Jesus was the Messiah. As devout Jews, worshiping God according to the institutions given them through Moses, they had faith in God; and now, as sinners against Jesus, they were believers in him as the Christ. With this faith they cried out: “What shall we do?”

It was granted to Peter to open the doors of the kingdom of heaven. On this feast day of Pentecost the door was opened for the first time, and to the Jews only. In answer to their earnest inquiry, the apostle replied: “*Repent, and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit.*” “Then they that gladly received his word were baptized, and the same day there were added *to the disciples* about three thousand souls.”

The reply of the apostle to those anxious inquirers embraces the terms on which a *believer in God and in Christ* can obtain and enjoy the remission of sins, and the fellowship of the “Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.” On these terms or conditions such an one can enter the kingdom of heaven, and become a member of the church, of which the disciples present on that occasion formed the nucleus in the city of Jerusalem.

These terms or conditions of pardon, or entrance into the kingdom of heaven, can not be different from, contradictory of, or inconsistent with, what Jesus said to Nicodemus, and what he commissioned his apostles to preach after his resurrection. The condition named to Nicodemus was a birth of water and Spirit, and those in the commission were belief in the gospel and baptism into the name of the “Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.” In the answer of Peter there is no mention of a birth, or of faith, or of the names of the Father and the Spirit.

He had preached the gospel according to his commission, and three thousand believed. These he was commanded to baptize, and they were accordingly baptized.

His commission said nothing of repentance and baptism in the name of Christ, or by his authority; but Jesus had said to his apostles, soon after his resurrection, when explaining to them the scriptures which related to him, that "repentance and remission of sins were to be preached *in his name* among all nations." In the answer of the apostle we have "repentance and remission of sins" preached in his name.

If we are to regard this answer of the inspired apostle as expressing and announcing the organic law of citizenship in the kingdom of heaven, as we ought, we should find in it all the terms and conditions which Christ has ordained as necessary to the enjoyment of the blessings of his kingdom. This will be found, on a proper analysis, to be the case. The birth of water and Spirit, which Christ said was absolutely necessary to entrance into his kingdom, and the faith which is required by the commission, and the connection of the name of God and the Spirit with obedience to Christ, will all be found, either expressed or implied, in this organic law. Indeed, without these the law is incomplete.

But before we proceed to a more special consideration of the terms or conditions of admission into the kingdom of heaven, it is necessary, in order to a full understanding of this law, that we have a proper conception or knowledge of the relations which each of the persons of the Godhead sustains to it, and to the persons who submit to it. This is the more necessary because of the prominence given to the Lord Jesus as the atonement, priest and king of the kingdom of heaven; because in his hands are the reins of universal empire; and especially because the kingdom of God on earth is managed and directed by his authority, and in his name. Though Christ is exalted at the right hand of God, and all authority in heaven and earth has been placed in his hands; yet are the Father and the Spirit intimately connected with, and related to, the kingdom of God. Obedient believers are immersed into the name of all the persons of the Godhead; and hence the disciples are brought into relation with all these. This being so, the divine persons sustain a specific relation to the elementary terms or conditions of the organic law. The difference between the Jewish and christian dispensations is not so great and radical as to effect any very material change in the relations of the persons of the Godhead. Possibly but little more has been done than to emphasize some of the features, or elements of the Remedial System. The whole Divinity was engaged in the work of redemption under the patriarchal and Jewish dispensations; but for certain reasons the Divinity was made to stand out before the view as a unity and not a trinity. Hence the prominence of the *Theos* under those dispensations.

The elements of the Remedial System were as marked and as distinctly separated under those former dispensations as under the christian, and, indeed, more so; and the conditions on which the blessings flowing from these elements were secured, were not essentially different from those that obtain under the christian. Faith in God was ever the primary condition of acceptance with God. Repentance was equally so. And so was the offering of sacrifice. Without these psychical states the offering of sacrifice availed only for the redemption of life. The offering availed nothing for the expiation of guilt unless offered by faith and a heart-felt repentance. They were necessary precedents to the act of pardon. The same principles hold good under the christian dispensation. These psychical states are equally indispensable. There can be no pardon without them.

Whilst these dispensations of the Remedial System, in these particulars, are so much the same, yet in one aspect they are very much unlike. There was no psychical relation under Judaism, between the sinner and his sacrificial offering. Under christianity a psychical relation is prominent and essential. This is a distinguishing feature of the christian dispensation. Faith in the christian atonement is just as necessary to salvation as faith in God. There is no truth more clearly stated in the christian scriptures than this. It is the ground-truth of the whole scheme. But more than this.

Not only is faith in the sin-offering of the christian dispensation indispensably necessary to the salvation of the soul; but equally important is *obedience* to the person who is the christian atonement. All the outward obedience that is required of the sinner in order to his pardon, is rendered *directly to the Lord Jesus*, because the institution of baptism, which is this act of obedience, is administered by the authority of Jesus, and in his name. The ordinance is not administered in the name of God and the Spirit. Immersion *into* their name is quite a different idea.

In view of these facts we discover that there are four conditions absolutely essential to salvation, no one more important or necessary than another. These are, 1. Faith in God; 2. Repentance towards God; 3. Faith in Jesus as all that he claims to be; and, 4. Obedience to Christ.

In the logical arrangement of these acts of the soul, repentance must necessarily follow the conviction of sin; and in order to determine its proper position in the arrangement, we must consider against whom sin is an act of disobedience and an offence. This will lead us still further into the consideration of the relations which the persons of the Divinity sustain to the law of pardon and to the sinner.

Since Christ is the atonement for sin, he can not be the person against whom sin is committed. This is evident. It is God who pardons, and it is God against whom sin is committed. He judges and determines whether the atonement offered by Christ

is ample and sufficient for remission, because he is the party offended by sin; and if he determines the sufficiency of the atonement, he also determines its necessary precedents, which are faith in God and repentance towards him. Conviction of sin is based on faith in God, and repentance is a consequence of this conviction. The scriptures declare that repentance has reference or relation to God; and such must be its relation as determined by its position in the Remedial Scheme. The fact that the atonement under the christian dispensation is a person, does not alter or change the relations of faith and repentance. Under the reign of animal sacrifice, repentance was never exercised towards the victim, and how can it be under the christian scheme? There is no reason why it should be, and none why it can be. The scriptures affirm the contrary; and hence we must regard repentance as being exercised towards God. Its connection with faith in Christ is the same as its connection with conviction of sin, since faith in Christ is identical with the conviction of sin, when this conviction has reference to the claims of Christ. This conclusion we think is fully supported by the following statement of the apostle Paul: "There is but one God, the Father, *of whom* (ἐξ οὗ) are all things, and we *for him* (εἰς αὐτόν), and one Lord Jesus Christ, *through whom* (δι' οὗ) are all things, and we *through him* (δι' αὐτόν)." ¹ God is still the primary object of worship; but worshiped now only *through* Christ. The natural relations of the *Theos* and the *Logos* are not materially changed by the remedial relations of *Father and Son*.

The repentance required as a condition of remission may, to say the least, precede faith in Christ. This was the case in several instances recorded in the Acts of the Apostles. The Eunuch, Cornelius and Lydia are examples. These parties were pious believers in, and worshipers of, God. Their hearts were in the state which is expressed by repentance—*μετανοια*—and hence nothing more was necessary in these cases than faith in Christ, and obedience to him.

An analysis of the discourse of the apostle Peter on the day of Pentecost will show that all he said is in full accord with these principles. To these worshipers of God, who had come to Jerusalem from every part of the Roman Empire, and who had sinned in crucifying the Lord, or in consenting thereto, and were conscious of it, he said, "Repent, and be baptized," &c. They were penetrated with the keenest sense of remorse; but this was not the state of the soul required by repentance. Something more than a racking remorse or disquieting regret was meant and intended. It was, as we shall see, a turning of the soul to God. It was an act of the soul in returning to God, and laying the ground for an obedience to anything God might command. As Peter's hearers did not have this repentance before their conviction of sin against Christ; and as that sin, like all others, required

¹ 1 Cor. 8: 6.

repentance in order to remission, the first thing required was repentance.

An induction of all the facts recorded in the scriptures, which bear on this subject, will show that the answer of Peter on this occasion, with its statements and implications, embraces all that is required as necessary to remission of sins. These are, 1, faith in God; 2, repentance towards God; 3, faith in Jesus as the Messiah or Christ; and 4, obedience to Christ in the institution of baptism. And

I. FAITH.

The importance and necessity of faith as a condition precedent to remission, is universally admitted and maintained. The scriptures are too clear and explicit on this subject to admit of any doubt. But in the religious world there has been much discussion in regard to its nature, and the means by which it is produced. It is sufficient for our purpose to notice two prominent views, which differ so widely and materially that they may be considered the parents of all others. These views relate to the cause or means by which faith is produced: 1. That it is produced by a direct action of the Spirit of God on the mind of the sinner. Connected with this view, and growing out of it, are the subsidiary doctrines of Total Depravity and man's consequent inability to do anything religiously until his mind has been acted on by the Holy Spirit, to invigorate it, energize it, or direct it. 2. The other view is that "faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the word of God;" that it is the confidence produced by the testimony believed, which God has given concerning Christ in the scriptures which he inspired. This view runs a parallel of opposition to all that belongs to the other. Hence, one of them must be false. It will be only necessary, therefore, to prove that one of these is true, to show that the other is untrue; or to show that one is absurd to prove that the other is both rational and true.

There is a common sense way of viewing this anti-scriptural doctrine of the depravity of man's moral powers, or natural spiritual tastes, desires and inclinations, which may carry conviction more certainly than any purely logical or metaphysical argument. In the first place, how much is *assumed* by this doctrine? There is just as much reason for declaring that the whole doctrine is an assumption, from first to last, as there is for believing that any part of it is true. We know nothing of the strength and force of the human soul while man was in Eden, beyond what may be inferred from the single fact of Adam's transgression. Such an inference will not be found to favor the assumption under consideration. Was that temptation the strongest with which the human soul has ever had to contend? This can not be inferred. On the contrary, we might infer that, under all the circumstances, it was not. Then, as Adam gave way under that temptation, we might more reasonably infer that he was not as

strong in his moral powers as man has shown himself to be outside of Eden and its pure, moral influence. We can not, therefore, maintain, with any degree of reason, that the soul's powers have suffered impairment or depravity on account of, or by, or through, that transgression. It certainly can not be positively known, and ought not, therefore, to be affirmed. Even such an inference is unreasonable, and contradicted by facts of every day's experience and observation. If man's psychical powers have been impaired or depraved by Adam's sin; if the moral force and strength of his soul have been abated by that act of transgression, we have no means of proving it, nor, indeed, of even inferring it, simply because we have no knowledge of Adam's moral force and power of resistance before he became a sinner. We can, consequently, institute no comparison between what man is now, as to the force of his moral nature, and what he was then.

If man's experience and trial in a state of sin are to afford him any aid in resisting temptations, and of acquiring a mastery over himself; if he is to be made stronger by trials and sufferings in a state of sin, then we would be justified in concluding that, without such experience and trial, the moral force of man would be weaker. What experience or trial had Adam to invigorate the force of his moral nature? It must be admitted that he had none.

It is cheerfully conceded that man's moral powers are weakened by sin—by repeated acts of sin. But what degree of depravity can we assign as the result of *one* sin? This is beyond our means of determining. Result is the only index to the degree. Who can affirm that this result is perceptible in any instance of a first transgression? The trial may be made and observed closely. Take a case as nearly parallel to Adam's as can be found among men, and observe what the result will be in such a person. Adam was surrounded with the best of influences. He knew nothing of sin before the fatal day. Then let us take a young man who has been reared under influences of a holy and righteous character, and observe what effect the first act of sin will have upon him. Will that effect be depravity? Will it not rather be the reverse, by the alarm it occasions and the shock it gives? An arousal of one's consciousness to the nature and consequences of a wicked act will rather tend to strengthen the moral force than to weaken or deprave it. It is the nature of such an act to arouse and sting the conscience, and this monition of the conscience is *designed* and *tends to check* the soul and prevent a repetition of the act. Who can say that such was not the case with Adam? The inference is in favor of such a conclusion, and what we observe and know of the working of a first act of disobedience on the innocent heart, corroborates the conclusion. We are, therefore, justified in characterizing the doctrine of depravity inferred from the sin of Adam, as the sheerest assump-

tion, without any countenance from the dictates of common sense, or the observed facts in man's moral history.

This doctrine of implanted or transmitted depravity, arising from one act of disobedience by the progenitor of the race, is again shown to be absurd and groundless by the doctrine of supernaturalism, or direct spiritual influence, which has been reared upon it. If the doctrine in question be true, then every instance we find among men of a high moral nature, as evidenced by the life of the individual, must be the result of such action of the Spirit of God. This doctrine of spiritual influence was conceived and invented to meet the requirements of the doctrine of depravity. The latter doctrine conceived men as "*dead* in trespasses and in sins," and consequently as incapable, spiritually, of any living act as the literal dead are of motion. Thus spiritually or psychically dead, they were powerless for any act until "made alive" by the direct and special act of the Holy Spirit. Now, if any instances can be found in the history of the race, since the introduction of christianity, (logically since Adam's ejection from Eden,) of a high moral nature, as evidenced by the life of the individual, in which we have no reason to suppose or presume such an influence from the Spirit of God; but on the contrary, every reason to disbelieve or deny such influence, then must this doctrine of spiritual influence be untrue in fact. The advocates of this doctrine can not claim that men who disbelieve revelation; who repudiate the fundamental fact and essential doctrines of christianity—such as the atonement—; they can not claim that such men are the subjects of the Spirit's influence. If so, the Spirit was unable to make them believers in Christ, which is his great and primary work. The Spirit was unable to awake them from the death of sin. Such a conclusion would upset the whole doctrine, and prove it vain and foolish. There have been many men, and there are yet living many men of high moral force and character, who are disbelievers in the religion of the Bible. Whence, then, their moral power? Whence the force that raised them from the common depravity of the race? The law of transmissibility was as strong and as invariable in them as in others. How and why, then, the failure? The truth is, the doctrine has no countenance from any direction or source whatever. It is contradicted by the history of the race, by every day's experience and observation, and by the plainest suggestions of common sense.

But further: In the absence of scriptural authority we are left to our own reason to determine the truthfulness or falsity of the doctrine. If the doctrine of implanted depravity were true, we might admit the truth of the doctrine of spiritual influence, which was invented to meet its requirements. But on the assumption that the doctrine of direct and energizing action is true in fact, we ought to expect that the doctrine could be established by consciousness, since this is the only other source of evidence we can

have after the scriptures fail us. Otherwise what proof can we have of the fact? What, then, says consciousness? If we could be actually conscious of such an influence from the Spirit without the intervention of means, this would prove the truth of the doctrine. But have we such proof? The advocates of the doctrine will not affirm that we have. But should we not be conscious of the spiritual impression if it is actually made on the mind? Were not inspired men conscious of the action of the Spirit on their minds? Paul seems to say as much.¹ Otherwise how could they know the source and nature of what they spoke or wrote? This they did know; and they must, therefore, have been conscious that the Spirit was acting on their minds. But this knowledge was their own, and not another's. How were others to be assured of this inspiration?

When a man declares that the Spirit of God acts directly and immediately on his mind for any purpose whatever, he can not expect credence to be given to his statement until he has furnished the necessary proof. All direct action is of the nature of inspiration, and is to be so classed, and the same proof, as to the fact, should be required as in the case of inspiration itself. When one claims that he is the subject of a direct action of the Spirit of God, he should be required to prove it by the only competent testimony—miracles. So did the men who "spoke as they were moved by the Holy Spirit." In the absence of such proof, the claim is pure assumption, and entitled to no consideration whatever.

This theory in regard to the influence which the sin of Adam has had on the moral nature of the race, and of the consequent incapacity of the mind of men to take cognizance of spiritual subjects, and to exercise a "saving faith," is based on an entire misconception of the nature of man, and of the effects which sin has had upon him, and especially of the effects which it produced in the person of Adam. The *terminus* of the effect of Adam's sin was his spirit. There were no effects extending to his body except consequentially. His body was as hale and sound just after as before he sinned. His "fall" was simply a loss of favor, and banishment from the presence of God. There was no depravity of mind or of body that can be proved or established by any fact or process of reasoning. Hence, there were none transmissible, and none transmitted, unless the *malum was entirely absorbed by Cain*, the first born; for the theory failed in the case of Abel, as has been already remarked in a former chapter.

The sin of Adam did not place the *race* in a state of disfavor with God. It did not bring on the soul of every individual spiritual death. This state or condition is not possible except on the occurrence of actual, personal sin. Masses are not thrown into this by the act of one. They fall into it as individuals by personal sins. "*The soul that sins shall die.*" Only such are found

¹ 1 Cor. 7: 6, 12, 25, 40; 14: 30-32.

“dead in trespasses and in sins.” Children do not fall into a state of disfavor before God, until they sin after maturity. Dying before this, they ascend to heaven without the stain of sin. They have no sin, either “original” or personal. The taint of “original sin” is a figment of the imagination. Being without personal sin, who can affirm that the sin of others has marred their innocency, or impaired their moral powers?

The scriptures regard men as capable of choosing between good and evil; as themselves determining whether they will serve God or idols.¹ No where do they represent men as urging the plea of inability, or of even intimating that their moral nature was injured by the sin of their progenitor. The Lord located the difficulty, whatever that may be, in the *will* of men. “You *will* not come to me that you may have life.” There was no thought in his mind of a want of moral power to come to him; but rather an utter indifference, and a deep and settled, but unreasonable prejudice in their hearts against him.

But this state of the heart is claimed by the advocates of the doctrine of depravity, as the result and proof of the influence of Adam’s sin on the moral nature of man. No one will deny that there is a fearful indifference on the part of men in general to their eternal interests. The fact is evident and incontrovertible. The only question is, What produces or produced this indifference? These theorists say, hereditary transmission; that it was made a part of man’s nature, and became as transmissible as any other quality, feature, or peculiarity of his being. A conclusion can not prove the truth of the premises assumed, unless there be no other conceivable premise. This is not the necessity in this case. The indifference of men to the interests of their higher nature can be accounted for on other grounds; on premises more reasonable, and more easily established by observation and experience, and the known influences which environ the race in its present state or condition. The chief reason would seem to be that the mind is too much absorbed by the present; that present interests crowd all others from the mind, and distract its attention from things that lie beyond the moment. The present, because of man’s nature, has more influence over the mind and life than the future, and will maintain its influence until the spiritual assert its mastery over the animal. There are antagonistic elements in man’s being. He is of the earth, earthy, and of the heavens, heavenly, and as either nature dominates, so do the interests of its world, and man is controlled accordingly. The scriptures give a general reason or cause for this indifference by ascribing it to the “god of this world, who has blinded the minds of them who believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them.”² But the god of this world uses means with which to blind the minds of men, and these are classified as “the lust of the flesh, the lust

¹ Josh. 24: 15. ² 2 Cor. 4: 4.

of the eyes, and the pride of life." These absorbing the attention and interest, the mind has no time nor inclination for divine things.

It creates no surprise if a man is not arrested and diverted from his business by the report that a child had just been drowned in the stream which runs near by. An exclamation of surprise and regret escapes his lips, and he hurries on. Presently one comes hastily and tells him the child was his! Immediately all is changed. He rushes out frantically. His heart is overwhelmed by distress. Nothing now can arrest or divert his attention. All is forgotten but his child. His mind and heart are all absorbed in the effort to save it. He rushes frantically and heedlessly into the stream with the hope that his hand may light upon it, and he rests not until he sees it again alive or dead.

What has wrought the wonderful change? Nothing but the fact that the child was his. So with the sinner. Convince him that *he* is lost,—worse than drowned,—and as he loves life, will he be in earnest. We have but to awake men to a sense of danger to see them lay aside their indifference, and embrace the fleeting moment to lay hold on the hope of eternal life. The common events of life will do this. Let men but feel that death is nigh, and they will show how they value their souls. No entreaty will then be required. There will be no question then as to their power to believe and obey the truth. The prospect of death has aroused the soul, and not any special work of the Spirit of God. They believe the gospel and feel remorse on account of their sins with the same mental powers with which they believe their physician, and tremble at the nearness of death.

Motives and considerations are the powers or forces with which the Spirit of God arouses the soul, and excites it to action. In no other way does he attempt to convert men. Such were his means and such his method in every instance of conversion recorded in the christian scriptures. If it be supposed that these means are inadequate, and the motives presented impotent, to produce conversion, without his invigorating the soul previous to, or at the time of, presenting the motives, then does this direct work of the Spirit seem a very strange procedure. Such a work of the Spirit being of the *nature of inspiration*, can not be considered as belonging to the category of motives. Inspiration possesses no converting power. No man was ever converted by being inspired. It is not a converting agency or means. Nor are man's moral powers strengthened by inspiration. Balaam who "loved the wages of unrighteousness," was an inspired man—a prophet of God. His inspiration did not drive covetousness from his heart. It does not seem to have strengthened and energized *his* moral powers. How, then, can it be expected that a direct operation of the Holy Spirit on the sinner's heart can do anything for his conversion?

There is nothing within all the range of human knowledge

more positively certain than that men can, of their own inherent and unassisted powers of mind, understand, believe, and obey the gospel of Jesus Christ. On this fact is grounded man's responsibility, and the righteousness of a final judgment. The gospel is presented to men for their acceptance or rejection, and they are responsible for the action they take with reference thereto. The scriptures are as clear and positive on this as on the resurrection of the dead. If men are morally or mentally incapable of understanding, believing, and obeying the gospel, until the Holy Spirit impresses on their mind and heart the power to do these things, then is it clear that men can not be held to a higher responsibility than that of a secondary character, the Spirit himself being held for the first.

But these acts of the soul are within the range of its inherent and natural powers. It was so under the previous dispensations of God's government over men. So spoke the prophets: "Son of man, I send thee to the children of Israel, to a rebellious nation, * * * and they, whether *they will hear*, or whether *they will forbear*, * * yet shall know that there has been a prophet among them."¹

The Lord said to the Jews: "The words which I speak to you they are spirit and they are life," and, "They shall judge you in the last day." Of what value is it that the words of Christ have a life-imparting and a life-producing power, if the soil in which they are to be sown is a sterile waste? And on what principles of righteousness can those words judge men in the last day, if the human soul be incapable of receiving them? But the arguments which might be arrayed against this irrational doctrine, so fatal in its consequences, are almost without number. Turn whatever way we will, they crowd our footsteps from every direction; from the sacred scriptures; the nature of man's mental and moral being; the history of the race; and daily observation and experience. Turn we now more directly to the subject of faith.

Faith is a power. Whatever else it may be, it is certainly a mighty force. It is greater than all other powers of the soul except love. Reason falters, staggers, and falls in its presence; questions, hesitates, and doubts. Faith places its eyes on its object, and moves forward, never hesitating, never doubting, and never faltering. No trial is too great, no questions too perplexing, no difficulties too embarrassing, and no impossibilities too mighty or staggering. It believes all things, and hopes all things. When God is its object it believes all things possible, because God is omnipotent; that nothing of his promises will fail, because God is faithful; and that nothing of its hopes will perish, because God ever lives. Thus Enoch and Abraham, Moses and Daniel, walked with God, and trusted in the faithfulness of his promises. Faith walks firmly and steadily, with its

¹ Ezek. 2: 4; 3: 11.

eyes fixed on the invisible. It despairs not when seeming contradictions cross and impede its way, nor faints when the view is darkened by the clouds that crowd its path. The splendid examples which the apostle has gathered up from the history of his people, exhibit the power of faith over the lives and fortunes of men in a striking degree, and show what men have done and can do under its inspiration. Without such examples, the world could never have known the power and capacity of faith as the ground-work of a character immortal and imperishable; as the force and agency of a life that is built upon the invisible; and as the inspiration of deeds that have no parallel in history.

Reason is a child in the presence of this giant. However great and mighty its deeds may be; however wonderful and startling its accomplishments, or great its achievements, Reason can not boast of the stake, of the torture, and of the dens of wild beasts as its trophies. Cold and calculating, it has never boldly and cheerfully faced the faggot and the flame in vindication and support of its convictions. It never feels the glow, and the passion, and the onward sweep of faith as it rushes forward to vindicate its beliefs, and attest its unwavering and undying trust. Reason builds no character that can not be shattered by misfortunes, or broken by disgrace. It has no hopes that will not vanish before doubts, nor courage that can endure the test of ridicule. It has no eyes for the invisible, nor feet for the impalpable. It can not walk upon the unstable water, nor face the tempest as it frowns. It has no anchor fastened in the Unseen, nor cords binding it to the Ultimate and Beyond. It has no strength under trials, nor consolation and hope in death. It lives and moves and exults in its own powers; it has no almighty arm on which to lean. As a guide, it is blind; as an inspiration, it is weakness itself. It goes forward, and recedes; it doubts, and hesitates; wavers, and declines until lost in the maze and labyrinths of uncertainty. As to what is Yonder, it knows nothing, and can determine nothing. Its horizon is narrow; its acquisitions few. Poor, feeble, blind, it can not tell man what man most desires to know; can give him no strength in his weakness; nor guide him where he can not see. But by faith, we know that the world was made by the word of the Lord; by it we know that God is, and is a rewarder of all who earnestly and diligently seek him; by it we know the way and means of salvation; by it know our destiny—what we are, whence we are, and whither we are going—borne rapidly on the wings of time.

The objects of faith are God and Christ; God, as the creator, bountiful benefactor, and redeemer of men, *to whom* all devotion is rendered, and all worship offered; and Christ, as the mediator and intercessor, *through whom* God redeems, and is worshiped, and as the avenue through whom all blessings from the Fountain of unending fulness flow. Faith, therefore, has *persons* for its object. It is only persons that can save; only they that can re-

deem. Hence, faith is trust or confidence in a person who is able to do for us what we need and desire. We *believe* in him as such; but faith takes hold of him as such, and appropriates the person to his own wants and needs. The action of faith, therefore, is *upon* its object, and not *in* it. Hence Christ says: "He who believes *on* me (εἰς ἐμὲ), has everlasting life;" and, "Every one who believeth *on* him (εἰς αὐτὸν), may have everlasting life;" and, "He who believes *on* him (εἰς αὐτὸν), is not condemned." The act of believing on Jesus is expressed in the christian scriptures by the accusative of the object governed by a preposition, and in the instances cited above, and many others, by the preposition *eis*. This is a singular construction of language, and seems intended to show that the believer and the person believed on, sustain to each other a peculiar relation, wherein all that is in the person believed on, may flow to the believer through his connection with him. When no such relation is intended, but only Christ's *words* are to be believed, the construction is the dative after the verb, believes. And so in regard to God, Moses, and the prophets.¹ But when a statement is to be credited as true, sometimes the thing believed to be true, is placed in the accusative, without a preposition, the case in such instances being determined by the action of the verb terminating on the object.² This difference in the construction of the language employed would seem to point out a distinction between the use of the word translated believe, when applied to persons and when applied to things. Thus we may say that we *believe things*—that is, that they are as represented, or the reverse, or different,—but that we have *faith in persons*. We believe the things said of a person before we have faith in him. We believe, for instance, in the physician called to treat us when ill, and why do we believe in him; that is, confide our case to him, and place ourselves in his hands? Simply, because we believe that he is honest and skillful. So with regard to the Great Physician. We believe the truthfulness of the testimony concerning him, and believing this, we put our trust or faith in him.³ Hence, we may discriminate, and say, that the act of believing is purely a *mental* operation; but that the act of faith is an act of the *soul*. "With the heart"—that is the soul—"man believeth unto righteousness;" with the mind many of the Jews, such as Nicodemus, believed the things, and saw the force of their testimony, but they did not receive him as the apostle of God.

This distinction between faith and belief is made still more manifest by another view or phase of the subject as presented in the scriptures.

Faith is not only a condition of pardon, but the ground of justification. It has, therefore, an aspect as it respects man, and an aspect as it respects God, as we have already remarked else-

¹ Luke 1: 20; John 10: 38; Acts 26: 27. ² John 11: 26.

³ John 20: 30, 31.

where. Its nature does not essentially differ under these views; but is presented in a light which intimately connects it with remission. This, as we have also seen, is not an arbitrary act of the governor of the universe, but one grounded on justifiable reasons. Under this light faith is seen to be a certain condition or active state of the soul, which approaches, in value, man's perfect obedience to all that is enjoined by law, and by which the righteousness of the law is realized by one who is a transgressor of law. Now, this state of the soul differs much from the purely mental act of *believing the truth*. Such an act, being expressed by the dative of the object, and not by the accusative with a preposition, is rather the *means* by which the soul attains to the act or condition of faith. Thus, when the mind fully believes all that is said in attestation of the claims of Jesus, then the soul embraces him by faith, if the believer realizes the importance that Christ is to his eternal happiness. Now, it is for the latter act that the theory of immediacy claims a direct influence of the Holy Spirit, in order to make him realize what Christ is to him, and to excite in his heart an interest in his soul's salvation. We so understand the teaching of the religious world on this subject. But this is the grand and primary assumption of the doctrine of Immediacy; for the scriptures ascribe this faith to the belief of testimony; in proof of which we cite the following passage: "And Jesus says to her, Your brother shall rise again. Martha says to him, I know that he shall rise again in the resurrection at the last day. Jesus said to her, I am the resurrection and the life: he who *believes on me* (εἰς ἐμὲ), though he were dead, yet shall he live. And whosoever liveth and believeth on me (εἰς ἐμὲ), shall never die: *believest thou this?* (πιστεύεις τοῦτο). She said to him, Yea, Lord, I believe that thou art the Christ the son of God."¹ Martha believed what Jesus said of himself; this convinced her that he was the Christ, and she received him as such. In receiving Jesus as the Christ, she believed *on him* (εἰς αὐτὸν). The former we designate as belief, because it was the means of faith, and the latter, faith, because it expresses the repose of the soul on him.

This view is further corroborated by what the scriptures say of faith. The apostle Paul states faith to be this: "Now faith is the ground of things hoped for, the conviction of things not seen,"—the ground of our hope, and the confidence that the things which we see not, yet do really exist. It sees things that are invisible, and is fully persuaded of their existence. It is the ground of hope, because it believes on him who made the promises. It is fully persuaded of all things which God has done or spoken, because it trusts in him. By it men walk as seeing him who is invisible, and confidently hope for that which is promised. It is the eye of the soul, and the confidence of the heart.

Men may believe all the facts, and truths, and statements in

¹ John 11: 25, 26.

the Bible, and yet be lost, because there is no salvation in them. They may afford us light and knowledge, comfort and consolation, support and strength; but there is no salvation from sin through these, except as a means to an end. Salvation is in, and through, a person—Christ; not even through or by the *truth* he uttered. We may believe that yonder bridge which spans that broad stream, possesses all the qualities necessary to a safe transit; yet if we never trust it by actual trial, our belief will never rise into faith. The truth as it is in Jesus can and will avail the soul nothing until incorporated in faith. He is the rock on which the church is built; he “the chief corner stone;” and we as living stones are built on this foundation. The truth is not, and can not be, the foundation; not even the truth that he is the Christ; but he himself, the personal Messiah, the tried rock, the precious stone, who is to be the judge of the living and the dead.

Faith comes by hearing and believing the testimony of apostles and prophets, and in no other way. The Holy Spirit produces conviction in no other way, or by any other means; produces faith in no other way, nor by any other means. No instance can be found to disprove this statement. Men may be led to, or brought to, this testimony by many and various providential ways and means; but these providences never convert, never produce faith; only “the testimony of the Lord” can do this. In respect to these operations of the mind, religious truth does not differ from any other truth. The mind believes religious facts and truths as it believes all other kinds, and with no more need of foreign aid, such as the direct agency of the Holy Spirit. All that the mind requires is the proper kind of testimony. Give it that, and it believes with the same facility with which it believes other facts and truths. “We know that thou art a teacher sent from God; for no man can do the things which thou doest, except God be with him.” So spoke a timid Jew, who never became a christian. So he reasoned, and so he believed; and so may all men, if they will but exercise the ordinary powers of their minds, and obey the honest convictions of their hearts.

II. REPENTANCE:¹ *Metanoia*.

This act of the soul was partially considered when the mission of John was under consideration. It was then regarded as a turning of the soul to God; literally, a *reversion of mind, purpose, and desire*; a turning away from one state of mind, purpose, and desire, to another. The act is limited to the soul. Another word is used in the Greek when another kind of turning is indicated, as in Acts 3: 19. The Harbinger came preaching

¹ We use this English word because of its general currency and use in this connection. It does not strictly represent the original; but having no other word, we use it with an appropriated meaning, and as defined by the words, “turning with the whole soul to God.”

a return of the soul to God, as the necessary preparation for the reception of the Messiah, and as a necessary precedent to the remission of sin in the baptism which he administered, and he used this word to express the idea. The purpose of John was to "turn the children of Israel to the Lord their God," and to effect this turning, he preached this repentance, and baptism, and connected with them, as a blessing, the remission of sins. Now, as remission of sins follows this act of obedience—this state of the soul; and as remission is not an arbitrary act on the part of God; but one which must be justified by the grounds on which it is granted, we should find in repentance all that justice and holiness can require in order to allow it to become a condition of pardon.

The repentance required as a condition of pardon under the dispensation of the gospel, is the same essentially as that required by John; for Peter, on the day of Pentecost, when announcing for the first time the conditions on which men can be saved, used the same word that was used by John. As this act of the soul embraces all that it is capable of doing in obedience to the command, repent, this act must exhaust the meaning of the word used to express the command. Hence, in the "turning of the soul to God," we have an exhaustive definition of the word translated repentance. The soul can do no more than give itself to God, and this is all that God requires. This was the preparation of heart and mind that God desired and required as necessary to the reception of his Son, the Messiah; for without such a preparation—without such a submission of heart and mind to the will of God, on the part of the people, the rejection of Christ was assured. So Christ himself seemed to think and say, when he said to the Jews, as they murmured at his teaching: "No man can come to me, unless the Father, who hath sent me, draw him. * * * Every one, therefore, who hath heard, and learned of the Father, cometh to me." This turning of the soul again to God, was required that the people might be in that condition of mind and heart, which would dispose them to learn from, and be taught by, the Son. This was the preparation intended and in view when John was sent to preach repentance.

The definition which we have here given to repentance determines another question of importance, viz: Toward whom is repentance exercised? With which person of the Trinity, Father, Son, or Holy Spirit, is repentance related? As it is defined to be the soul's return to God, he must be the person toward whom it is exercised, and with whom it stands related in the Remedial System. This was clearly and evidently the case under the mission of John, as is unquestionably implied in the following statement made by the angel to Zachariah: "And many of the children of Israel shall he turn to the Lord their God." Jesus was not known in the repentance preached by John. It could not, therefore, have sustained any relation to him

then. It was not even preached in his name. God was the object of their faith and repentance, and the authority for their baptism. Jesus was only in expectation, It is, therefore, unquestionably certain that repentance was exercised towards God, and related to him under the mission of John.

We may now inquire, whether this relation between God and repentance was changed, modified or disturbed by the coronation of Christ, and his consequent investiture with universal authority and dominion? If not, then the relation continues the same under the reign of Christ, and if so, it should appear in the scriptures which record events and transactions subsequent to the coronation of Christ and the inauguration of his kingdom, or in the relations which Christ then assumed to the Remedial System, as its mediator, intercessor, and expiator. Was, then, the relation of repentance, as to its object, changed, modified, or disturbed by the coronation of Christ? As ample and sufficient proof that it was not, we may cite the following passage: "Testifying to both Jews and Greeks *repentance towards God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ.*"¹

As repentance is related to God, its relation to *faith in God* is that of consequent to antecedent. It necessarily follows faith in God. This is self-evident, if repentance is related to God. But it *may precede faith in another person of the Godhead*. It did precede faith in the Messiah under the mission of John, and may under the reign of the gospel, and actually did in several recorded cases of conversion to Christ. But the generally received view is that repentance is connected with Christ, and follows faith in him. The believers in a mystical or supernatural origin or cause of *faith in Christ* (though it would seem unnecessary to *faith in God*), regard faith in Christ as consequent upon repentance; but their views upon the subject are so confused and unsystematized, that it is not strange that they should confuse the relations of repentance in the system of pardon. Neither of these views is correct, because they assume a *genetic* connection between faith in Christ and repentance. It should be observed that these acts of the soul, are acts of obedience. Faith in Christ and repentance toward God are requirements of God as necessary precedents to remission; but there is no genetic or causal connection between them. Faith follows conviction of sin, and so does regret, or sorrow, or anguish, on account of sin. Between these there is a genetic connection. This regret, or sorrow, or anguish, on account of sin, is not the repentance of the scriptures; but these, with faith, are made the ground of the command, repent. If the relation which exists between cause and effect, existed between these states of the heart and repentance, then would repentance follow necessarily and universally these states. But such is not the fact. Men may repent in this sense; their consciences may be lacerated and tormented by remorse and anguish

¹This statement (Acts 20: 21) is expressed with more force in the Greek.

without leading them to the repentance which turns the soul to God. Judas Iscariot felt the first kind of repentance, but not the last, and so have thousands of others. Hence, repentance is a *command*, not an *a priori* conclusion. It is what the reason approves as just, right, and proper; but not, possibly, just what it would have suggested. It is the same that may be said of baptism. When we understand the purpose and relations of baptism in the Remedial System, we may see much beauty and propriety in making such an institution an integral element of the law of pardon; but could human reason have reached it by a process of *a priori* argument? Certainly not, and simply because there is no logical or natural connection or sequence between this conclusion and the premises on which it may be regarded as resting.

But this subject is more fully illustrated by the relation which repentance sustained to the Remedial System under the Patriarchal and Jewish institutions.

Repentance, as here understood and defined, has always been regarded as an essential condition of remission of sins, from the day of Adam's transgression to the present. But it was as much a revelation and a command of God as was sacrifice. For being a condition of remission or pardon, none could have conceived it or commanded it, but the person who was offended by the transgression. During the existence of these dispensations, the elements of the law of pardon were essentially the same as at present; and we ought, consequently, to find the same relations existing between these elements themselves, and between them and God, as obtain under Christ. And such is really the case; so that what is obscure under one dispensation may be cleared up by what is more evident under another. When, therefore, we look at the relations which repentance sustained under the Patriarchal and Jewish dispensations, we discover that repentance was never spoken of as related to, or as exercised toward, the victim of sacrifice; but toward the God from whom pardon was sought by the sacrificial offering. This statement is too plain and evident to require any argument. It is, in the light of the scriptures, self-evident. As Jesus, therefore, is the victim of the Christian dispensation, repentance can have no relation to him, or be exercised toward him.

Nor can repentance be regarded as sustaining this relation to Christ, because he is *King*, and for the simple and evident reason that his regal authority is not primary and inherent, but delegated.¹ Besides, he is not the king of whose law sin is the transgression; but the mediator and intercessor with this king in behalf of the sinner. It is not he who grants pardon, but God through him. "God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself." "Repentance and remission of sins" were preached in his name; but it is *God* who grants these.² Hence, he who grants

¹ Math. 28: 18; 1 Cor. 15: 28. ² Luke 24: 47; Acts 11: 18.

repentance must be he to whom the act is directly related, and toward whom it is exercised.

That repentance under Christianity is related to God, and not to Christ, we think is further evident from Paul's discourse on Mar's Hill, in which he declares that "the times of this ignorance God winked at; but now commands all men every where to repent." Still more evident is this made by the remark of the same apostle to the Elders at Ephesus.¹ In preaching Christ to the people of that city, he proclaimed "repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ." Paul preached according to the principles proclaimed by Peter on the day of Pentecost. The same Spirit inspired both these apostles. What they uttered was the utterance of the same Spirit. Hence, as Paul preached, so did Peter; and as Peter, so did Paul.

On the day of Pentecost Peter had only Jews as his auditors. They were worshipers of God; consequently, were believers in God. They were convicted of sin in crucifying Jesus of Nazareth. This conviction changed their views and feelings toward Christ. They believed on him. Under these circumstances they desired to know what they should do; that is, do in order to be pardoned of that sin. They had all the faith that God requires in any case, and hence were informed only as to what remained to be done to insure their pardon. "Then Peter said to them: Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins." Of them only two other conditions were required: repentance toward God, and baptism by the authority of Christ. This institution is primarily related to, and connected with, Christ, and not with God, (though administered in one sense in the name of all the persons of the Divinity), because of Christ's relation to the sinner as his sin-offering. It is *by* the blood of Christ, and *in* baptism that sins are remitted; hence the connection and relation of baptism with and to Christ.

Several cases of conversion recorded in Acts of Apostles show that the views here taken of repentance are scriptural, both as to its meaning and relations. The first of these in the order of their connection is that of the Ethiopian officer of queen Candace. Philip, an inspired evangelist, converted him under a special mission. The history of this case is well known. It is recorded in the 8th chapter of Acts. This officer had been up to Jerusalem to worship God according to the ritual of the Jewish religion, and was returning home when overtaken by Philip. On taking a seat by his side in his chariot, the Evangelist "preached to him Jesus," and when the officer proposed immersion, Philip said there was nothing in the way of it if he believed on Jesus. He was then baptized on his faith in Jesus. But two things were here required of this Ethiopian officer, viz: faith in, and obedience to, Jesus as the Messiah. He was already a believer in God, and a devout worshiper of him. Hence he had the faith

¹Acts 20: 21.

and repentance required toward God, and that too before he had even heard of Jesus as the Messiah. This faith and repentance could, therefore, have had no relation to Christ whatever. In this case we have repentance toward God preceding faith in our Lord Jesus Christ.

The same may be said of Cornelius, and with more emphasis; because we know more of his character, which seems to have been as perfect before God as any one of the race has ever presented. He was "a devout man, and one that feared God with all his house; who gave much alms to the people; and prayed to God continually." What change in heart and mind could such a one need? His heart was right before God, and what more could be asked? God acknowledged his alms-giving and prayers; what was yet lacking in him? All that faith in, and repentance toward God could effect in a man's character was possessed by him; what could be yet wanting? He had not yet obeyed Christ. His sins were not yet actually pardoned. If he had died before he heard of Christ, he would have been saved beyond doubt. But he needed yet what Christ could do for him, and for this reason he was directed by a heavenly messenger to send for Peter, who would tell him "what he ought to do," and speak to him "words whereby he and all his house should be saved." Peter obeyed the heavenly vision, and preached Jesus to Cornelius and his household; and Cornelius believed and was baptized. Peter knowing the character of the man, spoke to him the words he needed for his salvation. Cornelius believed on the Lord Jesus, and was immersed in his name. The Holy Spirit testified to those present that Cornelius and his household were acceptable believers on Christ by "falling" upon them, and speaking by them. Having faith and repentance as respects God, they needed only faith in Christ and submission to his authority in baptism. In this case the repentance required by the gospel preceded faith in Christ, and shows that repentance is not related to Christ or to faith in him.

The conversion of Lydia is another instance similar to those of the Ethiopian and Cornelius. She was a devout worshiper of God, a Jewish woman, as may be supposed from the fact that she was a regular worshiper of God by prayer certainly, and possibly by the reading of the Jewish scriptures. She, hearing Paul preach, was baptized—immersed on her faith in Christ, and by his authority. Here also repentance preceded faith in Christ; for only two things were required of her—faith in Christ and submission to his authority. The faith and repentance which pertain to God she already had, being a devout worshiper of God. She needed the same that the Ethiopian and Cornelius needed, viz: the actual remission of sins; and this can be had only on submitting to the authority of Christ.

But it may be asked, Is the same true as regards the Gentiles? They are presumed not to have the knowledge of God, and con-

sequently not to have either faith or repentance. This fact could hardly change the relations of the terms or conditions of pardon. These relations can not be one thing as respects the Jews, and another as respects the Gentiles. This our common sense would teach us. But we are not left to this doubtful guide. The scriptures affirm that the terms of pardon sustain the same relations to the Gentiles as they do to the Jews. Paul preached in Ephesus continuously for about two years, during which time many of the Jews and Gentiles became obedient to the faith, "so that all who were in Asia heard the word of the Lord, both Jews and Greeks." To both Jews and Gentiles Paul declared that he had spoken to them the whole counsel of God, "testifying to both Jews and Greeks, repentance toward God, and faith toward (or upon) our Lord Jesus Christ."

In Paul's speech on Mar's Hill he seems to have sketched in general outline, his manner of presenting the gospel to the Gentiles; and it was not really different from that to the Jews. The Gentiles were ignorant of God, and worshiped creatures of their own imagination. To such he did not first preach Christ, but God, for the reason that Christ is but the agent, and God the principal, in the work of salvation. This speech of Paul is much to the point, and affords us a good illustration of the logical method of presenting the gospel of Jesus Christ to the world at large. He first lays before the Athenians the being and character of God, and the relations which he sustains to the world of mankind, as creator, preserver, and bountiful benefactor. Then he proceeds to preach to them Christ, by saying: "The times of this ignorance God winked at; but now commandeth all men everywhere to repent; because he hath appointed a day, in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained; whereof he hath given assurance to all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead." In this discourse we have faith in God, and repentance toward him required, now based on the fact that he has interposed for the salvation of the race through Jesus Christ, on whom he requires men to believe, and to whom they must become obedient. The faith and repentance which have respect to God, bring men into the relation with God, which obtained in the cases of the Ethiopian nobleman, Cornelius, and Lydia, which psychical acts were a necessary preparation for the reception of the truth concerning Jesus. Men must be brought to God first, that they may hear and believe his word, before they are prepared to believe and obey Christ.¹ It was on this word that Jesus rested in part his claims. To this word he constantly appealed, and went so far as to declare that "No man can come to me unless the Father who hath sent me, draw him;" and God draws men to Christ by his word. So the Lord himself affirmed: "It is written in the prophets: 'They shall all be taught of God.' Every man, therefore, that hath *heard*,

¹ John 5: 46, 47.

and hath *learned* of the Father, cometh to me.”¹ Such was the case with the Ethiopian, with Lydia, and with Cornelius. These were all taught of God, and hence became obedient to Christ so soon as he was presented to them.

The state of the mind and heart of these individuals shows, beyond all questioning, all that was intended, and all that can be effected, by faith in God, and repentance toward him. We have in their state of heart a living example, or definition of the repentance required by the gospel as a condition of salvation. No verbal definition can give us so clear and so accurate a view of what was, and is, intended by repentance, as these cases of conversion recorded by the Holy Spirit. There is no fault in any statement made concerning them. The characters of these persons were all that faith in God and repentance could produce. Hence, we have in them a definition of repentance by fact, which shows the correctness of the definition here suggested and adopted: a turning of the soul to God, as a suppliant for mercy, ready to become obedient to whatever may be commanded and required.

III. IMMERSION.

The immersion of the body of the believing and repentant sinner *in* the name or *upon* the authority of Jesus Christ, and “*into* the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit,” equally with faith in God and in Christ, and repentance, is an element of the organic law of the kingdom of heaven, and as such necessary to the enjoyment of the blessings of that kingdom. This bodily act is associated with the psychical acts of faith and repentance in the commission given the apostles by the Lord after his resurrection, and in the law of pardon announced by the apostle Peter on the day of Pentecost, and it was administered in every case of conversion recorded in Acts, or alluded to in the Epistles. No exception to this statement can be found in the christian scriptures. It would be a strange and contradictory fact if such could be found. The Lord himself had said, before his kingdom was inaugurated, that it was impossible for any one to enter his kingdom without first being “born of water and the Spirit,” and how could his divinely commissioned apostles have made any statement, or done any thing, contrary to this? We must, therefore, find in the organic law of the kingdom, and in the administration of that law by the apostles, the illustration of the meaning and intent of the birth of water and of the Spirit, and an application of the principles which it inculcates. In other words, the faith, repentance, and baptism of the christian institution are but the formal and more explicit statement of the meaning and intent of the “new birth.” As baptism, therefore, is an integral element of that change expressed by the words “new

¹ John 6: 45.

birth," the necessity of this ordinance is both clearly and positively affirmed by the Lord himself. It has been connected by the Lord with the psychical change called a "birth of the Spirit," and who is competent to affirm that these two can, in any case, be separated? That one may be omitted, or disregarded, or annihilated by a modification of it, and not the other? The divine law-giver alone has the prerogative of deciding what shall, or shall not, be required as necessary to pardon; and it is man's highest wisdom and piety to accept these as ordained, whatever they may be.

The ordinance of baptism has been lightly spoken of as merely an *external rite*, in contradistinction to the psychical acts or states of faith and repentance, and as ranking, therefore, subordinately to these in importance. Because christianity is a *spiritual* religion, it has been assumed that nothing is essential to the life and enjoyment of that religion, but what is *spiritual*; but what touches, or proceeds from, the spirit of man, assuming in all this that nothing can be made a spiritual blessing, which is an external ordinance, or of the nature of a rite or ceremony. Without stopping to controvert this statement as a philosophical truth, we simply affirm that it is not a fact; and if not a fact, it can not be a philosophical truth. The fact, however, that men have so regarded and treated the ordinance of immersion, has led to its modification, or rather annihilation, in the substitutes of sprinkling and pouring. To treat any ordinance of God in this manner is to charge God with folly, and to assert the superiority of the wisdom of men. To characterize this procedure as it deserves, would be regarded as uncharitable. It is to profess obedience to a divine institution while observing a substitute; to assert acquiescence, while following our own suggestions or dictations. This is not of faith. It is not of the lineage of the man who hesitated not to offer his son as a burnt-offering; of him who plead for no substitute, or modification of the command; who did not *reason* on the subject, or consider that the promises of God would thereby fail: but who accepted by faith, journeyed by faith, and obeyed by faith. Such can not be "the children of Abraham, and heirs according to the promise," since they have not his faith. When men reason about God's ordinances or commands, and replace these with the result of their own reasoning, faith has departed. To deduce from any premises, or course of reasoning, that the sprinkling of a few drops of water on the forehead will suffice for the immersion of the whole body in water, is not of faith, but wholly of human folly.

In the scriptures of the new covenant, baptism is conspicuously, and, as far as we know to the contrary, inseparably, associated with faith and repentance on the one hand, and with the remission of sins on the other; and we can as well break the connection in one case as in the other. The whole religious world asserts a connection of the psychical states or acts of faith

and repentance, with the remission of sins, and affirms their importance and necessity therefor; but few see any connection or relation between immersion and remission, except, possibly, in the case of that effete doctrine of "original sin," with which baptism has no more connection than with the worship of the Hindoos. But in the christian system baptism stands as the connecting link between the necessary psychical states and the remission of sins, serving as the embodiment or practical application of these states to the end in view. In the organic law, no distinction, or discrimination can be made for the one or against the other. What God has united or combined, man has no right to put asunder. The great blessing of remission is made dependent upon all these, and, as far as we know, not more upon one than another. Each does its own peculiar work for the sinner, and that work can not be complete and perfect, without the work of each of these separately and combined. Faith lays the ground work of action, and becomes the moving power or force; repentance is faith in motion toward God; and baptism is the *obedience of faith*, and the *end* of repentance as it respects the remission of sins. Pardon can not, therefore, take place *in* faith, or *in* repentance, but *in* baptism. Hence, remission follows on immersion, and not on either of the others. This conclusion will be found fully corroborated by the teaching of the christian scriptures.

It must be observed, and not forgotten, that no one of these, nor all of them combined, *procure remission*. This only the atonement can do. Faith, repentance, and baptism are but conditions, or means, by which the blessing is to be enjoyed, not the procuring cause of the blessing. *Each is a step toward the blood of Christ*. This removes the stain of sin, and gives the sinner life; and immersion is the stage of the soul's journey to Christ, where the "heart is sprinkled from an evil conscience," and the "body washed with pure water;" where the sinner offers the appointed sacrifice for sin; and where he is brought into contact and relation with the blood of Christ, because it is only there that he comes into relation with his death. It is by immersion, and by this only, that the sinner comes "into Christ." Faith does not place him there, neither does repentance; only immersion; for as many as "have been baptized into Christ, have *put on* Christ;"¹ we are then *in* Christ, and in the enjoyment of all that he has procured for man; for in being baptized into Christ, we are baptized into his *death*.² So being in Christ, we are new creatures, and in the possession of all the blessings that he has procured for man. Among these is the remission of sins; and therefore for a repentant believer in Christ, such as the Eunuch, Cornelius, or Lydia, the organic law provides immersion in the name of Christ, for the remission of sins.

Baptism alone is not for the remission of sins, any more than

¹ Gal. 3: 27. ² Rom. 6: 3.

faith or repentance alone; but it is *the one* of the three in which the *act* of pardon takes place. It is when baptized, and not until then, that the sinner has any *assurance* that his sins are forgiven. Remission of sins is the act of God in the heavens,¹ which act must be announced to the sinner in some way before he can know, or have the assurance that God has "blotted out his sins" from the "book of his remembrance." This announcement, we affirm, is made by baptism, and by this alone. It is God's method of declaring to the sinner that he has pardoned his sins. No feeling or impulse of the heart; no dream nor imagination can give this assurance. The assurance of so important a fact should be placed beyond all doubt and uncertainty, and this is done by the infinitely compassionate and merciful Father in the several declarations which he has made in regard to this action.² The certainty is just as evident as language, and the philosophy of the christian system, can make it. The scriptures most positively affirm that he who believes on the Lord Jesus Christ, and turns to God with his whole soul, and is baptized, shall be saved, pardoned, or justified. It is God's word that makes the fact of his pardon certain; certain on his obedience to the gospel in immersion. The *design* of immersion is to give to the obedient sinner this assurance; to *declare* to him that God has pardoned his sins in the name of Christ, and for his sake. It is, therefore, a *declarative* ordinance. It is this much, whatever else it may be. But it is more. It has a significance and importance that grow out of the nature of the work which is to be accomplished by the Christian System. It shows the nature of that work, and illustrates in a beautiful and symbolical manner the means by which the work is to be realized. That work is the salvation of the sinner from death, and his restoration to life, and the means by which this is to be effected, is the death, burial, and resurrection of Jesus Christ. On these three facts is based the hope of the race; and immersion is the symbolical representation of these facts to the world.

The grand work which the Christian System proposes to accomplish is man's salvation from sin. To understand the means, and to appreciate the method by which this work is effected, we must consider the peculiar condition of man which makes this work necessary. To do this we must repeat, to some extent, what has been already said elsewhere.

Man is in a state of death. His soul lies in spiritual death, which is separation from God, and his body is in a state of death and gradually molds to the dust whence it was taken. This leaves man in ruins; his body decomposed, and his spirit, disembodied, in a state of eternal separation from the presence and glory of God. * This is the work of sin.

To save man from this ruin, the gospel of Jesus Christ came, with its atonement and resurrection, the one to redeem the spirit,

¹ John 28: 23. ² Mark 16: 16; Acts 2: 38; 22: 16.

and the other the body. The one can not be effected without the other. If there is no atonement, there can be no resurrection of the body; and if no resurrection, an atonement is useless. Man must be saved in his entirety, if saved at all. The resurrection of the body rests on the atonement; and an atonement necessitates a resurrection of the body. The atonement gives life to the spirit, and the resurrection gives life to the body; so that by these man lives again in all the fulness of his being. There is, and can be, no life to the spirit and body without these.

As there is no life for the body but by and through a resurrection, so neither is there for the spirit. Death implies a burial, and life a resurrection. The body having died is buried, and if it live again, it is only by a resurrection. The resurrection, therefore, saves man, *as to his body*, from this consequence of sin. So in regard to his spirit. It is dead on account of sin—"dead in trespasses and in sins." Being dead, it must be buried; and if it live again, it must rise from the dead. There must be for it a resurrection as there is for the body. This resurrection we have in "the new birth," and represented by a symbol. The death of the spirit is sin, and the life of the spirit is righteousness. Its mortality is sin; its immortality righteousness. When, therefore, it is free from sin, it lives forever. Death and life are predicable of the Spirit only by figure, and so is a resurrection; but they are none the less real. The spirit undergoes a change in conversion which is analagous to that which the body undergoes in the resurrection. This change is radical, sweeping, and entire. Because of this change the spirit is said to be created anew, and to become a new creature. The Lord represents it under the figure of a birth,¹ and the apostle by a burial and resurrection.² Birth and resurrection are, in this connection, correlates. The change in the soul of man, which ends in forgiveness, is a resurrection from its death in sin, and is analogous to the change which the body undergoes when made immortal. In a word, the spirit being "dead in trespasses and in sins," must be buried and raised again before it can enjoy life again. What represents and symbolizes this change, and stamps it with its true character? What ordinance, as a symbol, represents this burial and resurrection of the spirit?

Immersion is a symbolical representation of the facts of the gospel.³ Though it is the body that is immersed, yet the ordinance does nothing for the body. It has no reference to its wants in a state of sin. It has no meaning or significance as respects the body. Strange as it may appear, it has reference wholly to the change which the spirit of man undergoes in its conversion—in its transit from death into life, and from sin to righteousness. It says to the world that the man immersed has died in his mind and heart to the world; that he is buried out of its sight; and raised into a new life—into a new world,

¹ John 3: 5. ² Col. 2: 13. ³ 1 Cor. 15: 1-3.

“wherein dwelleth righteousness.”¹ Hence, Christ connects immersion with this change of the Spirit, and calls the great change which is completed in baptism, a birth of water and of the Spirit. By it the sinner is “born again;” by it raised from the dead. In it the “old man” is put off, and the new man put on. In it the “old man” is crucified and raised to life again, and is then a new creature.² The soul’s mortality, sin, has carried it to the grave, and there leaving its corruption, sin, it rises to life again—a life of freedom from sin, of righteousness, and purity. All its sins, like the body’s mortality, were left in the grave. When it arose, it arose free from all sin: “And you being dead in your sins, * * * he has made alive together with him, having forgiven you all trespasses;” “For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall also be [raised] in the likeness of his resurrection.” When men become alive from the death of sin, they lose their sins in the process of becoming alive, just as the body loses its mortality in its resurrection. The grave in which the soul is symbolically buried, is immersion; for only by that ordinance can the sinner be *planted in the likeness of Christ’s death*; that is the likeness of his burial; and only by it can he be raised in the likeness of Christ’s resurrection. “We are buried with him by baptism into death,” and from this death raised by baptism into a new life. What, therefore, the grave is to the body, immersion is to the spirit. Both die, both are buried, and both are raised from the grave in which they were buried. This is unquestionably the teaching of the scriptures as to the design and import of baptism, and as to its position or relation in the christian scheme.

But further: The scriptures speak of a relation which the saved or pardoned sustain to Christ. Christ alludes to this relation when speaking of himself as the vine and his disciples as the branches. The vine and the branch are essentially one. The union is vital. and hence necessary. The branch is *on* the vine, or *in* it, just as as we may view its vital connection. Christians are addressed as being *in* God, and *in* Christ, and, because of this divine relation, as *new* creatures. Out of God and out of Christ, men are lost; “without God and without hope in the world.” Separated from Christ they have no life. There is no truth in the scriptures more clearly or plainly revealed than this.

Now, as it is sin that separates men from God, and as the sinner is not *in* Christ, it must be evident and indisputable that, when they are *in* Christ, they must be free from sin; for if any man be *in* Christ Jesus he is a “new creature.” He has no sin then. He has been freed from sin. We find, then, that a man *out* of Christ is a sinner, and when *in* him he is a new creature, and free from sin. *When*, then, does he get clear of his sins, and become a new creature?

The christian scriptures are clear and explicit in their answer

¹ Rom. 6: 1-8. ² Col. 2: 11-14.

to these questions, as they should be in a matter where so much is involved. Men should know when they pass from death into life. This transition is a matter of testimony, and not of consciousness. This testimony is divine, and hence certain and unquestionable. The apostle John says: "We know we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren;" but this love of the brethren is the evidence that we *have* passed from death to life; not that which occasioned the change; not the passage *in transitu*. This passage, as we have seen, is a figurative burial and resurrection, but a real act of which the body is the subject, viz: immersion. So the christian scriptures state. "If any man be *in Christ*, he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new;"¹ and the sinner attains to this relation—*in Christ*—by baptism: "For as many as have been baptized *into Christ*, have put on Christ." All such are "one in Christ Jesus."² The last act *in transitu* is immersion. Faith, as we have said, does not place the sinner in Christ; neither does repentance; only baptism, as the single and specific act of transition; as the burial and resurrection by which men die to sin, and become alive to righteousness; by which they are "freed from sin, and become the servants of righteousness."

This view of immersion reveals the beauty of its relations in the Remedial System, and discovers a solid reason why such an institution was made an integral and important element of that system. It shows that the Remedial System would be incomplete and unsystematic without it. No institution or ordinance more appropriate or suggestive could have been conceived by which to represent to the world the great facts of the gospel, those on which the whole scheme of redemption rests; nothing more beautiful and impressive by which to show that the believer in Jesus Christ has done what his faith implied and demanded—died to the world, and risen in a new one; that he has passed the Red Sea,³ and rejoices on the banks of deliverance; and that he is now dead to sin, but alive to Christ forever more. Behind him lie the slavery of sin and the bondage of death; before him "glory, honor, immortality," and eternal life. The voice of the Son of God has been heard in the silent and hidden chambers of his soul, and he now rejoices in the light of love and peace. Hope has lit its flame in his heart, and anchored his soul to the world beyond. "Over the river" he sees the bright light of immortality. Beyond the cold, dark, surging sea of death he hears the songs of the redeemed, and his heart reaches out its aspirations and hopes. The glorious garments of the redeemed, whitened in that crimson stream which flowed from Immanuel's side, charm and attract his soul. The thorns that lie under his feet, and crowd his way, are forgotten, and he moves onward with his eyes fixed on his Redeemer. "Old things have passed.

¹ 2 Cor. 5: 17. ² Gal. 3: 27, 28. ³ 1 Cor. 10: 1, 2.

and all things have become new." He buried the past in the grave, and henceforth he lives to him who redeemed him. All this says the act by which he died to sin, and became alive to righteousness; all this says his baptism which transferred him "from the kingdom of darkness into the kingdom of God's dear Son;" all this says that symbolic grave in which he was buried as a sinner, and from which he was raised as a saint.

It does not lie along the line of our argument, or within the field of our object and purpose, to discuss the "form of baptism." The scriptures know nothing of such a question. There was in the days of inspiration but "*one* baptism," whether as respects "form," or repetition. There was then "one Lord, one faith, and one baptism," the obedience of faith in him. We have regarded baptism as meaning immersion, and this only; and the view presented in these pages, as to its design and import, shows that it can not be anything else.

CHAPTER IV.

THE BLESSINGS OF THE KINGDOM.

SECTION I.

THE REMISSION OF SINS.

The blessings to the individual, which are consequent upon the obedience of faith, may be embraced under two categories: The remission of sins, and the Gift of the Holy Spirit. These were the blessings named and promised by the apostle Peter to the penitent three thousand on the day of Pentecost. And these two are all that he mentions. While, therefore, there are others, they must be regarded as included under one or the other of these two categories.

The first in the order of time is the remission of sins. This effected, man comes again into his Eden relation with God, and stands before him as though he had never sinned; but much stronger on account of his experience with sin, and more appreciative of his union and communion with God. Though God does not come to him in person, as he did to Adam, yet man is not without the personal presence of the Divinity, when he becomes a christian. His christian relation would be imperfect and inadequate to his wants, were he not restored to his primitive relation. This is his normal relation, and it is the purpose and design of Christianity to restore him to it. It is realized by the personal presence of the Holy Spirit in the church, and his consequent personal relation with each individual disciple. But essentially necessary and preliminary to this relation of union and communion is remission.

When sin, as to all its consequences, is fully realized by the convicted soul, there is no blessing so earnestly desired, or so highly appreciated, as its remission. A quiet and guiltless conscience is essential to the soul's peace and happiness. But when it is lashed and torn by the conviction of sin, there is no

misery and unrest comparable to it. The loss of the favor and smiles of God is then felt to be a greater calamity than the loss of being, and still would be even if the love of life were ten-fold stronger than it is. On this love of life and happiness rests the hope of man's salvation from sin.

But such has been the benumbing effect of sin, and the diverting influence of the pleasures of this life, and the pressing and readily enjoyable interests of the present world, that but few of mankind attain the necessary realization of the actual nature, turpitude, and consequences of sin. When crowded and pressed by the high considerations flowing from man's nature and destiny, and still clinging with the fervor of unrelaxing love to the pleasures and interests of this life, many attempt to seek relief in the infinite mercy of God, whose love and compassion are too great, they think, to permit him to mete out to man the punishment and destiny threatened in the gospel.

There is another class whose experience with sin has been so slight; who have been reared under influences so favorable; and whose life, consequently, has been so wholly free from startling or shocking sins, that they fail to realize the true nature of sin. Such persons feel a corresponding indifference to the claims which the gospel makes on them on account of sin. This class can learn an important and salutary lesson from the example of Christ, who, though wholly without sin—"holy, harmless, and undefiled"—yet obeyed God in submitting to the baptism of John. Would he not have sinned if he had not done so? And will not the best and purest of the race sin if they do not publicly acknowledge the Lord Jesus Christ? There can be no doubt of this; and those who do thus sin, however upright and pure their lives may have been, will realize the sin when they come to face the realities of the world to come. Then the smallest sins will assume a hideous proportion, and darken the closing hour of life.

But if we would appreciate the fulness and richness of the blessing of remission, we have but to imagine our feelings, our unrest and misery, on the commission of some crime which awakes the conscience and confronts the soul with the doom of the eternally lost. If, in a moment of passion, we take the life of our neighbor, and see in his lifeless form the work of our own hands, then sin comes with all its turpitude and terror, and lashes the soul with a tempest of inexpressible misery. What would we not then give to undo the work of our rashness? With what untold wealth, if we had it, would we not purchase that life again, and place the victim of our sudden madness where he was but a while before? Can we imagine the feelings of Cain as he looked on his dead brother? The world, all love and brightness before, was then all darkness, and dread, and terror. The outlook on all sides was gloomy and dreadful. Within were spectres of darkness, the fiery and gleaming eyes of serpents, the dread image of a murdered brother; regrets and remorse; writh-

ings and moanings; the happy scenes of childhood and boyhood now hung with the pall of death! What would be his joy if that brother were to rise to life again! How ardently then would he love him, and tenderly embrace him! How quickly would all sorrow vanish; how quickly joy fill his soul! This is the joy of remission, the ecstatic felicity of regained favor. That the human heart might feel and enjoy this happiness the Son of God came and died.

But the consequences of remission are not limited to the joys of the present. They are eternal. They go with us to the grave, and make that dreadful passage light and joyful. It not only lifts an immense burden from the heart in this life, but it saves the soul from the consequences of sin in the world to come. The consequences of sin in this life, dreadful as they are, bear no comparison to those that shall overwhelm the soul in eternal perdition. It is these that awaken the conscience, and evoke the cry of anguish and despair. It was in view of these that Jesus died, and to save from these that he came. Their greatness and terror are to be measured and estimated by the price paid for man's redemption. Man can not see or realize what these are while in this life; but he may estimate them by the price that was paid to save him from them.

SECTION II.

THE GIFT OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

Man, like the angels of heaven, was made for the society of God. His highest happiness was made dependent on his personal communion with God. Such was man's happiness in Eden, where he was placed at the time of creation. This was Adam's heaven. But sin entered this sacred abode, and man went out. Eden was lost to Adam and his posterity by transgression, and man passed out into a world of darkness, where God was no more to be seen, and his voice no more to be heard. The world beyond was all darkness, and silence, and dreariness, and gloom.

But man was not left without hope. He did not go out like the sinning angels, with all hope of return cut off. He left with the mercy of God about him, and with the promise, faintly foreshadowed, that he might in the end return to all the enjoyments

and blessings which he had lost by transgression. His hope lay in what God would finally accomplish for him through that system of mercy initiated by the sacrifice which saved his life on the day of his transgression.

This system, beginning with the sacrifice which saved Adam from death, ended with that which it prefigured and adumbrated. During the four thousand years in which God was developing and perfecting this system, though invisible and inaudible, he was yet ever near to man, watching over him for his good, sometimes specially directing him, and sometimes signally punishing him for his crimes. Of this superintendence he gave evidence in various ways, so that during the centuries of the patriarchal and Jewish ages, man was always assured of the presence and supervision of God. Under the former dispensation he met man at the altar of sacrifice, where he answered his petitions, and communed with him. Under the Jewish dispensation, there were more visible, sensible, and demonstrative evidences of his presence. God then came nearer to man. He talked with Moses face to face, and to the people of Israel from the cloud that continually hung over the door of the tabernacle. He dwelt among that people, and moved in their midst by the symbols of his presence. The pillar of cloud by day, and the pillar of fire by night, which hung over their camps when they were resting, and went with them when they journeyed, were marked and striking evidences of God's presence with them. He set his tabernacle among them, dwelt among them, and walked in their midst, and was their God in a peculiar sense, and they were his "people above all others on the face of the earth." To this people he revealed himself more fully than he had been revealed before, and they realized by the many and wonderful displays of his power in their behalf, that God was indeed their friend, dwelling among them for their good.

The reason for this must not be overlooked. The reason that God separated from man was that man had sinned. God can not dwell with or among sinners. Man would consequently have shared the fate of the sinning angels, had God not provided a means by which his sin could be remitted. This was done, as we have seen, by sacrifice on the day that he sinned, and this would have preserved him in Eden, had the sacrifice been fully competent to blot out his sin. As it was not, he was obliged to leave Eden with the judgment suspended, or stayed, for the time being. Could Christ have died on the day of man's transgression, he would not have left Eden. The object of sacrifice is the pardon of sin; and when men enjoy this, God returns to them again. When he had saved the people of Israel, and made them a holy nation, he was prepared to dwell among them. Hence he said to them: "If you will walk in my statutes, and keep my commandments, and do them, and hearken diligently to the voice of the Lord your God, to do all his commandments, I will walk

among you and dwell among you," and bless you. It was because they had passed from the relation of the patriarchal age, into one of greater nearness with God, and were in a peculiar sense the children of God, and admitted into a closer communion with him. This relation of children was the consequence of their redemption from Egypt. He had bought them with the first-born of Egypt, and they were, therefore, his people by purchase. In that relation they were on their return to the fuller relation of Eden; and in proportion as the barrier to their reunion with him was removed, in that proportion did God draw near to them.

The Remedial System is the measure which removes the barrier of sin. For twenty-five hundred years it existed only in its most elementary state, when sacrifice, the altar, and the family priest were the prominent features. During that time God was still afar off, and no light came from heaven except by an occasional prophet, and through sacrifice. But under Judaism a more special and peculiar relation was established, when God made his appearance by symbols to men and among men. Then he built himself a tabernacle in which he might dwell, in which he met their high priests, and before which he could speak to the people. But he was with that people only by the symbols of his presence, and in the person of his Angel, by whom they were led through the wilderness,¹ and afterward by prophets, as their special instructors. Under this light and relation did the Jews continue until the coming of Shiloh, the Messiah, the Prince, when a new scene opened, not only upon the Jews, but upon the whole world.

Jesus of Nazareth was God manifested in the flesh: "And the *Logos* became flesh, and dwelt among us, and we beheld his glory, the glory of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth," so that they who saw Jesus, saw God also.² By him God dwelt among men, and came still nearer to them. The perfect atonement had appeared, when full and perfect remission was to be enjoyed. The barrier of sin was to be completely removed, and God and man were to come together again, not visibly, as in Eden, but really, through another person of the Godhead.

When Jesus was on the eve of his departure he comforted his disciples with the assurance that he would not leave them as orphans in the world, with no divine power to protect them, no father's eye to watch over them, and no divine presence to support and comfort them. He promised that, when he was gone, he would send them another *Paraclete*, who should remain with them forever. Thus, in the person of the Holy Spirit, was God to be thenceforth and forever with his people, and by him to dwell among them, and make them his tabernacle, or place of habitation.

¹ Ex. 23: 20. ² John 14: 9.

The personality of the Holy Spirit is a revelation of the Christian dispensation. It was only toward the close of the Jewish age, that the *Logos* came to be regarded as a person. This was not strange, since the emphatic revelation of the Jewish dispensation was the unity of the Godhead, a revelation designed to cure the world of idolatry. As idolatry was so strongly and so positively condemned and prohibited under Judaism, the growth of the idea of the personality of the *Logos* must have been derived from the prophecies concerning the nature of the Coming Age. The idea could not have come out of Judaism, whose characteristic distinction was the unity of God. When, therefore, we have our Lord promising his disciples *another Paraclete*, one in some particulars like himself, we must understand that he spoke of the Holy Spirit as a person. The language he employs places this beyond question.

While the Lord was on earth he was the comfort, stay, and instructor of his humble disciples. They had learned to love him, and to regard him as the Son of God, as one who had come from heaven to earth, and whom God had called his Son. He had laid before them in part the great purposes of his mission; and now when he was about to leave them to see them no more, he promised to send them the Holy Spirit, who should abide with them forever.

In this promise the Lord had in view more than the mere consolation which the Spirit's presence would give the disciples, though it is probable that they saw no more, and thought of no more. Christ could not perfect his great work entirely on the earth. He had come to give himself a ransom for the world, and to die in its behalf, and he must of necessity leave his disciples. This work accomplished, he needed an advocate on the earth, greater and more powerful than men are or can become. His name would have perished from the minds of men, or have lived only as that of a malefactor worthy of death, had not the Spirit been sent in his interest, and in that of the world for which he had given his life. Hence, Christ said: "And he shall take of *mine* and show them to you." He was to be the Lord's advocate also.

The work of the Holy Spirit, as the Paraclete, contemplated and embraced three important objects, the first of which related particularly to the disciples, the second to the church, and the third to Christ himself. It is with the second that we are now chiefly concerned, in considering the Gift of the Spirit, who, in the organic law of the kingdom of heaven, as proclaimed by the apostle on the day of Pentecost, is promised to every obedient believer.

That the *gift* of the Spirit, which is one of the blessings of obedience, is the Spirit himself, and not anything that he gives, or that is given through or by him, seems very clear from the explicitness of the language which the Lord uses when making the promise. He says: "I will send you another Comforter, and

when *he* is come, *he* will lead you into all truth, and bring to your remembrance whatsoever I have said to you. He shall take of mine and show it to you. He shall not speak of himself. He shall glorify me, and show you things to come." This is the work of an intelligent person, acting in the interests, and in the behalf, of another, not simply an influence or a power exerted by God. This person was sent by the Father in the interest of the Son, and while engaged in this mission he is doing the will of Christ, as Christ did the will of his Father while he was on the earth.

The Spirit made his advent on the day of Pentecost, in fulfillment of the promise made by Christ. Just before Christ ascended he told the eleven to remain in Jerusalem until they received the promise of the Father, of which he had spoken to them, and which, he said, they should receive in a few days. This was ten days before Pentecost. They remained in Jerusalem, and continued in devotional exercises in the temple,¹ and in a retired room,² awaiting the promise, without knowing the time of his coming.

His advent was attended by certain signs and wonders as evidence of his presence, and proof that he was the author of the phenomena witnessed. These were necessary, if the world was to be convinced that the apostles of the Lord spake as they were directed by the Spirit. They were also necessary to assure the disciples of the fulfillment of the promise. Hence, the Spirit made his advent in a miraculous manner.

The *phenomena* witnessed on the day of Pentecost were not evidences of the fulfillment of the promise which Christ made his disciples; but of the fulfillment of a promise that God made the Jewish people through his prophet Joel. There is no mention made in the prophecy of Joel of the promise of the Spirit in the sense and meaning of Christ to his disciples. That promise was that God would, in the last days, pour out *from*³ his Spirit, with the effect of having their "sons and daughters to prophesy, their young men to see visions, and their old men to dream dreams." The prophecy of Joel spoke only of what the Spirit would do in the last days, without even intimating any such thing as his advent promised by Christ. Hence, we must distinguish between the two promises, and not confound the person of the Spirit with what he did after he came in person to the disciples; not interpret the *scenes* of Pentecost as the promise of Christ, but only as evidence that the *Spirit* had come. So Peter seems to have interpreted these phenomena: "And having received from the

¹ Luke 24: 53. ² Acts 1: 13.

³ It should be observed, that it is not said that the *Spirit will be poured out*. Such language can not be used in reference to a *person*. It affirms that something is poured out from or by the Spirit, or by God through or by the Spirit, as in verse 33. The Spirit was *sent*, as the *Logos* was sent. This language is applicable to a *person*.

Father the promise of the Holy Spirit, he has *poured out what you now see and hear.*"¹ He had now come to guide the apostles into all the truth; to bring to their remembrance all the instruction he had given them; to show them the things of Christ; to announce his justification in the heavens by God; that he was now King of kings, and Lord of lords; and to glorify Christ by preaching to the world the unsearchable riches it was to enjoy through him. This was his work of inspiration, and it was confined to the persons who were chosen to be the media of communicating the whole revelation of God to man, which was necessary to complete the work of Christ, and which terminated with the inspiration of the *apostolic* church.

In this work of inspiration the relation of the Spirit to the men whom he inspired was quite different from that which he sustains to christians in general. In inspiration men are passive, being the instruments which the Spirit uses in speaking the mind of God to the world. There is no moral strength or virtue communicated by the Spirit in this work, nor moral change wrought in the soul. "The gift of the Holy Spirit" promised to the obedient believer, has no reference to inspiration. Inspiration was one of the *gifts of the Spirit*, after he had come to the church, of the same kind and character as the power to work miracles in the name of Christ. These gifts were but temporary, and they were given for a special and temporary purpose.² They can not be the promise which Christ had in his mind when he promised them a Paraclete who should abide with them forever.

And further: If what the Spirit *did in inspiration*, is all that was contemplated by the promise of the gift of the Holy Spirit, then the promise has not been made sure to those who have believed on Christ through the inspired apostles since those extraordinary gifts of the Spirit ceased in the church. This blessing is incorporated in the *organic* law of the kingdom, and is conferred on all who become subjects of the kingdom by obedience to this organic law. In no other way can the language of the promise be understood, or interpreted. Whatever "the gift of the Holy Spirit" is, it is made sure to every obedient believer by this promise. This being so, and the *gifts* of the Spirit—those which he bestowed on men for special and temporary purposes—having wholly ceased in the church, we must look for the fulfillment of the promise made by Peter, in the gift of the Spirit as the Paraclete of the disciples of Christ.

If we assume that the *gift* of the Spirit is the Spirit himself, as a person, and in person, in the sense in which we use these words when speaking of the *Logos*, then we may further assume that *this gift exhausts* all the promises spoken concerning the Spirit in his advent and mission to the church: so that we may conclude that that which *exhausts* all the promises, was the thing intended by the promises. No other view will or can fulfill the

¹ Acts 2: 33. ² 1 Tim. 3: 19. ³ Eph 4: 11.

promise of Christ, that the Spirit should remain with his disciples forever. He spoke of him as a person. He knew the nature of the being of the Holy Spirit, and spoke of him in language consistent with the nature of his being. As such the Spirit came from heaven, and spoke and acted consistently with the idea of his personality. The "gift of the Holy Spirit," therefore, is the Spirit himself.

As a person, he sustains personal relations with all other beings with whom he may be connected or associated. He is the "third person of the Godhead," and the Paraclete of the church of God on earth, and must sustain to that church, and the individuals which compose it, relations consistent with his personality of being. We should not conceive of him as the Jews did, as the power and influence of the Jehovah; but as a divine being, and as verily a person as is the *Theos* and the *Logos*. With such a conception, we will never lose sight of the nature of the relations which he sustains to the church, and to christians, nor have confused notions as to the nature of the great work which he was sent to accomplish.

This work is to be divided into two distinct categories: 1, that which relates to the conversion of the sinner; and, 2, that which relates to the christian. While it is our purpose to consider the latter particularly, and our special concern is with it; yet the latter can not be well understood and appreciated unless some consideration is given to the former. But it will suffice to say of this that the work of the Spirit is embraced under two other categories, subordinates of the first, viz: that which he does by the inspiration of chosen men, and that which he does by his providence in the interests of Christ, under whose authority and direction he acts in the work of redemption.

When the Spirit came, his first work was the inspiration of the apostles, that he might make known in human language the things necessary to salvation. This work was continued by the Spirit until the whole will of God was disclosed, and men had all that was necessary to their salvation from sin, and to their ultimate salvation in heaven through the church. This knowledge was communicated both in speech and in writing, during the time of the apostles; and enough of what was then said and written has been preserved in a permanent form to furnish future generations with all the knowledge that is necessary to a life of godliness and a mature growth in all the elements of the christian life. This word was uttered and written for the enlightenment of men, and to convince them of sin. By the inspired word he "convinces the world of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment," which was what Jesus said the Spirit would do when he came. Hence, all his work, embraced in these three categories, is effected and completed by the inspired word, so far as the action of the mind and heart is concerned. All the enlightenment which the mind enjoys on the subject of the soul's salvation; all the moral changes

wrought in the heart that looks to its relief from the burden of sin; all the aspirations which the soul can cherish for things heavenly and divine; all the generous impulses which men may feel urging them to works of piety and humanity;—all the zeal they may feel in the cause of the divine Master, have their source, and origin, and power in the word of the living God, which, in the exercise of its power, is “sharper than any two-edged sword,” and capable of searching out, and exposing the deep thoughts of the mind, and of laying them before the gaze of the awakened conscience. All the moral change, or spiritual revolution which men undergo in conversion, is effected through the inspired word. Whatever the Spirit may do in reference to, and with the view to, the conversion of any individual, by his providence, is done for the purpose of awakening his mind to what it has known of the word of God, or of leading the person where that word may be heard or read. His providences never interfere with, or supersede the word of truth; but on the contrary, they are always in harmony with the view that conversion, or conviction, or christian improvement, or advancement in the divine life, is to be effected by the inspired word. So the apostle teaches in these words: “*All scripture given by inspiration is profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, and for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect and thoroughly furnished for every good work;*” for “whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our instruction, that we through patience, and comfort of the scriptures, might have hope.” In that word which the Spirit uttered by inspired men, he has revealed all that God had to communicate to man, not already revealed; presented all the motives and considerations capable of moving the heart to obedience; and has fully exposed to view every terror and threatening that can awaken and spur the conscience to a life of righteousness, piety, and holiness. In that word it is shown that heaven stands exhausted of every power, influence, motive, and consideration by which men may be won from sin, and brought, through Christ, to the full enjoyment of the favor and communion of God: and that all that we need to know of God, and of the way of salvation, is there revealed, and only there. Such is the extent and nature of the work which the Spirit accomplishes through the inspired word.

If it be true that the Spirit accomplishes all these things by the word which inspired men have uttered and written, it may be asked what was the necessity of sending the Spirit to the disciples, and of that Spirit continuing forever with the church? Why could not apostles, prophets, teachers, and evangelists under the christian dispensation have been inspired, and have uttered and written the words of the Spirit, as they did under the Jewish dispensation, without the Spirit being sent into this world? What need was there that he should come from heaven to remain with the disciples forever? If inspiration were all

of his work under Christ, it would indeed be difficult to answer this question. But the fact is, that this was not the promise which Christ made to his disciples. He promised to send them the Holy Spirit as *another* Paraclete, one in his place, who should remain with them forever. The inspiration of the apostles, and "the conviction of the world of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment," were parts of his work, but not all of it. There are some things to be done for men, and especially for christians, which can not be accomplished by the inspired word, and whether these things could have been effected just as well by God in heaven, as by the Holy Spirit on earth, may well be questioned. It is an axiomatic truth that God never does anything unnecessarily. If he could have saved the world from sin without sending his Son into the world to suffer and die as he did, we may be sure he would have done so. That he did not do so, is proof that he could not have done so. So, as respects the mission of the Holy Spirit. As he did come, it was necessary that he should have come. He had other work than that of inspiration; other than that of the conversion of the sinner. This work might have been accomplished by the Spirit in heaven.

But it must be observed that the promise of the Holy Spirit, as a *Paraclete, is to christians*—to those already converted—already the subjects of his work of inspiration, so far as conversion is concerned. The *gift* of the Spirit has no reference to the conversion of the sinner; but to something that is to be done *for the christian, or in him, or both for him and in him.*

Distinguishing, now, the work of the Spirit in his mission to the church, from the means by which he accomplishes that work, we may proceed to consider what more he has to do after he has completed all that he purposed through the inspiration of men, and particularly, what *relation* he sustains to christians.

The Holy Spirit is not only the *Paraclete* of christians, but the executor of Christ's will—his minister plenipotentiary in the work of redemption. As such he sustains personal relations with Christ, and with christians. He is now the person of the Godhead who represents the Divinity among men, and through whom the work of salvation is carried on in the world. While Christ was on earth he was the representative of the Godhead; he worked the work of God; he was the Comforter or Paraclete of the disciples; and he *kept* the disciples in the Father's name. When he was about to leave his disciples he prayed his Father to keep them, and resigned them, as it were, into his hands. He prayed that his Father would send another Paraclete in his stead, to supply his place when he was gone. This prayer was answered by sending the Holy Spirit, and the cause of Christ in the earth was thenceforth committed to his hands. To supervise this he was to remain forever with the church.

This work of supervision we may call providential; and it embraces the oversight and care of all the interests of Christ's cause

on the earth. Wherever these interests call him, there the Spirit is found. He works not for himself or in his own name, though divine; speaks not of himself; all that he does and says is for the honor and glory of Christ. Sometimes he works for the conversion of men; sometimes for their instruction; and sometimes for their preservation from evil; and always and everywhere, and in all ages, for the general and special welfare of the church at large, and of every congregation and disciple in particular.

The scriptures give us a few examples of what we mean by the providential work of the Spirit, and these afford us a pretty clear conception of the manner in which he works, and the means he uses to accomplish his purposes. In the conversion of the Ethiopian nobleman an angel appeared to Philip, who was then in Samaria, and said to him: "Arise, and go toward the south, into the way that goeth down from Jerusalem to Gaza." The object of sending Philip down on this road was that he might fall in with the nobleman as he returned home. All the contingencies of their meeting were well weighed, and intervening events well adjusted. The time at which the nobleman would be at a certain place on the road, and reading a certain passage of one of the prophets, and the time it would require Philip to reach that place, were known and arranged by the Spirit. Philip set out, and here the work of the angel ended.

When Philip came into the road, and saw the chariot, the Spirit said to him: "Go near, and join yourself to this chariot." He did so, and found that the man was reading the 53d chapter of Isaiah. He at once opened a conversation with the Eunuch, which led to his preaching to him Jesus. At length the stranger believed, from the testimony which Philip presented, that Jesus of Nazareth, who had but lately been crucified at Jerusalem, was indeed the promised Messiah, the person described by the prophet in the chapter he was reading, and he at once submitted to the authority of the Lord Jesus.

This case is sufficient to show us how the Spirit works in conversion; not that he now employs angels and inspired men, and speaks to them as he did to Philip. God ordained that *men* should preach the gospel, and of this ordinance we find no infringement. Men must hear the gospel before they can believe it, and "how can they hear without a preacher?" To send the preacher to men, as in this case, or to bring men to the preacher, as in the case of Apollos, is the work of the Spirit's providence. The inspiration of Philip did not tell him that a certain man, at a certain hour and day, would be traveling along a certain road, by whom the gospel could be sent into a distant country; and when he saw the chariot before him, it did not tell him that the fact was of any interest to him. It would have passed from him unheeded had not the Spirit said to him, "Join yourself to the chariot." Of what the Spirit had done to bring the preacher to him, the nobleman knew nothing; and had the historian simply

given us the narrative without the incidents relating to the angel and the Spirit, we could have seen no special agency of the Spirit in the conversion. It is not unreasonable to suppose that there have been, in the history of the church, many cases of the Spirit's providence in the conversion of men, through whom the gospel could be carried into distant lands, or could obtain a firmer footing in the land of the person converted.

The conversions of Cornelius and Lydia afford us other examples of the same kind. The latter, a pious and godly Jewish woman, was seen by the Spirit in the town of Philippi, and he determined to convert her. He saw, moreover, many noble Bereans who only needed the necessary knowledge to become the disciples of the Lord Jesus. Paul had passed through Galatia and Phrygia, and was aiming for the province of Asia, whose chief city was Ephesus; but the Spirit forbade him to enter Asia. Then he determined to go into Bythia, but the Spirit again diverted him from his purpose, and turned him to the left toward Troas, where he found a vessel ready to sail for the destined port, where Lydia was selling purple. But of these providential events he knew not the meaning until the morning after his arrival at Troas. At night he dreamed that he saw a man standing on the coast of Macedonia, and crying to him to come over and help them. This dream or vision Paul interpreted as an indication of the Spirit, by whom he was directed, that he should go over into Macedonia. In all this his inspiration was no guide, nor did the Spirit speak to him as he did to Philip, and say, "Go down to Troas, and thence over into Macedonia." Yet he was led thither by the Spirit; and in the events which led to the conversion of Lydia, and to the gospel being preached in Macedonia and Greece, we see the providence of the Holy Spirit. How beautifully he weaves the wonderful net-work of events in the accomplishment of his purposes!

There is no truth more clearly and indubitably established than that God governs the world by special providences, in connection with or independent of his government by laws. There are ordained fixed and unalterable laws for the physical and moral worlds. With these he never interferes. If he submerge a district of country for the purpose of destroying its inhabitants, he does this in harmony with the laws which govern the physical world. If he attempt to save a part of the inhabitants of that country from the destruction intended, the attempt is made in perfect harmony with the same laws. And if, in certain cases, when his purposes can not be effected by established ordinances alone, he acts in conjunction with, or outside of, these laws, he does not thereby interfere with them, or violate them. If certain objects and purposes do not lie within the range of general or ordinary means, he interposes special acts, which appear to us in perfect line with the ordinary. Hence, in the events of providence we see no miracle. We could see no special direction of

Philip and Paul had not the historian so informed us. All those events appear natural and common; and in no instance now can we say positively that this or that event is providential, though we may be fully assured of it.

To this latter class belongs an event recorded in Acts, which relates to the providence of God among the saints. It is the case of Apollos, of Alexandria in Egypt, while he was preaching in Ephesus. The historian of Acts says: "And a certain Jew named Apollos, born at Alexandria, an eloquent man, and mighty in the scriptures, came to Ephesus. This man was instructed in the way of the Lord; and being fervent in spirit, he spake and taught diligently the things of the Lord, *knowing only the baptism of John*. And he began to speak boldly in the synagogue, whom, when Aquila and Priscilla heard, *they took him to them, and expounded to him the way of the Lord more perfectly.*" This man was well versed in the Jewish scriptures, and "instructed in the way of the Lord," so far as that was made known by the mission of John. He does not appear to have heard of the further developments that had taken place, and hence knew only the baptism of John. He was not an inspired man. What he knew he had learned, and what he yet lacked had to be furnished him by the ordinary means. Being an earnest and godly man, he needed only to be instructed that he might teach the way of the Lord more perfectly. Indeed, he may have often and fervently prayed to God to lead him into more light, and to increase his knowledge of the Lord Jesus. If he so prayed, it is no great stretch of the imagination to suppose that his prayers were answered by the Lord in sending him from Alexandria to Ephesus, where he would meet with persons capable of instructing him.

About the same time Aquila and Priscilla, two faithful disciples of the Lord Jesus, had been banished from Rome by the emperor Claudius, and were in Ephesus when Apollos came. They heard him preach in the synagogue, and seeing that he knew but little of "the way of the Lord," they took him to their own house, and instructed him more perfectly in the gospel. In all this there is nothing strange. All is very natural; so natural, indeed, that it arrests the attention of but few. But is it not an instructive case, and does it not teach us how God adjusts the events of life so as to accomplish good results to individuals? This case has, no doubt, many parallels in every age. Many pages could be filled with such instances of God's providence. We do not know, and can not know, what agency the Holy Spirit had in bringing about this interview between Apollos and his instructors. They had come from Rome, and he from Egypt, and they met accidentally, as we would say, in Ephesus. The Holy Spirit may have adjusted the events in the life of each so as to bring about this meeting.

As to the Spirit's preservation of the saints from evil in this world, Paul's life is full of the most remarkable instances. We

have but to read an enumeration of these by himself; what he suffered and endured for Christ, but out of which the Lord delivered him: "In labors more abundant, in stripes above measure, in prisons more frequent, in deaths often. Of the Jews five times received I forty stripes save one. Thrice was I beaten with rods, once was I stoned, thrice I suffered shipwreck, a night and a day I have been in the deep; in journeyings often, in perils of waters, in perils of robbers, in perils by mine own countrymen, in perils by the heathen, in perils in the city, in perils in the wilderness, in perils in the sea, in perils among false brethren; in weariness, in painfulness, in watchings often, in hunger and thirst, in fastings often, in cold and nakedness."

From such examples as these we gather the character and scope of the work of the Spirit which he does for the saints, and which can not be done through the inspiration of apostles. They develop a similar reason and necessity for the Spirit's continued presence with christians and in the church, or that which made God's presence among the Jews so necessary. The presence of God has, in every state of man, been necessary to man's well-being. For this reason he was with Adam in Eden; for this reason he dwelt among the people of Israel; and for this reason is the church "the habitation of God by the Spirit."

Under the light of these facts and scripture statements we may be able to understand and appreciate the purposes for which the Spirit was promised as a Paraclete to the disciples, and as the constant guest of the church, the comforter, advocate, protector and companion of every individual christian. The first object of his mission was to inspire men to proclaim the gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ, that he might, through the inspired men, "convince the world of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment;" to provide for the saints "all things that pertain to life and godliness;" and to furnish the church, through all ages, with those scriptures which are "*profitable for teaching, for conviction, for correction, and for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, and thoroughly furnished for every good work.*"

The second object was, that, by his *providences*, he might do all else that the interests of the cause of Christ, and the wants and interests of man might require, and which could be met only by providing for them as they should arise. No general provision could have been ordained at the beginning, which would meet the varied and constantly recurring wants and interests of man, tossed about on the tempestuous ocean of life, in a world constantly undergoing change. The presence of the Spirit, therefore, seems to be necessary that he may meet these contingencies. We conceive that it is the Spirit who immediately acts in providences under the reign of Christ. It is he of the Divinity, who is now in the church, and through whom or by whom God dwells in the church, as he dwelt formerly in the Jewish tabernacle, and in the temple built in Jerusalem. It is probable that he then

dwelt among his chosen people by the *Logos*, called the Angel of his presence;¹ and at no time in his proper person, not even in Eden.² But now, since the *Logos* has become the redeemer of man, and exalted therefor to the throne of the Universe, and has sent the Holy Spirit into the world for the purposes mentioned, we think it a proper discrimination to say that the *providences* of God in this world are the immediate and special work of Christ's advocate and vicegerent on the earth, and of the christian's Paraclete.

We have now reached the point in this investigation, where we may inquire and consider what is the full import and meaning of the promise made to every obedient believer: "And you shall receive the GIFT OF THE HOLY SPIRIT." What we have said is preparatory to a more special consideration of the relation which the Holy Spirit sustains to the christian. In the christian scriptures this relation is represented as very close and intimate. That was a grand and precious promise of Christ to his disciples: "I will not leave you orphans;" I will send you another Paraclete³—the Holy Spirit, "and he will take care of you and keep you from the evil one."

We have already observed that the *gift* of the Spirit promised by the apostle, Acts 11: 38, is the *Spirit himself, in person, and as a person*. The gift is not anything that the Spirit bestows on christians, as gifts miraculous—not a power or an influence; but a *person* in the highest sense in which we use the word in speaking of the divine being—in the same sense as when applied to God, and to Christ coronated in the heavens, "who is over all, God blessed forever."⁴ If we are to look on God and Christ—the *Theos and the Logos*,—as persons, we must so regard the Holy Spirit; for the divine ordinance that places the obedient believer in relation with God and Christ, also places him in relation to the Holy Spirit. Such is the statement of the Lord in the commission; for he commands them to immerse the believer "*into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.*"

This is a wonderful and intimate relation; so close and *intimate*, indeed, that the immersed is said to be *in God*, and *in Christ*, and *they in him*. The relation, in one sense, is that of oneness. The Lord speaks of his oneness with God; of his being *in God*, and God *in him*; and of his disciples being one, in God and in him: "I pray that they may be one, as *thou*, Father, art *in me*, and *I in thee*, that they also may be *one in us.*"⁵ This is a relation which exists between all true christians and God and Christ, and also the Holy Spirit.

But this is a union that pertains to the heart; the union of mind

¹ Is. 63: 9; Ex. 23: 20. ² See the general views expressed in chap. 1.

³ We should have said before that we use the word *Paraclete* because it is more comprehensive, embracing the ideas of Advocate, Comforter, and Intercessor, all of which the Holy Spirit is to Christians. The last word is the best translation, if we *translate*, and do not *adopt*.

⁴ Rom. 9: 5. ⁵ John 17: 21.

and heart; of judgment, sentiment, feeling, desire, not that of *person*, though persons are the parties to the union. An analogous relation we have among men, the relation that exists between husband and wife. The scriptures compare the relation which exists between Christ and the church to the relation that exists between husband and wife.¹ We are not startled at the language that pronounces the two *one flesh*. In the same sense are we to understand the oneness that exists between the christian and the entire Godhead, attained by being baptized into their names. But this relation, though in one sense real and literal, is not personal, as this term must be used in such a connection.

But what are we to understand by a *personal relation*? There is no difficulty in understanding the nature of this relation, as it exists among men. It is only when we use the word with reference to the infinite and invisible God, that our ideas become confused, or our conceptions nebulous. A *personal* relation is essentially the same among all orders of beings, whether divine, angelic, or human. In such a relation the person appears in all the entirety of his being. No part of him is, or can be, absent from the relation. A person is always a *unit*. We can not conceive of him as existing in parts. Hence, when persons sustain a relation to others, they appear in all the entirety of their being. So when God is represented as sustaining a personal relation with men or angels, that relation necessary to personal and spiritual intercourse and communion, he is in that relation with all the entirety of his being. A personal relation, therefore, is that bond of union which connects or associates two beings together for any general or special purpose which concerns their interests, pleasure, or well-being.

In the creation of the intelligent beings of the spirit-realm, God established between them and himself a personal relation, in order to their intelligent enjoyment of him. In a former chapter we saw something of this, and conceived a necessity that Jehovah, on his part, should manifest himself visibly to those high and glorious beings, that they might hold with the Godhead spiritual intercourse and communion. This relation and these blessings they enjoyed by virtue of their creation and the nature of their being. That intercourse and communion were personal and intelligent, and a matter of conscious knowledge, not wholly or essentially unlike, perhaps, that which man enjoyed in Eden, where Jehovah manifested himself to the perceptive faculties of man. But now that sin has robbed man of that *visible* communion with God, and since he must now hold spiritual intercourse and communion by faith and affection, and not by sight, the personal relation does not appear so clear and distinct, though it is as real, and essentially the same when the barrier to it is removed. Then God dwells and associates with man as at the first.

The remission of sins has been enjoyed by man under all the

¹ Eph. 5: 32.

dispensations of religion, through the institution of sacrifice, but more conspicuously under Judaism than previously, and more fully and completely under Christianity than under Judaism. But it was sufficiently full and real under Judaism to allow God to place himself conspicuously among that people. He was their God, who delivered them from the bondage of Egypt, and made his presence among them visible by "the pillar of cloud by day, and the pillar of fire by night," and by the tabernacle by which he dwelt among them: "And let them make me a sanctuary that I may be *seen* among them;" and "I will set my tabernacle among you, and I will walk among you; and I will be your God, and you shall be my people." The people realized the fact that God was in their midst by the symbols of his presence; by the words which he spoke to them through their mediator, Moses; and by the terrible judgments which he brought upon them. Never before had men been so completely under the eye and power of God. While he dwelt in their midst, every place where he walked was to be made fit for his presence. The sanctuary was consecrated for his dwelling place, and all their camps were to be kept clean. Holiness and purity are his dwelling places. Hence, the ceremonies of purification, and the various sacrifices ordained for the remission of sin. By the operation of these the barriers that separated man from God were removed, to the extent of their efficacy, and man approached his Eden relation with God. But between them yet stood the symbols of his presence. He looked upon the people of Israel from the cloud that hung over the door of the tabernacle, and from the pillar of cloud by day, and the pillar of fire by night. By these he walked in their midst, and dwelt among them.

Under Christianity all symbols and types disappear, and God dwells in person in the church, and walks among christians;¹ yet not in his *own* person, but in the person of the Holy Spirit.² All barriers to a personal union have been removed by the atonement which Christ offered, and God and christians come into the relation which angels enjoy in heaven, and which Adam enjoyed in Eden. It is no longer by symbols, but in *person* that he dwells among men who have attained the relation with the Godhead, which is secured by being immersed "*into the name of the FATHER, and of the SON; and of the HOLY SPIRIT.*"

It was to establish this personal relation between God and christians, that the Holy Spirit was sent by the Father and the Son to abide with the disciples forever, and to restore to them the relation that belongs to intelligent beings by virtue of their creation. The christian is a new creation, and hence he enjoys in consequence the relation which belongs to all pure and holy beings, whom God has created for spiritual intercourse and communion with himself as the fountain and means of their highest spiritual happiness.

¹ 2 Cor. 6: 16. ² Eph. 2: 22.

But spiritual intercourse and communion between the infinite God and his finite creatures, like that existing between finite beings themselves, are necessarily *personal* and *mediate*. They are not, and can not be, *direct and immediate*. No such intercourse and communion as these are known in all the realm of intelligent beings, and certainly no such communion is taught in the Sacred Scriptures. The Holy Spirit did not come to commune with the disciples of Christ directly and immediately. He came to speak to men as Christ spoke to men, in language which they understand, and to commune with them through the language which he employed in the persons of the inspired apostles. As a man, and while man, Christ communed with his Father as all other men do and must. He communed with his Father through the language of meditation and prayer; and now while seated on his throne, he speaks to his disciples in the words that he uttered while on earth, and in the words which the Holy Spirit has spoken in his name, and in his behalf. All this seems clear to the commonest understanding. But an idea has grown up among christians that the Holy Spirit literally and personally dwells in the soul of the christian, and there communes directly with his soul. This erroneous idea seems to be the result, principally, of a radical misconception of the nature and being of the Holy Spirit. Because the word Spirit in the Greek language, (*πνεῦμα*,) is neuter in gender, men have come to speak of him as an *impersonal thing*. The common version is responsible, to a great extent, for this erroneous conception; for it translates: "And the Spirit *itself*." Christ spoke of him as a person, and used the masculine pronoun, which fact settles forever the fact of his personality. But men seem to conceive of him as a kind of diffusible gas, filling the soul as gas a vacuum, or as water a sponge! and not as a *being*, a *person*, who has spoken to the world through men in intelligible language; who is one of the Godhead, infinite and glorious in person, majesty, and power, but for the time being subordinate to Christ, in that he has come into the world to speak of Christ, and not of himself, and to inaugurate and supervise his cause among men. Hence, we should conceive of him as a person, and of his work as the work of a person, done in perfect accordance with the nature of his own being and of that of the persons for whom, or toward whom, that work is done. In the light of this great fact, and the principles which it implies, we should read and interpret the language of the scriptures, where, from any cause, any doubt or ambiguity may exist as to the meaning, use, and application of the language employed.

What, then, is the relation which the Holy Spirit sustains to the christian, or to christians? Does he dwell *in* him, or *with* him? *in* them, or *with* them? And *for* what does he dwell? These questions grow out of the understanding that men have of the nature and purpose of the promise of Christ to his disciples,

that he would send them another *comforter*. Men have conceived that he is sent to the christian, and dwells *in him* for the purpose of *comforting* him in his distress or sufferings, and of *strengthening* him in his weakness and efforts to live a holy life; and that he comforts and strengthens the soul *directly* and *immediately*—by the direct and immediate exertion of his power on the mind or soul of the christian. This we conceive to be a fair and just statement of the doctrine of “*indwelling*,” which, we propose to show, has no support from the christian scriptures. On the contrary, we believe that the scriptures teach that the Holy Spirit is a person, and dwells *with* christians as a person, and comforts and strengthens them—if these two categories are understood to embrace all that he does for the soul—by means of the holy scriptures, which contain all that God has deemed necessary to say to man, and all the motives, considerations, hopes, and fears, which can inspire the heart to devotion, or restrain it from sin; which can comfort, strengthen, or enlighten the heart and mind. These are the true and legitimate powers and influences which one spirit can use with or upon another spirit,—the only powers, indeed, which can accomplish the desired object, so long as the spirit of man retains and exerts its own inherent, and self-determining will unimpaired and unshackled. If such be the province, purpose, and work of the *scriptures*, what comforting or strengthening is done by the Spirit’s *indwelling*? And if the *indwelling* of the Spirit be a fact, and does this work for the christian, what is the office of the scriptures with the christian? Are both needed as remedial measures? This is more than can be positively affirmed, or even rationally inferred. Were the scriptures positive and indubitable on the subject, there would be no reason or ground for doubt. But if the scriptures do not place the fact of such an *indwelling* beyond doubt; and if there shall be found no reason for presuming that such is the fact, we may reasonably ask the question, What can the Spirit accomplish for the good of the christian by a literal and personal *indwelling*, that can not be effected through the sacred scriptures?

It is at once objected: If the scriptures accomplish so much for the christian, why was the Spirit sent to the apostles? Could he not have inspired them as well while remaining in heaven, as he did when he came on the day of Pentecost? What was there for him to do that he should be sent?

These questions we regard as legitimate, and we shall confess our views erroneous if we can not dispose of them satisfactorily. If the Spirit’s great work in Redemption embraced no more than the inspiration of men to utter the will of God, then we candidly confess that that work could have been accomplished without his personal and continued presence with the disciples in every age of the world. But inspiration was only a part of his work, and that part, too, that concerned the interests of the sinner as well as the saint. There was evidently a special and peculiar work

to be done for the christian, which was the reason and necessity of the Holy Spirit's continuance with the church. Christ seems to have regarded the Spirit's coming as a necessity: "*It must needs be that I go away; for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come; but if I go, I will send him to you.*" He says in positive language that there was a necessity for his own departure, and this implies that there is a corresponding necessity for the Spirit's coming. This reason is not exhausted by inspiration. *Is it even exhausted by the Spirit's "indwelling"?* Has he done all when he has taken possession of the heart according to the common theory of his indwelling? No believer in this theory has ever attempted to show that the "indwelling" fulfills the whole promise. If we will make the distinctions that ought to be made, we will discover that there is, and must be, a work for the Spirit to do, which can not be done unless he is ever present with the church.

What, then, is the relation of the Holy Spirit to the christian? Can we determine the *manner* and place of his "indwelling"? If the scriptures speak on this subject, we must hear them. If they are silent, we are left to the uncertain light of general principles, but little understood.

Assuming as settled beyond doubt, that the Spirit is with the church since the day of Pentecost in his own proper person, and as a person, and here in accordance with the promise of Christ, we will now proceed to examine the language of that promise, to determine, if possible, whether this language, as well as other portions of the christian scriptures, sustains the view presented and advocated in these pages.

The words of the promise were: "I will not leave you as orphans: I will pray the Father, and he will send you another comforter (*Paraclete*), that he may abide with you forever, (*μένη μεθ ὑμῶν*), the Spirit of truth, whom the world can not receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him; but *you know him*, because he dwelleth *with* you (*παρ' ὑμῶν μένει*), and shall be *in* you," (*ἐν ὑμῶν*.) In this passage of scripture, three distinct words are used to express the relation which the Spirit was to sustain to the disciples. The pronouns are all in the plural number, and the prepositions must be translated accordingly. He was talking with them collectively. The first of these prepositions is *meta* with the genitive, which places the parties spoken of in the company of each other. The second is *para* with the dative, and has much the same meaning as *meta* with the genitive in this connection, both being used with a verb that signifies a continued presence, as *dwelling*. It places the persons in the same place, as a dwelling, signifying that they dwelt together.¹ The last is *en* with the dative also, and is not climactic, but only another word to express another *phase* of the association of the persons, as in 2 Cor. 6: "I will *dwell* among them,

¹ John 14: 23, *και μονήν παρ' αὐτῷ ποιησομεν.*

and *walk* among them.” This preposition, when used to express the relation that exists between persons, unless the language is evidently tropical, can have no other meaning than *with* or *among*, as in the passage cited from Corinthians. So also, when *things* are personified, as in this passage from Mark 6: 4: “A prophet is not without honor, except *in* his own country (ἐν τῇ πατρίδι αὐτοῦ) and *among* his own countrymen (or neighbors), and *in* his own house.”¹ The preposition *en* is the word here employed, twice translated (and properly) *in*, and once *among*.

There is no doubt or ambiguity as to the relation that is described by *meta* and *para*. No one will claim that these support the common view of personal indwelling of the Holy Spirit in the soul or body of the christian. The theory has arisen from the other preposition, *en*; and it is claimed that there is a climax in this passage, the climax of the intimacy and union being reached when the Spirit is said to dwell in the heart of the christian. That there is a sense in which God, and Christ, and the Spirit dwell in the christian, is very evident and unquestionable. The same words express this dwelling in each case; so that if the dwelling of God and Christ is literal or figurative, the same must be true of the dwelling of the Spirit. Christ said to his disciples, just before he left them: “If a man love me, he will keep my words; and my Father will love him, and *we will come to him, and make our abode with him.*” (παρ’ αὐτῶ). This is like the promise as to the Spirit’s abode with the disciples—“he shall dwell or remain *with you,*” (παρ’ ὑμῶν), and adds force to the statement that *en* must be translated in harmony with the other two propositions, *meta* and *para*. And this would be *among*. Such is the necessity laid upon us if we conceive that the relation between christians and the Holy Spirit is literal and personal.

On the translation of this preposition *en* by *in*, in the passage cited, and others to be presently noted, the doctrine of the personal and literal indwelling of the Holy Spirit in the christian is based. Slender and doubtful as this foundation is, men have built upon it a doctrine that contradicts the psychical constitution of man, does violence to the beauty and symmetry of the Remedial System, and virtually and logically sets aside the sacred scriptures as God’s means of enlightening, strengthening, and sanctifying the human soul.² These may be considered startling statements in regard to a doctrine that has lived through centuries, and had the support of great names; yet this may, nevertheless, be just and true. Men may not have examined the subject critically, or thought of questioning its correctness, and hence they

¹ Καὶ τοῖς συγγενεσι καὶ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ αὐτοῦ.

² The common doctrine of “indwelling” involves the doctrine of Immediacy, and is therefore chargeable with the consequences named. See Discourse of Religion by Theo. Parker.

may have taken for granted what they ought to have established by proof.

The passages of scripture usually cited and relied on as proof are such as the following:

1. "And shall be *in you*."
2. "But ye are not in the flesh, but in the spirit, if so be the Spirit of God dwell in you, (*οικει εν υμιν*.) Now, if any man have not the spirit of Christ, he is none of his. * * * But if the spirit of him who raised up Jesus from the dead, dwell in you; he who raised up Christ from the dead, shall make alive your mortal bodies, (*δια το ενοικον αυτοου πνευμα εν υμιν*), because his Spirit dwells in you."
3. "And because you are sons, God has sent forth the spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying Abba, father," (*εις καρδιας ημων*).
4. "That good thing which was committed to thee, keep by the Holy Spirit who dwells in us." (*το ενοικοντος εν ημιν*.)
5. Know you not that your body is the temple of the Holy Spirit who dwells in us?"
6. "And what agreement has the temple of God with idols? For you are the temple of the living God, as God hath said, I will dwell in them, and walk in them."

The strength of argument in these passages in favor of the doctrine of "Indwelling," lies in the preposition *in*, it being assumed by the argument that *in* properly translates in these passages the Greek preposition, *εν*. If it was the meaning and intent of the Spirit to say by the use of this word that he dwells *in* the christian, as a man's spirit dwells in his body, then the question of an actual indwelling is settled. But this is just what we deny. We maintain that *in* is not the proper representative of the original; that such a translation reduces the personal Spirit to an impersonal thing, and does not, in some of the passages at least, make good sense. No one will claim that God *walks in men*. The nature of the action requires the preposition to be translated *among*. In the first passage cited—"He shall be *in you*"—we have two other prepositions used in that connection. These unquestionably place the Spirit in company with the disciples, as a companion; and being used in the same connection with *εν*, the relation which they establish can not be destroyed by it. If this preposition places the Spirit *in* the christian, the relation indicated by *meta* and *para* is *destroyed*, and their use in the sentence nullified. This can not be admitted. We must, therefore, translate *εν* in harmony with *meta* and *para*, and by it place the Spirit *among* the disciples.

In all these passages the personal pronouns are in the plural number. The ambiguity of the English obscures the meaning. In the Greek the meaning is clear, because "you," and "us," and "your" are all plural. The singular of these pronouns does not appear in any of the passages. Hence, the indwelling spoken

of has respect to persons, and not to individuals, — to persons contemplated as a community, and not as isolated individuals. The use of these pronouns in the plural justifies this statement, and warrants such a conclusion.

In the passage cited from Romans we have a striking instance of the figurative use of *en*. That is, the word *en* does not describe an actual, but a figurative state. Christians are contemplated as being in the spirit, and not in the flesh. Here two states, called flesh and spirit, are contrasted. Christians have passed out of the flesh into the spirit. They were once in the flesh; but now they are in the spirit. The proof that they are in the spirit is that the Spirit of God dwells in them. That is, they are in that state or relation to God in which they are said to be in Christ, in God, and in the Spirit, and in which God, and Christ, and the Spirit are said to be in them. The dwelling in all these instances is of the same kind and category, not actual, but figurative. Men are said to be in this relation when they have the mind of Christ; when they love God; and when they walk after the Spirit, or in accordance with his teaching. It is that state of the soul which Christ calls believing on him. "And this is the will of him that sent me, that every one who seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life: and I will raise him up at the last day."¹ Here Christ promises that he will raise that man up who believes on him, and the apostle in Romans says that God will raise him up who has the spirit of God—the spirit of Christ, dwelling in him. In plain words, it is because a man is a christian that God will raise him up at the last day; and the evidence of his being a christian is that he has the spirit or mind of Christ. This is to be in the spirit and not in the flesh, and to have the Spirit of God dwelling in the heart; not actually and personally, but figuratively, just as God and Christ are said to dwell in the christian. Nor can men be literally and personally in God, or Christ, or the Spirit; only figuratively, when they have the spirit of Christ, and walk as the Spirit commands.

The passage, therefore, proves nothing in favor of the indwelling theory, since we may take the word spirit as referring to the *disposition* which accords with the mind of the Spirit. It is not positively clear and indisputable that the Holy Spirit is here intended, and this we think will appear more evident from the next passage cited, which is a continuation of the one under consideration.

"If any man have not the spirit of Christ, he is none of his." Though spirit is here printed with a capital in both the Greek and the English, yet this does not prove that the apostle had in his mind the Holy Spirit. This mode of printing is the work of men, who *presumed* that the Holy Spirit was intended. But this presumption is not sustained by modern critics.² They take the

¹ John 6: 40. ² Bloomfield *in loco*.

word spirit in this connection as meaning *mind, temper, or disposition*. Hence we would translate the passage thus: "If any have not the mind or disposition of Christ he is none of his." But if Christ [that is, the *mind* of Christ] be in you, the body is dead, but the spirit is alive because of righteousness. And if the spirit [this same mind] of him who raised up Jesus from the dead, dwell in you, he who raised Christ from the dead, will make alive your mortal bodies, because, or on account of, that spirit which dwells in you,"—because you have the mind of Christ, and should be raised to meet the Lord when he comes. This passage, therefore, proves nothing for the indwelling theory.

In regard to the passage in Galatians, where the preposition *en* does not occur, but where it is supposed to be implied by the words: "God hath sent forth the spirit of his Son *into your hearts*, crying Abba, Father," it must be observed that the apostle is not speaking of the relation which the Spirit sustains to the church, or to christians individually, but of that freedom from the bondage of the law, which they enjoyed through Jesus Christ. This same spirit he speaks of in his letter to the Romans as the spirit of adoption, by which we make the same cry, Abba, Father. • Under the law they were in bondage; they were slaves, and not sons. But now, having been freed from the dominion of the law by Jesus Christ, and having become the sons of God through him,² they enjoyed the spirit of freedom—the spirit of adoption—of sonship, and hence could address God as Father. Such is clearly and indisputably the meaning of the word spirit in this passage. It has no reference to the Holy Spirit, but to the mind, temper, or disposition of a son, and hence can afford no support to the doctrine of "indwelling."

The passage in Corinthians (1 Cor. 6: 19), seems to have some force in favor of the doctrine in question only when superficially examined. When viewed in the light of its connections, and the drift of the argument pursued by the apostle, it is found to bear on another subject. The apostle is speaking of some immoralities which had crept into the church at Corinth, and were corrupting the life of the disciples; and is showing how utterly inconsistent such practices are with the principles and purity inculcated by the gospel. The Lord had bought by his blood the whole man. The christian belongs to the Lord in the entirety of his being. Hence this same apostle elsewhere says: "I beseech you, therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God that you present your *bodies a living sacrifice* to God, which is your reasonable service;" and, "even so now yield your members servants to righteousness unto holiness." Our bodies are to be made instruments of righteousness. The whole man is redeemed from the power and dominion of sin, and placed in the service of Christ—of righteousness and holiness, so that even our bodies are to be kept

¹ Phil. 2: 5-7. ² John 1: 12.

pure. To the Corinthians he says: "Now the body is not for fornication, but for the Lord;" and, "Know you not that your bodies are the members of Christ?" For this reason it was a sin to "take the members of Christ, and make them the members of a harlot;" for "he who is joined to a harlot is one body," according to the law of marriage, and "he who is joined to the Lord is one spirit." Such a union between Christ and his disciples forbids sins which even pollute the body, because even the body is made "the temple of the Holy Spirit," who has been given to christians. As the *body* is a *member of Christ*, so is it the *temple of the Holy Spirit*, and if the language is figurative in the one case, it is also figurative in the other. The language being figurative, it does not bear on the subject under consideration, but refers more particularly to that *spiritual union which is the very life of Christianity*, without which all else is but form, and shadow, and vanity. The whole man is consecrated to Christ; and so pure and holy is the body by this consecration—so entirely consecrated to the service of God is it, that, like the temple of old, it is called, by figure, the temple of the Holy Spirit, who is now the representative of the Godhead on earth.

The true and real temple of God under the reign of Christ is the church. So the apostle Paul declares in his letter to the Ephesians.¹ The church is the body of Christ, and the spirit which animates this body is the Holy Spirit, both in his person and in his work. Men are built into this temple by the Spirit.² This is God's "habitation by the Spirit." In this the Holy Spirit dwells. To this temple he came on the day of Pentecost, and has been with it and in it since that day. This is a literal and personal dwelling. Unitedly the members of Christ's body constitute the church. Individually christians are members of his body. But all this language is figurative. Christians are not really a part of Christ's body only as that body is regarded as the church. But the church is an actual existence, and, contemplated as a temple of God where worship is offered, and in the style of the former dispensation, it is called "God's building," the temple which he now inhabits in the person of the Holy Spirit. For this reason it is a holy place, and the living stones of which it is built are holy. They are built into this temple as consecrated stones. Hence it is a temple of purity and holiness, and every where upon it is written in characters of light, "Holiness to the Lord." Therefore even the bodies are to be regarded and held as temples of purity and holiness, where God may dwell by these symbols of his presence.

A passage in Paul's second letter to Timothy is also cited in proof of the doctrine in question. It reads as follows: "That good thing which was committed to thee, keep by the Holy Spirit who dwells in us." Here the strength of the argument rests on the translation we give to *en*, in the words who dwells *in us*.

¹ Eph. 2: 19-22. ² Eph. 2: 18.

(τοῦ ἐνοικοῦντος ἐν ἡμῖν.) The sense will be just as good if translated *among us*, as if translated *in us*, and much more consistent with the idea of the Spirit's personality: so that, if we conceive of his dwelling as personal, we must translate the preposition, *among*; if his dwelling as figurative, then as in the common version.

The scriptures are everywhere consistent with themselves. They utter the same truth everywhere, though different language or figures may be employed in stating the truth. It would therefore, seem useless to say more on the subject. But since this theory of the Spirit's relation is so generally prevalent, and so deeply rooted in the minds of christians at large; and especially since the theory involves the doctrine of *Immediacy*, it may be well to look at other scriptures that relate to the subject.

The apostle Paul, in his letter to the Corinthians, speaks thus in the 3d chapter: "You are God's husbandry, you are God's *building*. According to the grace of God given to me, as a wise master builder, I have laid the foundation, and another builds thereon. * * * Know you not that you are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwells in you. (οἶκει ἐν ὑμῖν.) If any man defile the temple of God, him will God destroy; for the temple of God is holy, *which temple you are.*" Here the church is declared to be the temple of God. The "*you*" whom he addressed, were the church, and also the temple. In that church—in the *you* who were the temple, God dwelt by his Spirit, as he dwelt in the tabernacle and in the Jewish temple at Jerusalem. This is as plain as language can make it. But it does not state that he dwells *in* the individual, nor in individuals, except and only when they are contemplated as a *unit*, and as constituting a *body*, the church. But *among* them individually he may dwell and walk, as God did of old, when he dwelt among the people of Israel.¹ The pronoun is here in the plural, and refers to the church, and not to individuals separately, and hence it cannot be inferred that what is true of the church is also true of the individual. Yet this is the logic of the "indwelling" theory.

The apostle in 2 Cor., 6th chap. and 16th v., contemplates the church as a temple: "You are the temple of the living God;" and yet he has reference to the conduct of individual christians. The remark grew out of his advice or command for christians not to be *too intimate in* their relations with the society of unbelievers, and particularly not to intermarry with them, on the ground, and for the reason, that light and darkness, righteousness and unrighteousness, Christ and Belial, have no fellowship. There is and can be no agreement between these so long as each maintains its individual character. The christian is the temple of light and of righteousness, while the unbeliever, the friend of Belial, is the temple of darkness and unrighteousness. There can, therefore, be no "agreement" or concord between these, simply

¹ 2 Cor. 6: 16.

because there is and can be none between Christ and Belial. The one is the temple of God, and the other of idols, and they should be kept as distinct and separate as God and Belial. God dwells in one and Belial in the other. God walks among christians and Belial among unbelievers, and the apostle cites in proof what God said to the Jews: "*I will dwell among the children of Israel, and will be their God.*" In the passages in Exodus and Leviticus, in which these words occur, the preposition *en* is translated, in the common version, *among*, and ought to have been so translated in Corinthians. God may be said to literally and personally dwell and walk *among* a people, but not in them. When christians are addressed as a body or a temple, then the simile requires that the preposition *en* be translated *in*; but if as persons scattered throughout the earth, or viewed as the members of a certain church, or as a people, whether few or many, then the preposition places the Holy Spirit *among* them, but not *in* them, and it should be so translated. The thought must determine how the preposition is to be translated. When the thought requires that the word be rendered by *in*, then will it appear that the language is figurative; as for instance: "My little children, for whom I again travail in birth until *Christ be formed in you.*" Here Christ is contemplated as being formed in them. Literally and personally this is not, and can not be done. The language is figurative.

There is a purpose in the gift of the Holy Spirit, which is referred to by the Lord in his intercessory prayer on the night preceding his crucifixion, and which shows that the Spirit's continued presence with the church was necessary to the salvation of the individual christian. In that prayer he said: "While I was with them (*μετὰ αὐτῶν*) in the world I kept them in thy name." And since he was about to leave them, he prayed his Father to keep them. This prayer of the Lord was answered by the Father when he sent the Holy Spirit, to whom he gave in charge all the disciples then and henceforth in the world. That gift secured for them all that they lost in the departure of Christ. By the Holy Spirit, God sealed all the disciples to himself, and made by this their preservation in this world, and their salvation in heaven, secure. So the apostle wrote to the Ephesians: "In whom also, after that you believed, you were *sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise, who is the pledge of our inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession.*" While Christ was *with them*, he kept all but the son of perdition, and now the Spirit who is with them, will keep them until they are saved in heaven. Their union with Christ, their union with the Spirit, their union with God, is but the sealing and the assurance of their salvation in heaven; and it is the same relation essentially that will obtain in heaven. The life into which the spirit of man is introduced by faith and obedience is *eternal life*; and for the preservation of this life is the Spirit given. He is the plege that

God will raise the body from the grave. The destiny of the spirit determines the destiny of the body. The spirit being saved by the blood of Christ, the presence of the Holy Spirit is the pledge that God will raise the body. The Spirit's relation in sealing, keeping, and dwelling, is the same. If we know the nature of the Spirit's relation to the christian in one of these, we will know what it is in the other. The Spirit came to the disciples in obedience to the will of Christ, to supply his place with them. The Lord spoke of the Spirit as a person. As that messenger we can but view him as a person, and not as an influence; and hence we must conceive of his relation with the disciples as personal.

We have said that whenever the context, or language, or figure, requires the preposition *en* to be translated *in*, it will be found that the language is figurative, and is designed to express a *spiritual* relation, and not a personal one. Of this we have many illustrations in the christian scriptures. A few of these may be cited.

The relation existing between the sinner and the atonement; between the disciple and his Lord; between Christ and his church; between God and his children; and between the Holy Spirit and christians, is so close and intimate, that the strongest language is employed to convey to our minds its nature and character—its richness and fulness. This is principally due to the fact that the life of one is secured by the life of the other; that the guilt of one is canceled by the righteousness of the other; and that the one is wholly dependent on the other. This relation, which is spiritual and not personal; symbolical and representative, and not literal, is expressed by the apostle John in this forcible language: "And he who keeps his commandments *dwells in him and he in him;*" (*ἐναὐτῷ μένει, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐν αὐτῷ,*) "and hereby we know that *he abides in us,* (*ὅτι μένει ἐν ἡμῖν*) by the Holy Spirit whom he has given us;" and "If we love one another, God dwells in us (*ἐν ὑμῖν*), * * * Hereby we know that we dwell in him, and he in us, because he has given to us his Holy Spirit;" and, "whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, *God dwells in him, and he in God;*" and, "*He who dwells in love, dwells in God.*" In these passages christians are said to dwell *in God*. "In him we live, and move, and have our being." No one understands this language as literal and unfigurative, yet all readily gather its meaning. God is said to dwell in us, and so is Christ. Where the Holy Spirit is said to dwell in us, are we to understand that dwelling as literal and personal, while the dwelling of God and Christ is figurative? Such is the logic of the "indwelling" theory.

These strong expressions which represent God as dwelling *in* men, and men *in God*, are in perfect keeping with the close and intimate union which the scriptures represent as existing between the obedient believer in Jesus Christ, and the entire Godhead.

This union is spiritual—psychical, and is the foundation of the personal relation. “The soul of Jonathan was knit to the soul of David.” He loved him as he loved himself. This love was the cause and ground of their intimacy. So when the soul of the christian is knit to the soul of the Redeemer, then he dwells in God, and God in him. All this is plain; but who would apply such language, appropriate only to a psychical union, to the relation which the Holy Spirit as a person, and in person, sustains to the individual christian? Yet this is done by the “indwelling” theory.

The union and communion which the scriptures represent as subsisting between the entire Godhead and the disciples of Christ, are, in the highest sense, essential to man’s well-being in this world, and to his final salvation. It is man’s nature to be strengthened by association and spiritual inter-communion. It is essential to his happiness in human society, and equally so in his relations to God. For this reason God has condescended to dwell with him; in Eden, visibly; and since the loss of Eden, by symbols, and by the Holy Spirit. His relations to sin require this now more than when in Eden. Helpless, he needs a protector; ignorant, he needs an instructor; a sinner, he needs an intercessor; and swayed by passion, with spiritual powers weakened by sin, he needs powers to enable him to subdue his revolted nature, and enthrone his higher reason. All these he enjoys in his union with the Godhead, *into* whose names he is immersed, and under whose power he comes; and the Holy Spirit is the Divine representative in this union and communion between man redeemed and his Redeemer.

But this union is not such as to impair his natural powers, but rather to strengthen them. The Spirit acts on man’s powers and faculties in harmony with the nature and laws of his being. He addresses his mind and heart, his reason and conscience, in language that he understands; and presents motives and considerations that he can appreciate and embrace. He comforts, strengthens, and supports the mind and heart by the words he has uttered through apostles and prophets; he protects, preserves, and superintends the disciple by his personal presence in the church and among the saints everywhere, by both angelic and human agencies. If such is the work of the Spirit, and such his agencies and modes, what work does he, or can he, accomplish by his “indwelling in the hearts of christians”? It is not for their enlightenment, comfort, or consolation; for this work is effected by the word of God: “*for whatsoever things were written aforetime, were written for our instruction, that we, through the patience and comfort of the scriptures, might have hope.*” Whatever the Spirit does for the christian in these respects, he does by the word of God; what good for them he can not accomplish by this means, he works out by his providences. Thus we have in the word of God means which will do for the mind and

heart of the christian all that these require in this state of sin; and in his personal presence in the church and with the saints, all else that can not be accomplished by the divine word.

The view which we have now presented of the Holy Spirit's relation to christians, gives a full and intelligent conception of his work in this world, and of the means and methods he employs in accomplishing that work. This work, as we have seen, may be divided into two categories, (1), that which he accomplishes by the word of truth, and (2), that which he accomplishes by his providences; the first accomplishing all that the truth can do for the mind, and heart, and conscience; and the second all that the truth can not do, and was not intended to do, but which is necessary to the welfare of Christ's cause in the world, and of every church and saint in particular. The latter is a great and important work, covering a large field, and requiring many and varied instrumentalities. The gospel is to be sent into all the world. Men are the Spirit's agents. These must be chosen, fitted, and sent out to the work. The events in the lives of men, and the various agencies and work of human society are to be molded, directed, and made subservient to the cause of Christ and of humanity. The resources of states, communities, and individuals, are to be developed and directed, and forces to be set in motion, which shall work in the line of man's highest interests; and every thing that can contribute to this great end is to be ordained and set at work. The genius of men in invention, and their labor and industry in discovery; their science, and art, and civilization; all these are to be made tributary to the gospel of the Son of God. Who is competent for so great a work? Is not such a work divine? Can men alone develop and set in motion all these mighty forces, and direct them in the interests of Christianity? Certainly not. Only he whose horizon is as broad as the world, and whose vision is as clear and far-reaching as that which penetrates the remotest depths of the universe, and sees the minutiae as distinctly as he does the whole. He alone has the eye to see, the mind to comprehend and understand, and the power to execute. These are some of the reasons for the Spirit's constant presence in the church, and they explain the necessity of Christ's departure, and the Spirit's mission as the advocate of Christ, and the *Paraclete* of christians. His presence was to be for their comfort and consolation, their strength and reliance. To know, to be assured that he is ever present, is a strength to the heart, which naught else in this world can give or supply. To know that he is about us and with us, his hand overshadowing us with safety, his providences directing us, and his invisible power protecting us, and preserving us, has a sufficiency of consolation that naught else can equal. So David felt under the eye of God, and thus sang for his own and all ages: "I have set the Lord always before me: because he is on my right hand I shall not be moved. *Therefore my heart is glad and my*

glory rejoices;" * * "I will not fear what man can do to me;" * * "yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil, for thou art with me; thy rod and thy staff, they comfort me;" * * * "the Lord is the strength of my life, of whom shall I be afraid?" Such is the strength and heart-comfort and consolation of the man who feels and realizes by faith that God is nigh. This we have in the assurance that the Holy Spirit is ever present with us. This was the strength of Paul in his greatest trials. At his first answer before Cæsar, all forsook him. Yet the Lord did not forsake him: "The Lord stood by me, and strengthened me." The Lord is pledged to be with every disciple, and the Holy Spirit is ever present to fulfill that promise. The knowledge of this nerves the heart under all its trials, comforts us in our sufferings, and cheers us with the assurance that he will never leave us. He is here to catch our feeblest sigh, our unexpressed sorrow, and yet unformed prayer for help, and bear them swiftly to the throne of grace, and there *speak* them in language that tells all of our sufferings, trials, and temptations. The christian can, therefore, rejoice and sing: "The Lord is my shepherd, I shall not want. He maketh me to lie down in green pastures; he leadeth me by the still waters. He restoreth my soul; he leadeth me in the paths of righteousness for his name's sake. Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil;" and more fully realize than did ever Jew or patriarch, that "they who wait on the Lord shall renew their strength; they shall mount up with wings as eagles; they shall run and not be weary; they shall walk, and not faint." More than was ever hoped for, or dreamed of, or enjoyed by Enoch, Noah, Abraham, David, or Daniel, is realized to the saint by the gift of the Holy Spirit.

CHAPTER V.

THE CHURCH.

SECTION I. WHAT IT IS.

In the broadest acceptance of the word, the Church is that great Spiritual Empire, called in the New Testament, the Kingdom of God, the Kingdom of Heaven, and the Kingdom of God's Son. It was first announced as near at hand by John the Baptist, and after him by Jesus. It was fully inaugurated and established on the day of Pentecost, the apostles and the few disciples whom Jesus had made while on earth, and who remained steadfast to him till the last, constituting its nucleus. From that day to the present, all who have become disciples of Jesus, are members of it. It is now that great family of God on earth: that grand assembly of saints *called out and separated from the world*, but scattered, in communities, throughout the earth: the body of Jesus, and the Lamb's Bride. It is the anti-type of the Sanctuary of the Tabernacle and the Temple, in which the disciples or saints worship, and where they offer the incense of praise, thanksgiving, and prayer.

The term *Ecclesia*, the Greek word applied to the Church, indicates the manner in which it has been carved out of the great mass of mankind, as "the little stone cut out of the mountain." It indicates that all who constitute this assembly, *were called out*, and separated from the world, as a distinct body of men, marked out and ordained for a special purpose, isolated from the world by broad and distinct lines, and hedged in by ordinances and ceremonies, which constitute them "a peculiar people, a royal priesthood, and a holy nation"—the ONE BODY of Christ. As the one body of Christ, they are the one great Brotherhood, bound together by common ties, cemented by the same blood, animated and governed by the same principles, and partakers of the same hopes, blessings, and promises. Such is the Church of the

living God, "redeemed out of every nation, kindred, tribe, and tongue.

There is a subordinate, or limited, sense in which this word is used in the scriptures. It is applied to separate congregations of disciples. Hence, we read of the *churches* of Asia, the church of Corinth, of Ephesus, of Rome, or of Jerusalem; and of the churches in the houses of individuals. These are the only divisions recognized by the scriptures. These are natural divisions, harmonious and coalescent, like the members of the human body, animated by the same spirit, and invigorated by the same life. These are but masses of the same leaven, scattered or placed in different localities, working the same great changes in every community, and assimilating all to the nature and character of itself. The Church, therefore, is divisible only in such a sense.

The divisions of which the apostle speaks in his letter to the church at Corinth, were parties, or sects, in that church. Had they separated themselves, and each party gone to itself under their several leaders, they would then have been the prototypes of modern protestant denominations. Denominations are thus seen to be *sects*, and not branches of the church, or isolated masses of the same leaven which unifies all things, and produces results the reverse of parties or sects. These the apostle rebuked and condemned as carnal, and inimical to the spirit of Christ and the unity of his church.

Congregations are not *branches* of the church at large, but simply *representatives*. Each contains all that the others do, and all that the whole does. Every element necessary to the existence of the church as a whole, is found in each congregation; so that if only one congregation were left upon the earth, that single congregation would exhibit to the world all that is in, or is made known by the church. If all the congregations in the world were consolidated into one, no more would be seen in it, than is now seen in an isolated congregation. All are built on the same foundation. All have the same faith, the same Lord, and the same baptism. All have the same ordinances, and the same worship. What is found in one, is found in all, and what is not found in all, should not be found in one. Though independent, they are yet connected and united by all that is common to all. The same Spirit dwells in all, and hence all should be united as one body. All have the same chartered rights and privileges; all are organized on the same plan; and all have the same grades or orders of officials. All are co-equal. No one has the precedence or superiority over the others. There are no metropolitan or provincial churches or bishops. All are one, yet independent. Such were the churches in the days of the apostles, when the Holy Spirit was directing, molding, and establishing all things that pertained to the church, and to its work in the world. If we find things different now, we know

that these have come in through the pride, ambition, ignorance, or folly of men, and are but so many plague-spots which are to work ruin and death.

An apostasy has overtaken the church. There has been a "falling away" from the simplicity of the apostolic days; and so numerous and varied have been the corruptions and things foreign, which have been introduced, that these have almost entirely superseded, or obscured, the appointments of the Church as it appeared in the days of its purity and simplicity. Paganism and Gentile philosophy on the one hand, and things Judaistic on the other, have perverted the doctrine of Christ, and almost entirely overshadowed the simplicity of his appointments, by the glare, tinsel, and pageantry of Pagan and Judaistic forms of worship. These things are seen in all their fulness in the Roman apostasy, and in a greater or less degree in the churches which ostensibly protest against the abominations of Rome.

The great reformatory movement of the 16th century has split into many fragments. That movement aimed to rescue the church from the corruptions which the apostasy had engrafted upon it; but succeeded only in part, as was to be expected. The journey back to the apostolic church can not be compassed by one step in that direction. The departure was too great, and the corruptions too many and varied, and too deeply imbedded in the general mind of the church, for the movement to have been more than partially successful. That movement claimed as its object the restoration of the church. But when doctrines and philosophies began to plow furrows of discord in the ranks, schisms appeared in the body, the legitimate and direct offspring of the supremacy of doctrines over faith and its obedient life. The divisions which resulted from these schisms, when they became organized into different religious bodies, as belligerent as the doctrines which gave them existence, now distinguish the Protestant Church. Though schismatic as to their origin, and belligerent and divisive in their spirit and operations, they yet, all of them, claim to be christian, and designate their schismatic bodies as "*branches*" of the Church of Christ, and have claimed for their divisions both necessity and wisdom.

It is a weak and impotent defense of denominationalism, to say that denominations are but "*branches*" of the church. Their origin and spirit are, in their very nature, of the apostasy foretold by the apostle Paul, inimical to the teaching of Christ, and utterly regardless of his intercessory prayer. He prayed that his disciples might be one, united by his spirit and love, and the observance of his commandments; and Paul urged upon the church at Corinth that all should be of "the same mind and judgment;" that they should "stand fast in one spirit, with one mind striving together for the faith of the gospel," and not against each other for the building up and strengthening of parties. "A house divided against itself can not stand," says the

Lord; and divisions have done no other good to the world than to show what immense and irrepressible vitality the religion of Christ has, to have endured, for so many centuries, the shocks which its friends have given it by their feuds and divisions.

“Christ is not divided.” There are to be no Paulites or Cephasites among his people. There is nothing more pointedly rebuked and severely condemned in the scriptures than schisms or parties in the church, whether large or small; or whether separated from, or continued in, the body. There are no “branches” to the body of Christ. He is not divided. *Individuals* only are branches of him, as the vine into which they, as individuals, have been grafted. They are members of his body, because of their union and connection with him. But the schisms and parties which Paul rebuked, were *carnal*—unchristian, and devoid, to that extent, of the spirit of Christ.

The Church of Jesus Christ is not a continuation of the Jewish Theocracy, or “church,” as the Protestant world is accustomed to call that dispensation of religion; nor is it any part of Judaism. While it has many things in common with Judaism, such as the elements of the Remedial System, and its faith and piety; yet it is as distinct from Judaism as the principles of faith and law. Its initial point is as easily determined as that of Judaism. The pentecost of the Jews witnessed the enunciation by God of the Decalogue, and the pentecost which witnessed the coronation of Christ, also witnessed the first promulgation of the gospel. Judaism was essentially a system of *law*, mingled with mercy; Christianity is essentially a system of *mercy*, mingled with law. In the one law predominates as the principle of government; in the other, love and mercy. One was the “Old Covenant;” the other is the “New.” One was given to, and provided for, the Jews only; the other for both Jews and Gentiles. One reared a wall of partition; the other broke down that wall. In these things they are different and opposite; disconnected and dissimilar, and hence they are not one and the same.

The church of Jesus Christ is built on him as the chief corner stone, and on his apostles and prophets in a secondary sense, as the messengers who proclaimed his gospel by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. It could have had no existence, therefore, before the day of Pentecost, when Christ ascended his throne, and the Holy Spirit came from heaven, and inspired his apostles to preach the glad tidings of salvation in his name. What we would know of it, therefore, must be learned from the book of Acts of Apostles and the Epistles of the apostles, and not from the Pentateuch, Psalms, or Jewish Prophets. It is “the little stone that was cut out of the mountain” in the days of the Cæsars, and the last great empire that shall possess universal rule and authority, and mold into one universal brotherhood all the nations of the world.

SECTION II.

WHO CONSTITUTE THE CHURCH.

The kingdom of God is an empire of *mind*. It proposes to save the soul from the guilt and dominion of sin, and preserve it in a righteous allegiance to the Fountain of all happiness until its ultimate and glorious destiny is attained. As it is an empire of mind, its subjects are intelligent beings, capable of voluntary obedience and self-determined action. It is an empire, in many respects, like that under which the angels in heaven live, and so much like it, indeed, that, in the end, the two will be blended into one.¹

It may, therefore, seem strange to such as read only the New Testament, and have but little or no knowledge of the theological questions which have distracted and divided the church, that any question should ever have arisen in the church, touching the character of the subjects of the kingdom of heaven. The New Testament scriptures are so clear, and full, and explicit on this subject, that it seems exceedingly strange that the minds of men have been clouded in regard to it, so that they have engrafted upon the church the peculiar feature of Judaism—membership of children, because of the relations which belong to the flesh—and to this extent they have made a kingdom, which is part flesh and part spirit—“part iron and part clay.” This was the nature of the Roman Empire, by reason of which it fell into fragments. So must the kingdom of Christ, if thus composed of flesh and spirit; and so it has, as witnessed in the divisions following this admixture.

At an early period of his ministry the Lord had occasion to eradicate a notion of this kind. Nicodemus held a notion not unlike that which lies at the basis of infant membership. He seemed to think that Christianity was to be only a continuation of Judaism; that, at least, there was no very radical difference between them, such as to forbid Jewish rulers a participation in its blessings. The Lord undeceived him in that, and cut off all hope arising from Jewish birth-right. Jews were Jews, and were entitled to all the blessings of the Jewish covenant, by virtue of their descent from Abraham through Isaac. That birth

¹ Eph. 1: 10.

and the circumcision which sealed it, cut them off from the rest of mankind, and made them a peculiar people. The Lord came to abolish the privileges and restrictions of this birth; to break down this wall of division; and to establish a new order of things, by which both Jews and Gentiles might be consolidated into one family, to "make in himself of the two one *new man*, so making peace." This he effects by a new birth, with a seal and a circumcision consonant with the nature of that birth. This birth is of the spirit of man, not of his body; a word that expresses the revolution which the mind undergoes in becoming a subject of the kingdom of heaven. The Lord excludes all from this kingdom who are not "born of water and of the Spirit." He positively declares that no one can enter that kingdom without this birth. None, therefore, who do not, or can not, become the subjects of this birth, can be the subjects of this spiritual kingdom.

This *spiritual* birth is the change, the revolution, the conversion, which the mind or soul undergoes under the influence of Christ's teaching. This teaching is called by the Lord through Jeremiah, the *New Covenant*, which he proposed to make with the Jewish people "in the last days." This covenant is contrasted with the old or Sinaic covenant by the apostle Paul, in his letter to the Hebrews. The striking features of the old are shown very distinctly by the facts in the case. The Israelites had been the people of God for many centuries, and had been but recently confirmed as such by their purchase from the king of Egypt at the price of the "first-born of man and of beast." They had been saved by God in their passage through the Red Sea, and were now encamped before Sinai from whose summit God pronounced his law. This law was given to them as the chosen, and peculiar people of God, and was taught them *after* their adoption and purchase. On the other hand, and in striking contrast with this, the subjects of the New Covenant are not born under it by a birth of flesh, and then, when they reach maturity, taught the law by which they should live; but are taught the laws of the new covenant at the beginning. They have the laws put into their hearts and minds at the first, and by this enlightenment they become obedient subjects through intelligent conviction and action. They are born into this kingdom *through* and *after* this enlightenment of the mind, and change in the affections. Hence, their birth pertains to their spirit, and is the revolution which the soul undergoes after its enlightenment by the laws of the new covenant; after these have been "put into their minds and written on their hearts."

Now, from these scriptures it is perfectly evident and beyond all question, that the subjects of the kingdom of heaven are *all obedient believers*; persons capable of mental enlightenment and of the conviction of sin; persons who have sinned and been pardoned; whose hearts have been touched by the interposition of

Christ in their behalf; and who have openly and publicly confessed his name, and submitted to his authority in the act of immersion.

Such being the plain teaching of the Christian scriptures, we are justified in excluding from the kingdom of heaven, or the Church of Jesus Christ, all who are incapable of receiving the Lord Jesus Christ by *faith*, and of giving him the love of their hearts, and their voluntary and intelligent obedience. Therefore, neither infants, nor idiots, nor the insane, all of whom are incapable of intelligent action, can be considered as eligible subjects of the kingdom of heaven.

Infant baptism had its origin about the middle of the third century, in the days of Tertullian and Cyprian. It originated from reasoning as illogical and false as anything that can be imagined. Supposing analogies to exist where only accidental resemblances can be found, and ascribing identity to things which are as distinct and dissimilar as flesh and spirit, men have inferred the propriety of infant membership in the church, from the fact that infants were subjects of the kingdom of Israel under the old covenant. As that covenant was given to the lineal descendants of Abraham, through the line of Isaac, all *born* in that line were necessarily children of that covenant, and entitled to all it granted. But a birth of spirit is not predicable of infants. There are three things which belong to the birth of spirit: 1st, Faith; 2d, Repentance; 3d, a public confession with the mouth. These acts are possible only to an intelligent and responsible being, who is aware of the nature and purpose of these acts, and who acts from an intelligent conviction of the truth as it is in Jesus Christ.

Infant membership is one of the fruits of the apostasy. It was not known in the days of the apostles. This some of the advocates of the practice acknowledge. "Without the aid of tradition," says Bishop Kenrick, "the practice of baptizing infants can not be satisfactorily vindicated."¹ This is the testimony of a Roman Catholic, from which church Protestants have borrowed the practice, though disclaiming the authority on which the practice is based. Protestants pretend to find authority in the scriptures. They are bolder than the Romanists, but not so candid. But the ground of their claim, when fully considered, is an *inference* not at all warranted by the scriptures which they cite in proof.

Their first argument for the practice is, that "baptism having come in the room of circumcision," children are as legitimately the subjects of baptism, under Christianity, as of circumcision, under Judaism. This claim has been already shown to have no foundation in the scriptures, in what we have said on the covenants made with Abraham, and in regard to the essential difference in nature between Judaism and Christianity. It is unnecessary, therefore, to say more in this place.

¹ Quoted by Campbell: "Baptism: its Antecedents and Consequents."

The second argument is, that it is authorized by the Christian scriptures when they speak of the baptism of *households*. The whole strength of this claim rests on the slender foundation of the supposition, inference, or assumption, that infants were included among the baptized, since they are included in a household.

That there were infants in the households, or families, which are said in the scriptures to have been baptized, we might admit (for the sake of argument), and yet positively deny that they were included among the baptized. On the contrary, we positively affirm that they were *not* included among the baptized. This affirmation we now propose to make good, though the burden of proof lies on the other side.

The terms that qualify "households," exclude infants from what is affirmed of the households. If the qualifying terms are predicable of *all* the household—of every member of a family, then, of course, infants may be included. Paul says: "I baptized also the household of Stephanus." Here baptism is affirmed of the household, and the inference drawn from the statement is that his infant children were among the baptized. We know not whether there were infants in that household or not. We may presume there were, and yet deny that they were included among the baptized. This denial is based on the nature or character of the thing predicated of the household, viz: baptism. Is baptism predicable of infants? The answer to this question can not be determined by an inference. We must know more of baptism than what is inferred from such statements as the baptism of households. We must know more of the institution than that. Has the institution any antecedents and consequents? Is there any act on the part of the baptized preliminary, and essential to its validity, or anything following it, which an infant can not do, or enjoy? If so, then baptism is not applicable to, or predicable of, infants. This will be made evident by an illustration.

If the statement were that the household of Stephanus *lived* in Corinth, then all that *lived*, and belonged to his household, would be embraced by the predicate, *lived*, and the statement would include not only his children, but his *servants* also. The advocates of infant membership have never claimed that the *servants* of christians should be baptized, for the reason that they were members of the household. And why should they not be included as well as children? If the household includes the children, the servants must not be excluded without injustice to the argument.

In the cases of Lydia and the Jailer at Philippi, the terms predicated of those who were baptized, positively exclude infants. These terms are, in the case of Lydia, that "*her heart was opened so that she gave heed to the things spoken by Paul, and was baptized, and her household.*" Here were acts on her part which are impossible with infants. Hence, if her baptism had any con-

nection with the opening of her heart, and the attention she gave to the preaching of Paul, that baptism was also beyond the power and faculties of the infant. They certainly can not give heed to preaching, and hence can not be proper subjects of baptism.

In the case of the jailer the argument is still more conclusive against infant membership. When he came trembling with fear into the presence of Paul and Silas, he asked anxiously what he should do to be saved. "And they said, *Believe* on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, with thy house." Then "they preached to him the word of the Lord, and to *all that were in his house,*" and the jailer "was baptized, he and all his straight-way." In this case, *as in all cases,* the preaching of the word of the Lord preceded the baptism. What other purpose was this preaching for than that they who heard should *believe* on the Lord Jesus Christ? This was required of the jailer: so that not only hearing, but believing preceded his baptism, and that of his house. These are acts beyond the capacity of infants, and hence they can not be included among the baptized. These are the antecedents of baptism, and they positively exclude all infants. The same is true in regard to its consequents.

The historian of Acts further says of the jailer and his house: "And [he] *rejoiced, believing in God, with all his house.*" Here the baptized are said to have rejoiced because of their faith and obedience to the gospel. If there were infants in that "house," they were not among the baptized, because the baptized rejoiced, believing in God. This joy arose from the conviction that they were saved from their sins. Here are two other things impossible with infants. They can not have *convictions*, and they have no *sins*. They have no knowledge of sin, and hence can have none of the feelings which its presence occasions, or its remission produces. If the statement of the historian were that the jailer and all his house were *sleeping*, or were living in the prison, then we could include all that were of his family, both old and young, both master and servants; for sleeping and living are predicable of all. There are passages of such predicable terms in the scriptures, and these show still further the force and thought of the argument based on predicable terms.

Paul in his letter to Timothy, when speaking of the qualifications of the bishops, says: "If any man know not how to *rule his own house*, how shall he take care of the Church of God?" Here the thing done is ruling. Who are included or excluded? Children certainly are among the ruled; they are, therefore, included as the subjects of the action of the ruler; but only such as have passed infancy, and into the period of life in which the child knows what obedience and disobedience to a parent are.

In his letter to the Philipians this same apostle says: "All the saints [in Rome] salute you, especially they who are of the

household of Cæsar." The act of the household in this case is *saluting* their brethren at Philippi. The brethren in Rome greet the brethren in Philippi. None is, or can be, included, who is not capable of greeting or sending a salutation to their brethren. Especially did they of the household of Cæsar do this.

Attaching far more importance and efficacy to the ordinance of baptism than do the scriptures, or those who plead for, and practice, immersion, (but only for adults), Pedobaptists have invented a doctrine which they seem to think fully justifies and, indeed, requires, the baptism of children, and their reception into the church. This doctrine is "original sin," which makes even infants sinners because of the sin of Adam, the representative, or federal head of the race. But this doctrine has no foundation in reason or scripture. The *guilt* that stains the soul, and calls for punishment, is not transmissible. So God himself has declared by the prophet Ezekiel: "*All souls are mine*; as the soul of the father, so also the soul of the son is mine; the soul that *sins* shall die." The father shall die for his own sin, and not for that of his son; and the son for his, and not for his father's. No other than he who sins, shall die for that sin. Adam suffered in his own person the consequences of his sin, and God has not entailed that sin on the race, as respects punishment or guilt. Guilt is a quality of an action that can not be transmitted from father to child; hence, the doctrine that teaches that *any degree of guilt* attaches to the race because of Adam's sin, is wholly an assumption, without human reason or inspired scripture to countenance it.

The essential nature of sin is its guilt. This is the quality of an action that demands punishment, and which will finally drown the soul in perdition. It is this quality that calls for an atonement. Can infants do an act that has a moral quality? No one will affirm it. Infants can not be guilty of sin. The blood of Christ meets them at no point, nor under any circumstances, because his blood has special reference to sin. Moreover, his blood is without effect upon any one involved in sin, unless associated with faith and repentance, even though baptism be administered. Baptism is a useless ordinance in the absence of personal sins. The baptism which Christ ordained, and directed to be administered, is connected with his blood, "shed for the remission of sins." His blood is the atonement for personal sins. Hence, as infants have no personal sins, they have no salvation which comes from the *blood* of Christ; and as they can not exercise faith and repentance, the baptism which is inseparably connected with these psychical acts, was never designed for infants.

The doctrine of "original sin," on account of which the baptism of infants is claimed to be proper and necessary, implies the grossest materialism, in that it holds that sin is derived from the father to the child. It can not be asserted even of animals that their psychical *faults* or peculiarities are transmitted to their

offspring. *Traits* that belong to species are transmissible, because they constitute an element of the species, and arise from organic structure; but *faults*, or acquired traits or powers, are not transmissible. Animals may be trained or educated to a very great extent, and they may learn to do things that are not common to the species; but these traits will not be transmitted. Much less will the sins of the soul be transmitted, which has an existence separable from the body, and which is not derived with the body, but is a separate and individual creation, as far as *creation* can be predicated of spirit. It will live after the body, with which it is associated and allied in this life, has perished, and will "return to God who gave it." Whence, then, the human spirit? The scriptures say, from God. Whence the body? They say, from the earth, whence all organized beings of this world come. Thither it returns, as do all organized creatures. They all arise through, and are perpetuated by a system of reproduction and derivation. All that is of the organism, is derived. What is not of it—not specific to it—is not derived. Hence, the spirit being distinct and separable from the animal organism, in all its entirety, and not perishing with that organism, can not be derived with it. If it is, it should perish with it, and this, it is claimed by those who believe in the spirit's derivative existence and nature, it does. The doctrine of original sin, being based on the transmissibility of sin by the system of derivation, of which the body is the subject, is, therefore, essentially materialistic, and hence can not be in accord with the scriptures, which teach the soul's inherent immortality, and, consequently, its entire distinctness from the organism with which it is associated only in this life.

It may be claimed as a last refuge that original sin has an existence by *imputation*; that is, that God *imputes* sin to Adam's posterity because of their lineal connection with, and descent from, him, as the origin and representative of the race. There is certainly no closer connection, or genetic relation between Adam and his posterity, both proximate and remote, than there is between the father and his son. If sin is ever transmitted, it should certainly be found in the son of the wicked and ungodly father. But God says that the son shall not bear the iniquity of his father. He shall bear only his own sin. There is, therefore, no guilt attaching to the son as flowing from the father. Whether, therefore, the doctrine be based on the supposition of derivation or imputation, it finds no countenance from either scripture or reason. The Pedobaptist must, consequently, find some other ground for the practice, or admit its human origin in whole and in part.

The baptism which Christ ordained as a part of the organic law of his kingdom, can not be administered with any show of authority from the scriptures, or from common sense, where sin does not exist. The ordinance is connected with sin and its re-

mission, and has no virtue or propriety when administered to persons who have no sins. The exception to this in the case of the Lord Jesus proves nothing against this view. He was wholly without sin, and yet, had he failed to submit to John's baptism, which was administered "for the remission of sins," he would have sinned. As concerning him the baptism of John had an additional object, which was to afford an opportunity for the public recognition by God of Jesus as the Messiah. Infants have no sins, nor has God any purpose or object with them on account of which their baptism becomes a necessity, or even a propriety; and hence pedobaptism is wholly without the warrant of either scripture or reason.

In respect to the results or influences of Adam's sin on the spiritual or physical nature or welfare of his posterity, we have spoken elsewhere. Suffice it to say here, that all the conclusions at which we then arrived, which bear on the subject under consideration, confirm the present conclusion, that infants are not scriptural subjects of baptism. They have no right to any ordinance of the Remedial System, or to any of its spiritual provisions. The atonement meets them no where. Hence, nothing that pertains to the atonement concerns them in any way.

Who, then, properly and scripturally constitute the church of Jesus Christ? We answer unhesitatingly and with the fullest confidence inspired by the light of the divine volume: *None but those who have heard the gospel, and believed on Jesus as the Christ, the Son of God and Savior of men; who have repented of their sins and given the heart to God; and who have been immersed on the authority of Christ into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. Such only constitute the Church of God; such only are the subjects of the Kingdom of Heaven.*

SECTION III.

ITS FOUNDATION.

On this subject three distinct views obtain: First, that which holds that Christ is the foundation of the church; second, that which makes the apostle Peter the rock on which the church is built; and third, that which regards the truth, or more specifically speaking, the proposition that "Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God," as this foundation.

To determine, if possible, which of these views is the correct and true one, it will be necessary to examine these scriptures carefully. These different views have arisen from the interpretations which have been given of the chief and prominent passage relating to this question. This passage is found in Math. 16: 18, in a conversation which Jesus held with his disciples, regarding the impressions his teaching and miracles had made on the minds of the people. His ministry was then drawing to a close. He had preached the gospel in person and by his disciples, and wrought miracles, in Judea and Galilee, until he was known from one end of the land to the other. Thousands of people had seen him, heard his teaching, and seen his miracles, and many had been subjects of his miraculous power. Multitudes flocked to him from all directions, and wherever he went, his way was crowded by anxious listeners, and still more anxious sufferers. His fame was in all the land, and his name upon the lips and in the hearts of thousands. And now, when the time of his departure was drawing nigh, and his mission nearly closed, he seemed desirous of knowing what impression he had made on the public mind, and how he was regarded by the people as respects his true nature and mission. As he had never told the people, nor even his apostles, plainly, and in so many words, who or what he was, all were left to determine this from the works which he wrought, the principles which he inculcated, and the prophecies which related to him. Though he asked the Jews what they thought of the Messiah, who and what he was, yet he gave them no more light than the prophecies afforded.

But now the time had come when he must prepare the minds of the disciples for the great event of his mission, then not distant in the future, and he approached the subject by seeking from them what the people thought and said of him. They were near Caesarea Philippi when he said to his disciples, "Who do men

say that I the son of man am?" They replied: "Some say you are John the Baptist raised from the dead: some, Elijah; and others, Jeremiah, or one of the prophets." This indicated a confused state of public opinion. He said to his disciples, "Whom say ye that I am?" Peter replied: "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." This was the mind of all the disciples. On another occasion, when Jesus saw many who had been following him, turn away and leave him, he said to his faithful ones: "Will you also go away?" Peter replied: "To whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life; and we believe and are sure that thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." This was the judgment his disciples had formed of him. They had seen in the miracles which he wrought, and in the words which he uttered, a confirmation of the announcement of God at his baptism, and believed that he was the Son of God, as God had said. Such a person was, in their mind, the Prince Messiah, whom the nation was then earnestly desiring, and anxiously expecting.

The Lord was pleased with the reply of Peter. He was the first chosen apostle. He had surnamed him Peter soon after calling him. He saw in him a character that was fitly represented by the word, rock. Peter seems to have always stood in the front, and to have been the first to speak and act. Hence the fact, in this instance, that he spoke for all the rest. The reply of the Lord was therefore very natural. The figure he used in regard to his church seems to have been suggested, in part at least, by Peter's name. "Thou art Peter (rock), and on *this rock* I will build my church."

We should observe particularly the marked antithesis between the conception of Peter, and the statement of Christ. Peter, in confessing and declaring his faith that Jesus was the Christ, the Son of the living God, had in his mind the Jewish conception of the Messiah, for whom the nation was then anxiously looking, and from whom they expected so much. Jesus, on the other hand, was looking at the great purpose and grand result of his mission. He came as a king, the son of David, the Prince Messiah, to found a kingdom in this world, and he was then contemplating the foundation on which it should be established. He was the central figure in this great movement on the part of God, around whom gathered all the special and peculiar interests and purposes of the kingdom, and so he regarded himself. But this was not seen or known by either the Jews at large, or his disciples; and now for the first time, during his ministry, he began to develop his character in his relations to the church which he purposed to establish in the world. On what *rock*, then, did Christ purpose to found his church? Himself, Peter, or the truth?

In our efforts to determine this question several things must be particularly and carefully noted. Peter had confessed that

Jesus was the Messiah whom the Jews expected; and more than this, that he was "the Son of the living God." This conception of Jesus in his two-fold relation to the Jews and to the world, exhausts the whole character of Christ, and hence met with the full favor of the Lord. Jesus regarded this confession as embracing all that he was, as God manifested in the flesh—as the incarnate Logos; and it will be well for us to keep before our minds this two-fold character of Jesus of Nazareth while considering this question.

In the next place we should note well the reply of our Lord: "Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona, for flesh and blood hath not revealed this to you, but my Father who is in heaven. And I say to you, Thou art *rock* (*πετρος*) [as Jesus had named him before this time], and *on this rock* (*ἐπὶ ταῦτα τῇ πετρᾷ*) I will build my church." Now, two things must be noted here: first, the word *rock*, *descriptive* of Simon, is a masculine noun, and the rock on which the church is built is a feminine; so that these rocks can not be one and the same; second, the demonstrative pronoun, *this*, directs the mind to a rock that is different from the rock which is descriptive of the character of Simon, and which gives him the name of Peter; and forbids the conclusion that the two rocks are one and the same. Therefore, Peter can not have been in the mind of Christ as the rock on which he intended to build his church. Some *other* rock than Peter was the foundation he intended.

Was it the truth—the thing confessed—that "Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God"? It has been supposed that the feminine form of the word, as used by Christ, is proof that he intended the truth, or thing confessed, as the foundation. How the truth respecting the official or personal character of an individual can be the foundation of the empire which that person may establish among men, it is not easy to understand. That character may be essentially necessary to the right and authority of the person to occupy the throne; but independent of him, the truth has no value or power. The character the person possesses is simply his qualification as king, and may be absolutely necessary to his occupancy of the throne; but the kingdom can not be founded on a *statement* of his character, as the truth respecting Christ's official character is. We believe that he is "the Christ, the Son of the living God;" but this truth, or statement, or proposition, can not be regarded as the foundation of the kingdom. We may have monarchies founded on truth and righteousness in a well understood sense of the word, *founded*. In this case we simply understand that the government is *administered* on these principles, whilst they may be founded on the will of the king, or on a constitution. There is no government among men exactly analogous to the kingdom of Christ, because the head of no earthly government holds the same relations to its subjects that Jesus sustains to the subjects of his kingdom. On account

of the peculiar and intimate relations which he sustains to his disciples, and they to him, *he* is the center and ground of all the hopes and blessings which the kingdom is designed to confer on its subjects. Men, in becoming subjects of his kingdom, do not come into any peculiar relations to truth, different from that which they may sustain to it in other relations in life. The same may be said in regard to the relations which subjects sustain to kingdoms and empires. But when men become the subjects of Christ's kingdom they come into a peculiar and singular relation with him, and with the entire Godhead, and such a relation as is unknown among the kingdoms of earth. This relation must be considered in determining the foundation of the church. As this relation is wholly different from that which men sustain to the truth, or a truth, the truth in no phase of it can be considered as the foundation of the church of Christ. The truth, or a truth, can not be the savior that Christ is. It has no power to save from the consequences of sin, from which Christ saves men. It is no savior in the sense in which he is savior. Hence, it can not be the foundation of his great empire.

Christ is the foundation of his church. It is built on him. The scriptures place this beyond all question. Says Paul: "*Other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ.*"¹ On him as the foundation men and women are built. They are built *on* him, and *into* him. He is the foundation stone, the chief corner stone, on whom apostles and prophets are first built, and then on them all obedient believers in Christ,—all, indeed, who are *baptized into Christ*, whether gold or silver, or precious stones, wood, hay, or stubble,—all are built on this foundation.

It is a natural figure to speak of foundations as being made of rock. This only is immovable; and since God determined to establish a kingdom which can not be moved, he said long before that he would build it on the rock. Thus he spoke by Isaiah: "Behold, I lay in Zion for a foundation, a *stone*, a precious corner *stone*, a sure foundation." That Christ is this stone, he himself declares. He applies the prophecy of David to himself, in the parable of the vineyard, Math. 21: 33-42. He represents himself as the son of the Lord of the vineyard, who was cast out and killed, and said to the Jews who did this in his person: "Have you not read in the scriptures, The stone which the builders rejected the same is become the head of the corner." He was the stone who was laid as a sure foundation in Zion.

The Holy Spirit who spoke by Isaiah and David, speaks to the same purport by the apostle Peter: "To *whom* [Christ] coming, a *living stone*, disallowed indeed by men, but chosen by God, precious, you also as living stones are built up a spiritual house," &c. This stone is the object of our faith: "Whosoever shall *be-*

¹ For the omission of the article, see Bloomfield *in loco*, and the Four Gospels, with notes, by Dr. Geo. Campbell, pp. 152-162.

lieve on him shall not be ashamed." The stone is, therefore, a person, and this person Christ. He was the person rejected by the builders, the Jews; "the stone disallowed of men;" the "stone of stumbling and rock of offense;" and the stone "on which the whole building fitly framed together groweth into a holy temple in the Lord."

Thus far we have considered the subject in the light of the scriptures. This, indeed, is sufficient; but since some think that the scriptures teach otherwise, it will be well to show that our conclusion is sustained by other considerations. We may view the subject in the light of the relations which Christ sustains to the church, and of the purposes which he had in view in establishing it. There are reasons and considerations why he should be the foundation, and which make it impossible that any one else; or anything else, can be that foundation. To these we will now devote some attention.

This part of the argument calls for the consideration of another important word in this declaration of our Lord: "On this rock I will build *my church*." What is the church? What is that which is built on this rock? Peter says, in addressing christians, "*You, as living stones, are built up a spiritual house*." This spiritual house is the church, and christians are the living stones. Paul says to the Ephesians: "Now, therefore, *you* are no longer strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens of the saints and of the household of God, and *are built* upon the foundation of apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone." It is christians that are built on this foundation; men and women who have been made alive from the death of sin, and gathered into the *Ekklesia* of all peoples. The church, therefore, is that great spiritual empire, over which Christ reigns; that kingdom of heaven of which all obedient believers on the Lord Jesus Christ are the subjects. As living stones they are built into this temple of the Lord in which God dwells by his Spirit.

The church he calls his, because these living stones are built on him. All christians hold a peculiar and intimate relation with him. He is the atonement for sin, whose blood has washed away all sin; the priest who has offered that blood as an atonement; and the mediator who mediates for men with God. In these relations to the world he is the Savior. Men are saved *in* him. Hence, all christians sustain this peculiar and intimate relation with him. They are *in him* by having been immersed *into him*. Men are not immersed in or into the name of Peter, but in, and into, the name of him only who was crucified for them. Nor are men immersed into the truth. Baptism has no such relation to the *truth* of Christ as it has to *him*. Neither Peter nor the truth saves men from their sins. Hence, neither of them can be the foundation of that empire that consists entirely of men and women redeemed from sin. The blood of Peter, were it shed a

thousand times, could never blot out one sin. The truth has no blood to shed. It can not save from sin; it can not redeem from the power of darkness; nor rescue the body from the grave. Only the Lord Jesus can do for man all that his condition under sin demands or requires. Only he can make alive from the death of sin (Eph. 2: 1); only he can create the living stones, which are built upon him. These are the new *creations in him*. Therefore the Lord Jesus is the true and real foundation—the rock on which his church is built. Hence, he said (pointing probably to himself), “On *this* rock will I build my church, and the gates of hades shall not prevail against it.”

The rock on which the church is built can not be affected by death. Neither death, nor he who has the power of death, shall prevail against that rock or that church. “Those who sleep in Jesus, God will bring with him.” As Jesus arose, so all those who are his, will. This is true of the whole church. The grave will not prevail against it.

But does the relative, *it*, refer to the church? If so, much of the force of the declaration of the Lord is lost by the fact that “*all the dead*, both small and great, shall stand before God,” after their resurrection. The gates of hades will not prevail against any one of the race. Hence, the power of death over the church is no greater, nor less, than over all mankind. In this the church enjoys no greater privilege or glory than all mankind. Can it, therefore, refer to church? Does it not rather refer to rock? The objections to this are altogether grammatical, but not conclusive. The objections in the case of its reference to the church are different and greater, and seem to forbid such conclusion. If *rock* be its antecedent, then the statement possesses more force; for the whole question concerning Christ, and all that pertains to him, rests on his resurrection from the dead. “If Christ be not raised our faith is vain, and we are yet in our sins.” If he be not raised, the church is a myth. If he arose not, the church is impossible. If he arose not, the dead will not rise. On his resurrection, therefore, all things that pertain to the church depend, and they are naught, if his body goes to corruption. The failure, therefore, of the gates of hades to prevail against him, means everything. It means the destruction of all the powers of darkness, and the triumph of the powers of light with which Christ is allied. Against him naught shall prevail.

“On this rock [*me*] I will build my church, and the gates of hades shall not prevail against *it*.”

SECTION IV.

ITS NECESSITY AND PURPOSE.

Man is eminently a *social* being. This is his differential attribute, and arises from a nature that distinguishes him from the animals below him. This nature allies him to the higher order of intelligent beings who inhabit the heavens. The animal is gregarious, but man is social. On his higher nature society is based. Possessing such a nature, such a condition in life as society is essentially necessary to his well-being, and to the development of his psychical faculties in the line of his highest interests and good. Under its influences and appointments all the powers and capacities of his mind and heart increase and strengthen, until the animal is subordinated to the spiritual. Without the molding, refining, and developing influences of society man dwindles, and descends to a plane below the animal, roughens into all the asperities of a savage nature, and becomes degraded from all that distinguishes him as a species. To him society is a power. It exerts upon him an influence of which he is not conscious until isolated from its joys, and pleasures, and deprived of its associations.

As society is peculiar to man, its benefits are seen in those features of his being which are affected, or influenced, by its peculiar powers and advantages. These are his spiritual powers and faculties, the action of which is designed to enthrone the higher sentiments of his nature, and to subordinate the animal, until man's reason and conscience determine and control his actions, feelings, and desires, and place him on the plane of being for which his spirit-nature qualifies him and designed him. Whilst man's emotions and passions, feelings and desires, sentiments and actions, are molded, refined, and directed by the peculiar influences of society, this development looks forward to his ultimate association with beings of another sphere of existence, in which will be seen, far more than it is here, all that God intended man to be when he created him.

Involved in sin, man needs all that can save or preserve him from it, in order that he may again reach those things which were lost by sin. In the effort that God has made to save him, he has employed such means as will effectually do for man all that he needs. Among these means, and next in importance to the atonement, is the Church, that society of redeemed men, whose

life and tone are righteousness and holiness; that society which fosters all that God loves, and debars all that God dislikes. Here men have the proper society, and the proper and necessary principles; a society that throws around them proper influences, and affords them good examples; all that will strengthen the heart, and steady the will. It is a society of the enlightened, the pure-minded, the upright in purpose, in whom selfishness is abased; men who consider the welfare of others, and who work in this direction; men who aim to attain a higher plane of life than is known and recognized in the world; who "seek for glory, honor, and immortality" in the heavens; and who have ever before them, as the example of life and emotion, "him who knew no sin," on whose lips guile was never found. It is a society whose life and tone and principle are righteousness, holiness, peace, love and good-will to all men, and especially to "the household of faith." It is a society of light for men who have come out of darkness; of righteousness for men who have lived a life of wrong-doing; of purity and holiness for men who have led lives of impurity; of love and peace for those who have lived in hate, "hateful and hating one another;" a society in which all are "striving together for the faith of the gospel;" a society isolated from the world and its influences, where men learn to lead lives of right-thinking and right-doing, that shall fit them for the higher, more blissful, and more permanent society in the heavens. For such purposes as these was the Church ordained, and for the realization of these it is essentially necessary.

Heaven is exclusive in regard to sin. So is the church on earth. It is composed of redeemed men. They are the saints of the most high God; and though sinning and stumbling, as weak and struggling creatures, beset in this world by opposing forces, yet still they are saints, if struggling for a higher life, beloved and cared for by God; though erring, they are

"Like sunshine turned aside by a rill,
Though turned aside, is sunshine still."

They are "the born of God," and "do not commit sin." because they "keep themselves, and the wicked one touches them not."¹ Besides, the Lord "keepeth the way of his saints;"² "he will not suffer their feet to be moved; he that keepeth them will not slumber." "Because they have made the Lord their refuge, and the Most High their habitation, * * he will give his angels charge over them, to keep them in all their ways."³ Though they stumble, they shall not fall. "The eyes of the Lord are upon the righteous, and his ears are open to their cries." Such is the inheritance of the saints, and such the blessings of those "who wait upon the Lord;" who worship him "in the beauty of holiness;" and walk faithfully in the ordinances of his church, and in the life which is peculiar to that church.

¹ 1 John 3: 9; 5: 18. ² 1 Saml. 2: 9. ³ Ps. 121: 3; 91: 9, 10; Heb. 1: 14.

It is needful for men in this preternatural state, whether in society or in the church, that they be placed under circumstances favorable to the development of a good character. They must be removed from influences which are calculated to drag them to ruin, and placed under such as will raise them, and place them on the plane to which their spirit-nature would elevate them, and for which it qualifies them. Hence, the church of Jesus Christ is called the *Ecclesia*—the *called out*; and is composed of such as have been separated from the world by so revolutionizing a process as a death, burial, and resurrection.¹ Here they are under the shadow of the Almighty,—“the pillar of cloud by day, and the pillar of fire by night.” Here they are in the midst of “just men made perfect,” and enjoy all that wise counsel and upright example can afford. Here they are within the fold of the Great Shepherd, whose eye is ever over his sheep,—who “goeth in and out before them.”

Out of these purposes of the church there arises another, which is simply another phase of the same. The church was designed not only to aid the individual christian in the growth and perfection of his christian life, but also to be “the pillar and support” of the truth of God in the world; a great spiritual organism that is to conform the world to itself, and mold human kind after the divine model found in the human and divine Christ. Its purpose is to give tone and direction to all human society, to adjust all things human to its own divine pattern, and to fill the world with sentiments and principles, which shall redeem the race from the darkness and savageness of sin. In this work the church is a *power*. As an organized body, fully and well articulated in all its “joints and parts,” its powers are to be exerted on the race, until all mankind are made to feel its peculiar forces and principles. As the “little stone” cut from the mountain, it is to grow, and swell, and enlarge until it fills the whole earth; until all “the kingdoms of this world become the kingdoms of the Lord and of his Christ.” Standing out in the world as an isolated kingdom, powerful in its quiet majesty, and invincible in its silent, steady movement, it is destined to crush all before it, and then to elevate all to it, until naught shall be seen but that one great mountain filling the whole earth with its glory and power.

The church is God’s great power in the earth. It is the scene of his glory, and the dwelling place of his Majesty; that grand and glorious coliseum in which is witnessed the great contest between righteousness and sin; where angels and “just men made perfect” are spectators of the contest; and over which “Thrones and Dominions; Principalities and Powers” hang with intensest interest and breathless suspense.² The cloud that arose over the fair plains of heaven, and swept from that field of glory so many of their peers, they watched as it extended itself over

¹ Rom. 6: 1-6. ² Eph. 3: 10; 1 Peter 1: 12.

the Eden of man's earthly home, carrying disaster and ruin among men as it had done among angels; and now, as the Sun of Righteousness arises over a new Eden, they behold wonders and glories and counsels of the Mighty God, before which the dark cloud that had so bewildered, amazed, and stupefied their minds, is driven away. In the church they see the manifold wisdom of God, clear, bright, and gleaming with infinite splendor, so that even the dark cloud of sin has a silver lining on the side which lies next to God.

SECTION V.

ITS WORSHIP.

Worship belongs to a state of favor, and is the prerogative of *only* whom God admits to communion with himself. There is no worship, in the scriptural use of the word, for the condemned sinner. His first privilege is to become reconciled to God. Then he may worship.¹ It grows out of feelings and sentiments on the part of the worshiper, which arise from his relations to God, and from the circumstances attending those relations. It is the normal function of the pure and holy, and the natural expression of the feelings and sentiments of the soul in its recognition of God in these relations. These activities of the soul have reference to the being and character of God, his greatness, majesty, glory, and power, on the one hand; and on the other, to the blessings which the creature is conscious of possessing and enjoying, and which flow from the goodness and love of his Creator. Worship, therefore, arises from two classes of sentiments and feelings; first, those which relate to the being and character of God, and embrace all that is inherent in him; and the second, those which relate to the creature, and embrace all that the creature is, and all that he enjoys—his being and happiness.

All of God's intelligent creatures were made for two special objects: first, for his own glory, as Creator. They are the source of a greater revenue of glory and praise than all other of God's creations, animate and inanimate. Though sun, and moon, and stars, and hill, and mountain, and plain, speak his glory, majesty, and power; though the deep, with its great and little creatures,

¹ Such is the meaning of the cleansing and sanctification of the Jewish priesthood, the type of the christian.

and the earth, with its beasts, and cattle, and birds, and creeping things, show his wisdom and handy work—yet their wealth of praise is but poverty when compared with that which swells from intelligent beings, with souls capable of seeing, and appreciating God's greatness and majesty, wisdom, and power. Nothing in all the realm of being is so beautiful as intelligence, or so rich and precious as love—and these are the treasures of spirit-beings.

In the second place, intelligent beings were created that they might enjoy *being*, like God, and be happy in its possession, and in the possession and enjoyment of all that flowed from God with their being. This was his purpose in creating them, and if all creatures have not found these, the cause of failure lies not with God.

But the enjoyment of their being, and the happiness arising from this, lie in the line of the other purpose of their being,—the glory which they are to bring to God by the worship they render him. Their happiness is indissolubly connected with this. Should they cease to praise and glorify him because of his majesty and power, and infinite goodness, obedience would disappear, and sin would at once destroy all their happiness. The decadence of praise is the beginning of disobedience, and this the beginning of unhappiness.

But that the exercise of their psychical powers may honor and glorify God, it must be attended with certain feelings and sentiments toward him. That exercise may be characterized as worship, which consists essentially in praise and obedience. Worship is God's great prerogative, the creature's highest happiness, and one of the objects of the creature's existence. While the simple existence of intelligent beings reflect glory on the creator, as do all the creatures and works of his hands, the exercise of the powers with which his intelligent beings are endowed, affords God more pleasure and yields him greater glory than does the mere contemplation of them as the creatures of his power. There is nothing so grateful and pleasing as these; and when the intelligent creature gives these, he fulfills all that God designed or desired in his creation, and intensifies his own happiness to the same extent.

There are, very probably, no *forms* of worship in heaven. The exercise of the great powers of the soul—love and praise—requires nothing for their expression other than what is found in the organism of angels. If they possess organs by which they can express the feelings of their souls, these are all that are necessary. And this much is necessary. This much of form in spiritual worship is necessary, not on account of God directly, but for the sake of the creatures themselves. God may be, and no doubt is, honored by the unexpressed worship of the soul, but he demands more than this. He requires that he shall be honored before, or in the presence of others, and this can not be

done unless the soul expresses its love and praise audibly, or by some means through which other beings can know the state of the worshiper's heart. This necessity arises from the nature and relations of finite beings; and thus far in the expression of it, may worship among angels be presumed to have form, method, or means of expression; but this, however, may not differ from that by which they commune with one another.

Man's Eden relation was analogous to that of the angels, and worship there was not essentially different from that in the heavens, except so far as his organism made a difference necessary. More complex as a creature, and lower in the grade of creation than angels as to his organism, though a peer as to his spiritual nature, modes of expression, or forms of worship are more numerous with man than among his companions of worship in the heavens. What these were with Adam we know not, but we may infer their existence from the fact that God appeared to him in a form different from that by which he appeared to angels. When Adam sinned, then the *form* of worship appeared conspicuously, and since that time men have ever worshiped God through forms of some kind.

It would be interesting to trace the forms of worship which God ordained during the gradual development of the Remedial System, and to observe how the simple arises from the complex, as the great object of this system is attained, and a true, *spiritual* worship is again inaugurated for man's restored relation. It would be seen how inseparably and intimately a *formal* worship is connected with, and interwoven in, that system which proposes to save man. But suffice it to say that when that stage of development of the Remedial System was reached, in which the union of the divine and the human in the atonement took place, it is then we find that the more material forms, necessary under a mere animal atonement, give place to those which are more spiritual. This being so, the form of worship under Christ in the church should be essentially the same as in heaven, *spiritual*, as contradistinguished from the *formal* under the Jewish dispensation.

Spiritual worship, we have said, is grounded on the relation of favor. Wherever this relation obtains, spiritual worship exists, and is acceptable. Now, as the atonement for man is essential to his enjoyment of the favor of God, it follows that wherever men have had an atonement, and have embraced it, they have enjoyed God's favor. When men have employed the ordained atonement—even though an animal—in full assurance of faith, and in the profound conviction of the atonement's efficacy, they have enjoyed God's favor, and realizing this, have worshiped him in spirit and in truth. This was true under both the patriarchal and the Jewish institutions, as to the individual worshiper. This fact explains the acceptance of the worship of Abel, of Enoch, of Noah, of Abraham, of Melchizedek, and others, during the patriarchal age; and of all the truly pious un-

der Judaism—such as Samuel, David, Isaiah, Daniel, and a host of others of the Jewish age, than whom no better examples of piety and godliness have appeared in the Christian age. A spiritual worship, therefore, existed under Judaism, based on the more formal worship connected with the atonement in the temple service, but having no connection with it. It was found only in the family and the synagogue; and here, it will be observed, only the simplest forms have obtained, as alone compatible with such a worship. This worship was no where prescribed by Moses. We have no account of the institution of any worship but that connected with the tabernacle or temple service, which, after the settlement of the people in the land, in the days of David, was confined by the authority of God to the city of Jerusalem. Synagogues arose after the Babylonish captivity, and were originally instituted to meet a want on the part of the people, which the temple service did not, and could not supply. The people needed instruction in the law of God, and spiritual worship for the growth of their souls. The temple service did not pretend to afford these. It was not a spiritual worship, but one ceremonial and symbolical, whose virtue and excellence lay in the fact that that worship was but the shadow and symbol of the atonement of Christ.

It was, therefore, with this symbolic worship before his mind that Jesus said to the Samaritan woman, that the time had come when men would worship God acceptably only by a spiritual worship, which, not being connected with the temple service, was not confined or limited to Jerusalem, or any other particular place. He had no reference whatever to the synagogue worship. This God had never ordained, though it was acceptable to him. It was certainly a very proper harbinger to precede the introduction of the church, and to make ready for it a form of worship so perfectly consistent with, and adapted to, its own nature and purposes. The synagogue was the harbinger of the church, to afford the latter a fair and suitable field where it might take root, and gather its forces. As a fact, the synagogue was the place where the church found a footing in every place where the gospel was preached, and through it became a power in the towns and cities where Jews were settled. The apostles worshiped with their Jewish brethren in the synagogue, and there preached to them the gospel. This fact shows that there was, at least, no incongruity between the worship of the church and that of the synagogue, except that God was worshiped by the christian through Christ; but this did not relate to the forms or service of the worship. When a synagogue became a church by conversion to Christ, or the christians in the synagogue were separated from the Jews of the synagogue, the worship of the church and the forms of service were essentially those of the synagogue.

This will appear more evident after we know what the service

or worship of the synagogue was. We find this description of it: "When an assembly was collected together for worship, the service began, after the customary greeting, with the doxology. A section was then read from the Mosaic law. Then followed, after the singing of the second doxology, the reading of a portion from the prophets. Acts 15: 31; Luke 4: 16. The person whose duty it was to perform the reading, placed upon his head, as is done at the present day, a covering called *tallith*, to which Paul alludes, 2 Cor. 3: 15. The sections which had been read in the Hebrew, were rendered by an interpreter into the vernacular tongue, and the reader, or some other man, then addressed the people. Luke 4: 16; Acts 13: 15. It was on such occasions as these that Jesus, and afterward the apostles, taught the gospel. The meeting, as far as the religious exercises were concerned, was ended with a prayer, to which the people responded. Amen, when a collection was taken for the poor."¹ From this description it will be seen that there was nothing of the temple worship, or anything like it, in the service of the synagogue. The two kinds of worship were as distinct as were their designs, and the places where they were offered.

The worship of the church is equally simple, and equally removed and disconnected from all outward pomp, and show, and form, such as characterized both Jewish and pagan worship. The Lord said it was to be a spiritual worship, and in no sense or particular symbolic. There is no typical worship in the church as in the temple. Here all is real and substantial. This worship has no types nor analogies under Judaism. The like of it was known no where on earth but in the family and synagogue, where spiritual worshipers only were found. It has no special or exclusive days appointed for its service, because it is spiritual, and pertains to the life of the soul. Body, soul, and spirit are its sacrifice, and a pure and holy life its constant hymn of praise. Prayer and praise, intercession and giving of thanks are to be offered every day, and every where. Men are to pray without ceasing, and for every thing to give thanks. The life of the christian is to be one constant hymn of praise, one continual, burning, and shining light.

Whilst all this is true of the individual, yet more is required of him as a component part of the great whole, the church. There is a *public* worship, and this is properly the worship of the *church*. As the gospel can not save men in heaven unless they preserve clearly and faithfully in their minds and hearts, the means by which they have become christians, so first, for their own sake, and secondly, for the world's, the public worship of the church was ordained. And now, as the great central fact of the Remedial System is retrospective, as was the Passover to the Jews, so the memory looks back to the great fact by which the soul is saved from sin.

¹ Encyclopedia of Relig. Knowledge, Art. Synagog. Prideaux, pp. 306-7.

The Lord's Supper is the central figure around which gathers the public worship of the church. From this it draws its inspiration. All that is in this worship is inspired by the death of Christ. He is the subject of the memorials spread on the table; the inspiration of the songs of praise, and the ground of all supplication and hope. The only forms in this worship are those which "show forth his death until he come again," and which are necessary to express the feelings and sentiments of the mind and heart in the worship of prayer, praise, thanksgiving, and exhortation and teaching. Hence, when the church came together on the Lord's day, it was to commemorate the Lord's death, and thus keep in memory the great fact on which its salvation rested. When thus assembled, the scriptures were read, prayers were offered, "psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs" were sung, teaching and exhortation given to the people. This done, the church, as a body, retired, to meet again in another week. There was nothing in this worship, in the days of the inspired men, taken from the pompous ceremonies of Judaism or paganism,—nothing of temple or altar service.¹

The view here presented is fully sustained by Neander, than whom we have no better authority. He says of the spiritual worship of the church: "This character distinguished the christian worship from that of all other religions, which consisted in symbolical pageantry and lifeless ceremonies. As a general elevation of the spirit and heart to God, as well as the enlightenment of the spirit and the sanctification of the heart, were the object of every thing in this religion, instruction and edification through a common study of the divine word, and through prayer in common, were the leading features in christian worship. And in this respect it might in its form adhere to the arrangements made about the congregations of the Jewish synagogues, in which also the element of a spiritual religious worship was the prevailing ingredient. As the reading of portions of the Old Testament had formed the ground work of religious instruction in the Jewish synagogues, this custom passed into the christian congregations."²

The preaching of the gospel for the conversion of sinners was not a part of the worship of the primitive church. Whilst every act of a christian, which he may do in the name of his Lord, is, or should be, an act of worship, in its general sense, the preaching of the gospel is not properly an element of the public worship of the church on Lord's days. The opportunity may be taken advantage of to preach the gospel, when occasion requires, as did Paul, when he met with his Jewish brethren in the synagogue at Antioch of Pisidia; but the prime object of the meeting of the church on the first day of the week was such as we have indicated.

¹ Neander's Church History, p. 181.

² Neander's Church History, p. 191.

The worship of the synagogue among the Jews did not contrast more strongly with the worship of their temple in Jerusalem, than does the worship of the apostolic church with that of the apostasy.

When men began to confound Christianity with Judaism, especially as it respects their membership and priesthood, and, intent on conciliating the prejudices of Jews and pagans, had allowed the doctrines of the gospel to be tinged by the philosophy of the Greeks, then Jewish and pagan forms of worship were introduced into the church; so that, at last, more of Judaism and paganism than of christianity was seen in the apostasy. The worship of the Roman church is chiefly, if not wholly, ceremonial, the very reverse of christian. Its worship is from Judaism and paganism, *tinged* with christianity, while the great body of the protesting churches may be characterized as christian, *tinged*, in various degrees, with Judaism, both as to their doctrines and their practices.

With the pompous and ceremonial worship of the Jewish ritual, God was not well pleased. They did not reach the inner man. God, therefore, abolished the whole with Christ, and introduced another, whose righteousness should not consist of forms, but in the power of the heart. He can not be pleased, for the same reason, with such a worship now. The ritual of the Jews he ordained to continue for a time, and abolished it forever when Christ came. Then he ordained a spiritual worship, which had for its object the glory of God and the spiritual growth of his people, by which they might be prepared for the worship which awaits the saints in heaven. There the worship will not be ritual and symbolical, but simple and spiritual. The christian will rise to the existing worship of the angels; and for this the worship of the church is designed to fit and prepare him *Every reason and consideration, therefore, points to the total exclusion from christian worship of all that God has repudiated by not having ordained it, when he established the church.*

The religion of Jesus Christ contemplates a *life*. It aims at the soul's purification from sin, and its redemption from the love and power of sin. This religion is not a mere sentiment, but the embodiment of a sentiment in the *life*; the implantation of high and holy principles in the soul, which shall bear fruit in the living man. It aims to redeem men from sin and invest them with righteousness, and thus through the salvation and regeneration of individuals, to make the world of the same character. The power of the gospel in its effects on the heart is seen in the life which that power creates. Christians are new creatures; new in the soul's desires and the life's pursuits.

An essential element of this religion, and fruit of this life, is the public worship of the church. The individual life must appear in the church life. The one is the exponent of the other. If there is life in the individual, there will be life in the congrega-

tion. If the power of the gospel is felt in the individual life, it will appear also in the church life. The latter is all important in the work of redemption. The gathered light of the church is the luminary of the world, the glory of Christ, and the ground and support of his cause among men. The church would have no power in the world, even if it could exist, had it no public worship. Its worship is as essential as its existence, the evidence of its life, and the power that holds it together; so that the worship of the church is the proof and measure of its life.

It is a truth both in fact and in principle, that, where a christian neglects the public worship of the church, he is well nigh a withered branch, and ready to fall away from the vine. It is hard, if not well nigh impossible, to maintain the christian life in the soul, if the public worship is neglected. Here lies the reason of that entreaty, if not injunction, of the apostle to his Hebrew brethren: "Neglect not the assembling of yourselves together, as the manner of some is." He saw the effect of this neglect on the individual life, and knew where it would end.

There is a profound philosophy in all this, and is recognized in all the exhortations found in the sacred scriptures, and by none more clearly, possibly, than by the prophet Isaiah, when he says: "*They that wait on the Lord shall renew their strength; they shall mount up with wings as eagles; they shall run and not be weary; they shall walk and not faint.*"

The Lord's Supper, as we have shown, is an essential element of the public worship of the church. Such an ordinance was unknown to the temple service and the synagogue worship. In this particular the church worship is peculiar. Yet the Lord's Supper is not without its type, or analogue. This was the Jewish passover.

The passover never passed out of or beyond the family. It was ordained for the entire nation, and was given to individual families. The whole people were the subjects of its action. It embraced both parent and child, since both parent and child were equally the children of God, and equally saved by its operation. It was an ordinance of worship for the people, and was observed by families; so that all might be instructed and benefited by its observance. It was never incorporated into the Jewish ritual, or made a part of the synagogue worship. The first it antedated by months, and the latter by centuries. It was an annual feast, and commemorated the first and greatest event in the history of that people.

An analogous event the Lord's Supper commemorates, but only in part, since the passover was but a partial type of the atonement of Christ. But, like the passover, the Lord's Supper is the ordinance of the people of God, and given to each family or congregation of christians, to be observed by them in commemoration of the sacrifice of the paschal lamb of the christian institution, and of a greater deliverance than that of which the

Israelites were the subjects. That deliverance was from the bondage of Egypt and the thralldom of an earthly tyranny; this from the bondage of sin, and a tyranny that crushes the *soul*, and fastens upon it the chains of eternal subjection. For both Jews and christians, therefore, are their passovers primary institutions, taking precedence of all others in importance and universality of observance. Here are type and anti-type, presenting many analogous features; but symbol and substance only in part.

The origin and purpose of the Lord's Supper are well known. It was ordained by the Lord in person, at the close of the last Jewish passover which he observed. The occasion was in every respect an appropriate one. The blood of the paschal lamb had saved the Israelites while in Egypt from the destroying angel. It was sprinkled on the door jambs and lintels of their dwellings, and the angel passed them over. So of the christian's paschal lamb. Its blood is sprinkled on the *hearts* of men, since it is the soul that is to be saved from sin. Both are commemorative ordinances. Both look back to an event in the past, and call to mind two great salvations. They serve to keep in memory the two great events, and to keep alive in the heart the gratitude which they are calculated and intended to excite.

There is one striking difference, however, between the two passovers. The Jewish was ordained as an *annual* feast, whilst the christian is *weekly*. This difference arises from the difference between the two salvations effected by them. Hence, we have said that the Jewish passover was but a partial type of the Lord's Supper. The one salvation was from human bondage; the other from spiritual bondage. The latter salvation is characterized in the christian scriptures as being more than a deliverance from bondage. It is also a *creation*. The christian, delivered from the bondage of sin, is a *new creature*. His deliverance makes him a *new creature*, a result which did not follow the Jewish passover. This feature of the christian salvation makes it quite distinct from the Jewish salvation. The christian salvation, therefore, has a two-fold nature, and for this additional characteristic, and as an explanation of it, we must find some proper type in the ordinances of God, which preceded the institution of the Lord's Supper. This will furnish a satisfactory reason for the observance of the latter being made weekly, whilst the former was annual.

With the *fact of creation* is inseparably connected the *week*.¹ Therefore, as the christian *salvation* is also a *creation*, the ordinance which is commemorative of this salvation, should be observed weekly, in order that the creative feature of the salvation may be exhibited at the same time. An analogue of the Sabbath, consequently, should be connected with the observance of the anti-type in order that its two-fold nature may be fully presented. As a fact, the Lord's Supper was observed weekly

¹ See this connection in chapter IV.

by the primitive churches, whatever may have been the reason therefor. In the day when the church was under the direction of the apostles, and when, we may presume, all things were done by their direction, we are warranted in the conclusion that this weekly observance was the consequence of apostolic injunction. At least no better reason can be given for the fact. We know that christian salvation has the feature of creation in it, and we know also that the division of time called the week, is based on the fact that God created the world in six days, and rested on the seventh, and, consequently, that the week is inseparably connected with the creation of the world. This being so, there is an antitypical week connected with an antitypical creation. There is a reason, therefore, why the christian passover, being the anti-type of the Jewish passover, and having as an essential feature the fact of a new creation involved in the salvation which it commemorates, should be observed weekly rather than annually, or at any other stated period. The observance of the Jewish passover was by command annual, and the Sabbath was in the beginning made a sacred day. Its profanation was punished by death; and the neglect of the passover, by separation from the people of God. If, then, the Lord's Supper has these types, as it has, we may expect that its observance in the light of the importance of its types, is not less important in the estimation of God. Indeed, if we are to judge of their relative importance by the comparative merits of the two institutions with which the types and anti-types are connected, we are held to the conclusion that the weekly observance of the Lord's Supper is important in the extreme.¹

This ordinance belongs to the Lord's people. In this it is the exact anti-type of the Jewish passover. No others have a right to eat at this altar. It is pre-eminently an act of worship. In this it is more than a solemn commemorative feast. It is the central figure, as we have stated above, of the Lord's day worship, the primary and chief cause that calls the church together on this day.

The day of its observance is the first day of the week, or "the Lord's day." It was on this day that the primitive christians assembled for its observance. This is now generally admitted. No other reason is assigned by the inspired historian for Paul's stay at Troas than that he might meet with the church on this day "to break bread." This was not the day on which Christ instituted the ordinance. The day of his death is not the most important in the plan of salvation. His death on account of sin would have availed nothing had he not been raised from the dead. It was his resurrection that declared him to be "the Son of God according to his spiritual nature."² It was his resurrection that sealed the truth of all he had ever said, and was his justification before the universe. Had he never been raised from

¹ Heb. 2: 1-3. ² Rom. 1: 4; Heb. 1: 5.

the dead, his mission would have failed at an important and critical period. But this occurring, all else is sealed as true, and he ascends to the throne of the universe. His resurrection, therefore, is an important fact in the scheme of redemption, and sets the seal upon his great work of a *new creation*.

“Behold, I make all things new.” With this new creation there is connected a day of completion. On this day Christ completed his work on the earth; and henceforth it is a day that commemorates the completion of the New Creation, and is called in the christian scriptures the Lord’s day. It is every way proper, therefore, that the central and leading ordinance of christian worship should be observed on the return of every Lord’s day, thus associating the two great events of his mission, his atonement and his resurrection, and commemorating both at the same time.

But it is not to be presumed that the weekly observance of the Lord’s Supper originated in any human reason, or with man as its author. The suggestions here submitted may discover some reason and propriety in it; but such reason and propriety, however clear and convincing, are not the reason or *authority* which christians have for the practice. The authority is much more simple than this. It is a very fair and reasonable presumption to suppose that the change from the Sabbath worship in the synagogue was the result of divine instruction and direction, and that all that pertains to the worship of the Lord’s day arose under the authority of the inspired apostles; so that the whole is of divine appointment. It is hardly to be supposed that the practice of a weekly observance could have become so general, or the unanimity, on the part of the Jews, in the change so great, unless the apostles had given instructions on the subject. It was no difficult matter for the Jews who worshiped in the synagogue, to change from the Sabbath to the Lord’s day when they became christians; but it is not to be presumed that they would have done so of their own accord, or at their own instance, or from their own reasoning. They must have had some instruction from the apostles; and though we have no record of such instruction, this is no evidence that none was given. In that day the Holy Spirit led the apostles into all truth, and the apostles led the church, so that we are justified in regarding the *practice* of the apostolic church, as it respects its worship, as the result of their teaching, and, consequently, of divine appointment. If, therefore, the primitive church broke bread every Lord’s day, we must regard this practice as of apostolic direction and appointment. And so as it respects all the worship of the church.

These things being so, we reach the further and equally important conclusion, that *all the worship* that obtained in the apostolic church was of divine appointment, and that what did not obtain in the church at that day, has not the sanction of God. So that we may say in general terms, and as an axiomatic

truth, that what that church practiced we should practice, and what it did not practice, we should not practice. If such a truth were admitted and faithfully observed, many disputed questions could be settled by a simple appeal to the practice of the church under the ministry of the apostles.

It may be a question worthy of our consideration, whether any worship offered on the Lord's day is acceptable to God unless preceded or associated with the observance of the Lord's Supper. As the atonement is the central and chief element of the Remedial System, it is natural to conclude that the Lord's Supper is the central and chief element of christian worship. This being so, it would seem to follow that the public worship, where this ordinance is not observed, is too imperfect to be regarded as adequate to the occasion, and hence, not all that God requires. The custom of so many churches, called christian, meeting on Lord's day for religious exercises, should be well considered before being pronounced acceptable worship. It is certainly not all that he requires, if we are to regard the worship of the first churches as any indication of God's will in the matter.

SECTION VI.

ITS ORGANIZATION AND GOVERNMENT.

"Salvation is of the Jews." To them "pertained the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the service of God, and the promises; whose are the fathers, and of whom, concerning the flesh, Christ came." All the apostles and early evangelists were Jews. The gospel had its origin among them. It was proclaimed in their synagogues, and the majority of its converts were the pious worshipers in those Jewish assemblies. In their scriptures the gospel was foretold and promised, and to these Christ appealed in proof of his claims. All that God has ever said and done for the salvation of the race has been said and done through that people, so that it is emphatically true that "salvation is of the Jews." From the temple worship of that people arose the atonement of Christ, and all that pertains to it; and from the worship of the synagogue the spiritual worship of the church took its form. All is, therefore, Jewish in origin.

In tracing the history of the rise of the church, as given in the

New Testament scriptures, we find that the apostles and evangelists generally sought their audiences in the synagogues of the Jews, which were, at that time, to be found in all places where Jews were found in sufficient numbers. It was here they found good soil for the word of God; here, a people prepared to receive the good news concerning the Messiah.

The gospel can take root and flourish only in a good and congenial soil. The good soil is necessary to its germination and growth. It will not flourish on the beaten path, or the thinly covered rock, or among thorns or weeds that shut out all the light and heat of the sun, and drink up all the moisture. It is not a force that uproots like the tornado, or breaks down like the tempest. Its comes rather with the gentle power of the heat and light of the sun, and, like that luminary, lifting up in silent vapor great oceans of water, it elevates humanity up to the higher plains of life. It does not break in among the customs of society and set all things in disorder that it may evolve out of the chaos a new order of things. It aims indeed at man's amelioration and his adjustment to a high, holy, and spiritual society, by means of principles which work like the vital force in the living seed; but it proposes to do this without working confusion or disorder among men. The gospel is not thus discordant in its nature. It is rather in harmony with what the soul seeks and desires. It comes to it as the treasury which has supplies for all that the soul needs; as that for which the pious heart of Jew or Gentile has so earnestly longed. Such a preparation of soul the gospel needs for its success. Such a preparation was actually made by the mission of John for the reception of Christ, and by the spiritual worship of the synagogue for the church. Thus as Christ's work coalesced with the work which the Baptist effected, so did the worship of the church coalesce with the worship of the synagogue, and in neither case was jar or discord produced. In the synagogue, therefore, did the gospel find a congenial field for its work.

If these things be true, it is but natural to suppose that the church was modeled after the synagogue in its organization and government. This conclusion is made somewhat more evident by the fact that the apostles say so little on this subject. They seem to have taken for granted that this subject was well understood by all the churches, and only required from them a knowledge of the character which the men should have who were made bishops and deacons in the church. The origin or institution of these offices is no where mentioned by any writer of the christian scriptures. When mentioned, they are spoken of as if well known and understood. Such knowledge came either by revelation from the apostles, or from the organization and government of the synagogue. The latter is much more probable, though both may be true. If by revelation alone, this fact would have made its mention necessary. But the inspired writers of

the christian scriptures make no such mention of the organization and government of the church. Their direction to the church in its selection of elders and deacons simply states the character they should possess, and the duties they should discharge.

Were the organization and government peculiar and different from that of the synagogue, doubtless the apostles would have said more on the subject. The absence of apostolic instruction can only be accounted for on the supposition that the worship, organization, and government of the church came in substance from the synagogue, through the special instruction of the apostles.¹ The synagogue had officers similar to those of the church, whose functions did not differ materially from those of the elders and deacons of the church.

In the synagogue there were six classes of officers, three of which were peculiar to the synagogue, and which, consequently, are not found in the church. The remaining three were: 1. "The rulers or elders of the synagogue." Of these there were always a plurality, as appears from Mark 5: 22, and Acts 13: 15. Among these there seems to have been one who was, in our style of speaking, the presiding officer, and was hence denominated *the* Ruler, though it does not appear that he had any greater power or authority. 2. There were "the collectors of alms, or deacons." 3. "The messenger or legate of the synagogue." This officer, Prideaux thinks,² "was one of the rulers to whom was assigned a special part of their joint duty. He labored among the people 'in word and doctrine,' prayed, preached, sometimes kept the book of the law, appointed the readers, and designated the sections to be read. Hence, he was also called *episkopos*, or overseer."

The other officers were appointed to meet certain wants of the people that grew out of their peculiar condition. The generation that returned from Babylon had lost the knowledge of the Hebrew language, in which the books of their law were written, and hence Ezra appointed interpreters.³ These were rather servants than officers of the synagogue, and served temporary purposes. There were also interpreters in the christian church.⁴ The Jewish people who were scattered throughout all the provinces of the Roman Empire, spoke the various languages of those provinces.⁵ Hence, on the day of Pentecost the apostles spoke in the various languages there represented. The gift of tongues, or of interpretation, was one of the miraculous gifts of the apostolic church. But such gifts were for temporary purposes, and ceased when the necessity for them passed away. Among these were the apostles, and prophets, and evangelists, and pastors, and teachers mentioned by Paul. They were given only for a time. They were not permanent officers of the church to continue

¹ Neander's *Planting and Training of the Church*, pp. 33, 34.

² Vol. 1, p. 306. ³ Neh. 8: 4-8. ⁴ 1 Cor. 12: 10. ⁵ Acts 2: 8-11.

through all time. Nor have they any representative in the post-apostolic church.

Excluding, then, these extraordinary and temporary gifts, we have remaining only two classes of officers in the church—bishops and deacons. These were designed by the great Head of the church to meet all the wants of a congregation of disciples, and all the purposes which God had in view in establishing the church, except the *propagation* of the gospel. Their functions fulfill all the required indications; so that no spiritual or temporal want remains, or need remain, unsupplied. The evangelist or missionary of the church is not properly an officer of the church. He is a servant with a special commission from the church to preach the gospel in places designated by the church. But of this more hereafter.

In the primitive church there was a plurality of both elders¹ and deacons. This is the wisdom and ordinance of God; and if it has not been found, during the history of the church, “to work well” in the estimation of men, this is simply because *men* have not been found to work well, but have presumed to encroach upon the prerogative of God, and supply the deficiencies of divine wisdom with things of their own conceit. It is safe to assume that God knows best, and that what he ordained is what he wanted, whether it suits our views or not. In the light of what he has ordained, we are safe in affirming that a congregation of disciples *is organized* when it has elders and deacons who have the character and qualifications prescribed by the great Head of the church through his apostles.

There was in the synagogue one of the elders who took the lead in the work of these officers.² So it is natural to presume that there was such an one among the elders of the church, though this is not distinctly stated, but simply *inferred*. On such ground we should walk cautiously. Inferences have done a vast amount of mischief in the church. The whole apostasy gradually arose from this source; and hence inferences should be handled with the greatest care, if allowed any consideration at all. The scripture which seems to recognize one among the elders as holding a somewhat more prominent position than the others, is the following: “Let the elders who rule well be counted worthy of double honor [support], especially *they who labor in the word and teaching*.” This additional work which gives him some prominence above the rest, does not, however, confer on him any superiority of rank or title, or additional “honor,” or prominence, in the congregation because of the nature of the work which he performs.³

The equality of rank among the bishops of a congregation was not long maintained after the death of the inspired men of the primitive church. Ambitious men in every age of the church

¹ Neander's *Planting and Training of the Church*, p. 34.

² *Ibid.* ³ *Ibid.*, note.

have found means and opportunities of elevating themselves in the church, and overriding their more godly and unpretentious peers. The great evils which culminated in the apostasy were not the growth of a day. Diverging lines start from a common point, and separate, it may be, by insensible degrees. So with christianity, pure and apostolic, and the apostasy. The slight distinction in the apostolic church between the elder who labored in the word and in teaching, and his peers who were equally effective in other duties of the eldership, diverged, during the apostasy, into the broad distinction that exists between the bishops of the Roman and the English churches, and their inferior clergy, and the "*minister*" of the Protestant denominations, and their inferior officers. The efforts of the Lutheran Reformation did not destroy these distinctions, but rather recognized them. No reformation has yet destroyed the distinction. The *principles* of the one with which the author stands identified, would do this, were they rigidly and faithfully applied by its adherents. But they are not so applied. The ambition of the men of the second generation has a deeper hold on their hearts than have these principles; so that, in this particular, the government of the primitive church will not appear by this effort at a reformation. The next may succeed better.

The "ministry" of the Protestant churches at the present day, distinct from the eldership, and above it, is a ministry unknown to the christian scriptures. It is wholly a human invention, entailing on the church evils which will never disappear until it is destroyed, and God's ordinance fully and practically restored. It cannot be denied by any one who has the faith of the gospel, that the organization of the church ordained by God, is all that is necessary to fit it for its great work in the world. If the Lord saw that bishops and deacons were all the permanent officers that the church needed in any age of its history, it is the highest presumption in men to add to these, or take from them. If he was satisfied with these, it is not our province to add, alter, or amend. He knew what the exigencies of time would require; he saw the end from the beginning; and he made every provision which was necessary to the success and triumph of his church in the world. It must be presumed that he omitted or overlooked nothing; and that we have in his word all that he saw proper to ordain. The fact that no other officers of the church but bishops and deacons are mentioned in the scriptures, is positive evidence that the Lord wanted no others. The rule should be axiomatic with every christian, that what the Lord omitted, we should omit. When he speaks, we should be silent, and when he stops, we should stop. He stopped at the institution of bishops and deacons for the church, as its regular, permanent officers, and there should we stop. To go further is presumptuous rebellion.¹

¹ 1 Samuel, 15 chapter.

No plea of expediency or necessity, as men may see, can be reasonably made in defense of what is so utterly without divine authority;¹ for such a plea will justify all the machinery which Romanism and Protestantism have seen fit to introduce. The alternative is plain and clear, either to adhere strictly to what God has ordained, or to open the flood gates of error and of every conceivable corruption. It is pure and simple apostolic christianity, on the one hand, or popery, with all of its pretensions, usurpations, and corruptions on the other.

We speak here of the *permanent officers* of the church, which the Lord intended the church should have in all future time. We have no allusion to the temporary *gifts* which the church needed in its incipency. The apostles were absolutely necessary to inaugurate the cause of Christ, and other extraordinary gifts were equally necessary for the church at that early day, and onward until it was so taught as no longer to require these spiritual gifts. So the apostle seems to state very clearly.²

The purposes which God had in establishing the church harmonize perfectly with the work which he gave it in charge, and this work, again, harmonizes with the duties of the officers of the church, as laid down in the christian scriptures.

DEACONS.

As no organization of men, either social, political, or religious, can be inaugurated and maintained without cordial co-operation and material aid, the church lies under this necessity. It can not succeed without the "sinews of war," and there must be forces appointed to this great work. In the church these are called deacons. Their qualifications are pointed out by the inspired penman, and show what kind of men is needed for the work. They are to be godly men, that the interests of the church may lie very near their hearts; and they must be men fitted by education and experience to manage the temporal affairs of the church. This is their chief and special work; but it is not clearly stated and defined in the christian scriptures, which fact justifies the supposition that their duties were essentially the same as those of the deacons of the synagogue. As, therefore, their work is temporal rather than spiritual, and does not, consequently, lie immediately in the line of the purposes for which the church was instituted, but only as a means thereto, we pass at once to the consideration of the duties of the bishops.

ELDERS.

Their qualifications and duties are pretty clearly defined by the apostles. As to *character*, the bishop must be: 1st. The husband of but *one* wife. That is, not a polygamist.³ 2d, Blameless;

¹ Kitto Encyclopedia, Article *Bishop*.

² Eph. 4: 11-16. ³ What more it may forbid is difficult to say. See Bloomfield's note on this passage.

3d. Discreet; 4th, Courteous; 5th, Hospitable; 6th, "Not given to wine;" 7th, Not rash; 8th, Not one who gets money by base methods,—an *honorable* man; 9th, Gentle; 10th, Not contentious; 11th, Not covetous; 12th, Not a recent convert, but a christian of age and much experience; 13th, Of a good reputation among men of the world.

Here is a splendid character, well fitted to be "an example to the flock," and a representative of the church before the world, and to *preach* a gospel of righteousness and holiness.

His *qualifications* in other respects are: 1st. He is to be "apt to teach,"—well qualified to teach. This has respect to his knowledge of the word of God, and his ability to impart such knowledge to the edification of the church; for we presume *this* teaching has reference to the disciples when assembled for worship. This aptness to teach implies also the ability to feed the flock of God as a good and faithful shepherd. Of this duty the scriptures speak thus: "Take heed to the flock over which the Holy Spirit has made you overseers [bishops], to *feed* the church of God;"¹ and again: "The elders who are among you, I exhort, who am also an elder [old man], * * * *feed*² the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight thereof, * * * not lording it over God's heritage, but be examples to the flock."

Coupled with this ability to instruct the church, is the ability to defend the truth of the gospel, and this also is required of the bishop or elder: "Holding fast the faithful word, as he has been taught, that he may be able by sound doctrine [teaching], both to exhort and convince the gainsayers; for there are many unruly and vain talkers and deceivers, * * whose mouths must be stopped."³ This duty embraces the work of such as were said to labor in the word and teaching. It concerns the propagation and defence of the gospel, and is based on the natural and acquired abilities of the party discharging the duty. 2d. Kindred to the ability to proclaim and defend the gospel, and to stop the mouths of gainsayers, is the ability to rule. This duty requires knowledge of the sacred scriptures, experience, and a good judgment. It is the most difficult and onerous of the duties of the office, and it demands abilities of no ordinary character. One who possesses the qualities of character mentioned by the apostle, will certainly make a wise and judicious ruler. Such he should be to command the respect and obedience due him from the church. 3. As a necessary qualification to the success of a ruler, *Vigilance* stands prominent. As a shepherd, he is to *watch* over the flock, and guard it against enemies. Vigilance, therefore, is an essential qualification of the bishop, without which the flock will become a prey to ravenous wolves.

On the character and qualifications of the bishop are based his duties. These are, therefore, without observing any special or logical order: 1. Ruling. Of this the scriptures speak thus: "Let

¹ Acts 20: 28.

² Be shepherds to.

³ Titus 1: 9-11.

the elders that *rule* well be counted worthy of double honor, especially they who labor in the word and doctrine." That these elders are bishops, and not simply old men, is evident, not only from the fact that they *rule*, but that they also labor in the word and in teaching. If the latter were officers, so were the former. Rulers are also *guides*, in that they direct and lead, as do the shepherds of a flock.¹ The apostle commands the church to "remember those who have the rule over you, [better, who *guide* you], who have spoken to you the word of God." Here *teaching* is associated with *ruling*, both being discharged as a duty by the bishops. And again: "Obey those who have the rule over you [who *guide* you], and *submit* yourselves; for they watch for your souls." Here *ruling* is associated with *vigilance*. These are duties of the bishop, and because of this, the church is to *obey* and *submit*. Ruling and obedience are correlative terms, and have here all the meaning that these words usually have. But the ruling is not of the arbitrary kind. The *character* of the officer forbids this. It is rather parental, and the submission that of children. Hence, the apostle says of this qualification: "One that rules well his own house, having his children in subjection, with all gravity; for if a man know not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of the church of God?" Here it is seen that the ruling is of the nature of *caring* for. So the apostle Peter also speaks: "Neither as being *lords* over God's heritage, but being *ensamples* to the flock." Thus is the *ruling* of the bishop of the nature of the love of the parent and the care of the shepherd; and is to be exercised rather by the force of example than by the power of authority.

Yet the bishops are invested with *authority*. Otherwise they could never *lord* it over the church. One can not abuse what he does not possess. They are invested with authority, because one of their duties is ruling, and the corresponding duty on the part of the church is submission and obedience. The government of the church is placed in their hands.² Ruling is *governing*, not simply presiding; governing akin to that which the father is presumed to exercise in the family.

The authority of the bishops in the church is limited, as to its jurisdiction, to the church of which they are bishops. This is clearly implied in the fact that bishops were ordained in every church,³ (Acts 14: 23), and by the exhortation of the apostle Peter to the elders of the churches to which he addressed his letters: "The elders which are among you I exhort; * * * *feed the flock* of God;" not *flocks*, "as of many," but *one*. This teaching is consistent with the fact stated by the historian of Acts, that Paul and Barnabas ordained elders in *every church*. The christian scriptures no where speak of a *diocesan* episcopacy. Such an extension of the jurisdiction of bishops is not even to be in-

¹ Psalms 23: 1-3.

² Neander's Planting and Training, p. 34.

³ Ibid, p. 148—note.

ferred from anything said in these scriptures. This assumption of powers arose in the days of Constantine,¹ whose conversion was the cause and beginning of so many corruptions and innovations in the church. *Independence*, in the sense that each congregation is a unit in itself—a separate, living organism, capable of discharging all the functions of the church, because possessing all its organs or instrumentalities, is written all over the apostolic church. They are all co-ordinate; peers in the one great realm of the kingdom of God, yet bound together by common ties as integrals of one great whole, having the same form, and animated by the same spirit. Independency was characteristic of Jewish synagogues; and since, in the beginning, the church was so closely connected with them, the same independency among christian assemblies may be clearly and reasonably inferred. There is nothing in the christian scriptures that conflicts with this presumption, to say the least; and we are justified in believing that the apostolic churches were independent in their organization, management, and administration.

As regards the government of the church in its executive department, three distinct views seem to obtain in the religious world. The first may be characterized as episcopal or presbyterian, as indicating that the bishops or elders discharge the whole function of ruling. The second is that the bishops are only presiders at the meetings of the church, and that the *church* discharges the function of ruling in its capacity of an assembly; that the church is not only the *source* of power, but the *executor* of its powers and authority. The third is a mixed form of government, a union of the first and second in the administration of its affairs, and is said by Neander² to have been the practice of the churches in the days of the apostles. He says: "The government of the church was the peculiar office of such overseers [such as Paul describes in his letters to Timothy and Titus]; it was their business to watch over the general order, to maintain the purity of the christian doctrine and of christian practice, to guard against abuses, to admonish the faulty, and to guide the public deliberations; as appears from the passages in the New Testament where their functions are described. But their government by no means excluded the participation of the whole church in the management of their common concerns, as may be inferred from what we have remarked in general respecting the nature of the christian community, and as is also evident from many individual examples in the apostolic church." Such a form of government seems adapted to every exigency that may arise. Some cases may require the sole attention and action of the elders; others may be best determined and settled by the assembled church; and others again by a special appointment, as is suggested by the apostle Paul in his first letter to the church at Corinth.³

¹ Kitto. ² Planting and Training, pp. 148-9.

³ 1 Cor. 6: 5. Neander's P. and T., p. 149.

The christian scriptures are more allusory than diadactic in regard to the organization of the church. They give no account of its institution and form of government. The one hundred and twenty who were in Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost, were the disciples of Jesus who followed him during his mission on earth. To these it would seem the three thousand were added after their conversion on that day. They were the church to which the pentecostal converts were added. The church was then without organization except so far as the apostles were concerned. For sometime after this all the burdens of the church were borne by the apostles.¹ It was not until exigencies arose requiring other officers, that deacons and elders were appointed.

As the whole burden of the management of the church was first on the apostles, the first elimination that took place was the appointment of deacons to attend to the temporal wants of the church.² This left the apostles the entire spiritual work of the church, as they desired and intended when they suggested the appointment of the seven deacons. The work had become too great for the apostles. Up to this time the common fund was placed in their hands, (Acts 4th and 5th chapters), and distribution was made by them or under their immediate direction and supervision.

As the disciples multiplied in great numbers, the spiritual work of the apostles became too great for them, even in Jerusalem. In the various cities where the gospel found a footing, and disciples were congregated into churches, it was simply impossible for the apostles even to attempt their spiritual supervision beyond written communications. Hence, the time came when their spiritual oversight was to be placed in the hands of men in every church. Thus the appointment of elders or bishops came in time. As every church needed the spiritual instruction which the apostles first gave, so spiritual men were appointed to do this spiritual work in every church. To ordain such men Paul and Barnabas revisited the churches they had gathered in the provinces of Asia Minor.³ Such being the origin and necessity of bishops in all the churches, it follows that their duties were essentially those of the apostles. Therefore, *mutatis mutandis*, the bishops of a church are the legitimate successors of the apostles, and all the successors that God intended the church should ever have in all her history. To all the work of the apostles as it respects the *administration* of the church, the bishops succeeded. The extraordinary and additional gifts to the church at that time were simply gifts to aid the apostles in their work. These gifts were extraordinary, because the men were inspired. Such men were necessary in the beginning. But when "the whole counsel of God" had been declared, and the churches advanced to that degree where uninspired men were sufficient, then the spiritual

¹ Neander's Planting and Training, pp. 30, 31.

² Acts 5th and 6th chapters. ³ Acts 14: 23.

gifts passed away, and the church was placed entirely in the hands of the bishops and deacons, whose respective duties comprised the differentiated duties of the apostles, the spiritual being confided to the bishops and the temporal to the deacons.

Neander says that the first object in appointing bishops was that they might rule. "They were chosen," he says, "as in the synagogue, not so much for the instruction and edification of the church, as for taking the lead in its general government."¹ Hence, to the bishops was committed the duty of ruling. "It is, therefore, certain," he further says, "that *every church* was governed by a union of the elders or overseers."²

As to the nature and extent of their ruling and of the submission of the church thereto, the scriptures are not clear and explicit. For this there may be several reasons, and chief among them the fact that christianity is a religion of love, not of statutory enactments. Where men are governed by love there is no need for such special and specific directions. The willing and loving heart discharges a known duty because it loves so to do. It needs but to know what is duty to do it. Love is the fulfillment of law. It prompts to, and secures, obedience when law does not. All the appointments and arrangements of the church were projected on this principle; and all ruling on the part of bishops, and obedience on the part of the church, must flow from love. When this is the case there will be no jar nor discord. Again, the church is of the nature of a family. There are fathers and mothers in Israel; there are those of middle life; and again, those of immature years. These are all on the same plane in one sense, but not in others. As in the family, so in the church, age and experience are made prominent and directive. The disciple of immature years is not placed beside the disciple of age and experience, nor allowed an equal voice and influence. They are exhorted to submit to such: "Likewise, ye younger, submit yourselves to the aged"—(*presbuterois*—old men). There is, therefore, ruling for some and submission for others. Where lie the limits of each?

Whatever is implied and intended by the words *ruling, guiding, overseeing, teaching, and feeding*, which are the functions and duties of the Eldership, belongs to the bishops of the church, and lays on the church the corresponding duty. These words place the bishops in a state of prominence and authority, and subject the disciples to the obedience and submission inculcated in the scriptures. To the extent that the bishops have authority, to the same extent is the church to submit. How are these limits to be determined?

The scriptures do not clearly define these limits. Practically, they are not of much importance when the whole church is influenced and governed by love. There can be no serious trouble when men are influenced by christian principle. This fact,

¹ Neander's *Planting and Training*, p. 34. ² *Ibid*, p. 148.

no doubt, was contemplated in all the appointments of the church. In a community where self-government is a conspicuous fact, external government is of but little practical use. When the church loses this quality, then no government will be of any avail. Self-government is the corner-stone of the religion of Jesus Christ; and if the church shall cast this away, it is no longer the church of Christ, except in name. In such a community, it matters not what form of government may exist. Dead as it regards the *life* of christianity, it had as well be dead as regards its forms.

But we are not speaking of, or contemplating, such a condition of the church. We are presuming that it is led by the Spirit of God, and are inquiring what is the government of the church of Christ, obedient to his instructions. We have no means of determining this but the meaning and intent of the words describing the duties of the bishops and of the church, and the few illustrating examples recorded in the scriptures.

As regards teaching, it is not difficult to determine the limitations in question. So long as the bishops teach according to the oracles of God, the submission of the church is absolute and unlimited. The obedience is not primarily to the bishops, but to Christ, because it is his teaching that is to be obeyed. In the providence of God the whole church has been supplied with the word of truth, and all can know what that truth is. They may, therefore, be judges of what the word of God teaches and directs, and set in judgment on what the bishops teach. If they teach contrary to the word of Christ, the church is under no obligation to obey, because their allegiance is 'first to Christ and his word. But such a case is rare, if, indeed, it is probable. It is hardly possible for good men so far to err as to cause their action to be rightfully disregarded or condemned by the church. It is but modesty to assume that the church may be wrong, and the bishops right; and, unless the matter be of great vital interest, affecting the reputation of a member, or the interests of the cause, the church had better acquiesce in the judgment of the rulers than weaken their influence and lessen the esteem in which they should be held by the congregation.

In respect to the other duties of the elders, ruling, guiding, and overseeing, the same good sense and modesty should prevail in the church. It is to be presumed that the *best* men are called to this office; men prominent in the congregation for piety, uprightness, good judgment, and their knowledge of the word of God; and it is fair to presume that they are as likely to be right as the church. At least the Holy Spirit seemed so to think when he placed in their hands the ruling, guiding, and overseeing of the church. When, then, the elders are acting in the discharge of either of these duties, it is the duty of the church to obey and submit, unless it *knows* that their action is in flagrant violation of the word of God. In such a case love and good sense will carry

both parties through the difficulty. If such submission is not the duty of the church, then we must conclude that the words ruling, guiding, and overseeing, with respect to the elders, are without meaning—that they describe a shadow, and not a substance. What, therefore, the elders judge, direct, and advise, the church should readily execute.

In the light, then, which the words describing the duties of both parties throw on the subject, the conclusion seems fully warranted, that it is the duty of bishops, in all the affairs pertaining to the government and management of the church, to rule, guide, and oversee, and of the church to submit, obey, and *execute* the decisions of the bishops. If the church can not conscientiously do this, because of some additional or different light which it possesses, and which was unknown to the elders, the latter should have been put in possession of this light before their advice was given. If not in possession of the church at a sufficiently early period, then good sense and respect for their rulers demand that action in the matter be postponed until the rulers can reconsider their decision or advice in the light of the additional information afforded by parties possessing it.

An illustration may serve to place this matter more intelligibly before the reader. A. has committed a sin which reflects discredit upon the church. It is a public offense. The elders are the watchmen on the walls of Zion. They watch for the souls of the saints. They confer with the offender and place the sinfulness of the offense as clearly as possible before him. He may deny or admit all. If the former, they proceed to convince him that they have sufficient evidence of his offense. He may still confront them with a positive denial. The elders are satisfied that their evidence is reliable and sufficient, and they tell him he has added to his sin by denying it. He remains incorrigible. The elders are thoroughly convinced of his sin, and adjudge him worthy of exclusion. They so represent the case to the church, and the church has nothing to do but to *execute* the will of Christ in such a case, by withdrawing from the offending brother. "*Ab uno disce omnes.*"

But an objector will say, Suppose, after all, that the elders are wrong? Is the church to submit and to execute their decision in that case? We would reply, How does the church *know* that the decision of the elders is wrong? The whole church did not hear the evidence, and how can the church pronounce the decision contrary to the facts and law in the case? To do so is simply absurd. But, says the objector, suppose that in the end it should turn out that the elders were wrong? In that case the church would have executed a wrong, and in ignorance. This objection may have all the force that can be thrown into it, and still it does not remove the difficulty it raises. To err is human, and since the church is as much human as the Eldership, it can not hope to be exempt from errors of this kind. The objection resolves

itself into this: The case must be tried and adjudicated by the whole church, and for this alternative we would simply ask the authority. To the church the Holy Spirit did not commit the functions of ruling, guiding, and overseeing, and can she, under any circumstances, assume them? Such a right must be first shown from the scriptures. We therefore throw the objector on the defensive, and require him to show the *right* of the church to take such a course. That right can not be found in either the scriptures or sound reason. Where the scriptures speak, we should follow; where they are silent, we should stop. They have given into the hands of the bishops the functions of ruling, guiding and overseeing, and there we follow. They are wholly silent on the subject of the church discharging these functions, and here we stop. As to any difficulty that may arise under this appointment by the apostles of Jesus Christ, we may rest assured that it will be no greater than under any other; otherwise, that other would have been adopted. Therefore, we may implicitly accept and follow the instructions of the Holy Spirit, when he says: "*Obey them who have the rule over you, and submit yourselves; for they watch for your souls;*" and should they make any serious mistake in their ruling, the responsibility will rest on them. It can not be reasonably assumed that greater evils will attend the appointment of the Elders discharging these necessary functions than if the whole church should discharge them.

The view here presented is warranted by some rational considerations. It can not be questioned that the gospel first spread among the Jews, and gained a foothold in their synagogues. We know, moreover, that the form of worship of the synagogue and the church, when the Jewish christians became separated from the synagogue by persecution or other causes, was essentially the same. As, therefore, the form of worship of the synagogue was transferred to the church, it is in every way reasonable to suppose that its government was also. This fact is hardly questionable in the absence of all positive statements in the scriptures to the contrary. The gospel never ran counter to Jewish customs and prejudices unless in cases of vital interest; and when such was the case the apostles were very explicit and positive on the subject. But they say nothing against the government of the synagogue, nor give any explicit directions in regard to the government of the church. On the contrary, they use the language of the synagogue, and describe the officers of the church by terms that were applied to those of the synagogue, and speak of their functions in a style that lead us to suppose that the government of the church was intended to be modeled after that of the synagogue.

In the synagogue the elders discharged the functions ascribed to the elders of the church. Similar duties rested on the synagogue as the scriptures require of the church. A popular government was unknown to the synagogue, and inconsistent

with the whole fabric of the Jewish institution and the customs and modes of thinking of the Jewish people. The idea of the synagogue as an assembly discharging the functions of ruling, guiding, and overseeing, would have been preposterous. The ordinances of God are all wise, exactly adapted to the end in view: and in the synagogue we have an illustration of this in the appointment of age and experience to the office of ruling and overseeing.

The relation of christians to the laws of God as expressed in the New Covenant, is the same essentially as that of the Jewish people to their laws. Both become the people of God by a birth, and by that birth come under certain obligations, through the discharge of which they honor their parents. Jewish parents were required to teach their children the law of the Lord. This was done in the family, and also in the synagogue after it was instituted. Here the Jewish scriptures were read, interpreted, and expounded. In the days when copies of the law of God were multiplied by manuscript, the people at large were wholly dependent on the synagogue for their knowledge of the law and of the prophets. Hence arose some of the functions of their rulers. The church at the time it was instituted was similarly situated. For a time the church was wholly dependent on *inspired* men, and the letters of the apostles. When the first had passed away, the latter alone remained, and the church was the only place where a knowledge of these could be had. The customs of the synagogue in respect to these matters passed into the church. And so what was seen in the synagogue came to be known in the church. Under these circumstances it is impossible to suppose that so wonderful a change or innovation was introduced into the church, as that the young of the church were entrusted with its administration and government equally with the old, which must be presumed, if the church as an assembly was invested with the powers and duties of government.

The instances which the advocates of the democratic view of church government present in support of their position, and as against the one here maintained, we pass by with the simple remark, that they must be interpreted and viewed in the light of the facts presented in the history of the synagogue and of the apostolic church. Being inconsistent with these facts, the view can not be scriptural, and hence may be dismissed until it is shown that the church and synagogue had no relation or connection with each other in the age of inspiration, and that the facts here presented have no foundation in the history of the Jewish people and of the apostolic church. •

The function of ruling, guiding and overseeing being the official prerogative of the elders, it can not be scripturally discharged by any other official. The duty is peculiar and limited to these officers. But their function of teaching, while especially the duty of the eldership, may, nevertheless, be discharged to a greater or

less extent by any male member of the church who has the requisite knowledge and ability. As all christians are kings and priests before God, all who are not specially debarred, and who have the ability, are permitted to preach the gospel, immerse penitent believers, and, when necessary, preside at the Lord's table. For these no special ordination is necessary. The right and privilege were conferred when the disciples were made priests. Ordination by the church can not confer these primarily, but only additionally, when, in the judgment of the church, the necessity arises.

While such is unquestionably the right and privilege of any qualified male member of the church, yet propriety and the submission which is expected of all, demand that the member shall subordinate his right to the judgment and advice of the church, in order that he may have the countenance and co-operation of the church in any work he may undertake to do. Such a one then is properly an evangelist. Such were Philip and Stephen, deacons of the church in Jerusalem. Their ordination was intended to make them deacons. So far as the record goes there was no ordination to make them evangelists—to confer on them the right and privilege to preach the gospel.

An evangelist is simply one who preaches the gospel, as did Philip. Every man who preaches the gospel is an evangelist in the generic sense of the term. Such were the apostles and their assistants, as Silas, Timothy, Titus, and Barnabas. But the apostles were more, and so, possibly, were Timothy and Titus. They were the evangelists of the apostle Paul, and not of a church. "They were attached to his person and not to a church,"¹ and were under his immediate direction. They went where he sent them, and came when he called, and while in the discharge of the mission given them by Paul, they were his ministers, with special authority from him, which terminated at his pleasure, and for ever at his death.

The evangelists of the post-apostolic age hold *no official position in the church*. They may hold one *to* it, but not *in* it. If one who has been accustomed to preach the gospel, as did Philip, assumes the duties *in* the church, which belongs to the bishops, he is no longer an evangelist, but simply a member of the church, discharging the simple duty of preaching, or he is one of the elders, and the one described in the scriptures as "laboring in the word and teaching." The word evangelist should be applied to none others than those who are the missionaries of the church. Such they were in the days of the apostles,² and such should they be now, and not "wandering stars," without sphere or orbit; darting meteors, owing allegiance no where, and attached to no system.

In the beginning of the gospel several instrumentalities were ordained by the Lord for the two-fold purpose mentioned by the

¹ Neander. ² Neander's *Planting and Training*, p. 151.

apostle Paul in his letter to the Ephesians. He there states that Christ, after his ascension and coronation, "gave to some, apostle; and to some, prophets; and to some, evangelists; and to some, pastors; and to some, teachers," that they might labor "in the perfecting of the saints, in the work of the ministry. and in the edifying of the body of Christ." Here are three¹ objects to be accomplished by these several instrumentalities; and it would seem that the instrument ordained was adapted to the nature of the work to be accomplished. Thus pastors and teachers were ordained for the work *in* the church, and the evangelists more especially for the work outside, called in general terms, "the work of the ministry," whilst the apostles and prophets were designed for all the wants and requirements of the gospel in its incipiency. Such seems to have been the nature of the work committed to their hands by the Lord when he gave them their commission. They were first to preach the gospel to all the world. This was the work of the ministry. In the next place, they were to teach the disciples all things that he should command them; and this was the work in the church—the building up of the body of Christ.

Although the apostles had this fulness of authority, and needed no further or additional authority to discharge the work committed to their hands; yet we find, on one occasion, that the church at Antioch sent Paul as its missionary to preach the gospel in regions where it was as yet unknown.² Barnabas was associated with him, and whilst these persons were discharging the work placed in their hands, they were the evangelists, or missionaries of the church at Antioch, to which they gave an account of their work on their return.³ After this, Paul falling back on the authority he held as an apostle of Jesus Christ, took Silas and went on another preaching tour, during which, after visiting some of the churches he had planted during his first tour, he crossed over into Macedonia, and from Philippi he passed through Thessalonica down to Athens and Corinth. This was the work of the ministry, which seems then to have been limited to the preaching of the gospel and the gathering of the disciples into congregations, where the work of perfecting the saints and of edifying the body of Christ was to be accomplished. This was first accomplished by himself in person while he remained among them, and afterward by the pastors and teachers, ordained for this work.

On this occasion—the second preaching tour of Paul and Silas, Barnabas and John Mark also went out on the missionary work—the work of the ministry, to which, it is probable, they were specially ordained, either by the apostles as ministers plenipotentiary, or by some congregation; the former more probably, as would seem from Ephesians, chap. 4: 11. These were not apos-

¹ Really but two, since the 1st and 3d are the same.

² Acts 13: 1, 2. ³ Acts 14: 27.

bles, but simply teachers and prophets, (Acts 15: 1), and probably evangelists, and went on a special mission of preaching the gospel. This is the work, or service, or ministry, of which Paul so often speaks, and in which he had so many to help him.

But Paul was more than an evangelist of the church of Antioch. He was an apostle of Jesus Christ, and as such had authority over churches. Both functions were discharged by him. Not so with Silas and Timothy who attended him, or with Barnabas and Mark, who labored in another direction. The first two were his aids in the *ministry*, a work inferior to, and different from, that of the apostleship. Silas and Timothy were evangelists, so constituted by Paul, as an apostle of Jesus Christ. As far as we know, they were never at any time the evangelists of a church. They seem to have been connected with Paul in his work, and to have been sent by him on several occasions to do a certain and special work. They were *his* evangelists, if evangelists in any special sense, and discharged the work which he placed in their hands, and while so engaged, were rather sub-apostles, than evangelists in any sense. They had authority granted them by the apostle which no evangelist possessed, so far as we know from the scriptures. The functions which they discharged were not the functions of Barnabas and Mark, or of Philip and other evangelists like him.

The post-apostolic church has no such functionaries as these extraordinary and special gifts. It may have apostles and prophets, teachers and evangelists; but only in a generic sense. Its missionaries may be called apostles and evangelists; and its bishops, teachers, pastors, and prophets; but even then only when they are so made by the proper and necessary church action. There are no persons now who are above and independent of the church, as were the apostles. The church and discipleship are the sources of all authority and privilege now. The whole work of the gospel is placed in the hands of the church, and is discharged by it through the instrumentalities ordained by the Lord. Its three-fold work is now discharged by its bishops and evangelists, and when we specialize this work, "the work of the ministry" may be assigned to the evangelist by the church, and all else discharged by its eldership. And since the apostles were also evangelists when occasion required, so can the bishops become evangelists when opportunity or necessity demand it. In the post-apostolic church, the bishops are all that the apostles were, except what was involved in, or made necessary to, their inspiration, and what grew out of it.

"The work of the ministry," as known in the present day, has no analogue in the apostolic church. The "minister" of modern times has no representative there. This is a growth of the apostasy, the full fruit of which we have in the Pope of the Roman church. The modern "minister" does not claim to be an Elder or an Evangelist. He claims to be different from and above

these, while discharging their functions. Some claim to see the prototype of the 'modern minister in Timothy and Titus, while between them there is scarcely one point of comparison. He is but the creation of the apostasy. The Holy Spirit did not ordain such an officer in the church. So far, therefore, as he claims distinction and authority not warranted in the scriptures, he is an usurper.

The gospel has been placed in the hands of the church. She is to proclaim it to the world by the instrumentalities which the Lord himself ordained. To her is committed the work of salvation, and the means of accomplishing this work has been placed in her hands. These are the individual disciples and her bishops, and such aids, as missionaries or evangelists, as she may ordain for the work. This work, as we have already remarked, is a two-fold work, of which "the work of the ministry" is one. This, as distinguished from the others, is the work of preaching the gospel to the world, and in this every disciple may be engaged in some way; but it is especially committed to the bishops of the church, and to the missionaries or evangelists whom the church may appoint.

There is too little said of the duties and responsibilities, and of the extent of the power and authority of evangelists; and they were too much under the immediate direction of the Holy Spirit or of the apostles to enable us to generalize on these subjects, so as to apply the principles deduced, to their work in the church of to-day. We have no such account of them as we have of the bishops. These are the only spiritual functionaries of the church of which the scriptures speak. Evangelists are not mentioned as being necessary or intended for the post-apostolic church. Hence, we can only *infer*, and speak of evangelists in a *generic* sense, meaning simply those who preach the gospel for the conversion of sinners. But this being now the work of the church, it follows that evangelists must do their work under the direction, and with the sanction, of the church, when propriety or necessity, or both, require it. The church must now do "the work of the ministry" through the preaching of the gospel; and the persons whom it may ordain or commission for this work, we may call evangelists, whose power and authority are to be determined by the *special* work placed in their hands. Acting under a special commission from a church to preach the gospel in destitute regions, and organize churches, the evangelist must be considered as invested with the power and authority which his church may have in this direction. Churches have the authority to constitute a part of their membership into separate churches, and ordain for them elders and deacons, and thus place them on a footing with the mother church. The church is the leaven placed in the great mass of mankind, and it certainly has the privilege and authority to scatter this where it will, that separate masses of mankind, in which it may be placed,

may be leavened. This the church may do through its evangelists, or through the establishment of churches from its own membership.

The work of the ministry, we have said, is now given into the hands of the church. In one sense it is given into the hands of every disciple; but particularly into the hands of the church. The church is to accomplish this work through the means ordained by the Lord. This special means we understand to be the evangelist. But the question arises, How is the church to do this, and what is the relation which the evangelist sustains to the church ordaining him to this work? Can the church place him in this ministry, and have no oversight or further concern about him? Is there a something distinct and isolated called the *ministry*—a function separable and separated from the church, which men may discharge in their individual capacity, under a general commission granted them by an ordination of the church? In other words, can one church constitute a man an evangelist, for any other church than itself? Can it make him an evangelist at large and for all time? This, to say the least, is somewhat questionable. A church's action must be limited to its own field of operation. This may include its own precincts and the neighboring destitute regions. One church certainly can not constitute a man an evangelist for another church, no more than it can select, appoint, and ordain another church's Elders. This conclusion seems necessary and unquestionable, if churches are to be regarded as independent and integral parts of the body of Christ—separate masses of leaven scattered through the world to work its own peculiar changes in the separate masses of mankind with which it comes in contact.

If the work of the ministry is the work of the church, its agents must be those ordained by the Lord, and these are limited, so far as the scriptures inform us, to the bishops, and the evangelists whom the church may ordain for the work. This being true, the ministry and the evangelist can not be independent of the church and its supervision; consequently the ministry and minister of the present day are things unknown to the organization of the apostolic church.

SECTION VII.

ITS TRIUMPH: THE MILLENNIUM.

The attributes of God are a sufficient pledge to the universe that the Remedial System, which he has provided for man, will not fail of the object for which it was instituted. It is not consistent with our knowledge of his being and character to believe for a moment that he can fail in anything he undertakes. The design of what he undertakes is not to be measured by what we consider ought to be the results. What we may consider a defect or a failure in his work, is not to be taken as God's estimate of it; nor must what we may regard as his design or purpose, be taken as what he designed or expected. For the finite mind to judge of the infinite mind, and say that its plans and purposes have proved defective and failures, is a presumption that can not be properly characterized. What *men* may look on as a failure or as a defect, may be all that was intended or expected, and all, indeed, that was possible in the nature of things. Absolute perfection can not come of finite instrumentalities acting on finite objects. Hence, such a thing is not to be expected in any work of God.

The creation is a work of possibilities and probabilities, not one of absolute certainty and perfection. These are found only in God. Besides, these possibilities and probabilities are relative. Whilst all things may be regarded as possible theoretically, yet practically they are not. It is possible, for instance, for the gospel to save all men, because it can save one; but it is not probable that it will, because the will and consent of the sinner are necessary, and it is only probable that these will be given. In one aspect, therefore, God's plans will prove successful, but a success only relative and imperfect, not absolute, because contingencies inhere in, and are inseparable from, their practical operation. These convert the certain into the probable, and forbid any expectation that contemplates more than partial results.

When the Jehovah determined on the creation of the universe, with all its possibilities, probabilities, and contingencies, he certainly did not *design* that sin should be one of its results. On the contrary, he designed and desired that all his intelligent creatures should be happy, and that forever. They were created

with this view, and made capable of it. The structure, so to speak, of their whole being contemplated this, and made it possible. But as these creatures were not material machines, regulated and worked by unreasoning and infallible law, but were above this domain of his creation, and in the field of mind and will, where judgment and consent play so important a part in the results actually realized, the certainty of the possible and the infallible is converted into the contingency of the probable and fallible, and so we have but partial completeness or perfection as to desired results.

Sin is the cloud in whose shadow the spectres of doubt arise and flit before our vision. Because many of the angels sinned and were banished from heaven, we are ready to infer that his work in creation was a failure. We do not stop to look into the possible and probable, and inquire whether God expected absolute perfection of his work in this particular. If he *expected* that *every* intelligent creature would preserve his allegiance to himself forever, and thus continue forever happy, then, in the light of actual results, we may consider that his expectations were not realized. But have we any reason to suppose that he expected this result? Certainly not. The infinite mind knew what would happen before the work began, and knew it so certainly, that the result was actually contemplated and fully considered; so that the occurrence of sin was no surprise to Jehovah. He knew what would happen in the event of his creating such beings. The infinite mind conceived, and infinite wisdom ordained proper and adequate means by which his intelligent creatures *could* preserve their allegiance and happiness; but he could provide no means by which he could infallibly insure this, because the object on which these means operated was the will of finite beings. Hence, knowing the nature of the beings whom he intended to create, and the means he intended to employ, he saw the results at the beginning. His work contemplated a contingency. It was within the view of all his plans and purposes, and the contingency happening, this fact could not mar his work so as to make it a failure. That the means which he ordained were proper and adequate is proved by the fact that all the angels did not lapse. If but a few comparatively fell, this is enough to show that the defect did not lie in the means, but in the will of the governed. The fact that sin irrupted into the universe, and carried ruin and disaster to all who became involved in it, is no proof that God's plan and design in creating intelligent beings were a failure and a mistake, and that they ought not to have been created; for all that has happened was anticipated by the infinite Mind. This contingency was not sufficient to deter him from creating. Therefore, as we ascribe to Jehovah infinite attributes, we must assume that the disaster which has overtaken his intelligent creatures was not enough, in his estimation, to make his work a mistake and a failure.

So we may reason in regard to the Remedial System which God has provided for men involved in sin. This scheme has in view the salvation from sin, and employs proper and adequate means. After providing for the pardon of men's sins, it then proposes to preserve them from sin, and its means of doing this are the same in kind as those employed in preserving the allegiance of angels. It finds man involved in sin, and proposes to save him by means adapted to his nature and to the end in view. He is not a machine, nor are the means physical forces acting on him according to the law of cause and effect. In this scheme God addresses him as the master of his own thoughts and actions. The means are not coercive, but persuasive; not arbitrary, but rational. The scheme seeks and requires man's co-operation. This is essential to its success. If his will resists all these means, the scheme can not save him. The *gospel* is God's power in this work, and if this power fail, the gospel being perfect and complete, the failure must lie at man's door. Infinite power is confined in its operation to the gospel, and if men reject this, infinite power can not save them.

The gospel is a moral agency, and its field of operation is the mind and will of men. They can accept and they can reject, and they do accept and reject. The service of *will* is essentially and necessarily a *willing* service. Hence the gospel must be accepted by the will if it is to save men. "Thy people shall be a willing people in the day of thy power." The gospel appeals to man's understanding, will, and heart. It is capable of enlightening his mind, controlling his will, and evoking the profoundest love of his heart. In this way it saves men. It can not save them in ignorance, in obstinacy of will, and hatred of heart. Men can shut their eyes to the light, refuse their consent, and withhold their love. This is sin, and so long as they continue to do this, God can not save them. The co-operation of men is, therefore, absolutely necessary to their salvation by the gospel. Their salvation without the consent of the mind and will, and the love of the heart, is simply impossible, and *were it possible, it would not be desirable*. There is and can be no allegiance to God in the absence of these, and without allegiance, man's salvation from the guilt, dominion, and power of sin is one of the impossibilities by which God is hedged in by the nature of finite beings. The success, therefore, of the Remedial System in the salvation of men depends not on God, or on the imperfection of anything he has done; but on the action of the *will* of men. The gospel is all that infinite knowledge, wisdom, and goodness could make it. And so is the nature and being of man. Therefore, if man be not saved by it, the fault lies not in the constitution of either, but in the will of either God or men. That it is not in the will of God the scriptures every-where affirm. It must be, therefore, in the will of men. This being so, the whole question is resolved into this: either God should not have created

man with this great disaster in view, or man is solely to blame for his non-salvation. The latter we assume is the only proper and just conclusion, justified by the scriptures, and sanctioned by common sense, and the highest reason.

That all men will not be saved is a truth not to be questioned. That vast numbers of the race will be lost is equally true. But it is equally true that vast numbers will be saved, and, indeed, have been saved.¹ In this the gospel has demonstrated its power to save.

But the objector may say that the ratio of the saved as compared with the lost is small indeed, and that success can not be ascribed to a measure that does not do more than this.

However small the number of the saved may be as compared with the lost, this argues nothing against the efficacy and wisdom of the remedial scheme. The lost are not lost because of any deficiency in the means, for the fact that some are saved disproves such a supposition. If the gospel *can* save one, it *can* save many, and if many, then more, and so on to the last one. But then its practical efficacy depends upon something else, not a part of the gospel, as an agency of salvation, but wholly foreign to it. This is the co-operation of the will and heart of the party to be saved. If this be not active with the gospel, the gospel is practically without power to save. If the gospel fails, it fails with those "in whom the God of this world hath blinded the eyes of them who believe not."² Men can not be saved in unbelief. Belief is an act of intelligence, will, and the heart, of which act men are the masters.

Who can tell what number of the lost ever gave the gospel a moment's attention or consideration? Food will not preserve and perpetuate life unless it be used. Life is in the food. It may be stored in abundance around us, and yet we will die if we use it not. No fact is better known than this. At this the mind does not wonder. We are not surprised that men die who will not eat. Nor do we ever think of blaming God for this, or of charging the food with inefficacy. Nor would we wonder and find fault with the government of God if the whole race should perish by refusing the means of life. We would blame neither God nor the food, but the folly of men in not using it. So with the gospel. It can save only those who embrace it. It was not designed to do more. Therefore, if it saves those who embrace it, it is efficacious to save; and all who are not saved by it, are not saved because they do not embrace it. All the failure, therefore, belongs to man, and not to God or the gospel.

But mankind are disposed to estimate the success of an undertaking by the measure of its results. As the results are great or small, so they estimate the success. We are not disposed to question the propriety or justness of this course. In one view of the case it is just and proper; in another, it is not. The Lord seems

¹ Rev. 6: 9, 10. ² 2 Cor. 4: 3, 4.

to have regarded it as more curious than practical. When asked by his disciples as to the *number* that would be saved, he did not answer the question, because, possibly, he regarded it as an idle one. A much more important question was, Would *they* be saved? Hence his answer: "*You* endeavor to enter in through the narrow gate. But few enter it. Strive to be among the few. Many are passing in at the broad gate that leads to ruin." Here we have the few saved and the many lost. The Lord saw this, yet he did not hesitate to die for the sins of the world, though he knew what would be the result.

Still, the question presses on some minds, Why could not God have devised means that would *certainly* save all men? Such a question resolves itself into another, which shows the absurdity of such a thought. It had as well be asked, Why does not God save men in spite of themselves? So the Universalist and Unitarian argue, though from opposite premises. To save men by the gospel without their consent and co-operation is one of the impossibilities, as we have said, by which God is hedged in by the finiteness of creation. The *object* on which the infinite works is finite, and this limits God in his means and operation. Illustrations of this we have in abundance all through the organic world. The eye of the bat and the owl can not endure the light of the meridian sun. The sloth can not move with the speed of the reindeer. Tropical animals and plants can not live and flourish in the Arctic. We do not express any wonder at this, or charge the Creator with folly or weakness. But when we come to apply the same principles to God's work in salvation, the skeptical mind grows at once querulous and captious. The same principles are, indeed, true as it regards things physical. A watch is a structure of great delicacy. It must be handled and used according to the laws of its mechanism. A blow that would mold a piece of the same metal into a beautiful coin or medal, would annihilate the watch. Nimble and delicate fingers must adjust its deranged parts with equally delicate instruments. It can not be done at the forge with the tools of the blacksmith. So we may reason in regard to intelligent beings. The possession of a self-determining will places them above the world of cause and effect, and hence we can not look for invariable results. They are to be treated and governed according to the constitution of their being. The gospel is offered to spirit-beings who possess a self-determining will; who are capable of spontaneous and independent action; who are operated on by spiritual powers, and not by physical forces; beings who are to be controlled or influenced, if at all, by moral forces, and hence we can not expect invariably favorable results. Men will spurn and reject the gospel as they do any other truth, even though its considerations and motives are infinitely higher, greater, and more desirable than those of any other truth.

The gospel of Jesus Christ being the means which infinite wis-

dom has ordained to save men from the guilt and punishment of sin, and from all the consequences which sin has entailed on the race, and that, too, in a way that will honor God before his intelligent universe, we may expect that its success can, in no way, depend on any other power, influence, or aid than what is found in its provisions; that it depends on no other power of God exerted external to, or independent of, what belongs to the gospel, such as the motives and considerations presented in the gospel. These are all that God proposes to use, or can use, in winning the heart and mind of man away from sin, and in planting in him the love of righteousness.

As to the ultimate success of the gospel in saving men, we have, on the part of God, all that can insure it. On the part of man we can only hope that it will succeed in saving him; for its practical success depends on his action. It meets him as he is, involved in sin, and surrounded by good and bad influences, and pleads with him with the fervor of infinite love. It appeals to the strongest passion of his being, and lays before him every consideration that can stimulate this passion, and make it active. If he is lost after this, his ruin is the work of his own hands. This our reason declares, and so the scriptures affirm.

If, therefore, we are to judge of the success of the gospel in saving men we must consider it as it is related to God on the one hand, and to man on the other. God has done all that he can to insure its success. In this respect the gospel is complete and perfect: for it can save men, and has saved thousands. As to the number of men who will be saved, it is but partial in its success. It has not saved all; but such a success was never contemplated.

But what of its success as to numbers? The question recurs: "Lord, will there be but few saved?" The heart somehow feels that *numbers* are to determine the question of ultimate success. What, then, as to the number? Will there be but few, comparatively, saved?

The fact, of course, can not be determined before the end. That vast numbers of the race will be lost, there can not be the slightest doubt in the mind of such as believe in the divine inspiration of the christian scriptures. By the great judgments of God on mankind millions of the race have gone down to eternal ruin. What vast numbers were swept away by the flood! The history of the race is full of the judgments of God against sinners. These are but the pledges of God as to what he will do with all sinners. If the great drama were to close now, it might be fairly presumed that the lost would far exceed in number the saved.

But the end is not near. The age of the earth can not be computed. It is hoary with age. Its life is measured not by years, nor by centuries, but by *ages*. Antiquity is but as yesterday. The end of so much preparatory labor is not near. The great problem of humanity and of sin is one of difficult solution.

Though God "has waked and worked for ages," his work is not nearly finished. The veil of the future was lifted from before the eye of the christian prophet, and he saw in the distant ages the struggles and fortunes of the church; its persecutions by the powers of the earth, and its ultimate triumph over all the world; when "the seventh angel sounded, and there were great voices in heaven saying, The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ, and he shall reign forever and ever."¹

This triumph of the Lord Jesus was seen by the prophet Daniel under another symbol. To the king of Babylon was outlined in a dream the history of the world until the coming of Christ, and then the fate of the kingdoms of earth before the kingdom which Christ was to set up, seen by the king, as a little stone cut out of the mountain, smiting and breaking in pieces all the kingdoms of this world, and rolling onward until it filled the whole earth.²

In these prophecies we have the assurance that the church will yet triumph in the earth, and that the saved, in the end, will far exceed the number of the lost. God seems pledged to this conclusion. The strength and power of righteousness in the human heart will ultimately be seen to be all that is expected. It will yet be seen, before the great drama closes, that righteousness shall cover the earth as the waters cover the channels of the deep. This shall be the result of the fulness of the knowledge of God in the earth.³ The gospel is preached in the world for the salvation of the world, and that it will not fail of its object we have the assurance of God himself. Thus he declares: "*For as the rain cometh down, and the snow from heaven, and returneth not thither, but watereth the earth, and maketh it bring forth and bud, that it may give seed to the sower, and bread to the eater; so shall my word be, that goeth forth out of my mouth: it shall not return unto me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it.*"⁴

Applying these words of God to the gospel of Christ, we have in them the pledge of its ultimate and glorious success. But the *extent* of this success is not determined by this passage. It is here limited to the purpose for which it is sent. If the purpose be universal dominion, then have we the pledge of the gospels' universal dominion in this declaration of God, and in the prophecies concerning the church, spoken by Daniel and the apostle John.

John in the isle of Patmos saw this glorious consummation of the gospel, this universal triumph of the church, and describes it in the glowing and gorgeous imagery of the Apocalypse. He saw

"All dross removed, and heaven's own pure day,
Full on the confines of our ether flame."

¹ Rev. 11: 15.

² Danl. 2: 34, 35.

³ Is. 11: 9.

⁴ Is. 55: 10, 11.

He saw Satan chained and bound for a thousand years, and during this time the souls of martyrs, and thrones, and those who sat upon them. He saw them reigning in power and executing judgment in the earth,—living and reigning with Christ a thousand years.¹ This is the millennial period of the church, during which Christ will reign supreme on the earth; when the little stone will have become the mountain, and will fill the whole earth.

Are these thousand years of universal triumph of the church to be considered literal or prophetic years? If literal, it seems but a short time of the earth's history to give to the Lord. The world has groaned under the weight and oppression of sin for six thousand years, and christianity has been struggling with it in all its forms, phases, and powers, for well nigh two thousand, and yet but little comparatively has been accomplished toward its universal supremacy. If the great drama is to close with the seventh millennium of the world, as some suppose; if Christ is to have but one thousand years at the end of time, there seems but little prospect now of this prophecy being fulfilled. The time is too short for the *principles* of the gospel to accomplish this result, unless it advance in the future with infinitely greater speed and power than it has done in the past. It is true that christianity does advance with accelerated speed and accumulated power, as it extends its sway and influence in the world; but it is too much to expect that a few centuries will accomplish more in the future than hundreds have done in the past. Humanity molds but slowly under the influence and power of the gospel. It will not differ materially in the future from what it has been in the past, and the gospel's power and agencies are the same. How, then, can we expect the glorious results foretold by prophets to be realized a few centuries hence? The expectation is without any reason derived from the nature and operations of the principles of the gospel, or from the promises of the christian scriptures.

If the Spirit of God did not change the highly figurative and unliteral character of the language of the Apocalypse when he came to speak of this closing event in the church's history, we ought to interpret the language here as we do elsewhere in this wonderfully symbolic book. If this be justified, then we have ample time, it would seem, in the thousand prophetic years, extending the duration of the world to the extent of three hundred and sixty-five thousand from the beginning of the millennium, during which time the little stone cut out of the mountain shall continue to enlarge, and break in pieces and consume all the kingdoms of the world, and thereby become universally supreme.

Is such a supposition unreasonable? There is nothing in the

¹ We reject *in toto* the doctrine of the personal and visible presence of Christ on the earth at this time.

language of the Apocalypse to forbid it, and there is certainly none in the history of God's work in this earth. If viewed in the light of geological ages, the period of three hundred and sixty-five thousand years will not carry us farther back in the earth's history than the period of the Drift, and possibly not much remoter than the period of Alluvial deposits. The forces and agents of physical and organic nature wrought out the great changes which the earth has undergone in the past, and is still undergoing, and brought the world to its present condition. The time consumed in these vast operations was simply short of infinite. Yet we can not say that the work could have been done in a shorter time. For such a work a vast time is required, and yet with all this we can not charge these agents and forces with weakness, or God with unwisdom.

So is God's work on the minds and hearts of men by means of the gospel. The changes to be wrought, and the work to be done, are not to be effected in a few millennia. This the history of the race already shows; and if we are to compare the little of the past with its millennia, with the fulness of the future, shall we not compute the time of the work of that fulness by millennia of millennia?

In addition to these considerations, it is important to remember that this period of the church, when righteousness shall universally prevail, and all society be molded and toned by the principles of the gospel, will not come suddenly upon the world. It will not be the introduction of anything new or foreign to christianity, a part or a scene in a new system of things, suddenly shifted into view. It will not be ushered in by any sudden manifestation of miraculous or providential power, so marked and characteristic as to be recognized as such; but it will come in by the usual, natural, and gradual workings of the principles of the gospel. Such was the manner of its inception,¹ and such has been the manner of its growth and extension in the world, and by the same means and in the same manner, undoubtedly, will be the coming and fulness of its triumph. If this be not so, the result can not be ascribed to the gospel. The introduction and use of any other power, or powers, than those recognized as belonging to, and as being a part of, the gospel and its proclamation, and accomplishing the result by these, even though only additional to the gospel, will be a confession of the weakness and impotency of this great power of God in effecting the result intended in the universal triumph of the church. This result must, therefore, proceed directly from the principles and agencies of the gospel, as ordained by God, or we must admit the impotency of the gospel for the work for which it was ordained.

The gospel being the power of God for salvation, and the means by which the church is to triumph, and break in pieces,

¹Luke 17: 20.

and consume all human kingdoms, the approach of the millennial period must be gradual and ordinary, and not miraculous and abrupt. That glorious period must come upon the world like the meridian light of the sun—first the gray dawn when the stars of night begin to fade before the coming light; then the rosy hue of cloud and mountain top; and then the glorious orb itself, filling the earth with its glory and beauty. It reaches the zenith and the world rejoices in its light. Thus will Christianity rise to the height of its power and prevalence in the millennium. Such is the course and progress of all God's works: "First the blade, then the ear, after that the full corn in the ear;" and such must we expect to be the approach of the Millennium, when the world shall witness the triumph of Christ's cause over sin, and behold the little stone swollen to the dimensions of the whole earth.

CHAPTER VI.

THE KINGDOM OF GLORY.

SECTION I.

THE RESURRECTION.

The Kingdom of Glory is a necessary conclusion to the Kingdom of Grace. Man must live again beyond the grave, or the whole Remedial Scheme is a failure.¹ The blood of the atonement which was shed at the brazen altar, was without efficacy until sprinkled on the mercy seat in the most holy place, in the immediate presence of God; so was the blood of Christ taken by himself as high priest into the true holy of holies, the heavens, and there presented on the true mercy seat. This could not have been done had he not arisen from the dead, and "ascended up on high."

The idea of a resurrection is as old, at least, as Enoch. He prophesied that the Lord would come with "ten thousands of his saints to execute judgment upon all." He had particularly before his mind the coming of the Lord to punish the wicked. Jude, who mentions this prophecy, was speaking of the certainty of the punishment of the wicked, and instanced the cases of the fallen angels, the destruction of the unfaithful Jews in the desert, and the overthrow of the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah in proof, and then proceeds to speak of certain persons in his day, and says: "To such as these" Enoch prophesied of the punishment of God on sinners: and as it was the same spirit who spoke by Enoch and Jude; and as he says by Jude, this punishment is to be meted out on the same day as that on which the fallen angels are to be judged, we are justified in the conclusion that Enoch had before his mind the same day of judgment, and hence a knowledge of a general resurrection.

¹ 1 Cor. 15: 17.

Enoch's disappearance is another proof that a resurrection was taught the antediluvians. Moses does not say that Enoch *died*; but that he "walked with God, and was not; for God took him;" and Paul says of him that he "was translated that he should not see death." Enoch did not die, but was taken up to heaven, as was Christ, and as will be the living saints at Christ's second coming. If, therefore, the change which the living saints shall undergo when Christ comes, shall be the same to them as the resurrection is to the dead, then it must follow that Enoch's manner of disappearance clearly teaches a resurrection of the dead.

The knowledge of so stupendous a fact as the resurrection of the dead once having been given to the world, could never have been lost among a people who had seen so much of God in his judgments on mankind. The knowledge of God was early corrupted by idolatry, but was not thereby lost. Nor was so wonderful and important a fact as a resurrection of the dead. Abraham is the bright star of the patriarchal world, one of the grandest heroes of faith who have "lived and walked with God." If we are to presume that he had no conception of a resurrection, and that his knowledge of man's destiny did not extend beyond the phenomena of death, then is his life a strange enigma. If he believed not that he would live after death, his faith was a useless and unnecessary power. His experience assured him that he could not live on earth forever. What, then, could be the meaning of his faith in God, if there was no resurrection for him? He was promised a home and an inheritance in another land by the Lord when he told him to leave his father's house and journey to an unknown country. But when he reached that land, and was assured by God that it was his, he dwelt in it as though it was not his. He bought of the children of the land the place in which he buried his wife Sarah. He did not receive and enjoy that promise. He looked higher and farther off than the land in which he was but a pilgrim. He had no settled home there, and lived as though it were not his by the gift of God. His faith had shown him another land, and he looked not at Canaan, but off to that "city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God." He saw by faith a land after death. In Canaan he had no abiding place. In it he was but a sojourner. He dwelt there in tents, and lived as though the promise of a home looked beyond the land in which he thus dwelt. In thus living he "plainly declared that he sought a country: * * * that he desired a better country, that is, a heavenly, which God had prepared for him."¹ The construction which the apostle Paul put on the promise made to Abraham and his sons Isaac and Jacob, and the life which he led in the land of Canaan, plainly declares that Abraham had knowledge of a future life, and consequently of a resurrection, which he had derived from tradition.

¹ Heb. 11: 8-16.

The calling of Abraham marks a new era in the history of the race. Henceforth God confined the revelation of his will and purposes to the line of his descendants. But the light of revealed knowledge which Abraham had left behind him, was not put out or obscured by his calling. The light which he enjoyed in Ur of the Chaldees was still the boon of those he left behind him. Among these there was none greater than Job. Of all those whom the separation of Abraham thenceforth made Gentiles, he alone (except Balaam) has come down to us in history. He enjoyed the inspiration of God, if we suppose him to have been the author of the book that bears his name, and was, in all probability, of the line of Shem.¹ He had a knowledge of the resurrection. He contemplated the great question which has pressed itself on the mind and heart of man since the day that death placed him in the grave: "If a man die shall he live again?" and he spoke after this manner: "All the days of my appointed time will I wait till *my change come*; * * * for I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day on the earth; and after I shall awake, though this body be destroyed, yet out of my flesh shall I see God."²

During the Jewish dispensation the belief in the resurrection of the dead became more pronounced. Early in the history of the Jews it was taught by a necessary implication, as distinctly stated by the Lord Jesus in his conversation with the Sadducees: "Now that the dead are raised, even Moses showed at the burning bush, when he calleth the Lord, 'the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. For he is not a God of the dead, but of the living; for all are alive to him.'"

But when David came to the throne, and God began to make his promises concerning the "Seed," the "Shiloh," the "Prophet," and the "Messiah," more emphatic and distinct, it became necessary to state the ground or means by which the promise to David respecting the permanency of his throne, could be reasonably fulfilled. Hence David prophesied concerning the resurrection of the Messiah and his ascension to the heavens, and of his seat at the right hand of God. But though his words were spoken concerning the Messiah, yet David seemed to realize that they were true of him and all of God's people. He sings in his 16th Psalm: "I have set the Lord always before me; because he is at my right hand, I shall not be moved. Therefore my heart is glad, and my glory rejoiceth; *my flesh also shall rest in hope*. For thou wilt not leave my soul in hades; neither wilt thou suffer thy Holy One to see corruption. *Thou wilt shew me the path of life; in thy presence is fulness of joy; at thy right hand are pleasures forever more.*" This path of life led to the fulness of joy in the

¹ In the line of Shem have appeared all the men through whom God has revealed his will to men.

² Job 14: 14; 19: 25-27—Marginal reading.

heavens, and to the pleasures which saints shall have at the right hand of God in the world to come.

But Daniel is still more explicit in regard to a general resurrection. He lived during the captivity in Babylon, and prophesied concerning the fate of his people, the coming of the Messiah, and the universal triumph of the fifth kingdom; and says at the close of his prophecies: "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."¹ This language is almost identical with that of our Lord in his parable of the sheep and the goats.

At the time our Lord appeared the belief in a general resurrection of the dead was very prevalent among the Jews. The Pharisees, the largest and most influential sect of the Jews, were distinguished for their belief in the resurrection of the dead. It was, indeed, the hope of Israel. On one occasion, when under arrest, the apostle Paul took advantage of this general conviction to appease the wrath of his persecutors: "Men and brethren, I am a Pharisee; of the hope of the resurrection of the dead, am I called in question."² This tenet of the Pharisees was founded on the Jewish scriptures. Their conviction as to a general resurrection of the dead had its origin in their sacred writings. Hence, we perceive that the idea of a resurrection of the dead is not a revelation of the Christian Age,—not peculiar to Christianity.

The necessity of a resurrection arises from several considerations, among which we may mention: 1. The effect of sin on the being of man. Sin has brought death upon him, and death carries his body into the inorganic world, and his spirit into hades. Here his spirit must remain forever if his body be not made alive again, and united with the spirit at the resurrection of the body. The atonement would be of no avail if the spirit come not out of hades, and be not again clothed by an immortal body. It might procure remission of the soul's guilt, but what would this avail the spirit, if it were to continue forever in hades? The spirit must be brought out of hades to make the remission of guilt available to its eternal happiness. A spirit permanently disembodied would be an anomaly in the universe; and all of God's plans in regard to sin and man would be abortive were there to be no resurrection from the dead. 2. From the nature of the being of the atonement. The *incarnate Logos* is the atonement. Its death feature arises from the *human* being. The man only can die. The *Logos* is immortal and eternal, and can not die. The union of the human and the divine is absolutely essential to the being and efficacy of the atonement, both as to the death which it undergoes, and to the presentation of its blood on the mercy seat in the heavens. But more is necessary to the constitution and efficacy of an atonement than the blood of an innocent

¹ Danl. 12: 2. ² Acts 23: 6.

victim. The altar and the priest are equally necessary, and these are supplied to the atonement of Jesus Christ by the *Logos*. The union of the divine and human being necessary to the being and efficacy of the atonement; and the *Logos*, ever living by virtue of his inherent immortality, the dead human must live again before the ever-living *Logos* can, in the person of the Lord Jesus, present the blood of the human in the presence of God in the heavens. The death of Jesus Christ, without his resurrection, would have effected the eternal separation of the human and divine in him, and made impossible the presence of the priest and blood of the atonement in the true holy of holies. Thus would his atonement have been without purpose or efficacy if Jesus had not risen from the dead.

3. Man was made to live forever. Though mortal as to his animal organism, yet it was designed that he should never die. Provision was made for this in the garden of Eden. Man's natural and ordinary food will preserve his life only a few scores of years. Before the flood human life ran into centuries. But in Eden he would have lived forever through the virtue of the fruit of the tree of life. Man's deprivation of this food is the *genetic* cause of natural death. Now, since the race has been deprived of this food by no act of its own beyond that of the original pair; and since the deprivation of this source of perpetual life carries man to the grave, he suffers an evil for no fault of his own. This is contrary to the righteous principles of the government of God. Innocent children coming into the world by no act of their own, and passing out of it without their will or consent, plead against the evil of death which is an infringement on their inherent right to live, and which overtakes them through the fault of another. Justice demands that they lie not forever in the grave; and hence they must be raised, or God's justice is tarnished. As this last can not be, the innocent dead must be raised.

As sin, through the race's federal representative, brought death into the world by the destruction of the tree of life, so righteousness, through a righteous representative, Jesus Christ, brings life by his resurrection. "As by Adam all die; so by Christ all shall be made alive." As man is entitled to live (if he sin not) by virtue of his creation; and as this right was invaded and destroyed by the act of the head of the race, so it is but just that this right should be restored by giving him life again by the resurrection. Punitive death being inflicted as a punishment for sin, is the only death that justice demands or sanctions. Such a death is righteous and just, because the merited reward of the individual's sin. But natural death, not being punitive in any sense, is the infliction of an evil without personal demerit, and hence the righteousness of God demands reparation. This reparation God accords to the whole race by the resurrection.

4. Natural death has no *genetic* connection with sin; nor has the resurrection any with righteousness. It is not punitive, as

we have said. The latter anticipates and supersedes the former. Since the death of Christ no man has suffered punitive death for a violation of the laws of God. The wicked die *in* their sins, but not for, or on account of, their sins. This Christ did for them. Natural death has no connection with the atonement. The punitive death which the wicked, dying in their sins, are to suffer, is the "second death." "This death" is wholly punitive, and is inflicted on the sinner, and not on a substitute. But this comes after a natural death—after the resurrection. The resurrection is an essential prerequisite. God has denounced death against sin; and if a man does not enjoy in this life, all the benefits of the atonement, punitive death must and will be inflicted upon him in the day when all the affairs of this world, so far as sin is concerned, are to be finally adjusted. The final judgment, therefore, which is after this life, demands that the wicked shall be raised from the dead, and made to stand before the judgment seat of Christ; for this is the day which God has appointed, "in the which he will judge the world by that man whom he has ordained."

Though we thus see that the resurrection of the body is a necessity, growing out of the state and condition in which sin has placed the race, and also out of the nature of the means which God has ordained for man's salvation from all the consequences of sin, both proximate and remote, a difficulty has presented itself to some minds, which arises from the observed phenomena of death. What we see of man is his body and its manifestations. When the body dies the manifestations disappear, and it becomes almost entirely invisible. The chemistry of nature resolves it ultimately into its component elements, and the man disappears from our sight. This we call death, and it is the same in man and beast. "Then the body returns to the earth as it was," and man goes out in the darkness of this world, and we see him no more.

Will he live again? This is the pressing and difficult question, on which the science of this world can afford us no light. It would say that the beast will as probably live again as man.¹ We are in darkness here if without the light of revelation. In this light we see the true nature and destiny of man, and behold him again on the other side of the grave, clothed with an immortal body, and shining with the splendor of the angelic host. Whence and how his presence there in such brightness and beauty? Whence and how that glorious body?

The inspired historian of the Pentateuch tells us that the body of man—his animal organism—was made of "the dust of the earth," of the matter which composes the earth; and this statement is confirmed by the analysis which science has made of his body. "The first man is of the earth, earthy." The divine

¹ Such is the force of the argument of Bishop Butler in his *Analogy*, chapter, *Future Life*.

oracle also says: "Dust thou art, and to dust shalt thou return." This is the source and destiny of all living organisms belonging to this world. The bodies of men and of animals, as well as all vegetable structures, are ultimately resolved into their constituent elements, and resume their former relations in the inorganic world. Here the constituent elements that once formed the body of man can not be distinguished from those that once formed the structures of animals and plants. The carbonic acid gas exhaled from the lungs of animals can not be distinguished from the same gas that arises from the decomposition of the metallic carbonates. In the general commingling of elements set free by the decomposition of living organisms, these organisms are wholly destroyed and lost. Individual identity is not a quality or attribute of elementary matter. Whence and how, therefore, the resurrection of the body?

The apostle puts this question in the mouth of an objector, not in the spirit of honest inquiry, but of captious objection. The question is here asked and considered in the interest of Christ's religion. Hence, we will not say to the honest inquirer, as the apostle would not, "Thou fool." Such close their eyes to the light of truth, whether in nature or revelation. We propose to consider the question in the light of both, as did the apostle.

The apostle stated a scientific fact, and that, too, long before science had discovered the fact, when he declared: "That which is sown is not made alive unless it die," and "the body which is sown is not the body which shall be." The latter is a matter of observation; the former of scientific research and demonstration. This illustration of the apostle, when well understood, throws much light on the resurrection of the body of man, and his immortalization in the heavens. Hence, a general statement as to what science has discovered in regard to the first statement of the apostle, that no living organism is reproduced except by death and from death, will not be out of place.

The seed sown contains the living being enveloped in a somewhat indestructible substance, which is placed about it for the purposes of protection when not planted, and for food during the process of germination, and until its structure has so far advanced as to derive sustenance from external sources. During the stage of germination this enveloping substance, starch, is converted into dextrine, a substance identical in composition, but soluble in water, while starch is not. It is then in a condition to be absorbed and used by the living organism. This change of the starch into dextrine is the *death* which the seed undergoes in germination, which change is absolutely essential to the growth of the living being shut up in it. So long as the starch remains unchanged, so long is germination impossible. Hence the truth of the declaration of the apostle: "That which is sown is not made alive unless it die."

When the seed has grown so far as to extend its radix into the

soil, and its stem into the air, the new being is formed. It is then no longer the seed that was sown, but root, and stem, and leaf, a being wholly unlike the seed that was sown. The plant continues to grow; but it never becomes more than root, stem, and leaf until the seed sown appears reproduced as the ultimate purpose of all the changes that the seed sown underwent, and of the growth which appears as the result of these changes. Thus we have the truth of the other statement of the apostle verified, that the body which is sown is not the body that shall be, meaning by the latter the whole plant produced from the seed sown. The dead seed appears again in the living plant. Whence, then, comes the new plant? From the seed sown? Only in part, and this a very small part. The great mass of it came from external sources, much of which may have but recently constituted a portion of other organisms. It is thus seen that the living body is not the identical body that was buried, but the one which God has chosen to give it.

So, as respects the resurrection of man from the grave. His body dies and utterly perishes. The body that will be raised is not the body that was buried. This much the apostle states in positive terms, and this much science declares. And indeed more than this. So far as the ultimate elements which compose the various structures of man's organism are concerned, man's body is continually undergoing changes, decay and renovation, so that the elements which constitute a part of his body to-day will have passed out of it to-morrow. The body maintains its identity during life, in its general features, because these changes are cellular or interstitial, by which the body is renewed as rapidly as it wastes. These changes give us an entirely new body every few years, so far as its elementary constituents are concerned. The body that goes into the grave at the end of three score years and ten, is not the body of youth and manhood. The matter which composed the body in early life may, when death overtakes it, be constituents of one or more other living organisms, either vegetable or animal. These facts being incontrovertible, which are we to regard as the body to be immortalized, and how are we to understand its resurrection?

There are a few instances in the sacred scriptures of persons having been raised from the dead, and some consideration of these may lead us to the real thought designed to be expressed by the words, resurrection of the body. These cases may be divided into two classes: 1, those in which the persons being dead were buried; and, 2, those who, being dead, were not buried. The latter were cases of a literal resurrection of the dead. The body that died was made alive again, and lived as before, and was still a subject of natural death. In these cases there was time but for the beginning of decomposition. The body was still the same. Such were the case with the sons of the widows of Sarepta and Nain. The second class embraces those who were

both dead and buried, and in whose case a sufficient time had elapsed for decomposition to have taken place. Among these were Lazarus and those who were raised after the resurrection of Christ. These appeared in the same body in which they had been buried. In their cases decomposition was arrested by the divine power, and the injury sustained by death repaired. These rising with their mortal bodies, again died. The parties so raised were recognized as the same that had died and been buried. Here there was no change of body. It is evident, therefore, that the resurrection of the whole race can not be a resurrection like this.

The case of the Lord Jesus Christ was somewhat peculiar. He was raised on the morning of the third day after his burial. He came from the tomb of Joseph with the same body in which he entered it. He was recognized as the same person who had been crucified and buried. His body did not "see corruption." In the body in which he had lived for thirty-three years, and in which he had been crucified, he associated with his disciples after his resurrection. He ate and drank with them; and though he often appeared and disappeared suddenly, his body was as yet the same mortal creation, and so continued until he ascended into heaven from Mt. Olivet. Then his mortal body was changed, as will be the living saints at his second coming. "In a moment, in the twinkling of an eye," the mortal is put off and the immortal put on.

The change which the living saints are to undergo at the second coming of the Lord Jesus is identical in kind with the kind which passed over the body of the Lord when he ascended on high. The body in which they shall then appear will be the same as that in which the raised dead shall appear. This changed body will be the body of the resurrection—the immortal, spiritual body with which the dead shall rise to die no more—a body as imperishable as the spirit which shall dwell in it. Hence, as to its nature, it is said to be spiritual, in contrast with the former, which was earthly. This body is the body of the resurrection, and this "change" in the living body can not be different from that which the long dead and buried body shall undergo in the resurrection.

But those long dead and buried have utterly perished as to their bodies, and the elements of their organisms are lost, as it were, in the organic and inorganic worlds, and therefore the body that was buried is not the body that will appear in the resurrection. This will be the new body which the Lord will give the spirit at the resurrection.

Viewing the resurrection in the light of all these facts, we can not understand that any thing more is meant or intended than that the dead shall live again. This is all the word resurrection is intended to mean. The scriptures do not assert that the body which is laid in the grave will be raised. On the contrary, they

assert that such will not be the case. They affirm no more than that the dead shall live again, and that in that life the spirit shall be clothed with an immortal and spiritual body, whatever this may be.

What, then, is a spiritual body? What is meant by the word spiritual when predicated of the body of man?

On this subject our light is dim and feeble; negative, rather than positive. Our conceptions of a spiritual body are as obscure and defective as our notions of spirit. We call a something *spirit*, of which we see only the manifestations. It is invisible and intangible. It possesses no quality of matter which is within the sphere of our senses. We conceive of spirit as something wholly distinct from matter—as wholly immaterial. Beyond this we can not go. Matter and spirit are the extremes of being; the one created and the other uncreated; so that what is matter is not spirit, and what is spirit is not matter. Of the inter-space we know nothing. If, then, the resurrected body is a spiritual body, it is an immaterial body. This is the end and sum of our knowledge as to its substance.

The scriptures afford us but little light by which to obtain a conception of a spiritual body; of what is meant in this expression by the word spiritual. This feeble light is the little knowledge they give us of the being and nature of angels, and of the nature of the Lord's glorious body, to which men are to be allied in the resurrection.¹

In the first place, angels seem to have bodies, which are as perfectly adapted to the nature, wants, and life of their spirits as it is possible to make them. They are not clogged in their movements by the weight of matter. nor limited in their actions by the properties of matter. They move with the rapidity of thought,² and pass through the barriers of material things as though they presented not the slightest obstruction.³ Their bodies gleam with the beauty of the most precious stones, and shine with the splendor of light. So, the resurrected bodies of the saints. Our conceptions of their glory are feeble, but we know that they will resemble the body of our coronated Lord.⁴ The bodies of all created spirit-beings in the spirit realm are akin. They are spiritual in nature, and hence removed from all the properties of matter as we know these.

Whether it is possible so to arrange the elements of man's mortal body as that it shall become imperishable, we do not *know*, but we have no rational grounds to doubt it. We presume it is possible for God to make a material body imperishable or immortal. But this change in the relation or combination of the elements of matter would not destroy the properties of these elements, one of which is weight. An immortal material body

¹ Math. 20: 30; Luke 21: 36; Phil. 3: 21. ² Danl. 9: 23.

³ Gen 19: 1-14; Judges 13: 6, 15-20; Acts 5: 19-23.

⁴ 1 John 3: 2; 1 Cor. 15: 49; Phil. 3: 21.

would still have the general properties which belong to, and are inseparable from, matter. Such does not seem to be the spiritual body of our Lord, and of the angels; for these exhibit none of the properties of matter. Hence, we may conclude that the immortal body, with which man shall be clothed in the resurrection, will be an *immaterial* body. If this conclusion is justified by all the facts in the case, we may say that the resurrection does not imply, nor contemplate, the resurrection of the body that was placed in the grave.

This being so, how are we to understand the scriptures when they speak of the resurrection of the body? What is intended when it is said that the dead shall be raised?

The resurrection is affirmed only of that which is dead. Those of the race who are alive at his coming will be "changed." The raised dead and the changed living will be alike in the resurrection. This change in the body occurs in order that man may continue to live, and that in a sphere where death will no more be known. The resurrection of the dead is for the same purpose. The changed do not enter heaven with their natural bodies, neither do the dead. The change is into a spiritual body, and is designed to meet the wants of the spirit of man in the new sphere of life. By the voice of the Son of God "hades gives up its dead." The spirits of men come forth from hades at the call of the Son of God. This is *their* resurrection; and that they may not appear unclothed, or without a body, a spiritual body is created for them by God in the act of the resurrection. The new body is a creation, not a remodeling of the old. A new body is made necessary because "flesh and blood can not inherit the kingdom of God." "Corruption can not inherit incorruption." The mortal body can not pass into the immortal; the earthly into the spiritual. Hence the body of the resurrection is a new creation, and as far removed from the natural body as the spiritual is removed from the earthly—as *spirit* is from matter.

If these things be true, then it follows that there is no literal resurrection of the very body that was buried; and we must, therefore, find a meaning for the word resurrection that will agree with all the facts involved in the death, burial, and resurrection of the body of man.

The word is an accommodation to our ignorance. To us death seems an end of our being. We see nothing but the body. This appears to us as the man, and in his death we see his end. He passes from our sight, and is lost to our view forever. The resurrection asserts he will live again, and with this fact we associate the raising of his body. But here the scriptures, though accommodating their language to our modes of thought, correct our impression in regard to the appearance of the body, and declare to us that the body which we bury is not the body which will appear in the resurrection—that it will be a new body, such as God shall be pleased to give it. The prime thought is that man

will live again, and this is what he desires to know. Such is the scope and promise of our Lord when he says: "And this is the will of him that sent me, that every one who seeth the Son, and believeth on him, shall have everlasting life; and I will raise him up at the last day."

The mortal body utterly perishing, the new or spiritual body will be a new creation. The mortal is adapted to the spirit's abode on earth; the spiritual body will be adapted to the spirit in an immortal and eternal state of existence: but what that body will be as to its substance, the scriptures do not state. As it will be a new creation, it will not necessarily be material as to its substance. It will be like the body of angels, a spiritual body, adapted to a spiritual state, and to an eternal existence.

SECTION II.

THE JUDGMENT.

There is no truth more clearly taught in the holy scriptures; no principle of the government of God more firmly established; and no declaration of his will more emphatic, than that sin must be adequately punished in the person of the sinner, so far as this can be done. The same sentiment and principle obtains with human governments. Punishments are inflicted because of the demerit of sin,—because crime deserves to be punished, and ought to be punished. Yet in no case is the punishment of sin adequate to its demerit. If this were possible, punishment would be remedial and partake of the nature of an atonement. But this it never is, and can not be. Under human governments crimes are graded, and so are punishments; and when, in the judgment of human reason, the punishment and the crime are properly adjusted, then the former is regarded as adequate to the latter. But this sufficiency of punishment does not obtain under the divine government. Sin and punishment may be adequately adjusted in the world to come, as to the demerit of the one and the degree of the other; but in no instance is there the slightest hint that the punishment will finally atone for the sin, and set the sinner free. As far as the divine oracles speak on this subject,

they speak of the punishment as endless. The punishment of sin in the person of the sinning angels is an example and illustration of this truth. They are reserved in everlasting chains until the judgment of the last day; reserved for the day in which God will judge mankind by the Lord Jesus Christ, in order that sinning angels and sinning men may be assigned the same fate.

When the angels sinned they were banished from heaven—driven from the presence of God. This was their immediate punishment. In that state they have since been kept. No formal judgment—one of a judicial character—seems to have been pronounced against them. It would seem, from the statement of the apostle,¹ that they are yet *reserved* for this judicial sentence, which will be pronounced when the Lord Jesus Christ shall judge the world, at the time when the dead of mankind, both small and great, shall stand before his judgment seat. That sentence will be eternal separation from all the good, and holy, and happy in heaven. Then shall the judge say to those on his right hand: “Come, you blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world;” and to those on his left: “*Depart from me*, you accursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels.” Then shall the wicked “go away into everlasting punishment; but the righteous into everlasting life.” This “second death” is the only adequate punishment that God can inflict on the sinner, and yet this can not atone for sin, since it is to be eternal. This is the death for which God has provided no atonement, and can provide none. It was not possible for mercy to have been extended to angels, for reasons which have been already conjectured; and it will not be possible for mercy to be extended to the impenitent sinner on the day of judgment, because he rejected her overtures while living on the earth, and while mercy was offered. But on the day of judgment the mission of Mercy will have been fulfilled, and *Justice* will then be the arbiter of the destiny of men. Then, after he has judged the world in righteousness, and according to the deeds done in the body, the Son of God will yield up his authority to the Father, and thenceforth God will be “all in all.”²

After the reign of Mercy comes the reign of Justice; after the gospel that grants pardon, the law that inflicts punishment. Those who have spurned mercy will be brought face to face with justice, and receive the reward of sin, which justice demands. The days of mercy will have then passed forever. Then inexorable law, that is a stranger to mercy, will reign supreme. Then “the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven, with his mighty angels in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ;” and these he will “punish with everlasting destruction

¹ 2 Peter 2: 4.

² 1 Cor. 15: 28—“All things in all places”—the Supreme ruler over the universe.

from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power.”¹ After the reign of mercy, which terminates with our life, “there remains no more sacrifice for sins, but a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries.”² Such are the clear and unequivocal declarations of the Holy Spirit by the mouth of inspired apostles.

A day of judgment is the necessary conclusion of the gospel of peace. God has proposed to save men by means of the atonement of Jesus Christ, and if men refuse and discard this overture, their salvation from the ultimate punishment of sin is simply impossible. “There is no other name under heaven given among men whereby men can be saved;”³ so that if men shall reject the Lord Jesus, and will not have him to rule over them, and shall die in their sins, the condemnation under which they lay during their life on the earth will become eternal on and after the day of judgment. This day God has appointed in the which he will judge the world, and wind up the affairs of the administration of mercy, and settle forever and irrevocably the whole question of sin in the person of angels and men. God grants mercy to men during the life he has given on the earth, in which they may save themselves from sin by the means which he has placed within their reach; and there is no truth more clearly taught in the christian scriptures, or is a clearer dictate of common sense, than that men must suffer the consequences of sin, if they reject the means by which it may be forgiven. As the gospel of pardon is granted to men during life; as mercy reigns while life lasts; so there can be, and will be, no judgment day on this side of the resurrection.

As a fact we know that thousands and thousands of the race die in their sins. Vast numbers go to the grave with the crimes of life about them. But few comparatively suffer at the hands of human law the punishment due their crimes, and even the few who do, their punishment does not affect the guilt of their crimes—does not atone for their sins. If it be true that only those who have obtained pardon in this life can be, or will be, saved eternally on the day of judgment, it is equally true that those who die in their sins, and appear before the judgment seat of Christ unpardoned by his atonement, must go away into eternal condemnation, and suffer henceforth “the vengeance of eternal fire.” On this day will the suffering righteous and innocent of earth be vindicated, and their oppressors and injurers made to suffer for their misdeeds and crimes. The blood of the righteous and innocent has long cried to heaven against oppressors and evil doers; and the day on which this cry will be heard will be a day of condemnation—a time of vengeance and fiery indignation, which shall devour and consume all the ungodly. The high carnivals which sin has held in all the years of man on earth, and the bloodshed and crime under which the race shall have groaned

¹ 2 Thes. 1: 8.

² Heb. 10: 27.

³ Acts 4: 12.

from the death of Abel to the last moments of Gog and Magog under the last and fitful spasm of hate of the devil, will be checked on the verge of the grave, and held to a righteous retribution, when the dead, small and great, shall be judged and assigned their eternal state.

Terrible day! invoked by the innocent and righteous of earth, by the pure and holy in heaven, and by the righteousness and holiness of God! Righteous day! when sin shall meet its merited doom, and its fearful and destructive career be forever arrested! Glorious day! when the Lord Jesus shall come, attended by all the angels of heaven, to be "glorified in his saints, and admired in all them that believe." Not now the suffering, bleeding, dying Savior; but the glorious Judge, whose sceptre is righteousness, and whose tribunal is infinite justice and holiness. Not now the "man of sorrows;" but the glorious king, before whose throne the assembled universe of angels and men stand in awe, and dread, and hope! Not now the trembling, shrinking, suffering Lamb; but the Mighty Conqueror and blessed Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords, before whose face heaven and earth fly away. Not now wearing a crown of shame and contempt, an object of ridicule and hate; but a crown of stars, more brilliant than suns, and the object of the most fearful dread, and profoundest love and admiration.

"That man of sorrows! oh! how changed!"

Thus will the scheme of Redemption close, and demonstrate the infinite goodness, and love, and mercy of God toward sinning men, and display the righteousness of his Justice in the sentence which he will pass on men and angels on this great and final day. Then the intelligent universe shall witness, with feelings akin to those of the Divine Mind,

"The righteous saved, the wicked damned,
And God's eternal government approved."

CHAPTER VII.

THE THREE DISPENSATIONS.

The Remedial System had its initial point in the institution of sacrifice on the day that Adam sinned; its terminal, so far as its provisions are concerned, on the day that Christ was crowned in heaven. On that day an end was made of sin-offerings by the acceptance of Christ's atonement on the mercy seat in the true holy of holies. From that day onward the sin-offerings of the Jews were without the authority or sanction of God. At the destruction of Jerusalem, the place of acceptable worship under Judaism, the whole Jewish polity perished forever. Then were its sun, and moon, and stars torn from heaven and laid low in the dust of the earth.¹ In that terrible overthrow the temple was razed to the ground, its brazen altar broken down, and its priests scattered among the nations of the earth without Urim and Thummim; or record of genealogy by which to keep trace of the regal or sacerdotal family.

The coronation of Christ introduced the Christian Dispensation. Between this and the day of Adam's transgression, there were the Patriarchal and Jewish dispensations, which were preparatory to the Christian, and intended to foreshadow it. These constitute the three dispensations of religion which God has given to the world, or, as we may view them, three stages or phases of development of the Remedial System, of which they are the differentiated parts. The patriarchal began, as we have said, with Adam's transgression, and ended with the introduction of the Jewish by Moses, Anno Mundi, 2513. It embraced the whole race, and recognized all men as standing on the same footing before God. The Jewish dispensation began with the

¹ Math. 24: 29; Acts 2: 20.

Passover in Egypt, and terminated with Christ's coronation, and embraced only a part of the race, the lineal descendants of Abraham in the line of Isaac, and such of "strangers" as were bought with their money and circumcised.¹ This family or people were cut off from the rest of the world by circumcision, and afterward purchased by the Passover and covenanted by blood before Mt. Sinai. The christian dispensation began with the coronation of Christ,² and will terminate at the general judgment.³ Its blessings and privileges are open to the whole race—its provisions embrace all mankind; but only such are the people of God under it as are separated from the world by its peculiar birth and circumcision.

These three dispensations of religion are connected as three successive steps or phases of development of the Remedial System, and as such we propose to view them. With respect to the system they are its differentiated parts; as differentiations they are complete and perfect in themselves. There is no development of the one from the other. They stand isolated by distinct lines of demarkation. They undergo no change or modification during their continuance; but continue to the end as they were ordained and organized at the beginning. The principles on which they proceeded were established and settled at the beginning of each, and so remained unchanged to the end. This fact is worthy of being noted.

As these dispensations are differentiations of one great system, we shall find in them some things which are common to all, and some things which are peculiar to each. These we propose to consider in order to trace out the relations which these dispensations sustained to each other, and to the Remedial System.

The things that are common are, of course, primary and fundamental, or elementary to the general system. Among these we note—

1. Sacrifice, the altar, and the priesthood. These are *provisionary* elements, and relate primarily to God, since they are the means by which remission of sins is procured.

2. Faith in God, Repentance toward God, and Obedience to God. These are *conditional* elements, and relate primarily to man, since they are the means, as respects the sinner, by which, or through which, he enjoys the remission procured by the provisional elements.

3. Justification by faith.

4. A spiritual life and a spiritual worship.

5. The existence of law, as directive and regulative.

6. The hope of eternal life.

These things are common to all the dispensations, and hence are primary and fundamental in the Remedial System, and absolutely essential to the very existence of such a system.

But as the dispensations are differentiated parts or phases of

¹ Gen. 17: 12, 13. ² Acts 2: 36. ³ 1 Cor. 15: 28.

development of a common system, it follows that they also differ in some respects. Among these we note—

1. The relative development of the provisional elements—sacrifice, the altar, and the priesthood.
2. The corresponding extent of the effect of these, as seen in the degree of remission enjoyed under each of the dispensations.
3. The relation which men sustain to God under them, or the means and kind of adoption by which men become the people of God.
4. The modes, forms, or kinds of worship as exhibited in their religious services.
5. The kinds of justification, or righteousness.
6. The nature and kind of the promises and blessings guaranteed by the covenants of each.
7. The attributes revealed under each, and their relation to the Remedial System.
8. The nature or being of God as revealed under each, giving rise to the Monotheism of the Jewish, and the Tritheism of the Christian.

Under these categories may all the differences between the dispensations be arranged and exhibited.

And first, in regard to the things that the dispensations have in common:—

1. Under all the dispensations sacrifice, the altar, and the priesthood are primary and prominent; but under the first they appear in their most simple and rudimentary state; and their profound significance and essential importance would never have been known to mankind, had there been no further development of them, as seen under the Jewish and christian dispensations. There is reason for believing that the several kinds of sacrifices were known during the patriarchal age, such as sin-offerings and thank-offerings; and also the essential, physical character of the victim. The altar was a small mound of earth or stone—a rude heap some two feet above the general surface. The priest was the father or eldest son, without special appointment or investment; but divinely authorized to offer “both gifts and sacrifices.” These elements were the special appointments of God, given to the race of Adam, for they are all of a supernatural origin.

2. Under all the dispensations the benefits arising from an atonement, or the elements mentioned above, have been granted by God, and enjoyed by man on essentially the same principles and conditions; and the necessity of these is primary and absolute. There is no salvation for man without them. They are as necessary on the part of man as are the provisional elements on the part of God. Faith in God is indispensably necessary, and also repentance, and equally so is obedience in whatever act or manner it may be required.¹ Without these acts on the part

¹ Heb. 11: 6; Luke 13: 3; Rom. 2: 8; 2 Thes. 1: 8.

of man the atonement, so fully and freely provided by God, can do the sinner no good. The fulness and freeness of the provision but heightens the condemnation that follows its rejection. These acts of the soul—faith and repentance—are the same under all the dispensations. They refer to God. Under christianity faith in the victim or sacrifice is also required; and the act of obedience, essentially the same under all—the offering of sacrifice—has reference primarily to Christ, by which act of obedience the sinner is brought into relation with the blood of the atonement. These psychical acts, and the obedience arising spontaneously from them, and rendered in the appointed way, are the conditions on which remission of sins takes place. The psychical acts are essentially necessary and precedent to the acceptance of the bodily acts of obedience, whose merit lies in the fact that it is the expression and exponent of these acts of the soul. With this primary act of obedience, man's work in the pardon of his sins closes. On this act remission of sins follows, and this brings the obedient sinner into the favor and communion of God. He is then, as to the relations of his spirit with God, where creation placed him, and where the Tempter found him. In regard, therefore, to these fundamental conditions or precedents necessary to remission, the dispensations do not differ.

3. Whilst sacrifice and its concomitants, and these acts of the sinner, are all essential to the pardon of sin; yet remission does not follow these acts on the part of man as though it were a purely legal procedure, or of the nature of a commercial transaction, in which a *quid pro quo* is given and received, or in accordance with which the sinner enjoys the result by virtue of a right arising from his compliance with the conditions or terms prescribed by the law in the case. On the ground of law, or any kindred procedure, remission is simply impossible. No state or condition of circumstances can ever arise by which the blessing of remission can become a matter of right on the part of man, or cease to be a matter of unmixed grace on the part of God. Compliance with law, or obligations prescribed, is simply a duty, and when given, merits no praise, and advances the subject not one step toward remission. Pardon is based on other and widely different grounds, and is granted, when the prescribed conditions are complied with, so far as man is concerned, because of the state of the soul, of which the acts done are but the exponents, or living forms of the new life within. This state of the soul, or life within, is represented in the sacred scriptures by the word **FAITH**.

Remission is a somewhat complicated procedure, not near so simple as justification by law. In the first place, provision is necessary on the part of God in order to the procurement of remission—the provision of means that make remission possible. These are the grounds of pardon—the means of life, like the wheat growing in the field. But these means avail nothing

toward the purpose of their provision until man supplies the necessary conditions of their application. He must receive and use these, otherwise they are as wholly without power to save from sin, as is the wheat to preserve life while it remains in the field. But if man gather the wheat, and make it into food, and then use that food, the wheat will do all that God designed it to do. So with the atonement. God has adapted it to the end designed, as he has the wheat; but the results of the atonement do not follow, as if they and the atonement occupied toward each other the relation of cause and effect. Such is not their relation. A principle obtains in the work of remission by which the innocent victim becomes, as it were, the sinner, and is so treated, and the sinner the innocent victim. This virtual interchange of positions and relations gives rise to the procedures of *substitution* and *imputation*, which are inseparably connected with an atonement, and absolutely essential to its practical operation in the work of remission. An atonement is available to the sinner only as these principles apply it. They remove justification wholly from the domain and operation of law, and necessitate the true and real ground of remission, as respects man, namely, FAITH. Hence, all remission must and does take place on the same principle, whether the justification take place under the Patriarchal, Jewish, or Christian dispensation. Justification by faith is inseparably connected with an atonement, and impossible without it. Therefore, wherever an atonement exists, there also must justification by faith exist, and *vice versa*; so that if either existed under the patriarchal and Jewish dispensations, we must presume the existence of the other. Under the first we know that Abel, Enoch, Noah, and Abraham, and all others who had their faith; and under the Jewish, Moses, Samuel, David, and Daniel, and all others of like faith, were justified by faith; consequently, as respects justification by faith, the three dispensations do not differ.

4. Inseparably connected with justification by faith is a spiritual life, and, consequently, a spiritual worship. It is, indeed, spiritual life into which justification by faith introduces the obedient sinner. To this life spiritual worship naturally and necessarily pertains. It is, indeed, one of the chief purposes of pardoning the sinner, that he may worship God "in spirit and in truth." The pardoned sinner is not only admitted to this worship, but this is required of him. Since, therefore, spiritual life and spiritual worship are so intimately connected with justification by faith; and since this was enjoyed under the patriarchal and Jewish ages, it follows that a spiritual life and a spiritual worship were then accessible to the sinner.

Under the patriarchal age spiritual worship was not separated from the ritual at the altar, and hence was not conspicuous. Then all worship gathered about the altar, and consisted chiefly of sacrifices and supplications. When this worship was offered

in faith, and prompted by a conviction of sin, and a love of God, the ritual was then also spiritual. The same is true as respects individual offerings under Judaism; but here the ritual, because of the purposes of Judaism, so predominated as to obscure the spiritual. Still, there were many spiritual worshipers, such as Samuel, David, Jeremiah, and Daniel. But this worship was not Jewish in its character. It came in from the patriarchal, and was offered and accepted on principles which are common to all the dispensations.

After the Babylonish captivity, and when the people had returned to their own land, the wants and exigencies of the people required means and facilities by which they might know more of the law, and therefore worship more acceptably. Hence the synagogue was established, and there the law was read to the people, and spiritual worship offered. In the synagogue spiritual worship became social and convocational. The ritual and the spiritual were then forever separated, the first being wholly confined to the temple, and the latter to the synagogue. There was no spiritual worship offered in the temple, and no ritual in the synagogue. Their nature and objects were wholly dissimilar, so that the ritual worship was wholly out of place in the synagogue, and the spiritual wholly unnecessary in the temple, since it was symbolical. The synagogue was, therefore, Jewish, but not *Judaistic*. Its worship was no part of the institution given by Moses; yet it originated with the Jews, and afforded a place and an opportunity for spiritual worship. Though spiritual, it did not, and could not, supplant the temple or ritual worship. It will be well to make these distinctions, since the synagogue was the precursor of the church of Christ, and prepared the way, by its worship, for the introduction of the true spiritual worship which characterizes and distinguishes the christian age.

5. The dispensations are also alike in having law. Wherever there is an atonement, there sin exists, and wherever sin exists, there also must law exist. Where there is no law to transgress, there can be no sin; and an atonement has no meaning or purpose in the absence of sin. As, therefore, sin and an atonement existed under the patriarchal age, it is evident and conclusive that law was present during that age, though we have no account of its formal promulgation. Hence, it was an unwritten law, and more general and simple than what appears in the promulgated and written law of Moses. A written law under Judaism does not forbid the presumption of an unwritten law under the patriarchal age. That God did give some laws to the people of that age we have many reasons for believing. The people had the knowledge of clean and unclean animals, and the use of the former for sacrifice. They also had a knowledge of the different kinds of sacrifices, such as sin-offerings and thank or free-will offerings. There must have been many laws known to the ante-diluvian world, the transgression of which was the cause of the deluge.

They could not have known that the deeds which they daily committed were criminal or sinful, if they had had no law to tell them so; for "by law is the knowledge of sin."

It is a mistaken notion to suppose that *any* administration of the divine government has ever been, or can ever be, without law. Laws conform to administrations, to the exigencies and wants of the subjects, and to the nature of the relations which they sustain to the governor. All spiritual beings of a responsible station, are put under law at the time of their creation. This is done for various reasons, and chiefly for the welfare of the creature. The angels of heaven were so treated, and so was Adam in Eden. He had a promulgated law. If, therefore, law was necessary for angels,¹ and for Adam while in Eden, how much more necessary for beings involved in sin, with the hope of pardon held out. Law plays its part in man's recovery of the mastery of himself, and is necessary thereto. It is necessary to the attainment of a holy life. The pardon of sin is but preliminary to this. The effect of the atonement is not a godly life. It was not designed to produce this,—only the negative character of innocence, the result of remission. A godly life is the work of the man. It comes of effort, of struggles, of experience with sin and its temptations. It is the result of trials, and, it may be, of afflictions. It is the gold in the man appearing refined and burnished and shining with the glory of God. In such a life law does its peculiar work of directing and restraining. It is no prompter, but a regulator. Men involved in sin, and surrounded by sin, need a directive, regulative, and restraining guide and power, and this they have in law. Indeed, all spiritual beings need this, because all are capable of sin; much more those already involved in sin. The mastery of the will over the passions is the work of growth, of trials, and of efforts; but this growth must proceed in the light of the will of God as expressed in his law. There is light in his law, power in his word, and direction in his truth. Hence the importance of law to man in all ages.

The atonement does not set aside law, or render it unnecessary. Law must co-operate with it in order that those who reject the atonement may be condemned and punished, and that those who receive it may learn obedience and conformity to the will of God as expressed by law. But the atonement may, through the power of love which it excites in the soul of man, and makes active and powerful by its display of the love of God, render law practically unnecessary as a motive or restraining power, and to some extent as a directive. Love is an effectual prompter to obedience and faithfulness, and has a keener vision than law displays.

The law of Christ says to christians: "Forsake not the assembling of yourselves together, as the manner of some is." The world sees how this is regarded. It is obeyed almost entirely by those who are prompted by love, and not by a sense of duty in-

¹ Ps. 103: 20.

spired by the law. But however exalted this power may become, there is still need that law shall come to its aid in making the path of life clearer as we advance. Law prompts by fear and threatening, and love casts out fear; but it is not positively certain that any man, or even angels in heaven, ever passes beyond the influence of this power over his actions, though he may be unconscious of its existence and influence. Many powers and influences lie so dormant as to seem not to exist; but it only requires an occasion to prove both their existence and their power. It may be that the angels of heaven feel no influence from the punishment inflicted upon their sinning peers, but it is hardly probable. That terrible catastrophe can not be obliterated from their mind, and who can say that their fate does not still exert a salutary influence upon all who still preserve their allegiance? That fate is the threatening of law, an evidence of its eternal existence. Can we say, then, that law is not necessary even to beings who have never sinned? If necessary to them, how much more necessary to men, even when fully under the power and influence of the atonement!

It is not questioned that law was more prominent, conspicuous, and regnant under Judaism than under either of the other dispensations. Yet this prominence is only comparative. Judaism was not wholly legal, nor is christianity wholly non-legal, as some have seemed to think. In a state of sin neither is possible. One would destroy without mercy, and the other would save without justice. The mercy of God can not triumph over justice, nor his justice over his mercy. Man, since the day he left Eden, has never been from under the shadow of both. These attributes of God have always co-operated in the remedial scheme. Hence man, since he sinned, has never been without their exponents—an atonement and law. The prominence of the one can do no more than obscure the presence of the other; it can not obliterate it. In the one case law seems to predominate because of the weakness and imperfection of the remedial measures which were associated with it, and which were a part of the same system. So mercy, or faith, which is its exponent, seems to dominate under christianity, because of the greatness of the remedial measures. Mercy and justice, and faith and law, are co-operative and indispensable in every administration of Heaven among men. This ought to be so, since sin is upon the threshold of man's movements. It lies along every path, and confronts him in a thousand temptations. Man is under the darkness and thralldom of sin, and needs the light of God's law, and the pardon procured by the atonement. Men now walk in the full light and reign of justice and mercy, and need the faith and obedience which meet the requirements of both. So long as men shall continue as they are, surrounded by sin, and beset by temptations, the demands and threatenings of law must be added to the pleadings of mercy. So long as men shall sin, so long will justice continue to demand

their punishment, and mercy to plead for their pardon by the atonement. Law is necessary to show what sin is, and its threatenings are necessary to deter from sin. But if man's obedience springs only from fear, that obedience is only conformity, and its nature legal righteousness, a character that has never availed for man more than temporal blessings. Such are simply law abiding subjects, and can never expect more than what the law grants and provides.

Law expresses its behests in mandatory and prohibitory language, and confines its operations within prescribed limits. It can not bless where it has not commanded, nor punish where it has not prohibited. No action of the heart or life is sinful in the eyes of the law only as so declared by the law reigning at the time. There may be sins not so declared, but such sins law can not punish. Law, therefore, can not cover the whole field of sin, and for this reason is not adequate as a governmental measure. Nothing can do this that is not as comprehensive as *principles*, which sweep the whole field of human thought, purpose, and conduct. The law that governs by *principles*, and not by *statutes* merely, is the law which is of the gospel, and promises and grants blessings of a spiritual character, and directs and controls the life in the interests of man's highest destiny. It is the law of faith and love, and pronounces thoughts, purposes, and acts sinful, as they may not conform to, or as they may antagonize, its great and sweeping principles. This is the law of the christian dispensation, and it comports with all its aims and purposes; but it does not differentiate it, because it is applicable and regnant wherever and whenever man's spiritual interests are involved or concerned. Such a law as this will judge all men at the last day; and hence it can not differentiate the dispensations. But since temporal purposes and blessings were characteristic of, and predominant under, the former dispensations; and since the purposes and blessings of the christian are all spiritual and eternal, the law of faith was obscure under the first two, but prominent and regnant under the last dispensation.

6. The dispensations are also alike in having the hope of eternal life. It is readily granted that such a hope was entertained and enjoyed only by the few, such as Abel, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, and Job, of the patriarchal age, and as Moses, David, and Daniel, under the Jewish. Still, if *any* entertained such a hope, this fact shows that a life beyond the grave was an object of faith and hope. Enoch prophesied of the second coming of our Lord; and Moses chose "to suffer affliction with the people of God, rather than enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season, *esteeming the reproaches of Christ greater riches than the treasures of Egypt,*" whilst Job was sure that his Redeemer lived; and David, that "*in God's presence there is fulness of joy,*" and at his "*right hand, pleasures forevermore.*"

It is thus seen that the Remedial System has been gradually

developed, and that all its parts and elements, in their development, have kept equal pace with one another, and with the development of the system as a whole.

This closes what we have to say in regard to those things which are common to the dispensations, or which do not differentiate them. We have now to consider those things in regard to which they are distinct, and which differentiate the dispensations as phases or stages of development of the Remedial System. And,

1. They differ as respects the development of the things which are common. Among these we note, first, the primary elements of the system—sacrifice, the altar, and the priesthood. Under the patriarchal these were simple and rudimentary, and without the significance which characterized them under the Jewish and christian. They seem to have had no other object or design than worship, as an acknowledgment of an obligation, or as an expression of gratitude for mercies and blessings enjoyed. Examples of these we have in the offerings of Cain and Abel, and of Noah and Abraham; but in none of these have we any intimation of their true, real, and original purpose and significance. It is under Judaism that the true design and purpose of these elements begin to appear; and the light which they, as types, shed on the atonement of Christ, is essential to a clear and an appreciative understanding of the work of his atonement in the salvation of men. The shadows clearly outlined the substances foreshadowed. Symbols are beautiful and instructive when the light of the true falls upon them. But the Jew who had only the symbol, could not understand the true. He saw in these things but little, if any, more than did the patriarch. But the light of the christian age scatters and dissipates all shadows, and reveals the true intent and purpose of these elements.

We have no account of the institution of these elements. They are spoken of by Moses as if they had been well understood under the patriarchal age. Sacrifices were living animals and the fruits of the ground; the former as sin-offerings, and the latter as thank-offerings alone. Animals for sacrificial purposes were known as clean, and all others as unclean. This distinction *appears* first at the time of the flood, but was doubtless known to Adam, since such knowledge is supernatural. But under Judaism all the characteristics of sacrifices were more fully made known. Their suitability for the purposes in view appears in a clearer light. Thus far was sacrifice differentiated under Judaism.

The altar under the patriarchal age was simply a mound of earth or stones, rudely and temporarily heaped up. Under Judaism it was still a raised body, elevated above the general surface to indicate its true nature and purpose, which began to develop in the specially constructed and consecrated altar of the tabernacle. Under the patriarchal age this consecration was

indicated by its elevation: and such consecration under the Jewish is explained by the nature of the altar under the christian. We have in the simply elevated altar of the patriarchal age, and in the consecrated altar of the Jewish, the true types of the divine altar under the christian.

The priesthood under the patriarchal age was in its simplest form. It was found in every family in the person of the father, who was the priest of the family, without special ordination or consecration. The *high* priesthood was held but by one person, who appeared as the connecting link between the ante-diluvian world and the Jewish institution, and seems to have officiated for the whole race.

Under Judaism the priesthood is differentiated, first, by being limited to one family or branch of the new family of God, and to one family of this branch; and in the second place, by special consecration and investment, which was designed to indicate the true nature of the high priest under the christian dispensation. As respects, therefore, the development or differentiation of these elements of the Remedial System, Judaism is a marked advance on the patriarchal, and a distinct shadow of the christian dispensation.

2. Connected with these differentiations, and proceeding *pari passu* with them, is the *degree* of remission enjoyed under each. Animal sacrifices procured virtual and legal remission under the first two. This remission was incomplete, though virtual, as respects the *guilt* of sin; but full and actual as respects the *penalty* denounced against sin. Under Judaism remission was advanced one step further, and forgetfulness became a quality of the remission procured and granted by the Annual Atonement. This is the last and highest quality of remission, and it appears perfect and complete under the christian age.

3. In the next place the dispensations differ from each other as respects the relation which the subjects of each sustain to God, and as to the means by which the relation is attained, or by which they become the people of God. Under the first all men were the people of God by virtue of their creation and the symbolic atonement, or by creation and purchase by means of sacrifice. The purchase was as universal as the creation, because sacrifice was universal. All men were admitted to sacrifice, because all men were the people of God by creation. But there was no isolation of a part from the whole. All things were universal under the patriarchal age. Hence, the first step forward in the differentiation of man's relations with God was the isolation of a part from the whole, and the bringing of this part into a nearer relation with God than was enjoyed by the whole before. This isolation was effected by means similar to those which made the whole race the people of God, viz: a creation and a purchase. The isolation began with Abraham, but the creation with Isaac. He was the child of promise, and a special creation. He was

born of one as good as dead, and hence was a *supernatural* child, or a special creation. From him sprang the Jewish race as a new creation. By this creation a closer relation with God was attained, one in which the idea of sonship and fatherhood, as these are known and obtain under the christian, appears in the method of creation.

But this creation was but one of the means by which that people were isolated. The next means was the seal of this isolation, whereby all mankind might know of their creation and isolation. This seal was circumcision. By this they were made a very distinct people.¹

The purchase which is necessary to constitute a part of the race the special and peculiar people of God, took place, in the case of the Jewish people, at the time of their redemption from Egypt. They were then bought with the first-born of Egypt, represented by the blood of the Passover. This blood was the symbol of their deliverance, and it constituted the people of Israel the purchased people of God. Israel was God's first-born; and as he was in bondage to the king of Egypt, he was purchased by the first-born of Egypt. From that day forward the first-born of every family of this people belonged to God, and so of the first-fruits and the first-born of animals, all of whom had to be given to the Lord; and if they were such as were not allowed in sacrifice, they were redeemed by sacrifice—purchased from God by the blood of sacrifice.

But in addition to these—the creation and purchase—the people of Israel were also a *covenanted* people, by which they came into a still more intimate relation with God. At the foot of Mt. Sinai the descendants of Abraham, through Isaac, became the covenanted people of Jehovah, by which covenant God promised and stipulated to be their God in a special and peculiar sense, and they his people.

The covenant relation distinguishes Judaism from the patriarchal dispensation, as nothing of this kind, or analogous to it, was known then. In these respects, therefore, viz: the nature of the creation and purchase, the seal of circumcision and covenant, the Jewish dispensation was a marked development of the Remedial System, and a great advance from the simplicity and universality of the patriarchal age.

But these features do not distinguish the Jewish dispensation from the christian; for all these are found under the christian, but differing as to their nature. Here the creation, the seal, the purchase, and the covenant are all spiritual as to their nature, and eternal as to their object and purpose, which is in marked con-

¹ The seal of the natural creation, whereby the human race became distinguished from the animal, was the breathing into the animal the human Ego—a spirit separable from the animal, and capable of an independent and separate existence, which spirit is the seal of his creation that isolates him from all other animals.

trast to the fleshly nature and temporal character of these as they appear under the Jewish. The christian is a new creation,¹ his seal is the Holy Spirit,² his circumcision that of the heart,³ his purchase the atonement of Christ,⁴ and his covenant the gospel which is wholly spiritual and eternal in its aims and purposes.⁵ What, therefore, distinguishes the christian from the Jewish dispensation, as respects these things, is, that under the christian they are spiritual, and under the Jewish they are fleshly.

4, The dispensations further differ as respects the forms, ordinances, and nature of their worship. We read of no worship under the patriarchal but that which gathered about, or was offered at, the sacrificial altar. Here was the worship of Abel, of Noah, of Abraham, of Isaac, of Jacob, and of Job. These built an altar to the Lord wherever they pitched their tents, and there "called on the name of the Lord." Such worship was both ritual and spiritual; ritual, in that it was sacrificial; and spiritual, in that it was offered in faith and with prayer. In this respect the patriarchal worship was nearer the christian than the Jewish.

Under the Jewish dispensation appear numerous forms and ordinances of a ritual worship. The spiritual, though existing, is scarcely apparent. It exists because it came in from the patriarchal, and is inseparable from an atonement. But Judaism is made up of religious ordinances and ceremonies of a symbolical character, designed to teach and foreshadow by types what would appear under the christian, and to distinguish the Jewish dispensation from both the patriarchal and christian ages. Judaism was a system of ritual, ceremonial, and symbolical worship, without intrinsic merit or spiritual character. Its excellence lay in its typical and symbolical character. Its righteousness was ritualistic, ceremonial, and legal. The whole religious service was connected with the tabernacle, and had reference to the true and spiritual which were to appear under the christian;—to the christian atonement and its effects and relations in the salvation of men from all the consequences of sin. The provisions for *individual* remission were not purely Jewish. They came in from the patriarchal; but the Annual Atonement, which concerned the whole people, was symbolical in all its appointments, and was designed to foreshadow the plenary and perfect remission which was to be enjoyed under the christian, while affecting at the same time the sacrifices of individuals by supplementing and making them effectual for all the remission possible under the system.

An integral element of Judaism was its ceremonies, and those which concerned purification constituted one of its prominent features. These were also symbolical, both in effect and design. They accomplished only a ceremonial purity of the outward man;

¹ 2 Cor. 5: 17. ² Eph. 1: 13. ³ Rom. 2: 29; Phil. 3: 3.

⁴ Acts 20: 28; Eph. 1: 7. ⁵ Heb. 8: 10-12.

but they symbolized a spiritual purity, and taught the people the importance and necessity of personal and spiritual purity in man's relations with God. They were complementary to the atonement, and were designed to show its purifying effects. They cleansed the body from legal impurity, in order to show the effect of the atonement in cleansing the conscience from the impurities of sin. They were a necessary part of a system of symbols intended to portray the full and complete work of the atonement of Christ. Their virtue was wholly legal, and legal because symbolical, and they accomplished what other ordinances could not.

5. The symbolical, prophetic, and temporary character of the Jewish dispensation, as respects its institutions and ordinances, allowed and provided for a formal or legal righteousness, which was attended with its own peculiar rewards and blessings, all of which were temporary. Such a righteousness was peculiar to that dispensation, and distinguishes it from the patriarchal and christian; for no such righteousness is recognized under the former, nor possible under the latter.

This righteousness was purely legal, and may be distributed into two classes, because arising from two distinct kinds of law, viz: the moral, as expressed in the decalogue and other statutes; and the ritual, ceremonial, or statutory, which embraced the ordinances, rites, and ceremonies of religion. The righteousness of the former arose from perfect obedience to the moral law in the outward life: and the righteousness of the second, from a strict observance of the ritual and ceremonial service. Hence, we may say that the one was a legal-moral righteousness, and the other a legal-ceremonial, or ritual, righteousness. Such a righteousness was peculiar to the Jewish dispensation, and distinguishes it from the other two.

Though a moral law and a legal righteousness were a part of the Jewish system, yet the existence of a moral law did not differentiate that system of religion. Moral laws are universal and eternal, and peculiar to no time, or people, or system of religion. They are essential and elementary in every dispensation of religion which God has given to the world. Though not formally promulgated under the patriarchal, nor codified under the christian as under the Jewish dispensation, yet morality is as essential under the one as under the other. For this law, unlike the ceremonial, has its foundation in reason, and in the natural and eternal fitness of things which pertain to man's relations, duties, and obligations to his neighbor. But though such a law did not characterize or differentiate the Jewish institution, yet a righteousness in accordance with it was recognized.

The righteousness which belonged to the rites and ceremonies of that institution was limited to it. It was peculiar to, and characteristic of, that system of religion, and has never obtained under any other. There was no morality in the observance of

those rites and ceremonies. The priests could officiate acceptably in the temple worship, and possess the ritual or ceremonial righteousness, whilst their characters were positively immoral. The moral law had nothing to do with the ceremonial; and hence there was necessarily no morality in ceremonial righteousness.

Justification by law, or legal righteousness, is grounded on actual and perfect obedience to law, whether moral or ceremonial, and not on an *imputed or equivalent obedience*, as is the case with "the righteousness which is by faith." The law says that "he who does these things shall live by them." The man who faithfully observes its requirements, from whatever motive, is entitled to all that the law provides, stipulates, or grants. With the motives or state of the heart out of which the obedience proceeds, the law has no concern. Law takes cognizance of outward acts only. Its obedience or righteousness is purely and wholly formal or outward. If it were to look at the heart it might find disobedience, whilst the outward life is in strict conformity to its behests. Law, whether human or divine, can not take cognizance of the motive that prompts a right action, since the act of conformity is all that it can demand. Hence, as regards legal righteousness under the Jewish dispensation, God looked only to the fact of conformity. In this respect the two kinds of legal righteousness were the same.

Legal righteousness is further distinguished by the fact that it was personal, as contrasted with *imputed* righteousness, which is based on, or connected with faith. It is the possession and merit of the obedient man, by virtue of his own personal obedience, on account of which the merit is all his own. It secures to him by *right* all that the law promises. Hence the blessings of obedience are rightfully and justly his own, and naught can deprive him of them. This righteousness, as we have said, characterizes the Jewish dispensation, and makes it peculiar and distinct. Christianity, on the other hand, has no such righteousness under any circumstances. It requires, indeed, the conformity of legal righteousness: but a conformity that proceeds from faith and love, without which it regards conformity as but "a sounding brass and tinkling cymbal." It requires the obedience of moral laws, whether given under the Jewish or christian age, and also the observance of ordinances given to the church, or that belong to the gospel; but it attaches no merit or virtue to such obedience, even though it be perfect. It has but one righteousness, and that is the imputed righteousness of faith. It is this righteousness alone that is possible to the sinner, and the only one in favor with God. Hence legal righteousness has no place under christianity, though it differentiated Judaism; and had all its value and virtue in this life, because its blessings and promises were so limited.

The existence of a legal righteousness, with its rewards and blessings, under any system of religion, is possible and admissible

only when such rewards and blessings are limited to this life. Such a righteousness is consistent with sin in the heart, and hence its rewards, if any, must be limited to this life. Such we find was the nature of the blessings attending this kind of righteousness among the Jews. Indeed, the whole Jewish institution was temporal. It was never designed to continue beyond the coming of the Messiah. His birth was the chief object of the isolation of that people from the rest of mankind. When Abraham was called to separate himself from his kindred, and to go into a strange land, God made him two promises, out of which grew all the privileges and blessings promised and granted that people. These were, 1, that he should be the father of the Messiah; and, 2, that he would give him the land of Canaan as an everlasting possession. Through Isaac that nation was created and sealed as the peculiar and special people of God; and with the nature of this creation and seal the whole Jewish system was perfectly consistent. The whole is of this world, and naught of its rewards or blessings extends beyond a limited period of time. Indeed, the whole scheme terminated within the second millennium of the history of the Jewish race. The birth of the Messiah was the virtual end of that institution. After that God had no further or special use for that people. So God seems to have declared by Jacob, when speaking of the blessings that should come upon Judah: "*The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a law giver from between his feet until Shiloh come, then to him shall the gathering of the people be.*" And so Christ seems to have thought when he said: "The law and the prophets were until John." So also the apostle Paul, when he declared to the Ephesians: "For he is our peace, who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us, having abolished in his flesh the enmity—the law of carnal commandments *contained* in ordinances, that he might make in himself of the two one new man, *so* making peace." and thus ending forever the whole Jewish fabric, and establishing the christian. It is clear, therefore, that the whole Jewish institution was temporary; consequently its rewards, blessings, and punishments were confined to this life.

On the contrary, the christian institution is eternal in all its parts. Its kingdom is of the heavens, and not of this world. Its rewards, blessings, and punishments are all eternal, and bestowed and inflicted in the world to come, where man shall live forever. They pertain to his spirit, and not to his body. Its righteousness concerns the spirit, and arises not from conformity to law, either moral or ceremonial, but from Christ through love for, and obedience to, him. The kingdom does not consist of meats and drinks—in the enjoyments of this life, as did the Jewish; but "in righteousness and peace, and joy in the Holy Spirit." As respects, therefore, the rewards, blessings, and punishments of the two institutions, the Jewish and the christian, they stand

apart the distance that divides flesh from spirit, and time from eternity.

7. The dispensations again differ as respects the attributes of God which are revealed under them. In creation we have unfolded to our view the *knowledge, wisdom, power, and goodness* of the creator. But when sin appeared among men God's relations to man were changed, and thenceforth he appeared under new attributes, which are especially related to sin. Sin is rebellion and an offence; therefore his justice is displayed in its punishment; it is falsehood, error, and perversion, therefore his truth spurns and abhors it; it is polluting, corrupting, and degrading, therefore his holiness would obliterate it from his presence. The appearance of sin has, therefore, occasioned a further development of the attributes of God—his justice, truthfulness, holiness, love, and mercy. In this revelation which God has made of himself he is presented to the world as the inflictor of punishment on account of sin, and as the savior of man from all its consequences.

As respects the attributes of justice, truthfulness, and holiness, no dispensation has developed these so fully and distinctly as the Jewish. Other attributes appear only in cloudy outline, being but dimly perceived through the smoke of the burning sacrifice. But justice flashes out with fearful aspect in the law; truthfulness in the judgments which he visited on the people on account of their sins; and holiness appears in the purity taught by the various ceremonies of the Jewish religion; so that we may say that the Jewish economy in all its appointments displays in a very conspicuous manner the justice, truthfulness, and holiness of God.

It was necessary that God should be thus revealed in regard to sin, in order that men might know his estimate of the nature and merits of so great an evil. It was necessary that man should feel what these were, in order that they might more readily and fully appreciate God's relation to him as a sinner, and the absolute necessity of his being delivered from its guilt and power, and of forming a character consistent with the attributes thus revealed.

The Jewish ceremony was still but a partial revelation of God, as were both the creation and the patriarchal institution. During the patriarchal age the race was left with the simple institution of sacrifice and its concomitants, that sin might show its work on the human heart, and its power for evil. The restraints of law, such as obtained under the Jewish, were not thrown around men, but God made known his condemnation of sin in various ways and at various times. The institution of sacrifice allowed the race to live and continue, that sin might develop itself until the time came for God to show his will toward it, and his work in its destruction, and in the salvation of men. Hence the Jewish institution, with its revelation of God, and the

displays of his will regarding sin and man's recovery from its ruin.

The fuller display of this great work was reserved for the christian institution, where not only the attributes revealed by the Jewish scheme, but those which are more fully displayed by the atonement, are exhibited in their strongest light. Hence, under the christian dispensation the attributes of love and mercy are far more fully displayed by the atonement of Christ than was even possible by merely animal sacrifices. Here love comes out in all its force and strength, and mercy seems to triumph over the attributes demanding the punishment of sin in justification of the honor of these attributes. Where the atonement is the central figure, and this a person in whom are exhibited love the most wonderful, and mercy the most bountiful, and where the salvation of men, by means of it, is apparently the chief object, there do love and mercy shine conspicuously, and present God in the attitude of one who earnestly pleads with men in love for their salvation. With this atonement in his hand God beseeches men to be reconciled to him. Hence, he is here pushed forward, as it were, as the God of mercy, love, and pleading, whilst his justice, which has nothing for the sinner but punishment and death, is obscured and almost overlooked. Thus do the dispensations develop the attributes of God, and show that as the Remedial System comes out in all its fulness, so does God appear in all the fulness of his attributes.

8. The Remedial System, in its several phases, not only reveals the attributes of God, but also manifests the *nature of his being*. But little of this was known during the patriarchal age. Idolatry had become almost, if not quite, universal when Abraham was called. Why this was we may not even conjecture with any appearance of certainty. The language of creation intimates, if it does not clearly teach, a plurality of being in the creator, as he is spoken of in the plural. Elohim was the creator, and said when about to finish his great work, "Let us make man in *our* image, and after *our* likeness." Thence did the world have the idea of plurality in the creator. This must have been the origin of such a knowledge or conception; and it is no great stretch of the imagination to suppose that from this conception came idolatry. It may be that the plural Elohim of creation begat the idea of idolatry, as the being and character of God gradually faded from the mind. Whatever may have been the origin of idolatry in the post-deluvian world, we know that it was the immediate occasion of the separation of Abraham from his people in Mesopotamia, and of his isolation in the land of Canaan. Abraham was not an idolator, nor were his descendants before their enslavement in Egypt. While there they were brought into contact, after the death of Joseph, with the idolatry of that land; and hence it became necessary, when God was about to redeem them from that bondage, that he should reveal himself as he did.

Their minds were in a wretched state. They had the tradition of their fathers in regard to the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and still felt some hope in, and dependence on, him as their God; but they were enslaved to a cruel king, and surrounded by an idolatrous people, into whose notions and practices many gradually fell; so that, at the time of their deliverance, stupendous miracles were required to break these shackles, and shake them from their minds. As respects the being of God and his worship, they required a thorough revolution. In the revival of the God of their fathers in their minds and hearts, they required to be created anew, and have placed before them such a knowledge of God as would save them from a similar state in the future, and make them the means by which the name of God might be made known to the world, and he presented in his true character. Therefore we have the Monotheism of Judaism, the one Jehovah of the Jews, who, in all that revelation, made himself known as *one Lord*: "Hear, O Israel, the Lord thy God is one Lord."

This conception of the Divine Being is the true one under all the dispensations. His oneness is primary and fundamental, and essentially necessary to a true conception of his being. He is the one being of eternity, unoriginated and self-existent. Though plural in some sense, he is yet one, and so to be regarded and worshiped. This character of being was finally deeply instilled in the Jewish mind; so that when Christ claimed to be the Son of God, the thought was repugnant to what they had learned of God. Yet the incarnation of the *Logos* established the plurality of the Divinity, however difficult it may be to receive it as a fact. But if this be not a fact the christian dispensation is a myth, and so are all its pretended shadows and types under the Jewish;—so, indeed, is the whole pretended revelation of God.

Under christianity, which is distinguished by the incarnation of the *Logos*, and the personal administration of the Holy Spirit under him, the Jehovah of the Jews is presented as the triune Godhead, represented as *Theos*, God, *Logos*, the Lord Jesus Christ, and *Pneuma*, the Holy Spirit. Whilst the christian can see these three in the Godhead, because so clearly and distinctly revealed, and even their co-operation during the Jewish dispensation, the Jew did not, and with his revelation could not, though now, with the light of the christian revelation thrown over the Jewish, we can believe that the Angel who conducted the people of Israel over the Red Sea, and through the wilderness, was none other than the *Logos* who became incarnate in the person of Jesus of Nazareth. The full revelation of the being of God was reserved for the christian period, when we find the work of redemption distributed between the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. Here only could this full revelation be made; because here only does the Divinity become so personally and intimately involved in this great work, where the fundamental

and essential part of the remedial plan requires the presence and personal work of one person of the Godhead, as to necessitate his incarnation, and the continued presence of the Spirit in the church for the completion of the work begun and effected by the atonement.

The Jews did not realize the fact that their religion was symbolical, and consequently, temporary. They believed it to be permanent and unchangeable, and that they would continue forever the peculiar and chosen people of God,—that nothing would or could occur that would or could deprive them of this honor and glory. They imagined that their institutions were perpetual, and that the nation would continue forever as the favorite of Heaven. They regarded their religion as the sum of all wisdom, the special appointment of God, and the glory of their nation. They had as little thought of their religion being superseded by another as they had that they would be displaced by another people, and repudiated by the God of their fathers. Hence the self-reliance, confidence, and assumed superiority of the Jew. With him his circumcision and religion were God's pledges of his favor; his proofs that they were forever the special people of God. As the children of Abraham they presumed that they could not be disfranchised of the guarantees of God's covenants with him. Hence, they imagined that there was nothing that could dispossess them of their hereditary rights and privileges, and were ready to put him to death who said there was.

With such conceits and prejudices the apostle came into frequent and open conflict after the calling of the Gentiles. He disputed the correctness and justness of all such claims based on such grounds, and argued that God had superseded their covenant by a prior one made with Abraham before the birth of Isaac, according to which there was to be a people who should be the children of Abraham by faith, a ground of sonship which would admit Gentiles equally with the Jews to his favor and inheritance. This covenant, preceding the covenants of circumcision and Mt. Sinai, put an end to both at the time of its formal ratification and establishment, and thus forever abrogated all special claim on the part of the Jews. Indeed, under the first covenant, the Jew had no privileges or rights that entitled him to any consideration above the Gentile. It was intended at the time of the promise to embrace both Jew and Gentile—"all the families of the earth"—and when the promise was formally covenanted through Christ, the "promise was to the Jew and to all who were afar off," thus recognizing the Gentile as equal with the Jew under this covenant.

In this discussion the question of justification took the precedence, as the leading one, on the determination of which all else depended. Hence the prominence and leading character of this question in the writings of Paul. He argued that legal justification was connected with the Jewish religion, and with it stood

and fell; that justification by faith had no special connection with that religion; that it was older than the law, and was now prominent under, and characteristic of, the christian; and placed all men on an equal footing before God.

The coming of Christ set aside the Jew and his religion, that henceforth sinners might be justified before God by faith through the atonement of Christ. All other modes, or forms, or grounds of justification were discarded, and this alone made regnant. But this does not abrogate moral law, nor render the presence and aid of law under Christ unnecessary or redundant. The law of Moses, which was holy, just and good, could not have been abrogated as a *rule of life*, but only as a *mode or ground of justification*.

The christian dispensation reaffirms and re-enacts in form, substance, or principle, all that was common and essential to the Remedial System under the two former dispensations, and abrogates, or discards, only such as distinguishes them from itself. Under it is intended to be realized all that was aimed at under the former, which contemplated the pardon of sin and the consecration of the human soul to the service of God, as the necessary means of the attainment of the still greater bliss and more glorious worship of the redeemed in heaven.

CHAPTER VIII.

NATURE AND REVELATION.

Infidelity, in every age of the Christian world, has made unrelenting war upon the truth of God. Its deadly hate has suffered no abatement. Its energies have never tired. Defeat does not lessen the one, nor weaken the other. The blush of modesty, or shame from discomfiture, has never crimsoned its cheek. No amount or strength of argument has ever, for a moment, forced upon it the modesty of silence. It is as immortal as Satan, and as versatile as his genius. In modern times, when science has unfolded to the world many of the hidden mysteries of Nature, it has sought to arraign and press some of its discoveries in opposition to the truth of Revelation, that it might discredit by these means, its claims upon the attention and interest of mankind, and destroy its influence over the minds and consciences of men. It has allowed no fact thus discovered, which promised the slightest hope of success, to pass unobserved or untried. When Astronomy opened its wonderful discoveries to the world, eager hold was laid on these, with the hope that some of them might be found in opposition to the truths or statements of the Bible, or show an inconsistency of nature with revelation. But, failing to find that God had contradicted his *word*, by any thing he had done in this department of his *works*, it was not content to retire from the conflict, and confess its weakness and failure; but it proceeded to seek in other fields some fact of nature contradictory of Revelation.

Accordingly, when Geology began to reveal its wonders to the world—mysteries and facts of the most wonderful and interesting character, its hopes again revived, and it seized on the incontro-

vertible facts of the history of creation as unfolded by this science, and brought them into bold and defiant contrast with the history of creation as given by Moses, confidently affirming that the *ages* of geological history were wholly irreconcilable with the *days* of Moses, and hence that one or the other must be untrue. It saw in the long line of living beings that flourished on the earth in past geological ages a solid ground for declaring that the first creation of plants and animals on this earth, could not have taken place at the time stated by Moses, namely, about six thousand years ago.

If the truth of the Mosaic history rested on the interpretation formerly given it, it must be confessed that the facts revealed by geology are in irreconcilable antagonism. The force of the objection depends on the correctness of this interpretation. If this interpretation of Moses be incorrect, the arguments from geology fall to the ground. The objection, therefore, based on the revelations of geology, has no force except on this assumed correctness of the interpretation of the Mosaic account. An argument based on our ignorance of that against which it is arrayed is not legitimate. It will not do to conclude that a thing which we do not understand, is false because it appears inconsistent with what we do know. The facts of geology are incontrovertible, and the Mosaic account may be equally so, and will certainly be proved such when we come to understand it.

At the present day no candid believer in revelation rejects, or even doubts, the account of Moses, because it may appear to him not to agree with the facts of geology. As good and as honest minds as have ever adorned our nature, firmly and conscientiously believe both, and this proves that the enlightened mind discovers no real contradiction between the natural and revealed histories of creation.

But, if this harmony and consistency were as apparent as the unclouded sun, and as perfect and coalescent as a drop of water, infidelity would not thereby be abashed. Its voice can not be hushed by the most cogent argument, the most luminous reasons, or by the profoundest learning. Its author is not shamed by the grossest absurdity, nor silenced by anything from earth or heaven. Were all the light in the universe concentrated on one fact to prove the truth of God, it would not silence him. He would still pronounce that truth a lie, and labor with all his patience and industry to persuade men that his lie was the truth. He is pledged to a hostile opposition, no matter what floods of light may be thrown on his path. He will persevere in his efforts to deceive and destroy men, if the lie appear as distinct as a spot on the sun. If the truth of God were made as luminous as the sun (as it is), he would not hesitate to throw himself before that light with the hope that his shadow might fall on some mind, and thus darken and obscure the truth. Here lies the cause of the versatility, and, we might say, of the immortality of infidelity. This

origin explains the ceaseless efforts it makes to overthrow the truth of God.

Failing to press the general facts of geology into its unhal- lowed service, it has looked deeper into the secrets revealed by this science, and discerned a "law of progressive development," which it has used to inflict, as it hoped, a fatal blow on revela- tion. It saw in paleontology the revelation of some wonderful and interesting facts, and these it wrought into a theory of the progressive development of life on the globe, at once perverse of the facts of the science from which it derived its knowledge, and destructive of the truth of God as revealed in the Bible. The essential and fundamental thought of this theory is, that all the animals which have lived on the earth, from the earliest geologi- cal age to the present, owe their origin and continuance to the power of physical forces acting at first on the elements of which the simplest organism is composed, and by their own natural and peculiar action giving existence at first to the simplest organism, and thenceforth from this, and through this, by the power and influence of the same forces, producing the next highest, and less simple; and then from the second a third, and so on, until the most perfect and complex organism is reached, or developed, the last being as much the creature of the physical forces as was the first. It views every animal as the creation of natural law, the higher being derived from the lower by a process of develop- ment, or evolution; a process, in the views of the advocates of this theory, that is capable of carrying a being higher than its specific origin, thus denying a special creation in any case. It supposes that "the first step in the creation of life upon this planet was a chemico-electric operation, by which simple germi- nal vesicles were produced."¹ After these were thus created, it further supposes "that one species gave birth to another, until the second highest gives birth to man, the inferior organisms being used as a generative medium for the reproduction of the higher ones, even including man."² The series thus originated and developed, does not stop with man, whom the author con- fesses to be the highest yet brought on the earth; but beyond him he supposes that other beings will arise, developed from him, exhibiting a still higher grade of organism, which future being will present more of the spiritual and less of the animal than is seen in man.³

The infidelity of this theory of progressive development con- sists in the fact that it excludes God from the work of creation, except perhaps through the agency and operation of physical laws and forces—in that it denies any direct and immediate supernatural power in creation, such as the Bible declares, as- cribing all the living beings of the organic world to the force and influence of physical agents, thus making mind, which is conspic-

¹ Vestiges of Creation, p. 155.

² Vestiges, pp. 170, 178, 479.

³ Vestiges, pp. 27c, 271.

uous in the higher animals, a force of the organism—a product of agents to which no one has ever attributed any mental quality or power, thus claiming virtually that a stream can rise higher than its fountain. In asserting that man, though at present the highest of the series of animal organisms, is not the end and climax of that series, the theory designs to undermine insidiously the truth of the divine record, and place that record in antagonism to the facts of nature.

The real facts revealed by geology, which this theory so ingeniously presents, and from which it has framed its deceptive view of the origin of life, and the introduction of the various and numerous species that have filled the earth at every age of the earth's long history, we find briefly, but comprehensively and clearly presented by Agassiz, in his *Essay on Classification*, p. 158. He there says that "the general results of geology proper, and of paleontology, concur in the main to prove that, while the globe has been at repeated intervals, and indeed frequently, though after immeasurably long periods, altered and altered again, until it has assumed its present condition; so also have animals and plants living upon its surface, been again and again extinguished and replaced by others, until those now living were called into existence with man at their head. The investigation is not in every case sufficiently complete to show every where a coincidence between this renovation of animals and plants and the physical revolutions which have altered the general aspect of the globe; but it is already extensive enough to exhibit a frequent synchronism and correlation, and to warrant the expectation that it will, in the end, lead to a complete demonstration of their mutual dependence, not as cause and effect, but as steps in the same progressive development of a plan which embraces the physical as well as the organic world." The two great systems of creation belonging to this planet being embraced in one great and general plan, we would expect that the development of the one would keep pace with the development of the other. And this has really been the case, as we learn from the same distinguished author. He declares that there has been a remarkable correlation between the changes that the earth has undergone in past geological ages and the gradual development of the organic world, as manifested by the differentiation of the species successively introduced upon the earth. In the grades of animals that have successively appeared, we find a gradual advance toward the production successively of higher and higher types, until man appears, who closes the series. Of the relation that exists between the successive grades, the same author remarks: "Through all these intricate relations there runs an evident tendency toward the production of higher and higher types, until at last man crowns the series." The relation between the members of this series is so close and intricate that the series "appears like the development of a great conception, expressed in propor-

tions so harmonious that every link appears necessary to the full comprehension of its meaning, and yet so independent and perfect in itself that it might be mistaken for a complete whole, and again so intimately connected with the preceding and following members of the series, that one might be viewed as flowing out of the other”¹

These are the facts substantially on which the visionary theory of “progressive development” is based. The theory finds its best refutation in the facts on which it pretends to be grounded. Every where and in every age these facts declare that the Author of nature is an intelligent being, manifesting a mind of infinite reach and grasp. On this subject we may again profitably quote from the same learned author: “In order not to misapprehend the facts, and perhaps to fall back upon the idea that these changes may have been the cause of the differences observed between the fossils of different periods, it must be well understood that, while organized beings exhibit, through all geological formations, a regular order of succession, the character of which will be more fully illustrated hereafter, this succession has been from time to time violently interrupted by physical disturbances, without any of these altering in any way the progressive character of such succession of organized beings. * * * The simultaneous disappearance of entire faunae, and the following simultaneous appearance of other faunae, show further, that, as all these faunae consist in every formation of a great variety of types combined into natural associations of animals and plants, between which there have been definite relations at all times, *their origin can never be attributed to the limited influence of monotonous physical causes, which always act in the same way. Here again the intervention of a creator is displayed in the most striking manner, in every stage of the world’s history.*”²

It is thus seen that, so far from geology affording any foundation for this visionary theory, it furnishes us with the best refutation. This refutation, however, has reference entirely to the originating cause assigned for the existence of the organic world. There is yet another error in this theory almost as great as the one already considered, which lies in the fact that it affirms that a higher species than man will yet appear, developed from him, and presenting in his organism more of the spiritual and less of the animal than are seen in man.

There is to be seen lurking in this supposition the modern system of Spiritualism, the fundamental thought of which is the progressive development of the moral or spiritual nature of man, by means of the laws and spiritual forces of his organism, and the moral agents within the reach and under the control of all men. Through the natural forces and avenues open to all it is supposed that man will finally so subordinate his animal to his

¹ Essay on Classification, p. 166.

² Ibid, pp. 158, 159, and p. 17, note 2.

spiritual nature, as to approach closely to the divine character. It has just enough of truth in it, and resemblance in its pretended aims and purposes to the aims and purposes of the gospel of Jesus Christ,¹ to make it one of the most deceptive and destructive phases of infidelity that has yet appeared. In its essential features it bears a strong resemblance to the theory of progressive development just considered, and, like it, denies any special intervention of God in the affairs of men. As the one maintains a progressive development for the organic world by evolution, or the natural action of forces, physical and vital, so Spiritualism maintains a progressive development for the spiritual nature of man, through the agency of natural means; and there is about as much truth in one as in the other. We have seen, from the extracts we have made from one who is competent to speak on this subject, that there has been a gradual and progressive development of living organisms on the globe; not a development by evolution, through the action of vital and physical agents, but the development of a great thought in the mind of the creator. The organic world had its existence first in the mind of God, and the development we have of it on earth is but the development of that thought of God. There has been also a progressive development of God's revelation to man, and there is also a development of man's character through and by means of the laws, principles, and truths of this revelation. The Bible recognizes, teaches, and requires a growth spiritual in man, from a state of spiritual infancy to spiritual manhood; from a life and practice of sin to a life and practice of holiness;—a growth that has for its climax the holiness of God. Spiritualism, by perverting this great truth, and by ascribing this development of man's spiritual character to causes not recognized by the Bible, has erected a system which undermines, nullifies, and destroys the truth of God, as was designed and intended by its advocates.

We have now to consider this radical thought of this spiritualistic philosophy, which regards all men as capable of indefinite spiritual development, through the force and exercise of powers inherent in their psychical organism. It claims that the soul is in normal relation with every source of spiritual light and power, and supposes that it is enlightened and energized by special and immediate influence, and that the degree of influence which the individual enjoys is measured by his own psychical development and the general development of the age in which he lives. It holds that such aid or influence is all the inspiration that men can or have ever enjoyed; that no inspiration is different from, or above, this in kind; and that all men, whatever their natural power, or acquired development, have the same divinity in them, their differences as to character being wholly attributable to the degree of natural endowment, or of spiritual development which they have attained through means natural and common to

¹ 1 Peter 1: 16.

all. In this it is kindred to the so-called philosophy of organic development, which regards life—the life principle—as the effect, and not the cause, of the organism, which is not true; and the manifestation of life as proportionate to the grade of the organism, which is true, the prime error being that the cause is regarded as an effect.

Spiritualism sees in the great lights which have adorned the annals of the race: who have been as suns in the moral darkness of their age, an evidence of this universal law of inspiration. It sees no difference, but as to degree, between Socrates, Plato, Zoroaster, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Christ, and his apostles, this difference as to degree being wholly attributable to the natural endowment of the individuals and the psychical development of the age in which they lived, or the race to which they belonged. Its universal law of inspiration places all these men in the same category, the one excelling the other, not because of any special and peculiar inspiration of God, but on account of reasons which true revelation wholly discards. According to this universal law, the modern lights of this so-called philosophy fall, naturally, and necessarily, into the same category, as well as all others that may hereafter appear. As there is no limit to the law of organic progressive development, neither is there to the spiritual; no time in the history of the race when such superior men will not appear, and no time when such revelations will not be required and enjoyed. According to these theories, the organic world and the revelations of God to man by such means, will continue to progress in their respective development. As the one does not regard man as the end of the series of organized beings, so the other does not regard the religion of Jesus Christ as the end of God's revelations to man. As man is but one step or link in the series of organic development, so is christianity no more than a step in the development of a spiritual system,—a system that embraces within its ample folds Grecian, Persian, Egyptian, and Roman philosophers, Jewish prophets, and the founder and apostle of the christian religion, and all the modern spiritual lights from Swedenborg to Newman and Parker.

This Spiritualistic philosophy pretends to have for its object the moral elevation of the race, the subordination of man's animal nature to his spiritual, so that in his full and perfect development the spiritual may wholly predominate, thus realizing that higher type contemplated by the theory of organic development.¹ This superior development, it expects, will be realized in accordance with the principles of evolution, and by means of agents and powers common and accessible to the race—by the strength of intuitions and impartations of the divinity, the fulness and richness of which are to be determined by man's degree of spiritual development. Hence, this so-called philosophy places in the same category, and looks on with equal favor, Socrates, Plato,

¹ *Vestiges of Creation*, pp. 270, 271.

Isaiah, Christ and his apostles, and all the moderns of this school.

From this general statement of the principles of this philosophy, which we regard as fair and truthful, it will be readily seen how closely it is allied to, and connected with, the theory of organic development, the Spiritualistic beginning where the other in fact ends, or rather, where the former has placed the terminus of the latter; for the Spiritualistic philosophy looks for no higher animal organism than man, but begins and ends with him its system of moral or spiritual development. The organic theory looks for a higher type than man; but supposes that the future being will possess an organism in which the spiritual will predominate still more than in the present man; so that, in the end, the same object is realized by both, the one by *organic* development, and the other by *functional*, the object of both being the existence of a being in whom the spiritual will wholly dominate the animal by means of agencies acting from within.

As thus contrasted, the infidelity of both is apparent in that they deny the intervention of God in creation or by revelation; the first denying that man closes the series of organized beings on the earth, a truth clearly taught in the Bible, and *required by its revelation*; and the other denying that Christianity closes divine revelation, as asserted by the scriptures, and as *required by its provisions and purposes*.

We now propose a refutation of these theories or philosophies, if we may so dignify them, and shall show that *man, viewed as an animal and as a christian, closes God's works on the earth, as respects both creation and revelation*. To do this it will be necessary only to show that man closes the series of organized beings, and that Christianity closes the revelation of God to man. And we conceive that there is no better or more conclusive way of doing this than by showing that the one is *perfect as an organism, and the other perfect as a system*.

Anything may be said to be perfect when it accomplishes all the purposes for which it was created or ordained. Perfection is both relative and absolute. A being may be relatively and absolutely perfect at the same time; relatively, when compared with some perfect or absolute standard; and absolutely perfect when viewed in the light of its surroundings and relations; as when we say of a fish, that it is a perfect fish, but an imperfect vertebrate. If, now, we can prove that man is absolutely perfect, as to his animal organism, we prove that his organism closes the series of organized beings on this earth, and, *therefore*, that no higher type of organism can be introduced on this earth in accordance with the system of organized beings to which he belongs.

In what, then, does the perfection of man's organism consist? In this: that his relations to the organic and inorganic worlds with which he stands connected and related, are as numerous,

varied, and perfect as they can be,—that he is connected through his organism with, and related to, these worlds at every possible point of connection and relation. This is the absolute perfection which we affirm of man, and which constitutes him the crown of the series.

As has already been observed, the animal kingdom is divided into four great divisions, called branches, representing plans of structure, distinct from, and independent of, each other: yet connected and related as parts of one great system. That they are distinct from and independent of each other, and not so connected that one can be said to begin where the other ends, or the one developed from the other, has been so satisfactorily determined by the most indubitable evidence, that these divisions of the animal kingdom are now no longer regarded in any other light than as *natural* divisions, as real and distinct as divisions can be. This truth is demonstrated by the fact that the primordial cell (the initial form of all species), in its process of development, passes at once into the type of the branch to which the animal belongs. If it be a vertebrate, the first stage of development of the cell that indicates the type, will show that the animal belongs to this branch. It does not pass through the lower branches, and present their branch-type before reaching that to which it belongs, as would be the case if the evolution theory were true. This fact demonstrates the natural divisions of the animal kingdom.¹ If these branches were so connected in the system of organized beings as to show that the higher was developed from the one immediately below it, the development of the primordial cell would have been different from what it is. If its development were such as the theory of evolution supposes and requires, it would not have marked any natural divisions of the animal kingdom.

What is thus shown to be true of the branches is true also of the classes, and of all the other subdivisions. This the fact that *species are immutable* proves and requires. Specific differences are found between all the subdivisions, otherwise species could not be immutable. If species are immutable then is it plain that *species* is impressed indelibly on the primordial cell; and this can be done only by creative power. The germ-form of all animals is the same, and the accuracy and certainty with which the fecundated cell pursues its course in the process of its development in the line of its own species, can be accounted for only on the supposition that species exists in the cell. “However varied may be the series of forms through which the parent passes, the offspring repeats these with the greatest exactness; and the whole scheme of development may be described as one in which the primordial cell is tending toward the attainment of the perfect form and condition of the parent.”²

¹ Carpenter's Comparative Physiology, p. 126, and note 2.

² Comparative Physiology (Carpenter), p. 126.

The *natural* divisions and subdivisions of the animal kingdom fully demonstrate the falsity of that theory which supposes the higher grades to have been evolved from, or created in and by, the organism of the lower during the progress of development, and very clearly establishes for the animal kingdom an author, infinite in knowledge, wisdom, and power. The power that infallibly carries the primordial cell through all the stages of its development or growth along the line of its species, is as great as that which creates a world. How, then, can we for a moment regard the physical forces of the inorganic world, or the vital forces of the organism, themselves creatures, as capable of such an infinite work? The supposition is one of infinite absurdity.

The four great branches of the animal kingdom have existed from the earliest ages of the earth's long history. The vertebrates were represented by fishes in the paleozoic age, and were cotemporaneous with the other branches; and these four branches have continued to be the only primary and grand divisions into which the animal kingdom has been divided during the whole period that living beings have been on the earth. When we consider the vast period of time that has elapsed since animals were introduced upon the earth, and how varied and numerous have been the species by which the vertebrates have been represented during all this time; and when we find that no higher branch than vertebrates has appeared up to the present time, we may be positively certain that no higher branch will ever appear.

What we have said of the branch we may affirm of the class, the first differentiation of the branch, and the argument is just as conclusive, for the highest species of the vertebrate is the mammal. We are, therefore, justified in affirming that the mammalia close the subdivision of the classes.

If the physical forces of the inorganic world, either alone or in connection with the vital forces of the organism, were capable of originating and developing the countless number of beings that have lived and flourished on the earth, of every grade and structure, from the first dawn of life on the globe to the introduction of man, how does it happen that they have not been able, during a period of time to be estimated only by ages, to produce a higher grade of structure than the vertebrate, and during a very vast period, no higher class than the mammalia? Why have they stopped at these divisions? Why have they not originated and created other branches, classes, orders, or genera? Have they mind to determine natural, or possible, or proper limits? Or have they acquired no wisdom, or knowledge, or power during the long history of the earth? Can we claim for them infinity, and consequently no possible improvement? A real limit has been reached, and this limit could have been determined only by an exhaustion of wisdom, knowledge, and power, or by an infinite mind.

The conception in the mind of the Creator, as now developed by his works, contemplated the existence of an animal whose relations to the worlds with which it should be connected, and of which it should form a part, should be as varied, numerous, and perfect as it is possible for relations to be. Hence, in devising the system of organized beings, where such great diversity is seen in the individual species and members of the system, and yet such unity of plan and structure, one great thought was ever present before the mind of the Creator, toward which he was constantly working in all the differentiations of the kingdom. This thought is fully developed, and its purpose realized, in the organism which closes the series.

It is apparent to the most casual observer that the relations of the mammalia to the external world are more numerous and varied than those of the classes below them. It is equally apparent that the higher mammalia have more command over the systems of nature than the inferior. Hence, as the relations of an animal to these systems of nature become more numerous and varied, in that degree does the animal rise in the scale. And when we come to examine the relations of man and the adaptation of his organism to these systems of nature, we find that he is related to, and connected with them, at every possible point of relation and connection; that his relations to the world are as numerous and as varied as is possible to an animal organism. This being effected, the animal organism in him has attained its perfect differentiation, and its consequent perfect connection with the world of which it is the purpose and object. Therefore, it is clear that beyond him no higher organism can appear.

The vertebral class affords the best illustration of how an animal's relations and connections with the external world are to be viewed. Each class has definite and peculiar relations to its own sphere of being, and these mark the grade of differentiation of the class, and become more numerous and varied as we ascend the scale of the classes and their subdivisions. It is manifest to any observer that reptiles are above fishes, birds above reptiles, and mammals above birds; and this is the order in which the classes advance in the scale of being. This relative development of the vertebral classes is beautifully marked and measured by the relative development of their nervous centres, as indicated by their relation to each other. As the relation of these two centres changes, the amount of change measures the development of the classes. This relation is measured by an angle which obtains between the position of the cerebrum and the spinal axis. As this angle is found to increase, in that ratio does the class advance in the scale, and towards perfect development. The angle is the measure of the advance or differentiation of the animal organism. To show this it is only necessary to consider the development of the nervous centres as respects this angle. In its increase we will see the gradual subordination of the spinal to

the cerebral centre, and the consequent exaltation of the intellectual above the purely animal structure and functions. As the cerebrum increases in size its relation with the spinal axis changes. With its increase its angle with the spinal axis is also increased, so that the degree of cerebral development is marked and measured by the increase in the angle found to distinguish each class.

In the lowest class of the vertebrates—the fishes—the “brain is only a slight enlargement of the spinal marrow” at its cerebral extremity, this enlargement consisting of four divisions, among which the cerebrum, or brain proper, appears in its initial state or condition, the sensory ganglia, the other divisions, being relatively larger, with one exception. In this class the brain and spinal marrow are on the same horizontal line, the brain being simply an enlargement of the spinal cord. In the class of reptiles the brain appears much enlarged, overlapping to a small degree the adjoining ganglia. This development of the cerebral centre gives rise to a more complex structure of organism, and more numerous and varied relations with the surrounding world, than are seen in fishes; and the spinal cord forms a considerable angle with the cerebrum, indicated by the marked elevation of the head on the body, and more complex and diversified movements of the animal. In the birds the cerebrum is still more enlarged, overlapping still more the sensory ganglia, and reaching the cerebellum, the posterior body of the four divisions. Hence, in birds we observe a still greater freedom, and elevation of the head on the body, and a marked increase in the size of the angle formed by the two centres. In the mammals, the last and highest class of vertebrates, all these features are still more enlarged, and especially in the higher genera and species. In the lowest order of this class there is but a slight advance beyond what is observed in birds; but as we advance through the ascending series of the mammalia, we observe the cerebrum to greatly increase in size until it finally overlaps all the sensory ganglia and cerebellum, and presents the highest development of the brain. This supreme development is found in man, in whom the cerebral hemispheres appear the principal parts of the brain, whilst the sensory ganglia appear as if but rudimentary, and the cerebellum, large as it absolutely is, only a subordinate element of the cerebral centre.

As the cerebrum enlarges in size and overlaps the other portions of the brain, as observed when the different classes and their orders are compared, the angle formed by the brain and spinal marrow increases, until it reaches in man a right angle. Beyond this no further increase or advance is possible. When, therefore, this angle has become the greatest possible, that is, a right angle, we know that the organism presenting this angle has reached its highest development, and that its relations to the systems of nature are the most numerous, varied, and perfect to

which it is possible for the animal organism to attain. This angle being reached in the organism of man, and in man only, proves that he is not only the highest *in esse*, but the highest *in posse*, according to the plan on which organized beings on this planet are constructed.

To more firmly substantiate this conclusion, we produce here an extract from an author already frequently quoted. In his "Essay on Classification," p. 34, Agassiz says: "Again the first representatives of each class stand in definite relations to their successors in later periods, and as their order of appearance corresponds to the various degrees of complication of structure, and form a natural series closely linked together, this natural gradation must have been contemplated from the beginning. There can be less doubt upon this point, as man, who comes last, closes in his own cycle a series, the gradation of which points from the beginning to him as its last term. I think it can be shown by anatomical evidence that man is not only the last and highest among the living beings of the present period, but that he is the last term of a series beyond which there is no material progress possible in accordance with the plan upon which the whole animal kingdom is constructed: and that the only improvement we can look for upon earth must consist in the development of man's intellectual and moral faculties."

From this testimony it can be no longer doubted that man closes the series of animal organisms; and that the only further development that can take place in him, or from him, is the expansion or enlargement of the powers and faculties of his organism, whether these be physical or psychical. That the organic powers and faculties of his organism are perfect, his perfect organism attests. No other or greater can be created than those already found in him. That the intellectual powers and faculties of man are the greatest possible in an animal organism is evident from the fact that man's brain is the largest and most fully developed of the entire series. And as the powers and capacities of the mind depend on the development of the cerebrum; as the measure or development of the mind keeps pace with the development of the cerebrum; and as the cerebrum is most fully developed in man, it follows that the intellectual faculties of man are not only the most perfect of the whole series, but the largest and most perfect that can appear in or through an animal organism. The psychological development keeps pace, *pari passu*, with the development of the brain; and as man's brain is the most perfect possible, so is his mind, as regards its organic foundation. On this subject we may again quote from Agassiz. In his great work, entitled "Contributions to the Natural History of the United States," vol. 1, pp. 296, 297, he says: "It is a question of the greatest interest, whether the psychological development of animals rises in the same degree as the development of the complication of their structure generally. If

this be the case, it follows that the rank of the orders expresses at the same time the range of their psychological development. And we think this is really the case. Now, since we have shown that, owing to the complication of their structure, the turtles are really the highest among reptiles, we may expect to find in them also the highest psychological development of the whole class.

* * * Though the orders have been represented as the natural groups which, being founded upon the complication of the structure of animals, above all determine their relative rank, it is equally true that the classes, when compared with one another, stand lower or higher, in proportion as the system of organs which are developed in them have a higher importance, or are built upon a more perfect pattern. In the branch of the vertebrate there can be no doubt that the class of fishes, as a whole, occupies the lowest position, that the amphibians rank next to them, that the reptiles comes next, that birds stand above these, and that mammalia are the highest. Their whole structure shows this plainly. But to consider only the points which have a bearing upon the question under consideration, it is obvious that fishes, in which the whole bulk of the body is one undivided mass, the vertebral column continues in one horizontal line with the base of the skull, the muscular system is uniformly extended over the whole trunk, so as to allow only lateral motions, and the limbs reduced to branching digitations without concentrated activity, in which the brain is only a slight enlargement of the spinal marrow, and some of the organs of the senses are either wanting, or very imperfect, while others are blunt and obtuse; it is obvious, I say, that this class occupies, not only structurally, but also with reference to its psychological development, a much lower position than the classes of the amphibians and of true reptiles, in which the different regions of the body are more distinct, the motions more localized, the organs of the senses more perfect, and the brain larger. In these two classes the preponderance of the head is already fully indicated by its position being somewhat raised above the bulk of the body, and forming with it a more or less marked angle, while in most of them, the limbs are detached as locomotive appendages distinct from the trunk, though not yet so free as to move with perfect independence. In birds and mammals the progress is still more distinct. The different regions of the body are not only better marked, they are also more diversified in their structure, the body is no longer so prone upon the medium in which the animal lives; the head has acquired a special mobility in connection with the highly organized organs of the series, the larger brain and commanding position it has assumed: the motions are also more diversified, not only in themselves, but the anterior and posterior pairs of limbs are adapted to different purposes. All these features are brought to a climax in man, whose vertical station presents the highest contrast with the horizontal position of the body of the

fishes, whose head is so raised as to stand free above the whole frame, while the hands have become the willing tools of the manifestations of his mental powers. The gradations, as far as the structure is concerned, is as evident as possible, from the unwieldy and massive horizontal body of the fish, up to the commanding attitude of man; and that this structural gradation stands in immediate correlation to the degree of psychological development is equally evident, when we compare the mental powers of man and the imperfect faculties of fishes."

The general view here expressed corresponds with the conclusions which Carpenter expresses in his general survey of the animal kingdom. He regards "man's place in the animal kingdom as being, not at its head, nor at its centre, *but at the extreme most remote from its point of contact with the kingdom of organic life; in fact, at the point at which we may believe it to touch another kingdom, that of pure intelligence.*"¹

From what has now been said of the structural perfection of man's organism, it is evident that in him an organism is reached which presents the most numerous and varied relations with the external world, and which constitutes him the master of all the forces, powers, and agencies of nature, and which gives him a mind that enables him to subdue all things to himself, and make them subservient to his will and desires. His mind is confessedly the greatest of earth's creations, and demonstrated by the structural perfection of his organism to be the greatest in or through an animal organism. Since, then, his body and brain are the most perfect that can be produced in an animal structure, in accordance with the present plan on which such beings are constructed, it follows that we have no ground to expect any higher being than he, either by creation or evolution; and that the only further development that can take place is the development of the powers and faculties of his physical organism and psychical powers. In the development of these the greatest diversity prevails, so great at times as almost to make the lowest examples appear as distinct species. The organism of Samson or Goliath did not differ structurally from that of other men; nor did the wonderfully intellectual powers of Plato, Newton, or Bacon depend on a more perfectly organized brain, or one of a higher structural development, than is found in other men greatly their inferior in this respect. But such men as these show to what extent the powers or faculties of the organism may be developed, but no more; and if the future shall present the world with men far transcending these, that superiority will consist only of the greater development of the physical and intellectual powers and faculties common to the species.

It is only when these powers of mind and body are observed in such men as those mentioned that we are struck with wonder and awe, and are led to suppose that they differed from

¹ Comparative Physiology, p. 691.

commoner men of their day. But no one can claim for them the difference of *species*; only the accidental difference of race or individual, which we cannot explain. Greater comparative strength is seen in the insect than in the quadruped; and among the latter some are comparatively stronger than others, who have the same structural form. This we can not explain. Nor can we explain why one man should excel another so much as is observed in certain cases. The mystery is too deep for our philosophy. Comparative cerebral development will explain much of the mental phenomena that distinguish *species*; but not altogether what distinguishes races or individuals. When we compare the brain of man with the brain of the animals below him, much of his intellectual and moral greatness is explained, but not all. The difference of structure between the brain of the monkey and that of man is not so great as the difference between the intellectual phenomena which they respectively display. The larger and more perfectly organized and developed brain gives to man a great superiority over any animal below him; but the brain is not the only cause of the observed superiority of, and difference between, their intellectual phenomena. There is a source or basis of mind in man which is independent of his brain, and has no corresponding element of being in animals. This is his *soul*, a spirit-being independent in its origin or source of being from that of the animal, and a ground of continuance of being after the animal has utterly perished. This is a being of mind, higher in the scale of being than the animal, though united with it for a time. A part of the intellectual phenomena displayed by man may be fairly attributed to this being, which is additional to what is possible through the brain alone. But how much of the mind which man exhibits is to be ascribed to the *animal*, and how much to the *spirit* that acts through and by means of his brain, it is, and always will be, impossible to determine.

Though we can not determine from the phenomena of his being that man possesses a spirit distinct in origin and nature from his organism, and which will continue to live after the animal is dead, yet the conviction is deep and universal that such is really the fact. Whence this conviction? Of human reason, or of divine revelation? We may cheerfully admit that the phenomena of man's being could not originate such an idea; indeed, we may deny that they can, and yet reasonably cherish the conviction that man is more than an animal. This conviction really comes of revelation. But whatever may be the ground of the conviction, the world in general believes that man is more than a mere animal. There are some facts in his history which can not be explained on any other hypothesis. There are acts of his that possess a quality which the world does not ascribe to the same acts in animals. Animals may and do *kill*, but they do not, and can not, commit *murder*.

Hence there is a moral quality in the actions of men which can not be ascribed to the same or similar acts in animals. This fact ascribes a different nature to man, and such a nature he possesses.

The fact that such a quality as sin attaches to the acts of man, places him in a category above animals; puts him in a position very remote from the highest of animals, so that he occupies a position, not merely at the head of organized beings belonging to this world, but one pertaining to a different order or category of intelligent beings. Hence the view of Carpenter, that his position is one that borders on pure intelligence, categorically distinct from all that is animal, and wholly above the powers or faculties of the animal to reach. This nature seems to be the ground of his high moral character; the explanation of so many phenomena that have been observed in his history; and the ultimate basis of his high intellectual powers and faculties.

Finding, then, that man possesses a distinct and independent being called soul or spirit, and that this is the true *Ego* of the man, we reach our final argument to prove that his organism is the end of God's creations on this earth, and fully realizes God's primary as well as ultimate purpose in his creation. His spirit allies him to another and higher system of being than is found in this world, and continues his being when the material and organic worlds have fulfilled their purpose and passed away. His entire organism, therefore, connects two distinct and widely separated systems of the universe, the one ending in him, and the other beginning with him; the first, material, organic, and temporal, and the other spiritual and eternal. As these two distinct and widely separated systems unite in man; and as the spiritual can not be evolved from the material or organic, it follows conclusively that no higher organism than man can appear on this earth; consequently the theory of progressive development is not, and can not be, true. Man as animal is the end of God's works on earth. So his structure and the sacred scriptures most clearly and positively declare.

We have now to consider the theory of progressive development as it regards man's spiritual nature, as taught by Spiritualists or Rationalists of the present day, the infidelity of which is to be seen in its denial of any special intervention of God in the affairs of men; and in its denial of the authoritative character of the Bible as a special expression of God's will to man, and of the peculiar and special claims which it makes on the consciences of men. Like the theory of organic development, it excludes God from any direct or special intervention in the moral and religious development of the race by means of an expressed and authoritative revelation of his will, and ascribes all advancement or progression of the race to the agency of laws and to natural relations of the race with the Creator, which relations are common to all men alike, and which secure to them a normal and universal

inspiration, and all else that is needed. In the one case man's organism is the creation and field of the operation of laws called natural, and in the other, the development of the soul is the work of natural agencies, which operate on him through natural relations. In both God is excluded; in the first, as having exerted any direct agency in creation, and in the second, as having expressed his will by a verbal revelation. Hence, with Spiritualists and Rationalists the facts of revelation are all myths, and its truths, whatever there may be of these, are true, not because found in the pretended revelation, but because in accord with human reason. Sin, therefore, is a myth, and the atonement a superstition, the invention of men. That which all mankind have, from the earliest of ages, regarded as sin, and for which all nations have decreed punishments, and on account of which they have offered sacrifices, is with these philosophers only the manifestation of a low degree of spiritual development. With them every grade of moral character is but the measure of the spiritual development the individual or the age has undergone, with no quality of sin attaching.

The powers and agencies of this development Rationalists regard as common to the race, and within the reach or possession of every individual. These powers and agencies are both internal and external, both human and divine, the latter being exerted on the soul directly, or by intuitions, and not by a revelation such as the sacred scriptures claim to be. An external revelation with such is not necessary, and, with the most advanced, impossible. They may acknowledge the prophets and apostles of Jewish and christian times as such, but rank them no higher, and regard them as no more authoritative, than Persian, Grecian, or Roman sages. Virtually rejecting all divine revelation, they place before their minds no absolute or authoritative standard, such as christians recognize in the scriptures of the Jewish and christian ages. With them, the light shed on the world by prophets, sages, seers, philosophers, and by Christ and his apostles, is of the same nature and origin, and the one of no more intrinsic authority than the other, and to be regarded as no more *divine* than the deliverances of men of like character at the present time. If some ascribe a divine origin to the inspiration of the prophets and apostles of the sacred scriptures, it will be found on close inspection that the divinity of their inspiration does not differ essentially from that of the inspiration of Plato, Socrates, or Swendenborg. They claim for the latter equal authority with the former for the age in which the prophets, philosophers, or apostles lived; and deny that what was valid and true in one, is valid and true in another. The gradual progress of the ages, and the successive development of peoples, render the older effete, and the present vital only while present, itself, in turn, to become effete as the race advances. Therefore, as mankind advances in moral and intellectual development, enlarging

and increasing thereby man's spiritual wants, they hold that other men, superior to all who have preceded them, will arise and bless the world with their greater knowledge; and that the richness and fulness of their relations will be in proportion to the then existing degree of man's spiritual development. With them there will be no time in the future when this universal light, or additional revelation, will not be needed and given; no time when man will not be able to evolve from his own "inner light," intuitions, or more fully developed spiritual powers and faculties, the increased light needed by the advanced development. Just as the physical and organic forces of nature will continue the introduction of more highly developed organic beings, so as the race continues to advance in its spiritual development, will there continue to be evolved from man's spiritual powers, in direct communion with the divine being, higher, broader, and deeper knowledge of what man needs, and should enjoy.

Such a religion, common to Jews, pagans, and christians is subversive of the revelation of God, as given in the Jewish and christian scriptures. This theory of progressive spiritual development emphatically denies the revelation of God, and wholly discards the religion of the Lord Jesus Christ as supreme, authoritative, and final, and hence is infidel in all its warp and woof.

That the scriptures of the Jewish and christian religions are a revelation from God, and supreme, authoritative, and final during their respective ages, we have from the first accepted and claimed as a fact. It has not been within the purposes we had in view to prove the divine authenticity of these scriptures; but, receiving them as divinely inspired, to show the consistency and reasonableness of the system of redemption presented in them, and the phases of its development from its inception to its close. We claim that they meet all the spiritual wants of man, and provide all the means necessary for his salvation from sin, and the development of a character holy and spiritual, designed and calculated to fit him for the society of beings wholly without sin. These wants and needs are met by the atonement and the church of Christ, the first to give him spiritual life, or the pardon of his sins, and the other to preserve this life. These institutions, being found in the provisions of the Gospel, demonstrate that the gospel does all for man that his condition in this world requires, and hence that with it God has closed his revelation to man, and in and by it provided full, perfect, and adequate means for all that his condition in life requires or demands. This efficacy and sufficiency of the gospel of Jesus Christ is universally admitted by all professing christians, and denied only by the disbeliever, of whatever school or philosophy. Various reasons and considerations have been presented in these pages, showing the reasonableness and correctness of this judgment, but these have

by no means exhausted the subject. To the believer these reasons will appear ample and sufficient; but the skeptic will not so regard them. For him the correctness of the general judgment will be demonstrated in another way.

The unbeliever, as it respects the special revelation of God contained in the sacred writings, has a peculiar fondness for what he calls natural religion. He believes in the natural fitness of things as his reason discovers it. He is fond of arraying the natural against the revealed, and claiming for them an irreconcilable antagonism. He denies that the author of Nature can be the author of Revelation. This would be the case if they were antagonistic. The infinite author would, in such a case, contradict himself. But this is not true. The same mind can be discovered as working in both. The same thought can be seen running through both.

In the creation of the material and organic worlds one great thought was always prominent and chief before the mind of the creator, as demonstrated by the issue. This thought was man. All the creations that preceded him had reference to him. His organism was the model after which and toward which the Great Architect constantly worked. With man his work was complete. This has been made evident by what we have already said.

But we have yet to inquire, In what does this completeness, or perfection, consist? We have intimated what this perfection is when we said that we have in man an organism whose relations with the worlds in which he lives are as numerous and varied as it is possible for such relations to be. His organism is perfect and complete, because it meets these worlds at all points in which it is possible for an animal organism to meet them. His organism is in perfect and complete relation with them, so that all the benefits capable of flowing from them to man have an avenue in which to flow, and all the uses which man may make of them for his own advantage and happiness have means by which they may be exercised and enjoyed. Through his organism these worlds are to him all that they can be made to be. The means and instrumentalities by which such a being as the soul of man may derive advantage from these worlds are exhausted in his organism; so that his organism unites the spirit with the world in which it lives as perfectly and as completely as it is possible for such union to be. Such a union required the perfect development of the material and organic worlds, and this we have in the present physical condition of the planet and the organism of man.

Now what the organism of man is to the organic and material worlds, such is the gospel of Jesus Christ to the spiritual condition and wants of man in a state of sin. His normal relation is one of union and communion with God. Sin destroyed this union; and the purpose of the gospel is to restore man to, or place him

in, his normal relation, in which he can enjoy all that his spirit needs or requires. This the gospel does by taking away that which separates. Then the spirit passes into its normal relation with God, which connects him with God at all possible points of union and communion. Whatever effects this union must be complete, perfect, and final; for beyond this there is nothing to be done, and nothing more that can be done.

Revelation has an object and purpose beyond what the world in general sees in it. It is not simply a collection of moral laws designed for the regulation of man's conduct toward his fellow man; nor was it simply designed to give man religious institutions and forms and modes of worship, without reference to any other object or question than the amelioration of the moral condition of the race. It is greatly more than this. It has a logic that is never understood and appreciated until we view it as a great system, having for its object nothing less than the solution of a problem the mightiest with which Mind has ever grappled—the adequate punishment of sin, the salvation of men from all its consequences, and the justification of the righteousness and holiness of God in the work of the Remedial System. This system proposes to undo, so far as man is concerned, the evil which sin has wrought in his relations to God, and to give him back again all that he enjoyed at the time, and in the relations of his creation. In this work we observe the same mind, forethought, and purpose that are evident in the creation of the material and organic worlds. There the purpose was the creation of a being who would be perfect as respects his relations with these worlds; and here the provision of means which will place the sinner in his Eden relation with God, and remove every barrier to his spiritual union and communion with that source of life and happiness. This done, all is done for the sinner that can be done, or that his condition under sin requires to be done. This done, he stands before God as though he had never sinned. This full and perfect restoration of man to his original relations with God, the gospel of Jesus Christ fully and completely accomplishes; consequently it must be complete, and the end of God's work for the salvation of men. And since revelation has this as one of its prime objects, it must end with the ample and perfect provisions made for man's salvation. There is, therefore, in the gospel of Jesus Christ an end and close of revelation, and of all provision for the salvation of men from all the consequences of sin.

The perfection which characterizes the gospel of Jesus Christ consists of the two primary and fundamental objects or purposes of Revelation and of the Remedial System, viz: the salvation of men from sin and all its consequences, and the justification of the righteousness and holiness of God in this work of salvation. If the gospel possesses this perfection, which is all that can be done by a remedial system, and all that can be

made known by a revelation, then is it absolutely perfect. This perfection it does possess. Full and perfect remission of sins is provided for by the atonement of Christ; and by the atonement, God is fully justified in pardoning the sinner who receives it by faith and obedience. This is all that it is possible for a remedial system to accomplish, and hence, the gospel of Jesus Christ accomplishing these, there remains nothing more to be done, and so the gospel closes God's revelation to man, and his work for the salvation of the race from sin.

The gospel also provides for the maintenance of the relation which the atonement secures. This provision is just as essential as the first; for the relation of favor, union, and communion must be maintained, if the atonement is to benefit men in the end. Perfection of means is just as essential here as in the atonement. The church is as necessary, in the great scheme, for the christian, as is the atonement for the sinner. The church is man's Eden restored to him, where the Holy Spirit is the companion of the christian, as was God of Adam in Eden.

The gospel scheme provides the church and all other means necessary for the maintenance of the relation of favor secured by the atonement. Here men may feed on the bread of eternal life, and grow in knowledge, piety, and godliness; and thus become fitted for the higher life of the eternal state. The sacred scriptures are designed to thoroughly equip the christian for every good word and work. They afford him all the light and direction he needs in this life. They will guide him infallibly through the wilderness of this life, and enable him to attain at last, through the other provisions of the gospel, the joys of eternal life. They will do all for man's character that can be done. So God himself declares. They will mold man after the divine original, and make him in mind and heart like God. More than this can not be done by any means whatever. In doing this, the gospel does all for man that his condition in a state of sin demands or requires. It is, therefore, the perfection of a remedial system.

From whatever point of view we may look at the Remedial System as God's means and manner for the condemnation of sin, the salvation of the sinner, and his own justification in this work; whether we view it in whole or in part; or as regards its aims, objects, and purposes; whether scripturally, or philosophically, we reach the same conclusion, that the Remedial System finds its perfection and end in the gospel of Jesus Christ, beyond which, or more than which, nothing can be done. What remains after it concerns the growth spiritual of individual christians, and through the individuals, the whole church. The world will never see anything greater or farther advanced than the gospel of Jesus Christ; nor anything more perfect as respects its objects and aims, than the church, "the pillar and support of the truth," the home and family of the faithful in Christ Jesus,

the family of God on earth, destined for union with the family of God in heaven.¹ Beyond this grand and glorious destiny of the church of Jesus Christ, the heart's most ardent aspirations can not reach; and more than this no system of religion, whether divine or human, can possibly accomplish;—more than this even philosophers can not dream of, nor hope for. This destiny does for man all that can be done for him; and this, and all else kindred with it, being the work and fruit of the gospel, the *christian* is all that God can make, or designs, or wishes to make, of man. Hence, MAN AS AN ANIMAL AND MAN AS A CHRISTIAN, IS THE PERFECTION OF NATURE AND REVELATION, AND ENDS GOD'S WORKS ON THE EARTH.

¹Eph. 1: 10.

