

The Atonement

BY J. M. STEPHENSON.
PUBLISHED AT THE ADVENT REVIEW OFFICE.
ROCHESTER, N. Y.
1854.

THE ATONEMENT

There is perhaps no subject in the entire range of Christian Theology upon which more has been written, and which has been more fully and ably discussed, than that of the atonement; and yet I may safely say, there is none in reference to which the professed Christian world are more at variance, than this. But on this point all parties agree: that it is a subject second to no other in importance and utility. It is the foundation of the whole superstructure of the Christian Religion.

No one can fail to see the importance of having the foundation of a building of great magnitude and utility, composed of the choicest material, and executed with the most profound skill. Nor is any one prepared to appreciate or understand God's plan of saving men, without having correct views of the atonement. Our views of this subject will give shape to our views of every Bible doctrine. It is, therefore, a matter of vital importance that our views of this subject be correct. As an eminent writer justly observes, "Errors on this subject sap the whole structure of religion. All the great outlines of theology become vague and incoherent notions when deprived of their connection with this central truth."

4

In the investigation of this subject I propose considering:-

I. The true import of the Hebrew word rendered atonement. Not being a Hebrew scholar, I will give the criticism of another.

"The term in the Hebrew language, which we translate atonement, is *copher*. As a verb, it literally signifies to *cover*; and as a noun, a *covering*; generally, whenever the word occurs, something that has given serious offense, and produced a permanent state of variance between the parties is supposed; and then in relation to the party offended, it signifies to pacify, to appease, or to render him propitious; as Gen. xxxii, 20. 'And say ye moreover, Behold, thy servant Jacob is behind us. For he said, I will appease him with the present that goeth before me.' Eze. xvi, 63. 'That thou mayest remember and be confounded, and never open thy mouth any more because of thy shame, when I am pacified toward thee for all that thou hast done, saith the Lord God.'

"When applied to sin, it signifies to cover, or expiate it; to atone, or make satisfaction for it. Ps. xxxii, 1. 'Blessed is he whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin is covered.' Lev. xvi, 30. 'For on that day shall the priest make an

atonement for you, to cleanse you, that ye may be clean from all your sins before the Lord.'

"When the term represents the sinner himself, it implies his being covered, or protected from punishment, and is rendered a ransom, or atonement for him. Ex. xxi, 30. 'If there be laid on him a sum of money, then he shall give for the ransom of his life whatsoever is laid upon him.' Chap. xxx, 12, 15. 'When thou takest the sum of the children of Israel after their number, then shall they give every man a ransom for his soul unto the Lord, when thou numberest them; that there be no plague among them when thou numberest them. The rich shall not give more, and the poor shall not give less, than half a shekel, when they give an offering unto the Lord to make an atonement for your souls.'

"This seems to be the plain and unforced meaning of the Hebrew word *copher*; and when we look into the Greek version of the Old Testament, by the Seventy, we

5

find it translated *ilasmos*, propitiation; and 'to make an atonement,' they express by the word *exilaskoniai*, which signifies 'to render propitious.'-Hence, the apostles who wrote in Greek, when referring to the death of Christ, make use of the very same terms which are applied to the legal sacrifices in the Septuagint version of the Old Testament; representing the former, not only as a real and proper sacrifice, but as the truth and substance of all the sacrifices of the Levitical law, and the only true and efficacious atonement for sin. Heb. ix: *passim*, and Chap. x, 1-19. As, therefore, the Greek word *ilasmos* is expressly applied to Christ, 1 John ii, 2, 'And he is the propitiation for our sins: and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world.' Chap. iv, 10. 'Herein is love; not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins.' And as it gives the true signification of the original word when applied to an atoning sacrifice, we must either admit that the sacrifice of Christ was a real atonement or propitiation for sin, or be reduced to the alternative of denying all that the scripture says respecting the design and effect of sacrifices."-*Religious Encyclopedia*.-Page 144.

The cases where the offending party cannot possibly make satisfaction in their own person, and where the infliction of the threatened penalty would place the transgressor beyond the hope of recovery; (as is the case in all capital offences;) if in such case the suffering of another be accepted in his stead, the atonement thus made by a substitute is denominated a *vicarious atonement*.

This is the case with man. He has violated a law which requires perfect obedience; hence he cannot, in any way, make satisfaction for such violation, from the fact that it was all he could possibly do in the first instance to render perfect obedience; and to suffer the penalty (death) due for his transgression would ruin him; hence the atonement made by Christ is justly termed a *vicarious atonement*. "But

6

he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed."

Isa. liii, 5. "For I delivered unto you, first of all, that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures." 1 Cor. xv, 3.

Some writers confound *atonement* with *reconciliation*, and thus lay the foundation for the most fatal errors, such as Universalism, Restorationism, Swedenborgerism, etc.

As our writer of the Encyclopedia, has well observed, "the appeal to etymology in defence of this confusion of ideas is but egregious trifling, unworthy of a subject so vast and solemn. And as to Rom. v, 11, it is well known that the original word there used is not *ilasmos*, but *katallageen*, and should have been rendered reconciliation. It is God, not man, who receives the atonement; but believers, as the whole context shows, *receive reconciliation through Christ*." Parkhurst, in his Greek Lexicon, says that the Greek word, *katallagee*, in every instance which it occurs in the New Testament, except Rom. v, 11, is rendered *reconciliation*; and it is thus rendered in the margin of this text, and evidently should have been in the text itself.

ATONEMENT AND RECONCILIATION DIFFER

1. In their origin. The former had its origin in the *volition* of Jesus Christ, who voluntarily took our nature, and suffered and died in our stead: the latter has its origin in the consent of man's will to accept the sacrifice. They differ, as the necessary means to the attainment of an end, and the end attained by the use of the means.

7

2. They differ in the essential ingredients of their nature.

The former has exclusive reference to the mind of an offended God; the latter to the mind of offending and irreconciled man. The one is satisfaction rendered to God, for the claims of his broken law: the other is satisfaction on the part of the sinner with what God has done for him, and a full and hearty acceptance of his revealed plan. The one, therefore has reference to a condition of the Divine Mind: the other to a disposition of the human mind.

3. They differ in their object. The former has reference to God: the latter to man. God receives the atonement, and man receives reconciliation. The atonement may exist without reconciliation on the part of man; but reconciliation cannot exist without the atonement. The atonement is the cause, and reconciliation the effect, to those who avail themselves of its provisions. They differ, therefore, as cause and effect differ; and can never be confounded, without great violence to both. The Bible, everywhere represents the atonement as the ground and basis of reconciliation to God. Rom. iii, 24-26. "Being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation, through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; to declare I say, at this time his righteousness; that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus." Chap. v, 1. "Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ." Verses 8, 9, 10. "But God commendeth his love toward us, in that while

we were yet sinners, Christ died for us. Much more then, being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him. For if when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled we shall be saved by his life." 2 Cor. v, 18-21. "And all things are of God, who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation; to wit, that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them; and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation. Now then we as ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us; we pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God. For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him."

Having briefly investigated the nature of the atonement, I will now consider:-

II. The difficulties in the way of man's salvation, which renders an atonement necessary. They are:-

1. The penalty of God's law for Adamic, or original transgression.
2. The penalty for individual, or personal transgression.

To have clear views of the relation these penalties sustain to the atonement, it is of great importance that we understand, first, the relation they sustain to each other. They are denominated by some writers, a first and second death. But the terms first and second, are relative terms, pointing out the order in which the events specified occur. They are in all cases dependent on the supposed or actual existence of each other. A second supposes a first,

and a first supposes a second. Death, being the negative of life, must be preceded by life, hence a first and second death must be preceded by a first and second life. It would, therefore, be just as proper to call the rewards of the gospel a first and second life, as to call the penalties of the law a first and second death. The same that would make these a first and second would those also. There must be two lives and two deaths, to make either a first or a second, But had not the scheme of redemption been devised, man would never have lived a second life, consequently, could never have died a second death. What, in such case, would the penalty have been for the sin of our first parents? Would it have been a first death? Nay, verily; because no second would ever succeed it; hence it could not be a first. But, from the fact that man is actually exposed to two deaths, we call the one that occurs first, a first death, and the one that occurs second, a second death, just as we speak of a first and second life, a first and second birth, and a first and second Adam, simply to denote their order, and not their nature.

The penalty of God's law for original sin is death, (not a first death.) Mark the import of the language in which the first penalty is clothed! "For in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." "As in Adam all die," etc. The penalty for personal sin is equally explicit. "The wages of sin is death." (Not a second death, but simply death.) "Sin when finished bringeth forth death." To illustrate: The penalty in the State of Illinois for murder is death. Now, suppose a man to be executed according to their law, then to be raised from the dead, and executed a second time, for another offense,

would the fact of the same man's being put to death a second time, make the penalty in that State, for murder, a first death? Certainly not. But, in case the same man should die a second time, it would be, in reference to its order, a first death.

Christ not having died a previous death, and not being exposed to a subsequent death, could die neither a first nor a second death, but, as the Scriptures plainly teach, "He died the death of the cross." "For if when we were sinners, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son," etc. Not a first, or a second death, but "the death." This brings us to consider the difficulties in the way of man's salvation:-

1. The penalty of the law of God for the sin of our first parents, or the death threatened Adam in the Garden of Eden. The investigation of the nature of this penalty properly belongs to another part of this subject. The actual existence of such a penalty, or the fact of man's being exposed to death for Adam's transgression, is all I propose investigating under this head.

God having created man, appointed to govern him by a just, wise, and holy law, the reward of which was eternal life the penalty of which was death. This reward and penalty was represented by two trees, i. e., the "tree of life," and the "tree of knowledge of good and evil." Man's will was left free to choose the one and to refuse the other. Eating the fruit of these trees involved the great principles of obedience or disobedience; hence by eating of the fruit of the tree of life, Adam would have received the promised reward for obedience, which was eternal life; but, by eating of the tree of the knowledge

of good and evil, he must suffer the penalty which was death. Gen. ii, 16, 17. "And the Lord God commanded the man, saying, "Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat: but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it; for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." By this passage, we learn that the penalty of the law of God threatened Adam for was disobedience was death. But did Adam disobey? He did. Chap. iii, 1-14. Did he suffer the penalty? He did. Chap. v, 5. "And all the days that Adam lived were nine hundred and thirty years; and he died." Some may object to this view, because Adam did not die a literal death in the day he ate of the forbidden tree; he must, therefore, have died a *spiritual* death. This objection will be noticed in connection with the *nature* penalty threatened Adam.

But what relation do Adam's posterity sustain to this penalty? Are they exposed to the same death? Ans. They are. To this, the whole Scriptures bear testimony. The decree has never been repealed, that "dust thou art and unto dust shalt thou return." Mark the doom of Adam's immediate posterity. They shared their father's fate. The record reads thus: "And all the days of Seth were nine hundred and twelve years; and he died." "And all the days of Enos were nine hundred and five years; and he died." "And all the days of Cainan were nine hundred and ten years; and he died." "And all the days of Mahalaleel were eight hundred ninety and five years; and he died." "And all the days of Jared were nine

hundred sixty and two years; and he died." "And all the days of Methuselah were nine hundred sixty and nine years; and he died."

12

"And all the days of Lamech were seven hundred seventy and seven years; and he died." Gen. v, 8-31. Noah died; [Chap. ix, 29;] Abraham, Isaac and Jacob died; [Chaps. xxv, 8; xxxv, 29; xlix, 33; Heb. xi, 13;] David, a man after God's own heart, must also die; 1 Kings ii, 10; Acts ii, 29. Time would fail to speak of Joshua, Samuel, and all the Prophets, who died in the hope of a "better resurrection." Heb. xi, 35. Job declares the grave to be the final destination of all living. "For I know that thou wilt bring me to death, and to the house appointed for all living." Job xxx, 23.

The apostle Paul places the question beyond the possibility of a doubt: he plainly teaches that Adam's sin involved his whole posterity in death. "Wherefore as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned." Rom. v, 12. Not that all have sinned "after the similitude of Adam's transgression;" [verse 14;] but by, or through Adam, as our representative, all have sinned. Adam sinned personally, whereas, his posterity sinned by proxy, or by their representative. Adam, being the representative of the entire human race, as a natural consequence, entails his own nature and destiny upon all his posterity. Having, therefore, incurred a mortal, corruptible, dying nature, he entails the same nature upon the generations proceeding from him. Of course he could give his children no better nature than that which he himself possessed. Again, the same Apostle says, "For as in Adam all die:" [1 Cor. xv, 22:] thereby teaching that all mankind suffer the penalty threatened Adam in the garden of Eden.

13

a. Enoch and Elijah are excepted; and the righteous living at the Advent of our blessed Redeemer, will be exceptions to this statement, unless those did, and these will undergo a change equivalent to death. Who dare say they did not, and these will not?

b. The first penalty, or the death it inflicts, is unconditional. There were no conditions, or provisos attached to the penalty. The language in which it is expressed, excludes the possibility of pardon, without setting the law and its penalty aside. "For in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." "For dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return." It is inflexible; it must have the life of its victim.

c. It being unconditional, the righteous suffer it as well as the wicked; hence all die, (infants not excepted,) irrespective of moral character. "In Adam all die."

d. This death being entailed upon the human family by their first parents, or by an act over which they had no control, they are not personally responsible. This brings me to notice:-

2. The penalty of the law of God for personal sins. It is death. Both Testaments represent man as being exposed to death for personal sins. But, inasmuch as all die for original sin, none can die for personal sin, without a resurrection to a second life; hence the Bible teaches that there will be a resurrection of the dead, "both of the just and the unjust." To be preceded by a

second life, it must, in the nature of things, be a second death; hence while the penalty for personal sin is only one death, yet in reference to its relation to the penalty for original sin, it will be a second death. When I speak of

14

this death as a second death, I wish to be distinctly understood as having no reference whatever to the nature of the penalty for personal sin, but only its relation to a previous death. This must be the only sense in which the Bible speaks of it as a second death.

That man is exposed to die a second time is evident from many very explicit texts of Scripture. Moses makes the most solemn and touching appeal to the children of Israel, saying, "I call heaven and earth to record this day against you, that I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing: therefore choose life, that both thou and thy seed may live." This was a life which might be obtained by obedience; and a death that would be incurred by disobedience; hence it cannot refer to the first life or first death; for these are not conditional. Prov. xix, 16. "He that keepeth the commandment keepeth his own soul; but he that despiseth his ways shall die." All die the first death whether they "despise his ways" or not. Eze. xviii, 4. "Behold, all souls are mine; as the soul of the father, so also the soul of the son is mine: the soul that sinneth, it shall die." Verse 20. All die the first death, whether they sin or not; it must therefore refer to a second, or another death. Chap. xxxiii, 11. "Say unto them, As I live saith the Lord God, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked; but that the wicked turn from his way and live: turn ye, turn ye, from your evil ways; for why will ye die, O house of Israel."

The death threatened Adam cannot be averted by turning to God, consequently, this text must refer to another death. Jer. xxi, 8. "And unto this

15

people thou shalt say, Thus saith the Lord, behold I set before you the way of life, and the way of death." Jesus Christ says, "For if ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins." John viii, 24. This was a death that might be averted by faith; hence it must refer to another death, besides the one all men die, whether they believe or not.

Paul addresses personal agents who are responsible for their own actions, and tells them that the wages of sin is death. Rom. vi, 23. "For the wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord." Man cannot have eternal life in the present life, it must therefore refer to a future life; the death here threatened refers to the same state; hence both must be in the world to come, when man receives his reward for obedience or disobedience. See John v. 28, 29; Mark x, 28-31; Rom. ii, 7; Tit. i, 2. Life and death are also contrasted in Chap. viii, 13. Sin when finished bringeth forth death. James i, 15. "Then when lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin; and sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death." Personal sins will not finish their work until man is raised to a second life, to die again. But they that shall be accounted worthy to attain to that resurrection ("the resurrection of the just," Luke xiv, 14,) and the world to come (Mark x, 30,) will not die again, but be as the angels. Luke xx, 35, 36. "But they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection

from the dead, neither marry, nor are given in marriage: neither can they die any more."

1. This is the peculiar privilege of none but the righteous: "They which shall be accounted worthy."

16

etc. The unworthy will have part in the second resurrection [Rev. xx, 4, 5, 6,] and the second death.

2. "Neither can they die any more." This cannot mean more and most death; but, that they cannot die again. We are plainly told that all who do not overcome (are not *worthy*) shall die again, i. e., a second time. Rev. ii, 11. "He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the Churches; He that overcometh, shall not be hurt of the second death." The converse is, he that does not overcome shall be hurt of the second death. See also Chap. xx, 6. "Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection: on such the second death hath no power," etc; the opposite of which is, cursed and unholy is he that hath part in the second resurrection: on such the second death shall have power.

The lake of fire produces the second death. Rev. xxi, 8. "But the fearful and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone; which is the second death." The Bible nowhere teaches a resurrection from this death.

a. This is a second death, not to denote the penalty for personal sins, (that is death,) but to denote its relation to a previous death, which the same characters will have died.

b. The penalty for personal sins is inexorable. There are no conditions, or provisoes, attached to it, whereby it may be enforced, or set aside as the judge may choose. It must be inflicted, if justice be maintained. The penalty is inflicted, if a substitute be accepted, the same as though the guilty suffer

17

it. It must be suffered, either by the guilty, or by a substitute. And the only difference between the penalty threatened Adam, and that threatened his posterity, is, the Judge would accept no substitute in that case; (Adam and his posterity must die,) whereas, in this, he freely offers to accept the death of his Son in our stead.

c. Those who die in infancy, not being personal sinners, the law will have no claims on them for personal transgressions; hence not being subject to die again, when made alive by the second Adam, they will live forever.

Now, until these difficulties be removed, there can be no permanent salvation for fallen man. Any salvation wrought out for him in the present life, can avail but little while death remains back to captivate its victim. Any salvation in the future life, will be of little value, while another death remains still back, to drag its hapless victim down to irretrievable ruin.

Having investigated, first, the nature of the atonement, second, the difficulties in the way of man's salvation, which render the atonement necessary, I propose considering,

III. The nature of these difficulties; viz., the nature of the deaths to which man is exposed for the sin of Adam, and for his own personal sins. This proposition involves the nature of the penalty of the law of God; or, the condition in which those deaths place man. Does the responsible and intelligent man die? or, does all that is noble, intelligent and responsible about man, escape death, while the unintelligent, and irresponsible part of man's nature alone, is subject to death? or does the whole man, as an

18

intelligent and responsible being suffer the same penalty; i. e., death?

In the investigation of the atonement, much depends on the answers to these questions; for if death, as modern theologians vainly teach, be the separation of soul and body, while the body is remanded back to dust, and the soul doomed to an endless life in conscious misery, then Christ in suffering the penalty of the law, (as the Bible plainly teaches he did,) must have lost himself, *soul* and *body*, to redeem man. But if, as I shall endeavor to prove, the whole man, as an intelligent, responsible being, is subject to death, literal death, then all that the law demanded of Christ, as our substitute, was a literal death-the death of the whole, intelligent, responsible being.

But in order to a right understanding of the nature of the death man dies, it is necessary we should have correct views of the nature of man. Our views of death will, in all cases, harmonize with our views of man's nature. If we believe man to be a compound of mortality and immortality, we must give death a two-fold meaning, and understand the same term as having two distinct significations at the same time. If any part of man's nature be immortal, that part cannot die; hence death, when addressed to that part, must be understood in a figurative sense: that which is mortal must die; hence death, when applied to that part, must be understood in its obvious and literal sense. In the investigation of the nature of man, I will view man,

1. In his creation. Where, in man's history, might we expect to find the origin and existence of such a distinct, spiritual nature, as the "immortal

19

soul," if not in the history of his creation; and what must be our astonishment, not to find, in the entire Bible record, such an intimation. In Gen. i, 26, God makes known his intention to make man. In chap. ii, 7, he tells us the material out of which man was made. The record reads thus: "And the Lord God formed man (not man's body only) of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his (man's) nostrils the breath of life; and man (formed of the dust of the ground) became a living soul." It was the man formed of the dust of the ground who became a living soul, person, or man. Read Paul's inspired commentary on this text, written more than four thousand years afterwards. 1 Cor xv, 45. "And so it is written, (where was it thus written? in Gen. ii, 7, was the only place,) The first man Adam was made a living soul, the last Adam was made a quickening spirit. The first man is of the earth, earthy: the second man is the Lord from heaven." Verse 47. Mark well the language: "The first man Adam was made a living soul; the first man is of the earth, earthy;" thereby teaching, 1st. That the first man, and the first living soul, are synonymous terms. 2nd. That the first man Adam, the first living soul,

was of the earth; i. e., made of earth: "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground." What can be plainer? In the entire record of man's creation, we fail to find any intimation of his being in possession of any nature apart from the organism formed of the dust of the ground.

2. In his relation to the law of God. What was his nature, morally, physically and intellectually? Was he mortal? immortal? or was he neither? Ans. He was neither. That he was not mortal, is evident.

20

1st. From the fact that the penalty was death. Mortal signifies dying. To pass sentence of "dying thou shalt die," upon a dying man, would be no penalty at all. 2nd. The reward of obedience was eternal life. Now, if Adam was mortal, he must, from his very nature, die, whether he obeyed, or disobeyed; but that he was not mortal is evident, from the fact, that he had the privilege of eating of the tree of life, and living forever. That he was not immortal is evident, 1st. From the fact, that the penalty for disobedience was death, which could not have been executed, had man been immortal; for every definition of immortality excludes the possibility of death. Immortal-deathless; deathlessness, etc. 2nd. From the relation man sustained to the tree of life. See Gen. iii, 22, 23. "And the Lord God said, Behold, the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil: and now lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat and live forever: therefore the Lord God sent him forth from the garden of Eden." etc. If Adam was naturally immortal, why was it necessary to plant a tree in the garden for the perpetuation of his existence? Why was it necessary to drive him from the garden, and guard the tree of life, lest he should eat and live forever, if he was immortal and would live forever, whether he ate or not? What, then, was his nature? Ans. It was neither mortal nor immortal, but susceptible of either. Adam was placed upon probation. He was an undeveloped being. His nature, as well as his character, was suspended up on his action towards law. Hence he was susceptible of either good or evil, mortality or immortality. Two trees were placed before him, and he was left

21

free to choose between them. These trees represented two distinctive natures and destinies. To eat of one, he would become mortal and die: to eat of the other, he would become immortal and live forever. He did eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil; consequently incurred a mortal, corruptible, dying nature. This brings me to notice man,

3. In his relation to the execution of the penalty of God's law. The law and its penalty read thus: "And the Lord God commanded the man, saying, Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat; but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it; for in the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die;" or *dying thou shalt die*. See margin. The eating and dying are both represented, in the marginal reading, as a gradual work. See the margin of "thou mayest freely eat," verse 16; and "thou shalt surely die," verse 17. You cannot fail to see that the penalty, according to the marginal reading, requires two conditions: 1st. A dying condition: "*dying thou etc.*" 2nd. A dead condition: "*dying thou shalt die.*"

When Adam is adjudged guilty, and God proceeds to pronounce the penalty of his law, will he give us a correct exposition of the nature of the penalty? He certainly will. All earthly judges in issuing their verdicts against condemned criminals, either use the precise language of the penalties they denounce, or language synonymous. Will the Judge of all the earth be less reasonable, in his mode of procedure against the transgressors of his law, than fallible human judges in the execution of human laws? To threaten one thing, and to inflict another, would be unjust; because in that case, the subjects

22

of the law could have no warning against the punishment to be inflicted. But our Judge is a just Judge, and will leave all his subjects without excuse; hence he will make the penalty of his law so plain and explicit, that no one can fail to understand it, unless by the most palpable neglect, or consummate wickedness. With these preparatory remarks, enter, kind reader, with me, upon the investigation of this deeply interesting subject, the nature of that penalty we all suffer for Adam's transgression.

No need of witnesses to convict: they both confess their criminality; and God proceeds to pronounce the penalty. "And unto Adam he said, Because thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife, and hast eaten of the tree of which I commanded thee, saying, Thou shalt not eat of it: cursed is the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life. In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground; for out of it wast thou taken: for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return." Gen. iii, 17, 19. We will note,

1. The perfect analogy between the penalty itself, and God's own exposition of it. Penalty-"*dying thou shalt die.*" Exposition-"*in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life: in the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground; for out of it wast thou taken: for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return?*" From this, we learn that Adam was to be in a sorrowing, sweating, toiling, dying condition, until he returned unto the ground; i. e., until he was dead. Thus God not only denounced the penalty of his law, but actually employed the agents for its execution. He arrayed

23

the elements of heaven and earth against him, and doomed him to wear out his constitution by toil and sorrow. Then to complete the work, and make the execution of the sentence absolutely certain, the Lord drives him from the garden, and guards the tree of life by a flaming sword. Mark the language of Jehovah: "And now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live forever; therefore, the Lord God sent him forth from the garden of Eden," etc. He had just partaken of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil; and now, lest he put forth his hand and take *also*; (in *addition*, or *likewise*;) which shows that he had not eaten of the tree of life. That tree now being guarded, there remains no hope for Adam: he must die. He did die. "And all the days that Adam lived were nine hundred and thirty years: and he died." Thus was literally fulfilled the penalty-"*dying thou shalt die.*" He was in a dying condition nine hundred and thirty years: and has been in a dead condition for about five thousand years.

2. The condition in which the execution of the penalty places man; i. e., the returning of the man back to the dust: "For dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return." The reason here given why man returns to dust, is, that he was made of dust; "for, (because,) dust thou art," etc. Compare this with chap. ii, 7. "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground." Death being the reverse of life, resolves man into his original elements; hence was man composed of any other elements, death would resolve him back into these elements; but, being composed wholly of earth, or dust, death, as a matter of course, will return him back to dust. David's description

24

of death harmonizes with this view: "Put not your trust in princes, nor in the son of man, in whom there is no help. His breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth," etc. Ps. cxlvi, 3, 4. God made man of earth, and constituted him a living man, by giving him breath. In death the order is reversed. "His breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth." "Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return." "For that which befalleth the sons of men, befalleth beasts; even one thing befalleth them: as the one dieth, so dieth the other; yea, they have all one breath; so that a man hath no pre-eminence above a beast; for all is vanity. All go unto one place; all are of the dust, and all return to dust again." Eccl. iii, 19, 20. By these plain texts of scripture, we learn that death, or the penalty threatened our first parents, reduces the whole human family to their original element; i. e., to the dust of the earth. Man, being unconscious and unintelligent before he was created, will as a natural consequence, be in the same condition, when resolved into his original elements; "he will be as though he had not been;" and without a resurrection from the dead, he would remain in that condition to all eternity.

The following objections will be urged against the views presented in this article.

1. Man is in the image of God. God has no form; hence, the image man sustains to God, cannot consist in form; it must, therefore, consist in nature. God is immortal; hence, that portion of man's nature which is in the image of God, must be immortal.

This objection is predicated upon a false premise; remove the premise, therefore, and the objection will be removed. It grows out of the anti-Bible statement,

25

ment, that God has no form. The text quoted to sustain the objection, is a strong proof text that God has form, or personality. "And God said, Let us make man in our image," etc. Gen. i, 26. Here God proposes to *make* man in his image; not to make man, and then put his image into him, or stamp his image upon him; but to *make* him in his image. "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground; [chap. ii, 7;] hence, a being formed of the dust of the ground was in the image of God. The simplest definition of image, is, form; hence, man, made of the dust of the ground, was in the form of God; but for man to be in the form of God, God must have form. That Christ was in the form of man, all admit; and the Scriptures teach that he was in the form of God the Father. "Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus; who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to

be equal with God." If God has no form, how can Christ be in the form of God? but that God has form is evident from the fact, that Christ is in the form of God. "With this view, we are prepared to understand the meaning of Christ's language: "He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father." John xiv, 9. Christ being the form, or representative, of the Father, by seeing Christ, they saw the Father. But what of Christ could be seen? Nothing, save his form. The term, image, signifies form in the following texts: Gen. i, 26; v, 3; ix, 6; 1 Cor. ii, 7; James iii, 9.

2. Man alone, of all the creatures God created, is denominated a living soul; therefore, man must possess a nature which the inferior animals do not possess: this nature we denominate the immortal soul.

26

This objection, being founded also upon a false statement, must fail with the statement. The first time the term living soul occurs in the Bible, it is applied to every thing that moves and breathes. See Gen. i, 30. "And to every beast of the earth, and to every fowl of the air, and to everything that creepeth upon the earth, wherein *is living soul*," see margin. Also Rev. xvi, 3. "And the second angel poured out his vial upon the sea; and it became as the blood of a dead man; and every living soul died in the sea." It was the man, made of the dust of the ground, became a living soul, not that God made a living soul and put into him. Compare 1 Cor. xv, 45, 47.

3. Of man alone, it is asserted, that God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; hence, there must be something about man superior to the beasts: that something we call the deathless Spirit, the breath, (that is, a part) of God.

This, too, is a mistake, equally fatal to the objection. The same term is applied to every beast, bird, fish and insect. "And behold I, even I, do bring a flood of waters upon the earth, to destroy all flesh, wherein is the breath of life," etc. "And they went in unto Noah into the ark, two and two of all flesh, wherein is the breath of life. All in whose nostrils was the breath of life, of all that was in the dry land died." Gen. vi, 17; vii, 15, 22. It was literal air and literal life. See Isa. ii, 22; Job xxii, 3; Eccl. iii, 19.

4. How can matter think? Ans. By the power of God. God can as easily make matter think as anything else.

5. God decreed, that in the day Adam ate of

27

the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, he should die. He did not die a literal death, for more than nine hundred years after that day; hence, the death threatened must be understood in a spiritual or figurative sense. This departure from the literal signification of the term death, grows out of a supposed necessity; if, therefore, it can be shown that no such necessity exists, the reason for such a departure will be removed. The proper rendering of the Hebrew terms translated, "thou shalt surely die," is, "*dying thou shalt die*." (See margin of Gen. ii, 17.) This language demands two conditions: 1st. A dying condition: 2nd. A dead condition. The first condition must precede the second. The first commenced when Adam commenced dying: he commenced dying in the day that he ate thereof. In that day he became a mortal, dying being, and continued in the first condition nine hundred and thirty years; when he passed into the second condition; and he will

continue in the last condition until the trump shall sound and the dead be raised.
1. Thess. iv, 16.

Having investigated the nature of the penalty of God's law for original sin, and having shown that it reduces the whole man to the dust of the earth, I now propose showing that all the plain, literal teachings of the Bible in reference to the condition of the dead harmonize with this view.

Read the history of the death of all the patriarchs and prophets, (except Enoch and Elijah,) and you will find no intimation of any distinctive entity such as the immortal soul, or deathless spirit, which survived death. But, they lived, they died, and that all is said about them, save what is recorded of what they said and did. Compare the simple record

28

of the death of those holy men who died in faith with the obituaries of the present day. See Gen. v, 5, 8, 11, 14, 17, 20, 27, 31; ix, 29; xxiii, 17-20; xxv, 8; xxxv, 29; xlix, 29-33; 1, 24-26. Sleep is the most common term to denote the condition of the man in death. Read the following texts. Deut. xxxi, 16; 2 Sam. vii, 12; 1 Kings ii, 10, 11, 21, 43; 2 Chron. xi, 31; 2 Kings xx, 21; 2 Chron. xxxii, 33; xxvi, 23; Job iii, 13; vii, 21; xiv, 12; Ps. lxxvi, 5; Matt. xxvii, 52; Acts vii, 60; xiii, 36; 1 Cor. xv, 6, 18, 20, 51; 1 Thess. iv, 13-15; v, 10; 2 Pet. iii, 4. A more beautiful and appropriate symbol of death could not be found. In profound slumber there is no consciousness-no knowledge. Worn down with the labors and anxieties of the day, the weary traveler prostrates his aching frame upon a bed to sleep; mark that pilgrim, how sweetly he sleeps, how quietly he rests-eight hours elapse-he awakes-it is a blank to him-he wakes up just where he went to sleep; he commences thinking just where he left off the evening before. A dreamful state is a state of partial wakefulness. In profound slumber a person never dreams; the blood retires from the brain, it becomes inactive. All the organs of thought, of memory, being entirely inactive, of course, he cannot think; or even if he could, the organs of memory being paralyzed, how could he call to mind the result of such action? He could not. Transfer the quietude of unconscious sleep to the condition of all the dead, and you have the Bible view.

How quietly they sleep! "They shall not awake, nor be raised out of their sleep" "till the heavens be no more." The heavens may thunder and

29

the earth quake, the sea and the waves may roar, nations may rise, and empires may crumble to dust, and yet they hear not the sound thereof-they know it not. The rich and the poor, the small and the great are there, "with kings and counsellors of the earth, which built desolate places for themselves; or with princes that had gold, who filled their houses with silver: as infants which never saw light There the wicked cease from troubling; and there the weary be at rest. There the prisoners rest together; they hear not the voice of the oppressor. The small and great are there; and the servant is free from his master." Job iii, 14-19. No one associates pain, or trouble, or anxiety, with sleep; these belong to the succession of events connected with conscious existence. But in the grave there are no days, or weeks, or months, or years; the past, present, and future are a blank. The time which shall have elapsed from the death of Abel to the

resurrection, will be no more than that of the last saint who shall die. They will be judged, raised, rewarded if righteous, at the same time; and thus dispense with the necessity of a double judgment, and of rewarding or punishing men before they are judged: or if wicked, they will be raised and receive their recompense at the same time.

I will now investigate those portions of holy writ which speak in explicit language of man's condition in death. All the figures, parables, and metaphors must in all cases be harmonized with the plain teachings of the Bible. With this old Protestant rule for our guide, let us enter upon the investigation of this subject, having a desire to ascertain just what the Scriptures teach in reference to the dead; not what

30

we would have them teach. What saith the Scriptures, and not what saith our creeds, or ministers, should be the motto of every Christian. "To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." Isa. viii, 20. Amen. Then to the *testimony* let us go.

Job says, [Chap. vii, 21,] "And why dost thou not pardon my transgression, and take away mine iniquity? for now shall I sleep in the dust; and thou shalt seek me in the morning, but I shall not be." He declares that he would sleep in the dust, ["Unto dust shalt thou return,"] and that his Maker should seek him in the morning, but he should not be. "To be," signifies to exist. Why should Job not exist? Because he would return to dust. The Bible gives no account of but one Job, hence if Job is *asleep* in the dust, there can be no other Job awake in Paradise at the same time.

Again he says, "O that I had given up the ghost, and no eye had seen me! I should have been as though I had not been," etc. Job x, 18, 19. Here Job wishes he had died in infancy, and declares, had such been the case, he would have been as though he had not been. What would have been Job's condition, had he never existed? Would he have been conscious, or intelligent? No. Then had he died in infancy, he would not have been conscious or intelligent. Does not death place adults in the same condition it does infants? Let Job answer for himself. "Are not my days few? cease then, let me alone, that I may take comfort a little, before I go whence I shall not return, even to the land of darkness, and the shadow of death. A land of

31

darkness, as darkness itself; and of the shadow of death, without any order, and where the light is as darkness." Here Job tells us in plain terms his views of the place to which he expected to go at death, and how unlike all the descriptions we have ever read of Paradise, or the place to which the pious of the present day expect to go. They represent it as a place of order, and of ineffable light, from which its glorified visitants may return at pleasure, to minister to their surviving friends on earth.

Again he says, "For there is hope of a tree, if it be cut down, that it will sprout again, and that the tender branches thereof will not cease. Though the root thereof wax old in the earth, and the stock thereof die in the ground; yet through the scent of water, it will bud and bring forth boughs like a plant." Chap.s xiv, 7-9.

Not so with man, he dieth, and wasteth away, and all the skill of earth cannot extort from the cold and lifeless clay any signs of life. "But man dieth and wasteth away; yea, man giveth up the ghost, and where is he? As the waters fail from the sea, and the flood decayeth and drieth up; so man lieth down, and riseth not: till the heavens be no more, they shall not awake, nor be raised out of their sleep." Verses 10-12. This implies that they shall awake, and be raised out of their sleep when the heavens be no more.

"O that thou wouldest hide me in the grave, that thou wouldest keep me secret, until thy wrath be past, that thou wouldest appoint me a set time, and remember me!" Verse 13. He then asks one of the most important questions ever propounded to dying man: one that the philosophy of the world has

32

never been able to answer. "If a man die, shall he live again? all the days of my appointed time will I wait, till my change come." Verse 14. Job, having propounded this important question in the form of an affirmation, (as if he had affirmed, If a man die, he shall live *again*.) expresses his resignation-"all the days of my appointed time will I wait, till my change come." Now, if we can ascertain the place where Job waits, we may know with certainty, where all the righteous wait from death to the resurrection; for Job was a righteous man; and if any would be permitted to enter upon their rewards at death, it would be he. Let Job answer for himself. "If I wait, the grave is mine house." He then describes the nature of his habitation. "I have made my bed in darkness." Chap. xvii, 13. He next describes his nearest relation, and associates: the spirits of departed saints, of course. Not exactly. "I have said to corruption, Thou art my father: to the worm, Thou art my mother, and my sister. And where is now my hope?" Verses 14, 15. Ans. In the resurrection. "Thou shalt call, and I will answer thee: thou wilt have a desire to the work of thine hands." Chap. xiv, 15. Job was not an infidel, although he believed in the unconsciousness of the dead. He would have his hope in the glorious doctrine of the resurrection, written in a book, and lead in the rock forever; that the latest generations might read it. Hear the language of triumphant and all-conquering hope: O that my words were now written! O that they were printed in a book! That they were graven with an iron pen, and lead in the rock forever! For I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall

33

stand at the latter day upon the earth: and though after my skin worms destroy this *body*, yet in my flesh shall I see God; whom I shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold, and not another, etc." Chap. xix, 23-27. Note, first, worms were to destroy him, i. e., after etc. worms destroy this body etc. Verse 26. Second, he is to see the Lord with the eyes of the identical body that worms have destroyed. Third, his seeing God is predicated, not of death, but the resuscitation of the eyes and flesh, which worms had destroyed. Verse 26. Fourth, he expected to see God, not at death, but at the latter day, i.e., at the second advent and resurrection. Verse 25.

David's testimony harmonizes with Job's. Ps. vi, 5. "For in death there is no remembrance of thee: in the grave who shall give thee thanks." Is memory an attribute of the soul, or spirit? then that intelligent part ceases at death. What! the

righteous dead not remember their Creator? "For in death there is no remembrance of thee." Shall not they give him thanks for all his acts of kindness? "In the grave who (none) shall give thee thanks." Heaven, without thanks, or remembrance of God, would not be a very desirable place for a Christian! Yet, such is the state of all the dead, according to the above text.

Paul, speaking of David, [Acts xiii, 36,] says, "For David after he had served his own generation, by the will of God, fell on sleep, and was laid unto his fathers, and saw corruption." A short time before he fell asleep (or died and saw corruption) he expressed his hope. "As for me, I will behold thy face in righteousness: I shall be satisfied, when I

34

awake with thy likeness." Ps. xvii, 15. When will David awake in his (God's) likeness? When the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised. See 1 Thess. iv, 13-18; Phil, iii, 20, 21.

Read Peter's testimony in reference to David, written near two thousand years after his death. "Men and brethren, let me freely speak unto you of the patriarch David, that he is both dead and buried, and his sepulchre is with us unto this day." Acts ii, 29. But the theology of the present day teaches that good men ascend to heaven at death. Who would be permitted to ascend to heaven, if David would not?-and yet, an inspired Apostle informs us, that David had not ascended into the heavens, in his day. Acts ii, 34. "For David is not ascended into the heavens, etc"

Again, David asks the following questions, in reference to the condition of the dead, and leaves them for us to answer: "Wilt thou shew wonders to the dead? shall the dead arise and praise thee? Selah. Shall thy loving kindness be declared in the grave? or thy faithfulness in destruction? Shall thy wonders be known in the dark? and thy righteousness in the land of forgetfulness?" Notice, first, it is necessary that the dead should *arise* in order to their praising God. Ps. lxxxviii, 10. Second, his loving kindness shall be declared in the grave, (in the resurrection of the dead,) verse 11, first clause. Third, death, the grave, and destruction, are synonymous terms. Compare the last clause of verse 11 with verses 10 and 11. Fourth, the dead are in a state of darkness and forgetfulness. Verse 12. We are taught that the pious dead praise the Lord more than the living. The poet responds to

35

this sentiment, in the following touching strains:

"And when my voice is lost in death, Praise shall employ my nobler powers."

But the pious Psalmist says, "The dead praise not the Lord, neither any that go down into silence." Ps. cxv, 17. Why cannot the dead praise the Lord? Ans. Because they go down into silence-the grave. Death is represented as the great deliverer, whose errand of mercy is to loose the galling fetters, to break the cruel chains, and set the captive spirit free; to enfranchise the immortal mind, and give its nobler powers a wider, loftier range. But what saith the Scriptures? "Put not your trust in princes, nor in the son of man, in whom there is no help." Ps. cxlvi, 3. Why not put our trust in princes? Who could protect us if princes (who sway their iron sceptres o'er all the world) could not? He gives the reason. "His breath

goeth forth, he returneth to his earth; in that very day his thoughts perish." Verse 4. Observe, first, when a prince's breath goeth forth, he has no more power to protect us than the poorest peasant. "Kings and counsellors, . . . the small and great are there." Job iii, 14, 19, Second, "In that very day his thoughts perish." That the thoughts constitute the intelligence of the man, all admit. They perish, i. e., *come to an end, cease to be, die*. If we must have a heaven or hell for our departed friends or foes, we must be contented with a heaven, or hell, without thoughts. "Their memory and their sense are gone."

Solomon inherited his father's sentiments, in reference to the condition of the dead. He draws the analogy between a living dog and a dead lion, and shows the pre-eminence of the former over the latter.

36

"For to him that is joined to all the living, there is hope; (while there is life there is hope;) for a living dog is better than a dead lion." Eccl. ix, 4. So utterly powerless is a lion, (the king of beasts,) under the dominion of death, that even a living dog is better. From this comparison, he shows us the disparity between a living and a dead man; thereby teaching that there is as much disparity between a living and a dead man, as there is between a living dog and a dead lion. "For [because] the living know that they shall die; but the dead know not anything." Verse 5, first clause. The same part that has knowledge in a living man, knows nothing [has no knowledge] in a dead man. Just as certainly as living men have knowledge, just so certainly dead men know nothing. Are *love hatred*, and *envy*, attributes of the mind, or soul? if so, they perish. "Also their love, and their hatred and their envy, is now perished, etc. Verse 6. "Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do *it* with thy might; for *there is* no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in the grave, whither thou goest." Think of happiness, or misery, consciousness, or intelligence, without work, or device, or knowledge, or wisdom. These being attributes of the organism, perish with it. As man dieth, so dieth the brute; they all go to one place. Eccl. iii, 19, 20. Isaiah tells us what would have been his condition, had he died. Chap. xxxviii, 17-20.

The foregoing evidences must suffice from the Old Testament. I will divide the New Testament evidences into two classes. First, those texts which represent the hopes of the primitive Christians, as being centred in the resurrection of the dead, and

37

the second advent of Christ, instead of a transfer to heaven at death; which ought not to be the case, if all that is capable of happiness or misery, rewards or punishments, enter upon their respective rewards at death. Hear the motive our blessed Redeemer places before the minds of his people, "But when thou makest a feast, call the poor, the maimed, the lame, the blind, and thou shalt be blessed; for they cannot recompense thee; for thou shalt be recompensed at the resurrection of the just." Luke xiv, 13, 14. Why wait until the resurrection of the just, if they had immortal souls which would go to heaven when they died? Certainly they would receive ample pay for a few meals of victuals before the resurrection. This text proves, as positively as if our Saviour had actually affirmed

it, that no part of man will receive any portion of its rewards between death and the resurrection.

Paul, having enumerated all the ancient worthies, Patriarchs and Prophets, Apostles and Martyrs, and having recounted their sacrifices and sufferings, tells us where and when, they expected to receive their rewards; "that they might obtain a better resurrection." Heb. xi, 35. Read the entire chapter. Why must these faithful servants of the Most High, wait so many hundreds of years for their rewards, if the popular view be correct?

In the chapter quoted, "a better resurrection" is presented as the hope of all those ancient worthies, which would be surpassingly strange, if they expected to enter upon their rewards hundreds and thousands of years before the dead should be raised; but with the view that the dead are unconscious from death to the resurrection, all is plain, and easily understood.

38

Paul in his defense before Felix, a Roman Governor, testifies to the same hope: "But this I confess unto thee, that after the way which they call heresy, so worship I the God of my fathers, believing all things which are written in the law and in the prophets: and have hope toward God, which they themselves also allow, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust." Acts xxiv, 14, 15. Again, he declares the resurrection of the dead to be the hope, saying: "Of the hope and resurrection of the dead I am called in question." Chap. xxiii, 6.

Read the explicit language in which those fathers express their hope. Job says, "All the days of my appointed time will I wait, till my change come. Thou shalt call, and I will answer thee. Thou wilt have a desire to the work of thine hands. . . . For I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand in the latter day upon the earth: and though after my skin worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God; whom I shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold, and not another; though my reins be consumed within me." Job. xiv, 14, 15; xix, 25-27.

David says, "As for me, I will behold thy face in righteousness: I shall be satisfied when I awake with thy likeness." Ps. xvii, 15. 1st. When will David awake? Ans. At the resurrection of the just. Acts xxiv, 14, 15; 1 Cor, xv, 51-57; 1 Thess. iv, 13-17. 2nd. When will David awake in his likeness? Ans. When Christ shall be revealed. Phil. iii, 20, 21; 1 John iii, 2. 3rd. Did David ascend to heaven at death? Ans. He had not ascended in Peter's day. Acts ii, 34.

39

Isaiah, speaking of this hope, says: "Thy dead men shall live, together with my dead body shall they arise. Awake and sing, ye that dwell in dust; for thy dew is as the dew of herbs; and the earth shall cast out her dead." Isa. xxvi, 19. In reference to this glorious hope, Daniel was told that "Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life," etc. Dan. xii, 2. God assures Hosea that this blessed hope shall be realized: "I will ransom them from the power of the grave; I will redeem them from death. O death, I will be thy plagues; O grave, I will be thy destruction." Hos. xiii, 14. Compare this, with the triumphant song of the redeemed: "O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where

is thy victory? The sting of death is sin; and the strength of sin is the law. But thanks be to God, which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ." 1 Cor. xv, 55, 56.

a. A *dead law* can no more sting a man to death than a *dead scorpion*.

b. They shout victory by far too soon, who shout at death. For a man to shout victory over death just as he is sinking beneath his fatal blow, would be like a general shouting victory over an enemy, just as he was surrendering himself and army to that enemy. Death is represented as an enemy; not as a friend, as theologians and poets would have us believe. "The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death." 1 Cor. xv, 26. God's people will not triumph over this enemy until the dead shall be raised incorruptible; [verses 51-57;] when Christ shall be revealed and the righteous dead shall be raised; [verses 20-26;] when the Lord himself shall descend

40

from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God, and the dead in Christ shall be raised. 1 Thess. iv, 16, 17.

c. How different the hope of the fathers from the hope of their offspring of the present day. They had no expectation of receiving any portion of their reward until the advent of Christ and the resurrection, of the dead; these expect theirs at death. The Bible teaches, that when Christ comes his reward is with him: [Rev. xxii, 12:] they teach, that when death comes *his* reward is with him. When Christ would console his disconsolate disciples who mourned because their Saviour was going to leave them, he promised them that he would come again, and receive them unto himself: [John xiv, 1, 2, 3:] thereby teaching that they should see his face no more, after his ascension, until his return to earth, and that he would not receive them unto himself until that time. But the ministers of the present day tell us that they went to Christ, and were received by him more than eighteen hundred years before his second coming. The Bible associates the rewards of the righteous with the kingdom of God; and the establishment of that kingdom with the appearing of Jesus Christ to judge the living and dead. 2 Tim. iv, 1. Compare Dan. ii, 44; vii, 13, 14, with Matt, xxiv, 30; Rev. i, 7; also Dan. vii, 27, with Matt, xxv, 31-35; also verse 34, with Gen. i, 26; Micah iv, 8.

d. How different the consolation Jesus Christ and the apostles would give their bereaved friends, from that which the ministers of our day would give theirs. When our blessed Redeemer, with a heart overflowing with tenderest sympathy, would console the bereaved Martha and Mary, who mourned the

41

death of a beloved brother, he pointed to the grave where their brother was buried, saying, "Thy brother shall rise again." John xi, 23. See where their hopes were placed: "Martha saith unto him, I know that he shall rise again in the resurrection at the last day." Verse 24. But when the professed ministers of the present time would console their bereaved friends, they point toward heaven, saying, Your friends are not dead: they are in heaven: thus dispensing with the necessity of a future judgment, and resurrection of the dead: thus rewarding men before they are judged, and contradicting the harmonious teachings of all the Bible writers, which make all future rewards and punishments consequent upon

the judgment and resurrection of the dead. I cannot find one promise of a reward at death, between the lids of the Bible, or one commandment to prepare for death; but we are invariably pointed to the second advent of Jesus Christ, to raise the righteous dead, and change the living, and then reward them, all at one time, with *immortality* and *eternal life*. See 1 Thess. iv, 13-17; 1 Cor. xv, 22, 23, 50-57.

When Paul would console his Thessalonian brethren, who mourned the loss of dear friends, he points them to the descension of our Lord from heaven to raise the dead and change the living: he gives them all the consolation the gospel can afford: "But I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning them which are asleep, that ye sorrow not, even as others which have no hope. For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him." 1 Thess, iv, 13, 14. *When* will he bring them,

42

and *where* will he bring them from? Ans. "For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first: then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air: and so shall we ever be with the Lord. Wherefore, comfort one another with these words." Verses 16-18. Paul did not expect to receive his reward until the day of the Lord, and the appearing of his Son Jesus Christ. He expresses his hope to his son Timothy, just before his execution; and if any, who have ever lived, could expect to receive their crown at death, Paul might but hear his language: "For I am now ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand. I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith: henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give me at that day; and not to me only, but unto all them also that love his appearing." 2 Tim. iv. 6-8. The worthy patriarchs all died in faith not having received the promises: "These all died in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of them, and embraced them, and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth." Heb. xi, 13. They expected to receive those promised rewards when Paul receives his crown, and when all the martyrs and saints shall be rewarded. Read Heb. xi, 15-40. Verse 35 expresses their hope: "that they might obtain a better resurrection."

Having investigated that class of scriptures which

43

makes all rewards and punishments, after death, dependent upon the advent of Christ and resurrection of the dead, I will notice,

2. Those scriptures which suspend all future life upon the resurrection of the dead. Jesus Christ emphatically declares that Moses taught the resurrection of the dead at the bush: "Now that the dead are raised, even Moses shewed at the bush, when he calleth the Lord the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob." Luke xx, 37. Query. How did Christ prove that the dead shall [see Mark xii, 25] be raised, by quoting the language of Jehovah to Moses in the bush? Ans. God only re-iterated to Moses a promise he had before made to

Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. Compare Ex. iii, 6, with Gen. xxviii, 13. "Moreover he said, I am the God of thy father, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob." "And behold, the Lord stood above it, and said, I am the Lord God of Abraham thy father, and the God of Isaac: the land whereon thou liest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed." God promised Abraham and his seed an everlasting inheritance in the land. Chap. xiii, 14. "And the Lord said unto Abram, after that Lot was separated from him, Lift up now thine eyes, and look from the place where thou art, northward, and southward, and eastward, and westward; for all the land which thou seest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed forever." The Lord made a covenant with Abraham to this effect, saying, "And I will establish my covenant between me and thee, and thy seed after thee, in their generations, for an everlasting covenant; to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee. And I will give unto thee, and to

44

thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession; and I will be their God." Gen. xvii, 7, 8. "These all died in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of them, and embraced them, and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth." Heb. xi, 13. They "sojourned in the land of promise as in a strange country, dwelling in tabernacles with Isaac and Jacob, the heirs with him of the same promise." Verse 9. Stephen testifies that Abraham was not permitted to set his foot on the promised land: "And he gave him none inheritance in it, no, not so much as to set his foot on: yet he promised that he would give it to him for a possession, and to his seed after him," etc. Acts vii, 5. Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, expected to receive the promised inheritance through the medium of "a better resurrection." Heb. xi, 35. To sum up the evidence, God promised Abraham Isaac and Jacob, an everlasting inheritance in the land: "These all died... not having received the promises;" hence, if those promises are ever fulfilled, God must first raise them from the dead. Moses, therefore, taught the resurrection of the dead, by quoting the pledge the Lord gave Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, that he would give them the promised inheritance.

Jesus Christ lays down another premise from which we may deduct the same conclusion. He says: "For he is not the God of the dead, [the dead that shall not live again, as the Sadducees believed,] but of the living," etc., [Luke xx, 38,] i. e., those who shall live again; but Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, are

45

dead; God is their God; therefore, they shall live again. Paul when speaking of those very promises in connection with the resurrection of the dead, declared that God called those things which be not, as though they were: "(As it is written, I have made thee a father of many nations) before him whom he believed, even God who quickeneth the dead, and calleth those things which be not as though they were." Rom. iv, 17. Hence, when Christ spoke of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, as though they were then living, he called those things which were not, as though they were.

From the above testimony, we may deduct the following conclusions: 1st. Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, (and, through them, all their children by faith,) will not receive their promised rewards until they are raised from the dead. 2nd. Their future life is predicated, not of natural immortality, but of their resurrection. 3rd. The language of God to Moses at the bush, was quoted by the Saviour, not to prove that those Patriarchs were not dead, but that they would be raised from the dead, as a necessary prerequisite to their realizing God as their God.

Jesus Christ gives his Father a pledge that of all he has given him, he will lose none: "And this is the Father's will which hath sent me, that of all which he hath given me, I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the last day." John vi, 39. Here Christ gives the Father as a pledge, that he would lose none intrusted to him, but would raise them up at the last day: thereby teaching, that if he did not raise them up, he would lose them. But how could this be true, if they are immortal, will live forever whether raised up or not?

46

What, lose their immortal souls?! Again he says, "And this is the will of him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life: and I will raise him up at the last day." Verse 40. Here our Saviour predicates eternal life on the resurrection at the last day: thereby teaching, that if he should not raise them up at the last day, they would not have everlasting life; which could not be true if they have eternal life as attributes of their nature.

Paul declares that if Christ be not raised from the dead, then the dead shall not be raised; and if the dead be not raised, "then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished." 1 Cor. xv, 12-18. By sleep, the Apostle means death. See verses 13, 16, 20. Now, upon the hypothesis of the deathlessness of man's essential nature, how can it be said of the righteous, that if their dead bodies are not raised, they have perished? Could not the deathless spirit live forever, and enjoy all the bliss of Paradise, even though their unintelligent bodies should never be raised? But with the view that the dead know not anything; that all future life is dependent upon the resurrection of the dead; all is plain and harmonious.

Again, Paul declares that all his sufferings and sacrifices for Christ, would profit him nothing; nay, he goes further, and positively avers, that if the dead rise not, he would adopt the Epicurean motto, "Let us eat and drink; for to-morrow we die." 1 Cor. xv, 32. Hear his bold and decisive language: "If after the manner of men I have fought with beasts at Ephesus, what advantageth it me, if the dead rise not? let us eat and drink; for to-morrow we die."

47

If Paul possessed an *immortal soul*, which will live while God shall live, and co-exist with angels in bliss, or sink beneath the ire of a sin-avenging God, to writhe in anguish and despair while eternity is onward rolling, would it not matter how he lived? whether a good or a bad man? a virtuous or a vicious life? even though his dead body should never be raised? I cannot conceive how the resurrection of Paul's body could materially change the nature or condition of his undying soul, which will have enjoyed the bliss of Paradise at least eighteen

hundred years, before his unconscious body shall be raised! But on the theory of the unconsciousness of the dead, and, consequently, of no resurrection, no future life, it matters not how we live: then all our sacrifices and sufferings for the cause of Christ, would avail us nothing; and then it would be wisdom in us to spend the present life to the very best advantage; (to eat, drink, and be merry;) for it would be all the life we should ever enjoy.

The foregoing texts, prove conclusively, that the dead are in a state of utter unconsciousness, and that all future life is dependent upon the resurrection of the dead. This brings me to notice,

3. Those portions of sacred writ, which exclude the possibility of man's possessing immortality or eternal life in the present state of existence.

1st. Immortality is presented in the New Testament as a condition of the gospel, to be obtained by obedience. Paul, in his letter to the Romans, says, "To them who by patient continuance in well-doing, seek for glory, and honor, and immortality, [God will render] eternal life." Rom. ii, 7. If man possesses immortality as an inherent

48

quality of his nature, why should God command him to seek for it? The fact that God by the mouth of the inspired Apostle, commands us to seek for it by a patient continuance in well-doing, proves, first, that none possess immortality in the present life; second, that none ever will possess it, except those who comply with the conditions.

2nd. Will God confer upon the righteous and wicked indiscriminately, that which he offers as the reward of obedience, and the peculiar privilege of his people? Again, the same Apostle says, "But is now made manifest by the appearing of our Saviour Jesus Christ, who hath abolished death, and hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel." 2 Tim. i, 10. He predicates immortality of the abolition of death: thereby teaching that without a resurrection from the dead, immortality could not be secured for man; but Christ was raised as the first fruits of them that slept; (i.e., were dead;) [1 Cor. xv, 20;] therefore the rest of the dead will not be raised until the harvest of the resurrection; which will not take place until the coming of Christ. "For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive. But every man in his own order: Christ the first fruits; afterward they that are Christ's at his coming." 1 Cor. xv, 22, 23. Compare the foregoing verses with verses 51-55: "Behold I shew you a mystery; we shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump: for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed. For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this

49

mortal must put on immortality. So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory." By the passages quoted, we may learn, first, that Christ in his resurrection, as "the first fruits of them that slept," has given us a pledge that he will abolish death, and give all his children, who are asleep in him, immortality and eternal life, as the

Father abolished his death, and through him, as our surety, "hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel." See Acts xvii, 31, last clause: "Whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead." Second. These blessings will be received when Christ our surety shall return to earth; when "the trumpet shall sound and the dead shall be raised." Third. These inestimable blessings will be enjoyed by none only those who "are Christ's at his coming." Fourth. Life and immortality were brought to light (i.e., made manifest) by the abolition of death, and the resurrection of Jesus Christ, as the first fruits of them that slept."

Life and immortality are brought to light through the gospel. "Who hath abolished death, and brought life and immortality to light through the gospel:" thereby teaching that these are blessings of the gospel, and that none will receive them only those who comply with the conditions of the gospel; and they cannot receive them until they receive the rewards of the gospel; which will not be given until the advent of Christ and the resurrection of the dead. The term immortality occurs just once more between the

50

lids of the Bible: it is there represented as the exclusive prerogative of the Great Jehovah: "Who only hath immortality, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto: whom no man hath seen, nor can see; to whom be honor and power everlasting. Amen." 1 Tim. vi, 16. Here it is positively asserted that God only hath immortality; and yet, it is applied to the most deprived and abandoned wretch of earth. The facts I understand to be these: the Father only is *self-existent*; i.e., hath life (eternal life) in himself; and he has given his Son to have life in himself; that he should give it to them that are his at his coming. Compare John v, 26, with 1 John v, 9-12. "For as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself." "If we receive the witness of men, the witness of God is greater; for this is the witness of God which he hath testified of his Son. He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in himself: he that believeth not God, hath made him a liar, because he believeth not the record that God gave of his Son. And this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life; and this life is in his Son. He that hath the Son, hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God, hath not life." 1st. Eternal life is in the Son of God, i.e., the second Adam, not the first; hence the glory of conferring this blessing upon man belongs to the former, and not to the latter. 2nd. Eternal life has reached no nearer man than the Son of God; and none can have it only by having the Son: "He that hath the Son hath life." Those who do not have the Son cannot have life: "and he that hath not the Son of hath not life." He that believeth on the Son

51

hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son, shall not see life." etc. John iii, 36. 3rd. In what way do we have life by having the Son? Ans. By faith: "He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in himself." By hope: Paul says, "In hope of eternal life, which God, that cannot lie, promised before the world began." Tit. i, 2. "What a man seeth, why doth he yet hope for." Rom. viii 24. When will this hope be realized? Ans. In the world to come. "Then Peter began to say unto him, Lo, we have left all and have followed thee; and Jesus

answered and said, Verily, I say unto you, There is no man that hath left house, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife or children, or lands, for my sake, and the gospel's, but he shall receive an hundred fold now in this time, . . . with persecutions, and in the world to come, eternal life," Mark x, 28-30. Did Jesus Christ offer his disciples as a reward in the world to come, that which they had possessed from their earliest childhood; or even that which they then possessed by virtue of their discipleship? This sacred boon will be conferred upon all the dead, whose lives are hid with Christ in God, at the appearing and glory of Jesus Christ; [Col. iii, 3, 4;] when they reap the rich reward of patient continuance in well-doing. Rom. ii, 7.

3rd. All those who do not believe this record, make God a liar: "And this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life; and this life is in his Son." Every person, without exception, who believes that he inherited eternal life of Adam his first parent, or who believes that he has it, as an inherent part of his nature, makes the only true

52

God a liar, and robs his only begotten Son of the crowning glory of redemption. But blessed be the name of God forever and ever! there are a few who, with gratitude and adoration, are willing to believe the record God hath given of his Son, and give the second Adam all the glory and honor of conferring upon his believing children, the priceless gifts of immortality and eternal life.

a. The foregoing view exhibits the glory and utility of the atonement. It takes the crown of immortality and eternal life from the head of the first Adam, and places it on the brow of the second Adam. It abases man, and elevates his Redeemer. It leaves man a poor, mortal, corruptible, dying creature, without any ability to remedy his condition, and without anything of which to boast. It exhibits Jesus Christ as the only name under heaven, among men, whereby lost sinners can be saved. It presents the Babe of Bethlehem as the fairest among ten thousand, and the one altogether lovely. It makes the *atonement*, the only means, which the infinite wisdom of God could devise for the restoration of our fallen race; hence those who reject this plan must be lost, without hope or mercy. Hasten then O sinner! while Christ may be found, and mercy may be obtained.

b. This view enables us to realize the infinite importance which all the Bible worthies attached to the second advent of Christ, and the resurrection of the dead. They associated the resurrection with, the advent and all future life with the resurrection. They had no expectation of receiving any part of their rewards, for well-doing, until their Lord should return to raise them from the dead,

53

and give them a nature which should never decay, a life which should never end, and an inheritance which should never pass away. For these glorious privileges, they were willing to suffer all the privations earth could heap upon them, and many of them to seal their faith with their own blood, "having respect unto the recompense of the reward."

c. This view reconciles the justice of God. To punish men before they are judged, would be unjust in God or man. According to the Orthodox view, wicked men enter upon their punishments at death; from whose dreary abodes, they

shall ere long be summoned to appear before the judgment seat of Christ, to hear their fearful doom, and be remanded back to the same place; because it cannot be supposed that God made a mistake in the first sentence. According to this view, some will be punished hundreds and thousands of years more than others. To punish Cain five thousand years more than a murderer of the present day, equally as bad, would be the acme of injustice. But let them all wake up, from the unconscious sleep of death, just where they went to sleep, and receive their recompense at the same time, then all is harmonious, and equity and justice environ the throne of God.

d. It reconciles the conduct of God with the character the Bible gives him; viz., that he is no respecter of persons, and impartial in all his dealings with the children of men. To reward men before they are judged and their characters determined, would be the grossest contempt of law and equity: it would be a virtual abrogation of all law and order. Then to pretend to judge the same

54

persons, after they had received a portion of the rewards, which would have been consequent upon such judgment, would be the most solemn mockery, and consummate knavery. To reward some of his children thousands of years before others, equally righteous, would be the most palpable partiality. But to raise them all at the same time, to immortality and eternal life, would prove to an intelligent universe, that with God, there is no respect of persons; that "the Judge of all the earth will do right."

e. It robs the grave of all its gloom, and removes those fearful apprehensions, which most men have, in reference to the precise condition of their friends in death. With sweet and quiet sleep, no one associates painful ideas. This brings me to consider,

2. The nature of that penalty which will be inflicted upon all the incorrigible for the transgression of God's holy law. It has already been shown to be death. But the condition in which this death will place the sinner remains to be investigated. We have seen that the death threatened Adam reduces man to a state of unconsciousness. We may reasonably suppose that the death threatened for personal sin, will place him, a second time, in the same condition. This I will attempt to demonstrate. I invite your attention,

1st. To those portions of Scripture which contrast the punishment of the wicked with the future rewards of the righteous. In Ps. xxxvii, we have the destiny of the two classes presented in the most striking contrast. David says. "Cease from anger, and forsake wrath: fret not thyself in any wise to do evil. For evil doers shall be cut off:

55

but those that wait upon the Lord, they shall inherit the earth." Verses 8, 9. When in the world's history have God's people inherited the earth, to the exclusion of the wicked? Never.

Again, "For yet a little while, and the wicked *shall not be*: yea, thou shalt diligently consider his place, and it *shall not be*. But the meek shall inherit the earth, and shall delight themselves in the abundance of peace." Verses 10, 11. *Be* signifies to *exist*. The wicked shall not exist; their place shall not exist; they

shall be cut off: but the meek shall inherit the earth. The meek never have inherited the earth. See the promise for the meek: "Blessed are the meek; for they shall inherit the earth." Matt, v, 5. That this promise refers to the rewards of the gospel, none can deny; and that the converse refers to the punishment of the wicked, in contrast, is equally evident. How long shall the inheritance of the meek continue? Ans. "The Lord knoweth the days of the upright; and their inheritance shall be forever." Verse 18. Where will the wicked be during this time? Ans, "But the wicked shall perish, and the enemies of the Lord shall be as the fat of lambs: they shall consume; into smoke shall they consume away." Verse 20. Again, verse 22. "For such as be blessed of him shall inherit the earth; and they that be cursed of him shall be cut off." Mark well the force of evidence connected with these distinct classes. The inheritance of the upright shall be forever; but the wicked shall perish, etc.

Perish. (L. *pereo*.) To die; to lose life in any manner; to wither and decay; to be destroyed.

56

Webster. Then to make it still more explicit he says, "They shall consume; into smoke shall they consume away." How much of any thing is left after it is consumed into smoke? Look at the smoke as it ascends from your chimney; you look again, it is dissipated, and is gone forever. Just so with the wicked, they shall be destroyed forever. Ps. lii, 5. "God shall likewise destroy thee forever, he shall take thee away, and pluck thee out of thy dwelling place, and root thee out of the land of the livings."

Destroy. (L. *destruo*.) To kill; to annihilate; to demolish; to ruin; to lay waste. *Webster*. Now, you may annex the term forever to any of these definitions, and you have David's idea of the nature of future punishment. And yet again: "Depart from evil, and do good; and dwell forevermore; for the Lord loveth judgment, and forsaketh not his saints; they are preserved forever; but the seed of the wicked shall be cut off. The righteous shall inherit the land and dwell therein forever. Wait on the Lord, and keep his way, and he shall exalt thee to inherit the land: when the wicked are cut off, thou shalt see it. But the transgressors shall be destroyed together: the end of the wicked shall be cut off." Verses 27, 28, 29, 34, 38. Compare the contrast drawn in the above texts, with Prov. xi, 31. "Behold, the righteous shall be recompensed in the earth: much more the wicked and the sinner." The plain statement here is, that both classes shall be recompensed in the earth. Now if both classes are actually recompensed in the earth, the righteous by having an everlasting inheritance in the

57

earth, and the wicked by being cut off from the earth, where can the wicked exist? Again, if the wicked are recompensed in the earth, and yet cut off from the earth, where will they be? As Obadiah says, they will be as though they had not been. Obad. verse 16. "For as ye have drunk upon my holy mountain, so shall all the heathen drink, and they shall swallow down, and they shall, be as though they had not been." Were they conscious and intelligent before they had existence? Certainly not. Then they will not be, when the penalty of God's law for personal sins, passes upon them.

Once more: Solomon says, "For the upright shall dwell in the land, and the perfect shall remain in it. But the wicked shall be cut off from the earth, and the transgressors shall be rooted out of it." Prov, ii, 22. Malachi says, they shall be burnt up root and branch: "For 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, that it shall leave them neither root nor branch." When any substance, susceptible of being affected by fire, is burnt up, there is nothing left: so when the wicked are burnt up root and branch, there will be nothing left to enjoy happiness or misery. The same idea is expressed by John the Baptist. He says, addressing himself to men, "And now also the axe is laid urr to the root of the trees: therefore every tree which bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire." Matt, iii, 10. What does this fire do? Ans. It burns them up root and

58

branch. Again, he compares the righteous to wheat, and the wicked to chaff, and shows what will become of each. Speaking of Christ, he says: "Whose fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly purge his floor, and gather his wheat into his garner; but he will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire." How long could dry chaff exist in an unquenchable fire? It would require an eternal miracle to prevent its burning up. But the text declares that the chaff (i.e., the wicked, represented by chaff) will be burned up; then as if to make it more emphatic, he declares that the fire shall not be quenched. If the fire could be quenched, a portion of the wicked might be preserved; but if it cannot be quenched, it must utterly consume them.

Our Saviour, in the parable of wheat and tares, compares the children of the wicked one to tares; and declares that they shall be cast into the fire. Matt, xiii, 37-40. Again, he declares that those who do not fear God, shall be destroyed, both soul and body. Matt, x, 28. "And fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." Give this verse whatever construction you may, and it proves the entire destruction of the wicked. But the obvious meaning of the text is, fear not them which kill you, (i. e., take the present life,) but are not able to take away the future life; but rather fear him who is able to deprive you of both the present and future life. Verse 39 is a key to this verse: "He that findeth his life shall lose it: and he that loseth his life for my sake shall find it." The same

59

Greek word which is translated soul in verse 28, is translated life twice in this. Now one thing is certain: the same man cannot lose the present life, and find it at the same time; nor can he find and lose it at the same time. I understand it thus: he who will save the present life by denying me, shall lose the life I have to give; (i.e., eternal life;) but he who will lose the present life for my sake, (which he predicted they should, verse 21,) shall find it, eternal life. See Mark x, 30. According to this view, all those who do not fear God will lose both the present and future life; and the Bible no where reveals a third life. They will lose themselves. Luke ix, 25.

I will next investigate the very strongest proof text in favor of endless misery, and show that it proves the opposite, when taken in connection with other texts referring to the same thing. Matt, xxv, 46. That our Saviour here refers to the final doom of the righteous and wicked is admitted by all who believe in future rewards and punishments. He says: "And these shall go away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous into life eternal." Here the destiny of the two classes is placed in contrast; and the same original term is used to denote the duration of both.

Eternal. Having no beginning nor end; endless; ceaseless. *Webster*. This is the primary signification of the word eternal; and I can show no necessity for giving it a secondary meaning, in its application to the future destiny of the wicked, any more than the righteous; for the Bible sets no limitation to the duration of either, but frequently places them in antithesis to each other: thus

60

by contrast giving them equal duration. But to admit that the penalty for personal sin will be everlasting punishment, and to admit that it will be endless misery, are two very different things. Before you can read pain, torment, or misery, out of this text, you must first read them in. Every person must see, at a glance, that the whole issue turns upon the definition we give the term *punishment*. To say that the ungodly will be punished endlessly, and to define the nature of that punishment, are two things.

Punishment. Infliction imposed in vengeance of crime. *Cobb*. Whatever a judge awards to an offender for his offense, is punishment, no matter what; whether stripes, imprisonment, deprivation, or death. Now, let the issue be fairly stated, and let us meet it. Both parties believe the punishment to be eternal: both admit that whatever the Judge of all the earth awards to the finally impenitent, as the penalty of his law, will be punishment. Now, as we freely confess, that if the Judge of quick and dead should pronounce everlasting misery, to be the penalty of his law, then everlasting *misery* would be everlasting punishment; we ask you to admit, with the same candor, that if the same Judge should denounce everlasting *destruction*, as the penalty of the same law, then everlasting destruction would be everlasting punishment. The same that would make one everlasting, would make the other; the same that would make one punishment, would the other. What saith the Scriptures? Let them decide this matter. I have abundantly proved, by plain Bible testimony, that the nature of this punishment is

61

destruction; cessation of being; consumption, etc. I will investigate one more text on this point. Paul covers the whole ground. Speaking of the punishment of the wicked, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven, in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, he says: "Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power." 2 Thess. i, 9.

Here the Apostle declares the penalty of God's law, in reference to its *import*, to be punishment; in reference to its *duration*, to be everlasting; in reference to its *nature*, to be destruction: and then, as if to make it still more emphatic, he

declares, They shall be destroyed from the presence of the Lord. God's presence fills immensity; hence, when destroyed from his presence, they must cease to be; or according to the definition of destruction, they must be killed, annihilated, demolished, laid waste; or according to the Bible definition, they will be as though they had not been, be burnt up root and branch, consume into smoke, and be no more.

2. That class of scriptures which represents the punishment of the wicked as being the antithesis of eternal life. A few passages on this point must suffice.

In Matt. xxv, 46, everlasting punishment is placed in opposition to everlasting life. The antithesis of everlasting life is everlasting death, (i. e., destruction,) not everlasting life. Christ in his discourse with Nicodemus says, "And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so

62

must the Son of man be lifted up: that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life. For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him, should not perish, but have everlasting life." John iii, 14-16. The term *perish* in each of these verses is placed in opposition to everlasting life. Paul says, "For the wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life, through Jesus Christ." Rom. vi, 23. Here the reward and penalty of the law of God, are fairly and fully contrasted, each having its proper name; and in order to present them in the clearest possible light, I will give the definition of each term.

Life. A state of being animated, or living; (i. e., animated existence.)

Death. The extinction of life; mortality. *Webster*.

The contrast then, stands thus: Eternal life-eternal animated existence. Eternal death-eternal *extinction* of animated existence; or eternal deprivation of life. This view will harmonize all the plain teachings of the Bible in reference to the future destiny of man. With what propriety modern theologians, make everlasting life the antithesis of everlasting life, I cannot conceive.

3. That class which makes eternal life conditional. Those texts, above quoted, represent everlasting life as the reward of faith. "That whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." John iii, 14-16. The converse of this is, whosoever believeth not in him, shall not have everlasting life, but shall perish. Where a reward is rendered conditional, no reasonable person

63

son can expect to obtain it, without compliance with the conditions prescribed. "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life," etc. Verse 36. To see life, must mean to be conscious of it; because life is not susceptible of natural vision. Then just as certainly as believers will have everlasting conscious being, so certainly unbelievers will not have it. Again, our Saviour predicates eternal life in the world to come, upon leaving all and following him: thereby teaching that none will have it in that world, except they comply with those conditions. See Mark x, 28-31. Paul says, "To them who by patient continuance in well-doing, seek for glory, and honor, and immortality, eternal life." Here immortality and eternal life are represented as blessings to be sought for; to be conferred as the reward of well-doing; hence

none only those who seek for these blessings in God's appointed way, will ever have them.

There is not one promise of immortality or eternal life, between the lids of the Bible, for a sinner. How they can prevent corruption without immortality, and how live forever without eternal life, I cannot conceive. They will be raised to corruption and a second death. They that sow to the flesh shall reap corruption. Gal. vi, 7, 8; Rev. xxi, 8. They will be devoured. Rev. xx, 9.

Devour. (L. *devoro.*) To destroy; consume, *Webster*.

4. Those texts which emphatically declare the penalty of God's law to be death: such as, The wages of sin is death; For the end of those things

64

is death; Sin when finished bringeth forth death; The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death. Dying is the transition from life to death. A man is not dead until he ceases dying; hence if the sinner never dies, the penalty, which is death, will never be inflicted; nay, it will be as far from being inflicted, when untold millions of years shall have rolled away, as when the first moment had elapsed. To say that the sinner never dies, is to contradict the whole tenor of scripture: it is to make God a liar: he says the penalty of his law is death.

Again, if the sinner never dies, the last enemy which is death, will never be destroyed; but the Bible declares that death shall be destroyed; therefore its last victim will first be destroyed. and then death itself shall die. The Bible leaves all the wicked under the dominion of the second death, from which it offers no hope of a resurrection.

a. The view that I have taken of the penalty of God's law which we all suffer as a consequence of Adam's sin, will be objected to by many:

1st. Moses died and was buried; Moses was seen alive on the Mount, a thousand years after; therefore there must have been something about Moses which survived death. Read Matt. xvii, 9, and you will learn that this was a vision.

2nd. Christ promised the thief he would be with him in Paradise that very day; the thief's body was not in Paradise that day: it must, therefore, have been his soul. Luke xxii, 42, 43. This objection all turns upon the punctuation. Place the comma after the adverb, to-day, and let it qualify the first verb, say, and there is no objection in it.

65

It would then read, verily I say unto thee to-day, shalt thou etc. The thief did not pray to be remembered when Christ went into his kingdom, but when he comes into his kingdom; which will not be until his second appearing. Read Luke xix, 12; Matt. xxv, 31-35; 2 Tim. iv, 1. Paradise is synonymous with kingdom. Compare 2 Cor. xii, 4; Rev. ii, 7, with Rev. xxi, 2; xxii, 23. Christ had not ascended three days after his death. John xx, 17.

3rd. Paul was willing rather to be absent from the body, and to be present with the Lord; [2 Cor. v, 8;] there must, therefore, have been a soul or spirit in Paul, which could leave the body and go to God. Let Paul explain himself: "For we that are in this tabernacle do groan, being burdened: not for that we would be unclothed, but clothed upon, that mortality might be swallowed up of life." Verse 4. What was Paul's hope? Ans. That mortality might be swallowed up of life.

When did he expect to be present with the Lord? Ans. When he realized the fruition of his hope; of which he then only had the earnest. Verse 5. When will mortality be swallowed up of life. Ans. When the dead shall be raised incorruptible. 1 Cor. xv, 53.

4th. Paul desired to depart (i. e., to die) and be with Christ. Phil. i, 23. Paul's body could not depart and be with Christ at death; hence it must have been his intelligent soul to which he referred. Paul, in reference to his doom, did not know what awaited him, whether life or death; but in reference to his personal choice, or desire, he was perfectly decided he would prefer death to a life of persecution, and uncertainty, expecting the next event with him, to be with Christ. None of the Bible

66

writers associated time with death. They expected to wake up just where they went to sleep. This was the case with Paul. Here he expresses his desire to depart, and as the next event in his history to be with Christ. Hear what he says about his hope just before his departure. He there tells us plainly when he expected to be with Christ. "For I am ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand. I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith: henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give me at that day: and not to me only, but unto all them also that love his appearing." 2 Tim. iv, 6-9.

5th. The *souls* of the slain were heard crying, under the altar for vengeance. Rev. vi, 9, 10. The correct rendering of the original term here rendered soul, is person; and they were, evidently seen under the altar where their heads had been cut off; and they cried just as the blood of Abel cried. Gen. iv. 10.

6th. The spirit of one of the Prophets ministered to John a long time after his body had died. Rev. xxii, 8, 9. Read these verses over: it does not read anything like your construction. First, he is denominated an angel. Verse 8. Second, this angel declares that he was John's fellow-servant; and also the fellow-servant of his brethren the prophets. Verse 9. The same angel ministered to John, who ministered to his brethren the prophets. But if it was really one of the prophets, it must have been Elijah; for he was the only one who was then living. Dead men cannot communicate to living without a resurrection.

67

b. Objections will be urged against the view I have taken of the nature of the penalty of the law of God.

1st. The nature of future punishment is represented by a fire that shall never be quenched. Mark ix, 45, 46. "And if thy foot offend thee, cut it off: it is better for thee to enter halt into life, than having two feet to be cast into hell, into the fire that never shall be quenched: where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched." Jesus Christ was a Jew, and in his discourses with the Jews, he used the well-known phraseology of the Jewish prophets. This imagery is borrowed from Isa. lxvi, 24. "And they shall go forth, and look upon the carcasses of the men that have transgressed against me: for their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched; and they shall be an abhorring unto all flesh." All this is predicated of the carcasses of men. Carcass, a dead body. What kind of a worm

would prey upon a dead carcass? Evidently the literal worm which preys upon corruption. See Job xvii, 13, 14. What kind of fire would prey upon dead carcasses? Evidently literal fire; and if the worm does not die, and the fire is not quenched, they must be utterly consumed. An unquenchable fire is invariably used in the Bible to denote a fire which cannot be arrested or put out, until it utterly consumes that upon which it preys. See Eze. xx, 45-48; Jer. xvii, 27; Isa. xxxiv, 8-10; Matt iii, 12.

As to the term hell, here used, it is translated from the Greek word *Gehenna*, and represents a fire which was kept constantly burning in the valley of Hinnom, for the purpose of consuming the carcasses of malefactors and of beasts, for the preservation of

68

the health of the city. It was located near Jerusalem to the southeast. Now, what idea would a Jew naturally associate with the fires of Hinnom? Evidently that of entire destruction; for everything they had seen cast into that fire had been consumed. The term *Gehenna*, occurs just twelve times in the New Testament, and is always addressed to the Jews. It is analogous to Tophet of the Old Testament. Isa. xxx, 27-33.

2nd. Everlasting fire. Matt. xxv, 41. When the word everlasting, or eternal, is used as an *adjective*, its duration is always determined by the person or thing to which it relates; as "everlasting hills:" it denotes a period which will continue as long as the hills continue. When applied to God, it denotes endless duration; because God is immortal; but when applied to that which will come to an end, it must be understood in a limited sense: hence when it refers to the future reward of the righteous, it must be understood in an unlimited sense; because the Scriptures teach that they will be immortal; but when applied to the future punishment of the wicked, it must be understood in a limited sense; because the Bible plainly teaches that they will come to an end, die, be no more. In the following texts those terms must necessarily be understood, from their connection, in a limited sense. Gen. xiii, 15; xlix, 26; Ex. xii, 14; x, 8; Deut. iv, 40; xiii, 16; Joshua iv, 7; 2 Kings v, 27; 1 Chron. xxiii, 13; Isa. xxxiii, 20; Jer. xvii, 25; vii, 7; Hab. iii, 6; Jude 7.

3rd. Eternal damnation, (i. e., condemnation,) is a sentence of condemnation never to be revoked. Should it ever be reversed, it would not be eternal.

4th. The Vengeance of eternal fire. Jude 7. It

69

is the *vengeance* of fire, the inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah are represented as suffering. The *vengeance* of fire is to consume that upon which it preys. It is the *office* of fire to destroy whatever is susceptible of being affected by it. Read what this fire did for Sodom and Gomorrah. Gen. xix, 24, 25; Deut. xxix, 23; 2 Pet. ii, 6.

5th. "And the smoke of their torment ascendeth up forever and ever." Rev. xiv, 11. This has no reference whatever to a future state. First. It is during the existence and worship of the great beasts, and the image, brought to view in the previous chapter. Rev. xiii; xiv, 11. Second. It is during the faith and patience of the saints. Verse 12. Third. It is during day and night. Verse 11. Fourth. They are

tormented in the presence of the Lord. Verse 10. In the final sentence which shall be passed against the wicked, they will be destroyed from the presence of the Lord. 2 Thess. i, 9. Fifth. This is a proclamation of wrath, which is to be, subsequently, poured out in seven successive vials. Compare Rev. xiv, 9, 10, 17, with chapters xv, 1, 8; xvi. Under the sixth plague Christ has not come. Verse 15. Sixth. The same phrase (i. e., the smoke of their torment ascending up forever) occurs in Isaiah, in reference to the land of Idumea. Isa, xxiv, 10. Read the context.

The foregoing quotations are the very strongest proof texts of the popular, and almost universally believed doctrine of endless misery; and I submit to the candid reader, that so far from proving any such view, they form no valid objections to the view taken in this work, which makes the penalty of God's law for personal disobedience, literal death.

70

Having considered first, the nature of the atonement, second, the difficulties in the way of man's salvation, which make an atonement necessary, and third the nature of those difficulties, I propose investigating,

IV. The means by which these difficulties shall be removed. The immediate means by which these difficulties shall be removed will be, 1st. By a resurrection from the dead." 1 Cor. xv, 22. 2nd. By remission. Acts ii, 38. But back of these, as the grand producing cause, is the sacrificial offering of Jesus Christ for the sins of the world. Still back of this, the great impulsive cause, was the amazing love of the Father in the gift of his only begotten Son: "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him, should not perish, but have everlasting life." But for this, Adam and Eve would have been executed, upon conviction of guilt, without being permitted to fill the world with their degenerate and sinful offspring. Then those difficulties, apart from our first parents, would never have existed. The first and second lives, the resurrection of the dead, remission of sins-in fact, all the blessings of the gospel, may be traced to the death of Christ, as the stream to its own fountain. Hence this grand fundamental doctrine will claim our first attention.

The first thing which strikes the most cursory reader of the Bible, must be, that the pardon of our sins, and our entire salvation, is ascribed to the *death* of Christ. We will not now inquire in what sense his death availed to these great results; but we, at present, only state that, in some sense, our salvation is expressly and emphatically connected with that

71

event. Such passages as the following are too plain and explicit to be misunderstood. "I lay down my life for the sheep." "He gave himself for us." He died, "the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God." "Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many." "While we were yet sinners Christ died for us." "In whom we have redemption through his *blood*, the forgiveness of sins." "He gave his life a ransom for many." "We who were afar off are made nigh by the blood of Christ." "Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood." He made "his soul an offering for sin." "He hath poured out his soul unto death."

Numerous passages might be adduced, in which, with equal emphasis, the salvation of man is connected with the death of Christ. But what necessity for his death? Could no other means be devised for man's salvation, and yet God spare his well-beloved, and only Son? No: Christ must die, "unless some one able, and as willing undertake the rigid task-death for death, and die the dead to save."

1st. From reason. The law of God was a perfect law and required perfect obedience. It required all man's time and energies to render perfect obedience; hence when once transgressed, the transgressor could never make amends for such transgression, from the fact that it was all they could possibly do in the first place to satisfy the demands of the law. Future obedience could not expiate the guilt of past disobedience. It would remain against him to all eternity, unless an innocent person, who had never transgressed the law, should suffer its penalty in his stead. I can conceive of but two principles upon which pardon can be granted, one by remitting the

72

penalty, the other by accepting a substitute. The former would be, to all intents and purposes, a license to the disobedient, to continue their rebellion, and repeat their old transgressions. Such an act would make God the author of rebellion, and his only begotten Son the minister of sin. Such an act would destroy all confidence in the rectitude of the Supreme Ruler, and encircle the Throne of the Great Jehovah, with other clouds than those of justice and mercy. But on the other hand, to extend pardon to the repentant sinner through the medium of an accepted substitute, would maintain the rectitude of his moral Government, and the honor of his Throne. If, in one word, guilty man could render an adequate atonement for his transgression of the Divine Law, by anything he could suffer or do, then, verily, Christ died in vain. But that he could not, is evident,

2nd. From the whole scope of Bible teachings. This matter is put beyond a reasonable doubt by the testimony of scripture. "Thus it is written and thus it behooved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead." Luke xxiv, 46. In this passage, a necessity for the death of Christ is plainly and emphatically stated. If it be urged, that this necessity grows out of what "had been written," concerning his sufferings and death, by the prophets, it should still be remembered, that what the prophets predicted on this subject, was the result of what had been before determined in the council of heaven. Christ did not suffer and die because it was written; but it was written because he would suffer and die. Holy men of old wrote in this matter, as they were moved by the Holy Ghost, what God had before determined should come to pass.

73

The verse which follows abundantly proves this "And that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name." Verse 47. His death was not only necessary for the fulfillment of prophecy, but for the publication of "repentance and remission of sins in his name:" thereby teaching that there were no other conditions through which these blessings could be conferred upon man. It was God's purpose to offer "repentance and remission of sins" to man, before the prophets issued their predictions: it was his purpose to do this in the name of Christ, and by virtue of his death in their stead. This was predicted; but the

necessity of the prediction may be traced to an agreement between the Father and the Son, in which the Son, on his part, was to take upon him the nature of man, (sin only excepted,) and suffer and die in his stead; and the Father, on his part, was to "freely" give up his Son to die; and then accept that death as an equivalent for the deaths of all who will comply with the conditions of eternal life. And the necessity of such an unprecedented sacrifice, on the part of the Father and the Son, can only be accounted for upon the principle of the utter hopelessness of man's condition; because, could any other means have been devised, God, most assuredly, would have spared his own Son.

By virtue of this agreement the Patriarchs and Prophets were commissioned to predict the incarnation, suffering, and death of Jesus Christ, and through them, to proclaim "repentance and remission of sins."

The same sentiment is expressed in Matt. Xvi, 21. "From that time forth began Jesus to shew

74

unto his disciples, how that he must go unto Jerusalem, and suffer many things of the elders, and chief priests, and scribes, and be killed, and be raised again the third day." The answer of our Lord to Peter, who upon hearing this, replied, "Be it far from thee, Lord: this shall not be unto thee," breathes the same sentiment. "But he turned and said unto Peter, "Get thee behind me, Satan; thou art an offense unto me: for thou savourest not the things that be of God, but those that be of men." Verses 22, 23. This language plainly implies, that for Christ to suffer and die, in the manner he had just predicted, and not according to the carnal views of Peter, was "of God;" i. e., according to the appointment, or purpose of God. This is not language to be used in reference to a martyr's dying to prove his sincerity; for in such cases death is not of divine appointment, but of wicked human enactment. The death of Christ, therefore, was necessary because the Father purposed and appointed it as the only means of human redemption.

The same sentiment is expressed by our Saviour in his prayer to the Father in the garden of Gethsemane. "And he went a little farther and fell on his face, and prayed, saying, O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me." Matt. xxvi, 39. But it was not possible, and man be redeemed. Had it been possible, could any other means have been devised, the Father would have spared his Son that bitter cup; but no, that must not, cannot be, else the entire human family must drink it in their own persons, and die without mercy, hope, or future life.

75

Again our Saviour represents the same idea by a beautiful and pointed figure. "And Jesus answered them, saying, The hour is come, that the Son of man should be glorified. Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone: but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit." John xii, 23, 24. From this we are to understand that the death of Christ was just as necessary to the salvation of man, as the vegetable death of the seed of corn to the production of the harvest; it was necessary, therefore, in this sense, that one could not take place without the other. But for this, Christ would have remained "alone" and have brought "forth" no "fruit," i. e., have had no resurrection as the

"first fruits of them that slept;" then there could be no harvest of the resurrection; "then. *they* also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished." It would have been just as necessary for Christ to have suffered and died, had not the Jews with wicked hands put him to death; nay, a great portion of his suffering was in the garden, before he had been condemned to die; it was there, and then, his "*soul was exceeding sorrowful even unto death.*" The necessity of Judas' betraying him, of Pilate's condemning him, of the Jews' crucifying him, did not grow out of the fact that all these things had been previously predicted: but they had been foretold because God had revealed to the Prophets what malicious and wicked men, actuated by the vilest motives, would voluntarily do to his beloved Son; not what he had before decreed they should do. The latter would make the Father guilty of murdering his own Son; but the

76

former would make the actors themselves guilty of the enormous crime of putting their own Saviour and promised deliverer to death. They acknowledged their guilt, in reply to Pilate who pleaded the innocency of our Blessed Redeemer. "Then answered all the people and said, His blood be on us, and on our children." Matt. xxvii, 25. And how fully and literally this prayer has been verified, let their whole history testify. Paul and Peter bear united testimony to the same fact. 1 Cor. iv, 11; Acts iv, 11 12. "For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ. This is the stone which was set at nought by you builders, which is become the head of the corner. Neither is their salvation by any other: for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved." This is too explicit for comment. John wept much when he saw that "no man in heaven, nor in earth, neither under the earth was able to" raise the seal of death from the Book of Life. But one of the elders said unto him, "Weep not: behold, the Lion of the tribe of Juda, the Root of David, hath prevailed to open the book, and to loose the seven seals thereof." Rev. v, 1-5. The great book of eternal life was sealed against Adam, and all his posterity, in consequence of his disobedience; and none was found able in heaven, on earth, nor under the earth, except the Lion of the tribe of Juda, the Son of God, to open it; he alone, of all the host of heaven and earth, was worthy or able to bring salvation; to "abolish death" and bring "life and immortality to light through the gospel;" to turn back the "flaming sword" which

77

guarded "the tree of life," that those who do the commandments of his Father, may have right thereat and may enter through the gates into the city Rev. xxii, 14. Hence Christ is "the way, (the only way,) the truth and the life." Hence, "this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life; and this life is in his Son." 1 John v, 11.

Having investigated the relation the death of Christ sustains to the removal of these difficulties, as the great original and efficient cause, and having seen the necessity of his death, as the only means to the attainment of these ends, we are now fully prepared to investigate the secondary means or the immediate instrumentalities employed in removing those difficulties.

1. The first difficulty is removed through the medium of a resurrection from the dead. "For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive. But every man in his own order: Christ the first fruits, afterward they that are Christ's at his coming." 1 Cor. xv, 21-23.

First. Some of the Corinthian brethren had denied the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead; but all admitted the literal resurrection of Christ. The Apostle, in this chapter, endeavors to prove to them (having plainly delineated the consequences of the non-resurrection of Christ, verse 18) by this admission, that all the dead must be raised, showing them that Christ was raised as "the *first* fruits of them that slept," [verse 20,] which could not be the case, unless there should be a harvest of the

78

resurrection. There cannot be first fruits without a harvest.

Second. The harvest is always of the same kind as the first fruits or sample. If, therefore, Christ had a literal resurrection as the first fruits of them that slept, then all that are asleep, i. e., dead, must have a literal resurrection. See verses 42-45, 50-54.

Third. "As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." Here it is plainly and emphatically stated, that the same all which died in Adam, shall be made alive in Christ. In this case the remedy is as large as the thrall; the plaster as large as the wound: the first death fully and forever removed out of the way. The previous verse inculcates the same sentiment. "For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead." The two men here spoken of are denominated Adam and Christ in the verse following. "The first man Adam was made a living soul, the last Adam was made a quickening," or life-giving, "spirit." Verse 45.

Fourth. *All* died *unconditionally* in Adam, and all will be made *unconditionally alive* in, by, or through, Christ; so that the first difficulty will be entirely removed out of the way, and leave the whole world without excuse, as far as the result of Adam's transgression is concerned; but,

Fifth. "Every man in his own order." Verse 23. Although the passages quoted, prove that all mankind will be raised, irrespective of moral character, age, or condition, to a second life, by the second Adam, yet they do not prove that they will all be raised with the same moral characters;

79

but as the reverse of this, they positively affirm, that every man will be raised "in his own order." Simple life does not involve moral character. The wicked have the present life as well as the righteous. Moral character is not an attribute of life, but the result of man's action, as a moral agent, toward moral law.

The present life being a state of trial, man forms his character during this time for a future life; and the interim between death and the resurrection being a state of entire unconsciousness, they all will be, as a matter of course, raised from the dead with the same characters they had when they died. Hence every man will be raised with the same identical moral character he formed during the present

life. If he died a righteous man, he will be raised such; if an unrighteous man, he will be raised such. In the language of Scripture, "Every man in his own *order*."

The Bible brings to view *two distinct* orders in the resurrection, having distinctive *natures* and *destinies*. Our Divine Master bears testimony to these statements, saying, "Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in their graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation." Our Saviour here covers the whole ground. First. The unconditional resurrection of all mankind: "The hour is coming, in the which *all* that are in their graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth." Second. The two orders, the good and the evil: "They that have done good, . . . and they that have

80

done evil," etc. Third. Their respective destinies: The "*good* to the resurrection of *life*," the "*evil* to the resurrection of *condemnation*." It has been abundantly proved that the sentence of condemnation, which will be passed against evil doers, will be *literal death, destruction*, etc., hence the propriety of placing *condemnation*, in opposition to *life*.

Paul makes use of the same unlimited language to represent the resurrection of all the dead; and he then divides them into two distinct classes, saying "that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust." Acts xxiv, 15.

Christ uses similar language in reference to the first class spoken of in this passage: "But when thou makest a feast, call the poor, the maimed, the lame, the blind, and thou shalt be blest: for they cannot recompense thee: for thou shalt be recompensed at the resurrection of the just." Luke xxiv, 13, 14. The idea of a resurrection of the just, supposes a resurrection also of the unjust. The idea of the former class being rewarded at that peculiar resurrection, supposes first, that the latter class will have no part or lot in the resurrection offered as the peculiar privilege of the just; second, that they will have no part in the recompense offered to the other class.

Paul declares the hope of all the ancient worthies to be, "that they might obtain a *better resurrection*." Heb. xi, 35. A better resurrection supposes a worse; and the fact that holy men of old sacrificed all worldly considerations, and thousands even their lives, to obtain this glorious privilege, proves that they, at least, did not suppose the wicked would ever enjoy it. Why strive to obtain

81

a privilege all will enjoy, whether they strive or not? Is there no difference between the hope of the obedient and the disobedient? Will the most profligate and abandoned of earth realize the fruition of that blessed hope, which swelled the bosoms of Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles, and Martyrs, and inspired them to deeds of daring, and achievements of noble renown? No! no! These will "obtain a better resurrection." They will have "part in the first resurrection," be priests with God and Christ, and reign with him a thousand years.

Hear what the voice of Inspiration says in reference to the privilege of the first order, band, or company: "Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first

resurrection: on such the second death hath no power, but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years. Rev. xx, 6. The converse of which is, cursed and unholy is he that hath part in the second resurrection: on such the second death will have power; and they shall not be priests of God and of Christ, and shall not reign with him, etc. Here the order and destiny of these two classes is plainly brought to view.

Of the same import is the language of Christ to the Sadducees. He says, "But they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection (the first resurrection) from the dead, neither marry, nor are given in marriage; neither can they die any more; i. e., they cannot die again—a second death. The converse of this is, they that are not accounted worthy to obtain that resurrection and that world to come [see Mark x, 30] shall die again; the second death will have power over them;

82

they will be hurt of the second death; [Rev. ii, 11;] they will be cast into the lake of fire and brimstone [Rev. xxi, 8] which will produce the second death. 1 Cor. xv, 42-44, 53-57, is a description of the first order: "Christ the first fruits; afterward they that are Christ's at his coming." Verse 23. The first sheaf in the type, was a part of the harvest just as much as any of the subsequent sheaves. It belonged to the same order. Hence Christ the first fruits, and they that are Christ's at his coming, (in the antitype,) belong to the same order, or antitypical harvest. This brings me to notice,

Sixth. The time which will elapse between the two resurrections. The idea of a first and second, supposes a transition, however short, from one to the other. But had God given us no measuring line with which to determine the precise time, we would naturally suppose, from the uniform language of Scripture on this subject, that the second resurrection would follow the first in immediate succession; but the only safe rule in interpreting the Bible is, to explain all the indefinite portions by the definite ones in reference to the same subject. To illustrate: there are scores of indefinite prophecies in reference to the first advent of Christ, and only one or two definite ones, in reference to the time. Now, we explain all those indefinite prophecies in harmony with these definite ones. Just so, in reference to the resurrection of the dead: there are many indefinite portions of scripture pointing out this event; and yet, God has given us but one definite measuring line by which to ascertain the time which will elapse between the two resurrections. He emphatically declares the time to be a thousand

83

years. "And I saw thrones, and they sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them: and I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God, and (all those) which had not worshiped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads, or in their hands; and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years. But the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished. This is the first resurrection." Rev. xx, 4, 5. 1. That the demonstrative adjective, *this*, in the last clause of the fifth verse, points out the first class spoken of in the previous verse, is evident from the blessing pronounced upon such, in the sixth verse. 2. That all

the righteous dead are raised at the commencement of the thousand years, is evident from the fearful doom, which awaits all those who will have part in the second resurrection, at the expiration of the thousand years. See the converse of the blessing pronounced upon the former class in verse 6. Cursed and unholy etc.-on such the second death will have power.

With this view, we may learn how long a period will be occupied by Jesus Christ in removing all the obstacles out of the way of man's Salvation, and bringing back this revolted province in allegiance to the throne of his Father. Read 1 Cor. xv, 23-28. "But every man in his own order: Christ the first fruits; afterward they that are Christ's at his coming. Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule, and all authority, and power; for he must reign, till he hath

84

put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death."

Here his reign commences with "his coming," and the resurrection of "them that are his," and terminates, as independent king, with the destruction of "the last enemy"-death. By Rev. xx, 5, 6, we learn that the "rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished;" that then "the second death" is to have "power" over them; and they will be "devoured." Verse 9. Then the Son, having reigned until he has put all enemies under his feet, "delivers up the kingdom to God, even the Father," and becomes subject himself, that the Father "may be all in all;" that is, that the Father may be supreme, and the Son subordinate king under him. These are "the times of restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all the holy prophets since the world began." Acts iii, 20, 21. This glorious work of restoration begins with the Advent of the Great Restorer, to *change the living saints, to raise the righteous dead to immortality and eternal life*, and will be consummated by the complete and eternal extirpation of *all the effects of sin, and all the sinners* in the vast empire of God, and the creation of "*new heavens and new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness.*" 2 Pet. iii, 13. Then, and not till then, will all interposing obstacles be removed out of the way, and the grand, and ultimate *design* of the atonement be fully accomplished.

2. The second difficulty, or penalty for personal transgression, will be removed out of the way of man's salvation by remission. *Remission*, according to

85

Webster, signifies *pardon*, and pardon signifies the remission of the penalty. This is a common sense definition; because, if the penalty of God's law be death, and that death be remitted, what is that but the remission of the penalty?

In presenting this part of the subject, I propose two important considerations in connection with the same proof texts, viz., first, the fact of the penalty for personal sins being remitted; second, the fact of this remission being conditional; so that none may expect deliverance, except those who comply with the divinely appointed conditions.

John came preaching the gospel of the kingdom, "and saying, Repent, ye; for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." Matt, iii, 2. Here repentance is presented as an indispensable condition of admission into the kingdom of heaven. Again, Mark

says, "John did baptize in the wilderness, and preach the baptism of repentance, for the remission of sins." Mark i, 4. Luke says, "And he came into all the country about Jordan, preaching the baptism of repentance, for the remission of sins." Luke iii, 3. In both these passages baptism and repentance, are represented as necessary conditions of remission of sins. The Great Teacher conditionates the remission of sins, first, upon his own suffering and resurrection; and second, upon repentance. "And [he] said unto them, Thus it is written, and thus it behooved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day; and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem." Luke xxiv, 46, 47.;

The first condition has reference to Christ: the second, to the sinner. Christ complied with his condition,

86

and the sinner must comply with his, or suffer the penalty in his own person.

Just before our Saviour left the world, he commissioned his apostles to "Go in to all the world and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be damned;" [Mark xvi, 15, 16;] "but tarry at Jerusalem till ye are endued with power from on high." Luke xxiv, 43. Power to do what? Ans. To preach the gospel and proclaim its conditions. They obeyed the divine injunction; and while engaged in prayer, and with one accord in one place, the Holy Ghost came as a rushing mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting. Acts ii, 1, 2. Peter, being anointed with the unction from on high, and re-commissioned to engage in the glorious work of the ministry, stood up [verses 14-86] and preached the gospel to a promiscuous multitude of thousands, most of whom had doubtless never heard a gospel sermon. They believed, "were pricked in their hearts, and said unto Peter and to the rest of the apostles, Men and brethren, what shall we do? Then Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for (or in order to) the *remission of sins*, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." Verses 37, 38. By comparing Christ's commission to his apostles with Peter's exposition of it on the day of Pentecost, we learn that there are *three essential conditions in order to the remission of sin*, and salvation, or deliverance, which is consequent upon the remission of sin as the procuring cause; and according to God's prescribed mode of saving men, we might just as well dispense with one of these

87

conditions as another. Mark well the import of the language in which these conditions are couched. "*He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.*" Here, *salvation* is predicated of *baptism* just as much as of *faith*. They are coupled together as conditions of equal importance; and as well might we expect salvation in the neglect of the one as the other. The one is *faith*, the other *works*; and faith without "works is dead, being alone." James ii, 17, 26. A dead faith cannot save a man. Mark Peter's language: "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins," etc. Here repentance and baptism are both equally commanded; both coupled together as conditions of salvation; and remission of sins predicated of the one just as much

as the other. Hence I am safe in saying, that *faith, repentance, and baptism, are God's prescribed conditions of the remission of the penalty of his law for personal transgression.*

That faith and repentance are essential conditions of forgiveness will be readily admitted by all; but that baptism is essential also, will be denied by many. To such, I would refer, in addition to the foregoing testimony, the following plain and explicit texts of Scripture. Acts xxii, 10-16; 1 Pet. iii, 20, 21; Rom. vi, 3-6; 1 Cor. xii, 13; Gal iii, 26, 27. To be "baptized into Christ, to put on Christ," I apprehend is to become a Christian.

Again, that the penalty of the law, for personal sin, is remitted; and that this remission is conditional, is evident from the united testimony of the apostles. "Then Peter and the other apostles answered and said, We ought to obey God rather

88

than men. The God of our fathers raised up Jesus, whom ye slew and hanged on a tree: Him hath God exalted with his right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance to Israel, and forgiveness of sins." Acts v, 29-31. Read also Chap. xiii, 38; Rom. iii, 25; Col. i, 14. These texts establish the position that it is God's plan to *forgive the sins* of all those who *believe, repent and obey* the gospel. But upon what principle can God forgive sins and maintain the honor of his government, and the authority of his law? This brings me to notice,

V. The great principle involved in the removal of these difficulties, i. e., the justice of God, and the honor of his moral government.

Will the Supreme Ruler of the Universe virtually abrogate his own law, and dishonor his Eternal Throne, by remitting, or even relaxing its claims, without full and perfect satisfaction, to save a rebellious and disobedient race? Such an act would destroy all confidence in the justice of the only true God, and prove to an intelligent Universe that he disregards the rectitude of his own Throne and the honor of his own government. This cannot be. The moral government of God, being founded upon his own moral character, must be as immutable and unchangeable as its own Eternal Author. For God, therefore, to dishonor his law, would be to dishonor himself; to deny its claims, a denial of himself. It must then be a plan which will be in harmony with all the attributes of God; and which will maintain all the interests of his moral government. To be such, it must be a plan that God himself shall devise; because no other being would be adequate to the

89

task. And if it be a plan which God shall devise, it must maintain the authority of his own law, and the honor of his own government; and if he maintain the authority of his law, he must strictly enforce its penalty, either upon the guilty, or upon a substitute; and if he accept a substitute, it must be an *equivalent* in *value* to the demands of his law, and equal in dignity to the honor of his government otherwise his moral government would suffer loss and the rectitude of his character, as the Supreme Ruler, remain impeached to all eternity. Sooner far than this, would he spread the dark pall of eternal oblivion over this revolted world, and create a new race of obedient subjects. But, if a substitute be provided which shall meet the demands of his law, and vindicate the honor of his

government, it must be one which he himself shall appoint, and when appointed, accept; because he alone can estimate the dignity of this, or the value of that.

With these prefatory remarks, I pass to notice the Bible evidence, touching the great principle involved in removing the difficulties out of the way, so that God can be just, and yet the justifier of all those who will comply with the conditions of salvation prescribed in his word. They are removed by strictly enforcing the penalties of his law.

1. The penalty of God's law for Adamic transgression is death. Gen. ii, 17; iii, 19. This penalty Adam suffered in his own person. See Chap. v, 5. "And all the days that Adam lived were nine hundred and thirty years: and he died." And here the matter would doubtless have ended, had not the plan of redemption been devised, and his posterity would have suffered the penalty by their representation.

90

But a plan for man's recovery having been devised, God gave him length of days and probation, in which, not only to prepare himself for a future life, but to generate his species, and place them in a condition whereby they might enjoy the same privileges. But his posterity must as a necessary consequence inherit the nature and condition of their father. Adam, as a matter of course, could give his offspring no better nature and condition than he himself possessed. Having incurred a mortal, dying, nature, he entailed the same nature upon his posterity. Hence according to the testimony of Paul, all die by, or as the result of, Adam's transgression. "Wherefore as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned." Rom. v, 12. Not that all have "sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression," as this Apostle argues in verse 14; that is, by personal transgression; but by, or through, Adam, as their representative, all have sinned; and the penalty of the law for sin being death, as a necessary consequence, all must die.

Again the same Apostle says: "And not as it was by one that sinned, so is the gift; for the judgment was by one to condemnation. . . . For if by one man's offence death reigned by one. . . . Therefore as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation-For as by one man's, disobedience many were made sinners-That as sin hath reigned unto death," etc. Rom. v, 16-21. And again, "But the Scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe." Gal. iii, 22.

91

These quotations prove conclusively that God has imputed Adam's sin to all his posterity; and that they, as a necessary consequence, suffer the same penalty threatened their primogenitor in the garden of Eden. "*Dust thou art and unto dust shalt thou return.*" "*All are of the dust, and all return to dust again.*" "*For now shall I sleep in the dust.*" "*His breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth.*" "*Death passed upon all men.*" "*Death reigned from Adam to Moses.*" "*As in Adam all die.*" Numerous texts which might be quoted, bear united testimony to the fact, that *the penalty of God's law, for original sin, is strictly enforced upon the condemned, and the guilty. They have, and will, suffer the last iota of punishment*

threatened in that law. Thus the first difficulty will be removed in harmony with the justice of God, the rectitude of his law, and the honor of his government.

The following objections may be urged:

a. The penalty of the law of God being *eternal* death, would not a resurrection from the dead, be an infringement upon the claims of that law? This objection grows out of mistaken views of the nature of the penalty under consideration. It is simply death, without any reference to the time the criminal will be in dying, or the time he may remain under the dominion of death. To illustrate: The penalty, in most of the states for murder, is death. Suppose an individual to be adjudged guilty of murder, and sentenced to be hung between two hours specified by the judge, until he is *dead, dead*-Then suppose that man to remain dead to all eternity, would that prove that the civil law of the land for murder, is eternal death? Certainly not. It is simply death;

92

and when the criminal is dead, the penalty is satisfied, the law has no farther claims upon him. If therefore any power could raise such an individual to life, the law would not be infringed: it would have no claims whatever to be satisfied: the man would be as free as though he had never transgressed that law. Just so, in reference to the law of God. Its penalty is simply death. When, therefore, Adam and his posterity shall have died the first death, they will have satisfied the penalty for Adamic transgression. That law having no further claims upon them, God may, if he chooses so to do, raise them all to life again, and reward, or punish, them according to their merit, or demerit; and his law at the same time remain unimpeached, and the rectitude of his character untarnished.

b. Would justice inflict the penalty due the guilty pair upon all the millions of their innocent, and helpless offspring? It was with them a simple question of existence or non-existence. To exist at all, they must inherit the nature of their parents: to inherit their nature, they must heir, with it, all the liabilities, and conditions, to which that nature was subjected by the fall. Is not the present life with all its disappointments, and sorrows, preferable to no life at all? Add to these, all the bliss of faith, hope, and love, in this world; and glory, honor, immortality, and eternal life, in the world to come, which all may obtain, without money and without price. Is this injustice? Rather is it not justice and mercy meeting together and embracing each other?

c. Did not Christ suffer the penalty of the Adamic law? Ans. No: the guilty suffer that penalty.

93

God would not inflict the penalty upon the criminal and the substitute both.

2. The second difficulty, or the penalty for personal sins, is removed upon the principle of inflicting, it upon a substitute instead of the guilty. The same principle is involved by executing the penalty upon an accepted substitute as upon the criminal, provided the substitute be, in all respects, an equivalent. The penalty is actually inflicted in the one case just as much as in the other; and the authority of law, and the claims of justice equally maintained in either. That Jesus Christ *died in man's stead*, as an *actual substitute* for *all* those who will *comply* with the

conditions of pardon, may be abundantly proved by numerous plain and explicit texts of Scripture.

In presenting this important feature of the atonement, I will not meddle in the controversy between Calvinists, Socinians, and Arians, but will content myself with a careful elucidation of this fundamental doctrine of our holy religion. In carrying out this design, I propose dividing the Bible evidences upon this point, into two classes:

1st. That class which represents the Jewish sacrifices, under the Mosaical economy, to be both typical and expiatory.

A few general observations in reference to the origin and nature of sacrifices may not be out of place. The history of sacrifices immediately after the fall, is one of the strongest arguments in favor of the Divine origin of the atonement. The fact of their being of divine appointment is clearly demonstrated by the manner in which the Lord manifested his acceptance of Abel's offering, in contradistinction to that of Cain's. "And in process of time it came to

94

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 to his offering, he had not respect." Gen. iv, 3-5. Can any good reason be given why the Lord respected Abel's offering more than Cain's, save that "the firstlings of his flock," and their sacrifice, were typical of the sacrificial offering of the "Lamb of God, without spot," for the sins of the world? The one was a sin-offering, the other a thanksgiving offering. For the same reason the Lord expressed such peculiar satisfaction in reference to Noah's sacrifice. "And Noah builded an altar unto the Lord, and took of every clean beast, and every clean fowl, and offered burnt-offerings on the altar. And the Lord smelled a sweet savour; and the Lord said in his heart, I will not again curse the ground any more for man's sake." Gen. viii, 20, 21. Why should Noah be so particular to select of every clean beast, unless it had reference to the immaculate purity of the antitypical victim it represented. The same distinction, between clean and unclean beasts, is made in the subsequent history of Jewish sacrifices. The *ram* the Lord provided Abraham as a substitute for his beloved son Isaac, is a beautiful type of the Lamb of God who was prepared as a sin-offering for all who have the faith of Abraham. "And Abraham lifted up his eyes, and looked, and behold, behind him a ram caught in a thicket by his horns: and Abraham went and took the ram, and offered him up for a burnt-offering in the stead of his son." Gen. xxii, 13. This I understand to be the true object in offering

95

beasts in sacrifice, both by the Patriarch and the Jews: they were "offered up for a burnt or sin-offering in the stead of" the sinner.

The law demanded death: the transgressor confessed his sins upon the head of the innocent victim: the victim was then slain as a substitute for the condemned criminal, and offered upon the altar to make an atonement, or to appease the anger of God, as *a type of the death of Christ as our substitute*, and the *offering of himself "as a sweet smelling savior," to appease the wrath of a,*

sin-avenging God, to render him propitious, or make an atonement for the sins of the world. With these preparatory remarks, I pass to notice, first, the typical character of the Jewish sacrifices. Types, according to theological writers, signify signs or examples, designed by God to prefigure future things: and they must always cease when they reach their antitypes. It cannot be expected that any type will agree with its antitype in every particular, but only in its main features, so that the one may keep in mind the other.

The writers of the New Testament represent many of the ordinances of the Levitical dispensation as being typical. The apostle Paul calls the holy days, new moons, and sabbaths, including with them the services performed in the celebration of these festivals "a *shadow* of things to come;" "but the body" which casts the shadow, "is of Christ." Col. ii, 16, 17. Compare this with Lev. xxiii, in which the *four yearly feasts* are brought to view; especially verse 19. "Then ye shall sacrifice one kid of the goats for a sin-offering." The paschal lamb I believe is admitted by all Bible writers to be a type of Christ, and it, together with the sin offering, is found

96

in connection with the same ordinances, which the Apostle declares to be "a shadow," whose substance "is of Christ."

Again the same Apostle when discoursing expressly on the "sacrifices" of the tabernacle calls them "the *shadow* of good things to come," and places them in contrast with "the *very image* of the things;" that is, "the good things" just before mentioned. Heb. x, 1. "For the law having a shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things, can never with those sacrifices which they offered year by year continually, make the comers thereunto perfect." In chapters viii, and ix, he tells us that the services performed in the earthly tabernacle prefigured what was afterward to be transacted in the heavenly Sanctuary.

The Apostle, having devoted seven chapters to the priesthood, gives us the result of the whole matter: "Now of the things which we have spoken *this is the sum*: we have such an high priest, who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens; a minister of the Sanctuary, and of the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, and not man. For every high priest is ordained to offer gifts and sacrifices: wherefore it is of necessity that this man have somewhat also to offer. For if he were on earth, he should not be a priest, seeing that there are priests that offer gifts according to the law: who serve unto the example and shadow (or type) of heavenly things, as Moses was admonished of God when he was about to make the tabernacle: for see (saith he) that thou make all things according to the pattern showed to thee in the mount." Heb. viii, 1-5.

97

Here the earthly tabernacle, with all its services, is declared to be an "example and shadow of heavenly things;" we are then told that those heavenly things are the great *original* by which the earthly tabernacle, with all its furniture, was made; and, in the second verse, it is denominated the Sanctuary and the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched and not man: and that Christ, as our high priest, is minister there. From the first to the eighth verses of chap. ix, he draws

the analogy between the two tabernacles, and their distinctive ministrations; and at the ninth verse, he informs us that the earthly tabernacle "was a figure (a type) for the time then present, in which were offered both gifts and sacrifices." These instances are sufficient to establish the typical nature of the Jewish sacrifices. I propose showing.

Second, that these sacrifices were *vicarious* and *expiatory*. Vicarious signifies acting for another: vicarious suffering is suffering for another: vicarious death, dying for another: expiation, to appease anger, to atone for; or to bring about reconciliation as the result of the atonement.

To prove that this was the intention and effect of the annual sacrifices of the Jews, we need only to refer to them. The penalty of the law, as has been shown, for personal sin is death. The true question, then, to be considered, is whether such sacrifices were appointed by God, and accepted instead of the *personal* punishment or life of the offender, which otherwise would have been forfeited; if in such case, the life of the victim be accepted, instead of the life of man, then the *vicarious* nature of most

98

of the Levitical oblations may be clearly and easily established.

The high priest, himself being a sinner, must die for his own sins, unless a substitute be accepted; hence Aaron was commanded "to offer his bullock of the sin-offering, which is for himself, and make an atonement for himself, and for his house." Lev. xvi, 6. Then two goats were to be brought before the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, and lots cast upon them; the one upon which the Lord's lot fell was to be offered for a sin-offering, to make an atonement for the sins of the people. Verses 7-9. "And Aaron shall bring the bullock of the sin-offering, which is for himself, and shall make an atonement for himself, and for his house, and shall kill the bullock of the sin-offering, which is for himself; and he shall take a censer full of burning coals of fire from off the altar before the Lord, and his hands full of sweet incense beaten small, and bring it within the vail: and he shall put the incense upon the fire before the Lord, that the cloud of the incense may cover the mercy-seat that is upon the testimony, *that he die not.*" Verses 11-13. The mercy seat was upon the law of God which the high priest had broken, and had he approached it without an atonement for himself, he must have died; but what did he offer as an atonement for himself and his house? Ans. A bullock: the bullock, therefore, *died in his stead*, and God accepted his death as a *substitute* for the *life* of the high priest. It was the blood of the bullock which was accepted. Verse 14. Having made an atonement for himself and his house, he was then required to kill the Lord's goat, to make an atonement for the people. "Then shall

99

he kill the goat of the sin-offering that is for the people, and bring his blood within the vail, and do with, that blood as he did with the blood of the bullock, and sprinkle it upon the mercy-seat, and before the mercy-seat. And he shall make an atonement for the holy place, because of the uncleanness of the children of Israel, and because of their transgressions in all their sins. . . . And he shall go out unto the altar that is before the Lord, and make an atonement for it; and shall

take of the blood of the bullock, and of the blood of the goat, and put it upon the horns of the altar round about. And shall sprinkle of the blood upon it with his finger seven times, and cleanse it, and hallow it from the uncleanness of the children of Israel. And the bullock for the sin-offering, and the goat for the sin offering, whose blood was brought in to make an atonement in the holy place, shall one carry forth without the camp. . . . And this shall be a statute forever unto you: that in the seventh month, on the tenth day of the month, ye shall afflict your souls. . . . For on that day shall the priest make an atonement for you, to cleanse you, that ye may be clean from all your sins before the Lord. And this shall be an everlasting statute unto you, to make an atonement for the children of Israel for all their, sins once a year. Verses 15, 16, 18, 19, 27, 29 30, 34.

According to the law of sacrifices here given, the following peculiarities must be observed:

1st. The high priest is to sacrifice a bullock for a sin-offering to make an atonement for himself and his house; then a goat, for a sin-offering, to make an atonement for the children of Israel. Here

100

God has appointed the sacrifice of beasts for the sins, both of the priest and the people; but of what avail would these sacrifices be unless they were the appointed means of putting away their sins? That they were the means of remission of sins is evident from the fact that their blood cleansed the sanctuary from "the uncleanness," and "all the sins" "of the children of Israel." But to be the appointed means of the forgiveness of sins, they must be accepted as substitutes for the guilty; for if God, in harmony with the great principles of his moral government, and the claims of justice, could pardon transgression without satisfaction, in the Jewish dispensation, he might also in the Christian; and so any *sacrifice for sin* in either, would be useless, and unnecessary. But that he could not is evident,

2nd. From the fact that he required the life of the innocent victim as a necessary atonement for sin. First. The worshiper must confess his sin, laying his hand upon the head of the sacrifice, by which the sins of the truly penitent were figuratively transferred to the substitute. See Lev. i, 4, 5. "And he shall put his hand upon the head of the burnt-offering; and it shall be accepted for him, (i. e., in his stead,) to make an atonement for him. And he shall kill the bullock before the Lord; and the priests, Aaron's sons, shall bring the blood, and sprinkle the blood round about upon the altar," etc. Second. After transferring their sins to the substitute, the animal is then killed, and treated as if it had been the actual transgressor, to show that "the wages of sin is death."

3rd. The blood of the victim being shed must be sprinkled round about the altar, and upon all the

101

furniture of the holy place, during the daily ministrations, to cleanse them from the uncleanness, and from the sins of the people; but on the tenth day of the seventh month, the day of atonement, the high priest kills one animal for himself, and one for the people, and carries their blood into the most holy place, and sprinkles it upon the mercy-seat, which covers a broken law, to cleanse it from the sins of

the people; for "without shedding of blood there is no remission." Why is the shedding of blood so necessary that there can be no remission without it? Ans. Because the life is in the blood, and the penalty of the law demands the life of the transgressor if therefore a substitute be accepted, it must be one that has blood to shed; hence all the sin-offerings were bleeding victims. This is the reason why the blood, in all cases, was required to make an atonement for the sins of the people. Hear the testimony of God himself: "For the life of the flesh is in the blood; and I have given it to you upon the altar, to make an atonement for your souls: for it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul." Lev. xvii, 11. If the penalty of sin be death, and the life of the victim be accepted as an atonement for sin, it follows, as a necessary consequence, that the sacrifice of the beast is vicarious. Also verse 14. "For it is the life of all flesh, the blood of it is for the life thereof." Again in Deut. xii, 23. "Only be sure that thou eat not the blood: for the blood is the life; and thou mayest not eat the life with the flesh." In all these instances the life of the animal is not only required, but actually accepted instead of the life of the believing, repenting sinner. But it may be objected, that the principal sacrifices of the Jewish

102

dispensation were only typical, looking forward to Christ for their efficacy; that they could not, in themselves, take away sin. This may be admitted without impairing the argument in the least; for if the typical sacrifices took away sin by figure, then their antitype must take them away in fact: and if those were vicarious by figure, then this must be vicarious in fact.

It may further be objected, that many of those sacrifices had reference to fines, and temporal punishments. While this is freely granted, it must be confessed by all, that the principal sacrifices of the Jews, especially those connected with the day of atonement, had exclusive reference to the penalty of God's law for personal sin which, as has been abundantly proved, is that death which the incorrigible sinner dies after his resurrection to future life. No one believes that the sins of any were ever borne into the most holy place, except those whose characters were accepted by the judge; and whose sins were (at least figuratively) expiated by the ministration of the high priest; and "by the blood of sprinkling." That was what God required of a Jew in order to the pardon of his sins; and to deny pardon to him, through the medium of these religious ceremonies, is to exclude him from all part or lot in God's plan of saving men; for these were the only means of forgiveness God had revealed, or of which he had any knowledge. Many an honest Jew doubtless lived and died in ignorance of the relation those typical sacrifices sustained to the sacrifice of Christ.

4th. To denote God's acceptance of the sacrifice, it was consumed by the hallowed fire, which was kept continually burning upon the altar; and sometimes

103

to show the divine favor, fire from heaven would immediately descend upon the sacrifice. "And there came fire out from before the Lord, and consumed upon the altar the burnt-offering and the fat: which when all the people saw, they shouted, and fell on their faces." Lev. ix, 24. Both were designed to denote God's

acceptance of the offering, as a substitution for the penitent. God would not accept the offering of any except the believing and truly penitent.

5th. Salt was sprinkled upon the sacrifice, and oly incense ascended as a sweet smelling savour to God, that he might be propitious, turn away his wrath, and accept the sacrifice in the sinner's stead. Thus we have seen that most of the Levitical sacrifices were *typical, vicarious* and *expiatory*. Add to the already accumulated evidence upon this point, the fact that all the allusions to those sacrifices, in connection with the sacrifice of Christ, in the New Testament represent them as being vicarious and expiatory. With this view, we can be at no loss to understand what John the Baptist means, when, pointing to Christ, he exclaims, "Behold the Lamb of God which *taketh away* the sin of the world." John i, 29. Here direct reference is had to the animal offerings for the remission of sins. To avail myself of the concise manner in which another has arranged the scriptures upon this point: "As the offering of the animal sacrifice took away sin, so Christ as the sacrificial Lamb '*taketh away* the sin of the world.' As there was a transfer of suffering and death, from the offender to the legally clean and sound victim, so Christ died, "the just for the unjust;" as the animal sacrifice was expiating, so Christ

104

is our 'propitiation,' or expiation; as by the Levitical oblations men were reconciled to God, so 'we when enemies, were reconciled to God by the death of his Son;' as in the Jewish dispensation, 'without shedding of blood there was no remission of sins,' so, as to Christ, we are 'justified by his blood,' and have 'redemption through his blood, the remission of sins;' as by the blood of the appointed sacrifices the holy places made with hands were made accessible to the Jewish worshipers, that blood being carried into them, and sprinkled by the high priest, so 'Christ entered once *with his own blood into the holy places*, (Campbell & McNight,) having obtained eternal redemption for us,' and has thus opened a 'new and living way' for us into the celestial Sanctuary; as the blood of the Mosaic oblations was the blood of the Old Testament, so he himself says, "This is my blood of the New Testament, shed for the remission of sins;" as it was a part of the sacrificial solemnity, in some instances, to feast upon the victim, so, with direct reference to this, our Lord also declares that he would give his own "flesh for the life of the world;" and that 'whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; for my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed;' that is, it is in truth and reality what the flesh and blood of the Jewish victims were in type."

The instances of the use of sacrificial terms, in the New Testament, are almost innumerable; but enough has been said to fully establish the points under consideration.

I now pass to consider, second, that portion of Sacred Writ which represents Jesus Christ as dying for us; dying in our stead; giving his life a ransom for many:

105

such as, "*I lay down my life for the sheep*," "*He gave himself for us*," "*He died "the just for the unjust*," "*Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many*," "*Christ, died for us*," etc.

To prove that Christ died *for* man in the sense of dying in his *stead*, I will first quote those texts of Scripture which have unquestionably that meaning, and which cannot be so construed as to mean anything else without great violence both to the texts, and their contexts. Nor are such texts wanting: they are almost innumerable. The speech of Caiphas the high priest is right to the point. "And one of them, named Caiphas, being the high priest that same year, said unto them, Ye know nothing at all, nor consider that it is expedient for us, that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not." John xi, 49, 50. Here the high priest plainly declares that Christ or the nation must perish; and that by putting Christ to death the nation might escape. All must admit that the preposition *for*, in this instance, signifies *instead of*. It was expedient that Christ should die *for* (*instead of*) the nation. Also, Rom. v, 6-8. "For when we were yet without strength, in due time Christ died for the ungodly. For scarcely for a righteous man will one die: yet peradventure for a good man some would even dare to die. But God commendeth his love toward us, in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us." The same Greek particle is translated *for* in each of these four instances; and they evidently have the same signification.

Verse 5 indubitably fixes the sense in which Christ died for us: "For scarcely for (instead of) a righteous man will one die: yet peradventure for (instead

106

of) a good man some would even dare to die." On this passage Doddridge has remarked, "One can hardly imagine any one would die for a good man, unless it were to redeem his life by giving up his own." According to Watson, the Hebrew term, answering to the Greek particle here translated *for*, is used in the same sense in David's lamentation for his son Absalom. "And the king was much moved, and went up to the chamber over the gate, and wept: and as he went, thus he said, O my son Absalom! my son, my son Absalom! would God I had died for thee, O Absalom, my son, my son!" 2 Sam. xviii, 33. What else could David mean except to wish that he had died in Absalom's stead?

The same original term is rendered "in the room of" in Matt ii, 22. "But when he heard that Archelaus did reign in Judea in the room of his father Herod," etc. It is also rendered *for* in the following instances. Luke xi, 11. "If a son shall ask bread of any of you that is a father, will he give him a stone? or if he ask a fish, will he for (instead of) a fish give him a serpent?" When the same preposition is applied to the death of Christ, (Mark x, 45,) shall we not give it the same meaning? Hear the language of our Saviour: "For even the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for (instead of) many." Paul says speaking of Christ: "Who gave himself a ransom for (instead of) all." 1 Tim. ii, 6. In both these instances reference is evidently made to the blood of the victim which was offered upon the altar to make an atonement for the soul, or life. See Lev. xvii, 10, 11, For the life of the flesh is the blood; and I have given it to you upon

107

the altar to make an atonement for your soul: for it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul; for the life of the flesh is in the blood." Here it is the blood (i. e., the life) of the victim which is to make an atonement for the soul; and to

make an atonement for the soul is the same as to be a ransom for the soul, as will appear by reference to Ex. xxx, 12-16. "They shall give every man a ransom for his soul unto the Lord, that there be no plague among them." Here the plague was death; the ransom from death was the blood (i. e., the life) and the soul, thus ransomed, evidently signifies the life; for, as has been shown, the life of the victim, in all the sacrifices, was substituted for the life of man.

With this view, we are prepared to understand what our Lord means when he says, he "gave his life a ransom (i. e., an equivalent, or price) for (instead of) many." Compare also Isa. liii; 10. "Yet it pleased the Lord to bruise him; he hath put him to grief; when thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin," etc. What was to be made an offering for sin? Ans. His (Christ's) soul. That *his soul* here signifies his *life*, will appear evident by comparing it with John xi, 11, where Christ speaking of himself says, "I am the good shepherd: the good shepherd giveth his *life* for the sheep." The only reasonable conclusion from this text is, that Christ or his sheep must one or the other die; and that Christ by giving his life saved the life of his sheep: if so he must have died in their stead. The preposition for, has, without doubt, the sense of instead of, in the following passages of scripture. 2 Cor. v, 15. "And that he died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him which

108

died for them, and rose again." Also in Heb. ii, 9. "But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honor; that he by the grace of God should taste death for every man." Here allusion is made to the ancient custom among the Greeks of mingling poison in a cup, with which they inflicted capital punishment. Socrates tasted of this poisonous draught, and died. A cup of deadly poison is represented as being held to the lips of every man, who must drink and die: Jesus Christ takes the cup, and drinks it to the very dregs: "he tasted death for every man; he must, therefore, have died in the stead of every man.

Again in 1 Pet. ii, 21, "For even hereunto were ye called: because Christ also suffered for us," etc. Also Chap. iii, 18. "For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God." He then tells us how Christ "suffered, the just for the unjust," "being put to death in the flesh." The case stands thus: the *unjust* were condemned to death: Christ, the just, suffered for them, by "being put to death in the flesh" in their stead. That the preposition, for, is often used in the sense of because, or in consequence of, is freely admitted; but that it is used in the sense of instead of in the foregoing texts cannot be reasonably denied. In every example given, you may substitute instead of, for the preposition for, and it will convey the same idea; and certainly if terms are the representatives of ideas, the meaning of this term is fixed beyond the possibility of a doubt.

In the third place I will investigate those portions of scripture which represent sin as the impulsive

109

cause of the death of Christ; or in which the preposition, for, is used to denote causality; which is always the case when it can be substituted by because,

without changing the sense. For example: "For (because) God so loved the world." It is an acknowledged rule of Grammar, that when for can be supplied by because without impairing the sense, it is a preposition denoting causality. It is so used, in connection with the death of Christ in Rom. iv, 24. "Who was delivered for our offences;" because of our offences. When the expression because of sins is coupled with suffering it will admit of no other interpretation; as, "I will chastise you seven times because of your sins." Lev. xxvi, 28. And also in the following examples. 1 Cor. xv, 3. "For I delivered unto you first of all, that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures." 1 Pet. iii, 18. "Christ hath once suffered for our sins." Gal. "Christ gave himself for our sins." "Christ offered one sacrifice for sins." Also Rom. vi, 10. "For in that he died, he died unto sin once." What can this mean only that he died on account of, or because of sin? It cannot mean that he was a sinner, and died unto sin by ceasing to be a sinner. It has unquestionably that meaning in Isa. liii, 5. "But he was wounded for (because of) our transgressions, he was bruised for (on account of) our iniquities." In what way could Christ die for our sins only by suffering the penalty due our sins which is death? For a man to die for his own sins, is to suffer the penalty due his sins; to die for another man's sins is to suffer the very penalty that man would have suffered for his own sins, had not a substitute been provided.

110

Just so with Christ: he died for our sins, by suffering the identical penalty we should suffer had not his death been accepted as our substitute; hence the death of Christ, when considered with reference to our sins, must be understood as the punishment our sins merit; but when in reference to God as being a sacrifice to expiate or atone for them.

In the fourth place, I will investigate those passages which represent Christ as *bearing* our sins; which cannot fairly be understood in any other sense than that of bearing the punishment of our sins. Peter says when speaking of the death of Christ, "Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree, that we being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness: by whose stripes ye were healed." 1 Pet. ii, 24. Peter in this passage evidently quotes from Isa. liii, 11, 12. "He shall see of the travail of his soul, and shall be satisfied: by his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many; for he shall bear their iniquities; and he bare the sin of many." The same expression is used by St. Paul Heb. ix, 23. "So Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation." To bear sin in the language of scripture is to bear the punishment of sin. Hebrew critics say that the original word rendered *bear* in Isaiah liii, is never used for taking away, but for bearing a burden, and is employed to express the punishment of sins, as in Lam. v, 7: "Our fathers have sinned, and are not, and we have borne their iniquities."

The same idea of bearing sins is expressed by Isa. liii, 5. "But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities." He

111

then tells us in what sense "he was bruised for our iniquities," "the chastisement of our peace was upon him and with his stripes we are healed." Chastisement is

the punishment of sin, or at least of a fault; for where there is no fault, there can be no just cause of chastisement. But the apostle Peter applies this very prophecy to Jesus Christ, (1 Pet ii, 24, "Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree,") to whose immaculate purity, and perfect innocency, all the prophets and apostles bear united testimony. If, therefore, chastisement was laid upon Christ, it could not be in consequence of any fault in him; but in consequence of fault in us; "for our transgressions:" "his stripes" were the price of our "healing."

These quotations positively prove a substitution, a suffering in our stead. An innocent person, who had never sinned, "bare in his own body our sins on the tree," and suffered in his own person, as our substitute, the very "stripes" due "our transgressions," and the only means of our "peace," or "reconciliation;" "For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death," etc. Rom. v, 10. The same sentiment is presented to us in a still more striking, and forcible light in the 6th and 7th verses of the same chapter. "All we like sheep have gone astray, we have turned every one to his own way; and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all."

Bishop Lowth translates this passage, "and the Lord hath made to light upon him the iniquity of us all; it was exacted and he was made answerable." Other critics render this passage, "he put or fixed together upon him the iniquity of us all; it was exacted

112

and he was afflicted." This passage is inexplicable except upon the principle of the sufferings and death of Christ being vicarious. Watson observes, "Our iniquities, that is, according to the Hebrew mode of speaking, their punishment, are made to meet upon him; they are fixed together and laid upon him; the penalty is exacted from him, though he himself had incurred no penalty personally, and, therefore, it was in consequence of that vicarious exaction that he was "afflicted," was "made answerable," and voluntarily submitted, "he opened not his mouth."

The apostle Paul uses similar language in 1 Cor. v, 21. "For he hath made him to be sin (a sin offering) for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." Now, in what sense was Christ made to be sin? Certainly not by being made a sinner; for he was "without sin," "in his mouth was no guile;" nor could it have been by being esteemed a sinner; for, first, "sin" is here placed in contrast to "the righteousness of God," which no one claims to be only in appearance; second, the apostle makes another contrast, in this verse, equally striking. God made him who knew no sin, and consequently deserved no punishment, to be sin; that is, as one justly observes, "it pleased him that he should be punished; but Christ was innocent, not only according to human laws, but according to the law of God; the antithesis, therefore, requires us to understand, that he bore the penalty of the law, and that he bore it in our stead."

I will add one more text to the mass of testimony already adduced upon this point. It is one whose force cannot be evaded. It reads thus: "Christ hath

113

redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us: for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree." Gal. iii, 13. Paul here quotes from the writings of Moses. Deut. xxi, 22, 23. "If a man have committed a sin worthy of death, and he be put to death, and they hang him on a tree, his body shall not remain all night upon the tree, but thou shalt in any wise bury him that day; (for he that is hanged, is accursed of God;) that the land may not be defiled." This infamy was only inflicted, in cases of the most heinous offenses, and was designed to show the light in which God viewed the persons thus exposed: they were a curse, or execration. On this verse, I will give the remarks of Grotius, which are most conclusive:

"Socinus says, that to be an execration means to be under the punishment of execration, which is true. For *katara* every where denotes punishment proceeding from the sanction of law. 1 Pet. ii, 24; Mark xv, 21. Socinus also admits, that the cross of Christ was this curse; his cross, therefore, had the nature of punishment, which is what we maintain. Perhaps he allows that the cross of Christ was a punishment, because Pilate, as a judge, inflicted it; but this does not come up to the intention of the Apostle; for, in order to prove that Christ was made obnoxious to punishment, he cites Moses, who expressly asserts, that whoever hangs on a tree, according to the divine law, "is accursed of God;" consequently, in the words of the Apostle, who cites this place of Moses, and refers it to Christ, we must supply the same circumstances, "accursed of God," or obnoxious to the highest and most ignominious punishment "for us, that the blessing of Abraham

114

might come upon the Gentiles, etc. For when the apostles speak of the sufferings of Christ in reference to our good, they have special reference to the act of God, and not of men. Hence it is clearly proved that the death of Christ was penal, which it could not be in any other sense than by his taking our place, and suffering in our stead." ¹¹

The foregoing testimony establishes the position (as I humbly believe) that the death of Christ is vicarious; that the penalty of God's law for personal transgression, is removed out of the way of man's salvation, by being strictly inflicted upon a substitute, whom the judge may accept, in the room of all who will voluntarily comply with the conditions he has prescribed, without impairing, in the least degree, the authority of his just, and holy law, or impeaching the honor of his throne, or the rectitude of his moral government; so that God may "be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus."

Hence, the second difficulty is removed out of the way in harmony with all the attributes of God, and all the great principles and interests of his moral government.

In conclusion, I will consider the atonement in its relation,

1st. To the Father as the Supreme Ruler of the Universe. For the atonement to be of any avail to man, as a guilty and condemned criminal, it must be accepted by the judge. Even though a substitute should be provided, which, in every respect, might be adequate to the claims of the divine law,

115

yet unless the judge should see fit to accept such a substitute, in the sinner's stead, it would avail nothing.

The Bible every where represents the Father as being eternally, and unchangeably opposed to sin in every form, and under whatever circumstances it may be presented. As a being of infinite rectitude, he cannot, from the essential principles of his nature, look upon sin with the least degree of favor. As the Supreme Ruler, he cannot countenance a spirit of rebellion in any part of his empire. As a being of immaculate purity, his feelings, and sympathies, must be all averse to all moral, or physical impurity. Hence to be a plan which God can accept, it must in the first place be one which will render him propitious, or disposed to pardon the transgressor. To be such, it must appease, or turn away his anger.

The Scriptures represent God as being angry with the wicked every day. His fierce anger as being kindled against the whole world. Some writers, in order to evade the conclusion of the atonement's being propitiatory, deny the existence of such a principle as wrath, or anger, in the Divine nature.

If it be admitted that God from his nature cannot be angry with the wicked, that his wrath cannot be kindled against them, then no atonement would be necessary to turn away his wrath, or to appease his anger. But if the justice of God be punitive, (and if it is not punitive, his law is a dead letter,) then is there wrath in God; then is God angry with the wicked; then is the sinner obnoxious to his anger, and a propitiation becomes necessary to turn away his wrath.

The question under consideration is not whether

116

God is love, or whether he is of a peaceable nature; on this all parties are agreed; but whether God is holy and just; whether his creatures are under his law or not; whether that law has a penalty; and whether he as the author of that law, and the judge, is bound to execute and uphold it: if so, then indeed, is there wrath in God, which must be appeased before he can accept any plan for man's redemption. These are points upon which the Bible speaks in language too plain and explicit to be misunderstood. I will only quote a few of the numerous texts that might be selected: "And they shall be ashamed of your revenues because of the fierce anger of the Lord." Jer. xii, 13. "The anger of the Lord shall not return, until he have executed, and till he have performed the thoughts of his heart." Chap. xxiii, 20. "The fierce anger of the Lord shall not return, until he have done it, and until he, have performed the intents of his heart." Chap. xxx 24. "Before the decree bring forth, before the day pass as the chaff, before the fierce anger of the Lord come upon you, before the day of the Lord's anger come upon you. Seek ye the Lord all ye meek of the earth, which have wrought his judgment; seek righteousness, seek meekness: it may be ye shall be hid in the day of the Lord's anger." Zeph. ii, 2, 3. "He that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him." John iii, 36. "Indignation and wrath upon every soul of man that doeth evil." Rom. ii, 8. "For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness." Chap. i, 18. "Because of these things cometh the wrath of God upon the children of disobedience." Eph. v, 6. "The same shall drink

of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation." Rev. xiv, 10. "For the great day of his wrath is come; and who shall be able to stand?" Chap. vi, 17. "And great Babylon came in remembrance before God, to give unto her the cup of the wine of the fierceness of his wrath." Chap. xvi, 19.

Now, until the anger of the Lord can be appeased, and the fierceness of his wrath turned away, there can be no hopes of any plan for the sinner's relief being accepted; hence the atonement to be of any avail must first render God propitious. To do this, it must be an adequate atonement; because God, as a being of infinite justice and holiness, could not look with complacency upon a plan of salvation which would impair, in any degree, the claims of his law, or compromise the honor of his moral government. "To *propitiate*," according to Watson, "is to *appease* to *atone*, to turn away the wrath of an offended person." In the case before us the wrath turned away is the wrath of God; the person making the propitiation is Christ, the propitiating sacrifice, or offering is his blood. All this is expressed in most explicit terms in the passages. Rom. iii, 35. "Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God." "And he is the propitiation for our sins: and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world." 1 John ii, 2. "Herein is love not that we love God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the *propitiation* for our sins. According to Greek critics, the Greek verb here used, is the one so often employed by their writers to express the action of a

person, who in some appointed way turned away the wrath of an offended Deity. The sin-offering of the Old Testament expresses the same idea. "And the priest shall take of the blood of the sin-offering," i. e., the propitiation. Eze. xlv, 19. Also in Num. v, 8. "But if the man have no kinsman to recompense the trespass unto, let the trespass be recompensed unto the Lord, even to the priest; besides the ram of the atonement, whereby atonement shall be made for him."

I am told that the Hebrew term translated atonement in the last two instances quoted, and sin-offering in the first, answer to the Greek term rendered propitiation. But it is in connection with the blood of the victim in the former cases, and the blood of Christ in the latter; and in both cases the efficacy of the atonement is in the blood; because the life is in the blood: and the law demands the life of the sinner; hence without the shedding of blood there is no remission of sins.

In the second place, to be a plan which God shall accept, it must be in every respect an equivalent; otherwise his government would suffer loss in the exchange, and the authority, and rectitude of his law be correspondingly weakened. But that the sacrifice of his only begotten Son is in every respect an equivalent; that it vindicates the rectitude of his "holy, just and good" law, is evident from the fact that he has actually accepted the sacrifice, as absolutely perfect, as far as plenitude and efficiency is concerned. Nay, further, it is a plan, which he has not only accepted, but which he himself appointed. It must,

therefore, be one which his infinite wisdom shall approve, and his infinite justice vindicate.

119

In the third place, if it be a plan which God shall appoint, and accept, it must not only require entire submission and future obedience, but must place the sinner in a condition in which he will be as innocent, legally and morally, as though he had never transgressed the Divine law. To pardon the sinner while in a state of hostility to his moral government, would be a license to sin and rebellion. To grant pardon without security for future obedience, would endanger the future welfare of his subjects, and the harmony, and rectitude of his government. Hence the revealed plan of salvation, as we shall see in the sequel, requires the sinner to ground forever all his weapons of rebellion, and fight against God no more. It requires a life of perfect submission and obedience. To grant pardon while the sinner is legally guilty, would be a contempt of all law and order; it would be an utter subversion of his own justice, and an abrogation of his own law. To grant pardon while the sinner is morally guilty, would be a compromise of his own moral nature, and a free indulgence to moral guilt and impurity.

God as a being of infinite rectitude and purity, must require the entire removal of both these impediments. The removal of the first, i. e., legal guilt, is an act of the Judge. The remission of the penalty of God's law is necessary to the legal innocency of the sinner. God on his part, as the Supreme Judge, has promised (and he cannot lie) to pardon the sins of all those who will comply with the conditions on their part. The removal of the second, is an act of the criminal. A change in the legal relation the sinner sustains to God, as the transgressor of his law, does not necessarily involve a

120

change in his moral character. Without repentance, and reformation, he is just as guilty, morally, as if he had not been pardoned. To illustrate: A man, who is guilty of willful murder, may be sentenced by the judge to be hung: the executive may pardon him. Now, without unfeigned repentance would not that man be just as guilty, in a moral point of view, after he had received pardon, as he was before? Would he not be a murderer still, although pardoned? He certainly would. Just so, in reference to the sinner: he would be just as guilty, in the sight of God, and in the estimation of an intelligent universe, with, as without pardon, unless he should forsake all his sins, and "bring forth fruits meet for repentance." Hence, it would be morally and legally improper, for the Judge of all the earth, to grant pardon to the transgressors of his law without a moral change, or fitness in their natures and characters. And this is a work which God cannot do for man in harmony with his plan, which requires a voluntary acceptance on the part of the pardoned sinner; nor in harmony with the right of choice with which God endowed man in his creation. It must, therefore, be a work, which, if ever done, the creature must do for himself. Hence the propriety, yea, the necessity of God's conditioning the plan of salvation.

If then this be a plan which God can accept, it must be in harmony with all these principles; it must require all these conditions on the part of the sinner. But God has accepted this plan, as the whole Bible will testify; therefore the sinner

must comply with the prescribed conditions on his part or be for ever excluded from the pardon of his sins, and

121

from the rich rewards of the gospel, and the glorious privileges, and immunities of the kingdom of God. These conditions I shall consider more particularly in another chapter. I will now consider the atonement in its relation,

2nd. To the only begotten Son of God. If, as has been abundantly proved, the penalty of God's law for personal transgression, is removed out of the way of our salvation, by, the sacrifice of the Son of God in our *stead*, then indeed is it a matter of vital importance, that we have correct views of the nature and character of our *substitute*. To have clear views of the relation the atonement sustains to the Son of God, we must understand the relation the Son of God sustains to the atonement.

In presenting this part of the subject, I propose considering the Son of God as he was before his incarnation, as he was during his incarnation, and as he has been, and will be since his incarnation. I will also subdivide these three divisions, and consider them first, in their relation to the real nature of the Son of God, and secondly, in their relation to his official character. To resume the order proposed.

1st. The *pre-existence* of the Son of God claims our attention. The testimony on this point is so clear and explicit, that comment will be almost unnecessary. John the Baptist testifies that the Son of God *was* before him. John i, 15. "John bare witness of him, and cried saying, This was he of whom I spake, He that cometh after me is preferred before me: for he *was* before me." Again in verse 30: "This is he of whom I said, After me cometh a man which is preferred before me: for he *was* before me."

122

The reason given by the Baptist why our Lord was preferred before him is, that he *was* before him. This must signify that he was in existence, or existed before him. Also Chap. iii, 13. Says Christ in his discourse with Nicodemus: "And no man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that *came down* from heaven, even the Son of man which is in heaven." Here it is emphatically declared that the Son of man came down from heaven. Our Saviour styles himself "the bread of God which *cometh down from heaven*." Chap. vi, 34. The bread of life. Verse 48. "I am that bread of life." "This is the bread which cometh down from heaven." Verse 5. "This is that bread which came down from heaven." Verse 58. "What and if ye shall see the Son of man ascend up *where* he was before?" Verse 62. His ascending up where he was before, proves his pre-existence *there* just as much as it does his subsequent existence.

In the passages quoted there are two phrases used: "*came down from heaven*," "*ascended into heaven*." The former denotes his real existence, and personality before his descent from heaven, just as much as the latter denotes his existence and personality, before his ascension into heaven.

Chap. v. 38. "For I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me." Paul speaking of Christ says; "And he is before all things." Col, i, 17. *To be before all things he must have priority of existence to all other things*. Mark the explicit language of him who was best qualified to testify in

this matter. John viii, 58. "Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily I say unto you, *Before Abraham was I am.*" The obvious

123

meaning of this passage is, Before Abraham was born, I was in existence. Abraham the patriarch is the person here spoken of, because the Jews had just said unto him, "Thou art not yet fifty years old, and hast thou seen Abraham?" Verse 57. I will conclude the evidence upon this point by quoting one more text, which, from its majesty and explicitness, may well close an argument upon a subject of such magnitude and importance. John xvii, 5. "And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee, *before the world was.*" Note, first, to be susceptible of glory, he must have real conscious existence and personality; second, to have glory with the Father, he must be a real, intelligent being, just as much as the Father; third, to have glory with the Father before the world was, he must have priority of existence to the world.

In reference to his dignity, he is denominated the Son of God, before his incarnation. Hear his own language: "He that speaketh of himself, seeketh his own glory: but he that seeketh his glory that sent him, the same is true." John vii, 18. "Say ye of him, whom the Father hath sanctified, and sent into the world, Thou blasphemest; because I said, I am the Son of God?" Chap. x, 36. "In this was manifest the love of God toward us, because God sent his only begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him. Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins. 1 John iv, 9, 10. The idea of being sent implies that he was the Son of God antecedent to his being sent. To suppose otherwise is to suppose that a father can

124

send his son on an errand before that son has an existence, which would be manifestly absurd. To say that "God sent his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh," is equivalent to saying that the Son of God assumed our nature; he must therefore have been the Son of God before his incarnation.

It would be considered an honor in the world's estimation to be a son of Nicholas, and heir to all the Russias; but what is this in comparison to the honor of being the only begotten Son of God, and heir to the throne of this world; not to reign for a few brief years, and then descend from his throne into the silence of the tomb, but to reign forever and ever. Would it not be an honor for our adorable Redeemer to share the unclouded glory of all the angels in heaven; nay, to have all the celestial choirs join in unison to hymn his praise, and fall adoring before his throne? But what are all these demonstrations when compared with the eternal weight of glory he had with the Father "*before the world was?*" Would not he be considered rich indeed who should possess all the wealth of the world? But what is this in comparison to the riches of him who possessed the treasured riches of eternity; who, although "rich, for our sake became poor, that we through his poverty might be made rich."

The creation of the world, with all its vast oceans and mighty continents, and its numerous and varied population, is ascribed to this August Personage in his

pre-existent nature. "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. All things were made by him; and without him was not anything made that was made" John i, 1, 3. So unspeakably glorious is

125

this work, that its mere contemplation causes "the four and twenty elders to fall down before him, and cast their crowns before the throne, saying, Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory and honor and power: for thou hast created all things, and for thy pleasure they are and were created." Rev. iv, 10, 11. In the same exalted nature, he is represented as upholding all the works of creation. "And he is before all things, and by him all things consist." Col. i, 17.

Speaking of the dignity and glory of his pre-existent nature, Paul says: "Who being the brightness of his (the Father's) glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power." Heb. i, 3. In his original nature, in reference to his position, he was exalted far above angels, and all principalities and powers.

But in conclusion on this interesting part of the subject, let us investigate more critically the import of the term, *only begotten Son of God*: and, first, the bearing it has upon his original nature. To appreciate the atonement, we must not only understand the exaltation, glory and honor, our blessed Redeemer sacrificed in taking upon him the infamy and degradation of our nature, but also the *nature* he possessed previous to his incarnation; for if it was a human nature, then it was a human sacrifice; if it was an angelic nature, it was an angelic sacrifice; but if, as I shall attempt to show, it was a Divine nature, then the offering of our Lord and Saviour, was a Divine Sacrifice. It has already been demonstrated that the term, "*only begotten Son of God*," is applied to Christ previous to his incarnation. I will adduce one more passage on this point:

126

"And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth." John i, 14. Here the Word, and the only begotten Son, are used synonymously; thus, the Word was made flesh, and we beheld his glory, i. e., the Word's glory, etc. By reference to the first verse of this chapter, we learn that this Word, i. e., the only begotten Son of God, was in the beginning and was the instrumentality by which all things were made, which were made.

To be the *only begotten* Son of God must be *understood* in a different sense than to be a Son by creation; for in that sense all the creatures he has made are sons. Nor can it refer to his miraculous conception, with the virgin Mary, by the Holy Ghost; because he is represented by this endearing title more than four thousand years before his advent in the village of Bethlehem. Moreover, he is represented as being exalted far above the highest orders of men and angels in his primeval nature. He must therefore be understood as being the Son of God in a much higher sense than any other being. His being the only begotten of the Father supposes that none except him were thus begotten; hence he is, in truth and verity the only begotten Son of God; and as such he must be Divine; that is, be a partaker of the Divine nature. This term expresses his highest, and most exalted nature. Neither the Father, the prophets, nor the apostles apply a higher

term to him. The Son of God himself never claimed a higher title. The Jews accused him of blasphemy upon this high claim. John x, 36. This claim also excited their rage to the highest degree. John v, 18. In

127

this glorious and dignified character he is presented as the true Messiah and Saviour of the world; and as the great object of faith, and the author of eternal life. John i, 18, 36; vi, 69. In this character he is presented as the glorious object of worship by all the Host of heaven. Heb. i, 6. In the last clause of the previous verse the Father says, "And again, I will be to him a Father, and he shall be to me a Son:" and as has been shown, these passages refer to his primeval nature. And in this character he is represented as the Creator of the worlds. Heb. i, 2, 3; John i, 1-3.

But in the last place, on this point, What was the *origin* of this nature; or in other words, the origin of the Son of God. It is admitted by Trinitarians that the pre-existence, simply considered, does not prove his eternal God-head, nor his eternal Son-ship. Says Watson, a standard writer of the Trinitarian School, "His pre-existence, indeed, simply considered, does not evince his God-head, and is not therefore, a proof against the Arian hypothesis; but it destroys the Socinian notion, that he was a man *only*. For since no one contends for the pre-existence of human souls, and if they did, the doctrine would be confuted by their own consciousness, it is clear, that if Christ existed before his incarnation, he is not a *mere* man, whatever his nature, by other arguments may be proved to be." This is an honest acknowledgement plainly expressed. And in reference to his *nature*, it has been shown to be Divine; and being such, it must have been immortal. Indeed this proposition is self-evident; for he who is Divine, must be immortal.

We cannot suppose that Christ was mortal, and

128

as such, would have been subject to death, had not the plan of redemption been devised; he must, therefore, in his original nature, have been deathless.

The question now to be considered, then, is not whether the only begotten Son of God was Divine, immortal, or the most dignified and exalted being, the Father only excepted, in the entire Universe; all this has been proved, and but few will call it in question; but whether this august Personage is self-existent and eternal, in its absolute, or unlimited sense; or whether in his highest nature, and character, he had an origin, and consequently beginning of days. The idea of Father and Son supposes priority of the existence of the one, and the subsequent existence of the other. To say that the Son is as old as his Father, is a palpable contradiction of terms. It is a natural impossibility for the Father to be as young as the Son, or the Son to be as old as the Father. If it be said that this term is only used in an accommodated sense, it still remains to be accounted for, why the Father should use as the uniform title of the highest, and most endearing relation between himself and our Lord, a term which, in its uniform signification, would contradict the very idea he wished to convey. If the inspired writers had wished to convey the idea of the co-etaneous existence, and eternity of the Father and Son, they could not possibly have used more incompatible terms. And of this, Trinitarians have been sensible. Mr. Fuller, although a Trinitarian, had the

honesty to acknowledge, in the conclusion of his work on the Son-ship of Christ, that, "in the order of nature, the Father must have existed *before* the Son." But with this admission, he attempts to reconcile the

129

idea of the Son's being "*properly eternal*," as well as the Father; two ideas utterly irreconcilable. The idea of an eternal Son is a self-contradiction. He must, therefore have an origin. But what saith the Scriptures? They speak right to the point. The apostle Paul says, speaking of Christ, "Who is the image of the invisible God, the *first born* of every creature." Col. i, 15. Notice, 1st. This cannot refer to his birth of the Virgin Mary, in Bethlehem of Judea, because millions of creatures, in connection with this world, had been born previous to that time. Cain and Abel had been born more than four thousand years previously. 2nd. The following verse makes his birth antecedent to the creation of all things in heaven and on earth, including all worlds, all ranks and orders of intelligences, visible and invisible. "For by *him*." By whom? Ans. By *the first born of every creature*. The pronoun *him* refers to this being for its antecedent. "For by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him, and for him." Verse 16. All things in heaven and in earth, visible and invisible, thrones, dominions, principalities, and powers, evidently include all the orders of created intelligences. Now, he must have been born, i. e., had a real intelligent existence, before he could exercise creative power. But all the works of creation are ascribed to him as the "*first born of every creature*;" hence the birth here spoken of, must have been previous to the existence of the first creature in heaven or in earth. To be such, it must refer to his Divine nature, unless he had two distinctive natures before

130

his incarnation; for which no one contends. But the 17th verse fixes the priority of the birth here spoken of. "And he is before all things, and by him all things consist." Here the pronoun *he* refers to the same person for its antecedent, that the pronoun *him* does; and both refer to "the first born of every creature." And the "all things," he is before, in this verse, are evidently the "all things" named in the previous verse. Hence the point is fully established, that it is the Divine nature of our blessed Redeemer which is here spoken of; and that this nature *was born*: and in reference to his order, he was "*the first born*."

Again, in John i, 1-3, 14, we have the same class of evidence. "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made." "In the beginning," evidently refers to the commencement of the series of events brought to view in these verses, which was the creation of all things. This gives "the only begotten of the Father" (see verse 14) intelligent existence before the first act of creative power was put forth, and proves that it is his Divine nature here spoken of; and that too, in connection with the creation of all things. In verse 14, this Word, who was "in the beginning" "with God," who "was God," and by whom "all things were made, that were made," is declared to be the "only begotten of the Father," thereby

teaching that in his highest nature he was begotten; and consequently as such, he must have had a beginning. Associate the many occurrences of the term, "only begotten Son of

131

God," with the person, nature, and time, brought to view in the foregoing verses; and if any doubts still remain, in reference to the Divine nature of the only begotten Son of God having had an origin, you may compare them with those texts which exclude the possibility of his being eternal, in the sense of his never having had a beginning of days; such as "The blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords; who *only* hath immortality." 1 Tim. vi, 16. This cannot be understood in the sense of none having deathless natures, or being exempt from death, except the Father; for Christ at that time was immortal in this sense: so were all the angels who had kept their "first estate;" it must, therefore be understood in the same sense, that we all understand, his being the *only* Potentate; not that there are no other potentates; but that he is the only Supreme Ruler. There cannot be two Supreme Rulers at the same time.

Again, where it is declared, that there are none good except the Father, it cannot be understood that none others are good in a relative sense; for Christ and angels, are good, perfect, in their respective sphere; but that the Father alone is supremely, or absolutely, good; and that he alone is immortal in an absolute sense; that he alone is self-existent; and, that; consequently, every other being, however high or low, is absolutely dependent upon him for life; for being. This idea is most emphatically expressed by our Saviour himself: "For as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself." John v, 26. This would be singular language for one to use who had life in his essential nature, just as much as the Father. To meet

132

such a view, it should read thus: For as the Father hath life in himself, so hath the Son life in himself. If as Trinitarians argue, the Divine nature of the Son hath life in himself (i. e., is self existent) just the same, and in as absolute a sense, as the Father, why should he represent himself as actually dependent upon the Father for life? What propriety in representing the Father as conferring upon him a gift which he had possessed from all eternity? If it be said that his human nature derived its life from the Father, I would answer, It does not thus read; or even if it did, I would still urge the impropriety of the human nature of the Son of God representing itself as being absolutely dependent upon the Father for the gift of life. Would it not be much more reasonable, in such case, for the human nature of Christ to derive its life, and vitality, from its union with the Divine nature, instead of from its union with the Father? I understand this passage according to the natural import of the language: "For as the Father hath life (i. e., existence) in himself, (i. e., self-existent,) so hath he given to the Son to have life (i. e., existence) in himself."

I know I will be referred to the declaration of our Saviour, I have power to lay down my life, and to take it up again. John x, 18. Read the last clause of this verse: "This commandment (commission-Campbell) have I received of my Father."

I will conclude the evidence upon this point by quoting one more passage. Paul says, "And again, when he bringeth the first-begotten into the world, he saith, And let all the angels of God worship him." Heb. i, 6. He must have been his Son before he could send him into the world. In verse 2, the Father

133

declares that he made the worlds by the same Son he is here represented as sending into the world. His Son must have existed before he created the worlds; and he must have been begotten before he existed; hence the begetting here spoken of, must refer to his Divine nature, and in reference to his order, he is the first-begotten; hence as a matter of necessity he must have been "the *first born* of every creature." Col. i, 15. "The first born of every creature." Creature signifies creation; hence to be the first born of every creature, (creation) he must be a created being; and as such, his life and immortality must depend upon the Father's will, just as much as angels, or redeemed men: and as the Father has given his Son to have life in himself, so his Son will give this life to all his children. His invitation is to all, "Come unto me and I will give you life." The glorious promise for all the pious dead is, that their lives are hid with Christ in God, and when he who is their life shall appear, then shall they appear with him in glory.

Having investigated the original nature, glory and dignity of our Lord and Master; having gazed a few moments upon the face of him who is the fairest among ten thousand, and altogether lovely; having had a glance at the celestial glory he had with the Father, before the world was, and beheld that matchless form which is the image of the invisible God; and having looked with wonder and admiration upon this august personage, exalted far above angels and thrones and dominions, principalities and powers; we are prepared, as far as our feeble perceptions can comprehend, to appreciate that amazing love and condescension which induced our adorable Redeemer

134

to forego all the glories and honors of heaven, and all the endearments of his Father's presence. Although all his Father's treasures were his, yet he became so poor, that he had not where to lay his head; oft-times the cold, damp earth being his only bed, and the blue heavens his only covering; a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief-scoffed at by the Jews, and mocked by the Gentiles; a houseless stranger, he wore out his life under the ignoble garb of a servant, and last of all "*died, the just for the unjust,*" and took his exit from the world under the infamous character of a malefactor. O! was ever love like this! Did ever mercy stoop so low? Well might the poet exclaim,

"O for this love let rocks and hills
Their lasting silence break;
And all harmonious human tongues
Their Saviour's praises speak."

In presenting this part of the subject I propose considering,

1st. Those texts of Scripture which represent the Son of God in his highest nature as becoming man; as actually becoming flesh and blood. The first chapter of John places this matter in a clear light. He says, "In the beginning was the

Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God; and the Word was made *flesh*, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth." John i, 1, 14. Notice, first. In the first verse, the *Word* and *God* are used interchangeably: "the Word was with God-the word was God." Second, the *Word*, and the *only begotten* of the Father, are also used synonymously: "And the Word was made flesh,

135

etc., and we beheld his glory, (i. e., the Word's glory,) the glory as of the only begotten of the Father."

By this we learn that our Lord did not lose his personal identity in his transition from God to man, from the Word to flesh: "and the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth." It is the same person all the way through; and Peter, James and John beheld the glory as of the only begotten Son of God, when they were with him in the holy mount. 2 Pet. i, 17, 18. Third. "The Word," "God," "the only begotten of the Father," was made flesh; not flesh made, and the Word put into it; or united with it, but "*the Word* was made flesh." The natural import of this language is, that the only begotten of the Father, was actually converted into flesh, and as flesh denotes the real nature of the beings for whom he became a substitute, we may reasonably suppose that he became flesh; that the *Divine nature* was *made human*; nay, that the very substance of which he was originally composed was converted into flesh; otherwise he would not be a real man, a real substitute for man. To be such, he must represent man's *nature*, as well as his condition.

The same objections may be urged against the duplex entity of Christ, as that of man; nor does the Bible anywhere represent him as such a being, but invariably as a being having but one personality. If so, he could not have been Divine and human, mortal and immortal, at the same time. Hence he must have been Divine and immortal as a whole being, and human (flesh) and mortal as a whole being. But

136

how can that be? Ans. By the power of God. Or according to the apostle Paul, our Lord was "made of the seed of David according to the flesh, and declared to be the Son of God with *power*," etc. Rom. i, 3, 4. Third. As a real unit, being composed of flesh, he dwelt among them. Paul expresses the same sentiment in his quotation from Ps. xl. He says speaking of the advent of Christ: "Wherefore, when he cometh into the world, he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a body hast thou prepared me." Heb. x, 5. The pronoun *me* refers to his previous nature. Hear his language: "Then said I, Lo, I come (in the volume of the book it is written of me) to do thy will, O God." Verse 7. Do not all these pronouns refer to his previous nature? And is not the declaration, "a body hast thou prepared me," synonymous with that of the Word's *being "made flesh"*? Then it would read, Thou hast converted *me* into a *body*, i. e. "a body hast thou made me;" "the Word was made flesh." The *body* and *flesh*, in this case, would be convertible terms. This view is greatly strengthened by verse 7, where all the efficacy of the atonement is associated with the sacrifice of this body: "By the

which will we are sanctified, through the offering of the *body* of Jesus Christ once for all." And in verse 12, this very body is denominated *this man*: "But this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins, forever sat down on the right hand of God;" thereby teaching that *body* and man are convertible terms in these texts; hence it would express the Apostle's meaning in full to render the last clause of verse 5, a man hast thou prepared, or made *me*: "And being found in fashion as a *man*, he

137

humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross." Phil. ii. 8.

Again in Rom. i, 3, 4. "Concerning his Son Jesus Christ our Lord, which was made of the seed of David according to the flesh, and declared to be the Son of God with power," etc. Here it is emphatically declared that "Jesus Christ our Lord" in his highest nature, i. e., as the Son of God, "was made of the seed of David according to the flesh." David, as a whole being was flesh; hence he could entail no other nature upon his offspring; consequently when the Son of God was made the seed of David, he must have been made flesh. In his Divine nature he was the Root (i. e., the Father by creation) of David. Rev. v, 5. In this sense he is both the Lord and Son of David. Acts ii, 34. But all that was David's Lord, before his incarnation, became his Son afterward. No intimation that any part of his original nature was excepted when he "was made of the seed of David according to the flesh;" or when he "was made flesh."

Also in Phil. ii, 6-9. "Who being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God." That this verse refers to his highest nature will be admitted by all: and it is declared in the verse following, that in this nature he became man. Mark the explicit language: "But made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men: and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross." That taking "the form of a servant," and being "made in the likeness

138

of men," is synonymous with his becoming a real man, from the fact that in the very nature he described, he died "the death of the cross." What nature died? Ans. The human. Then the exalted being brought to view in verse 6, actually became a mortal man, and died.

I will quote one more text on this point. Heb. ii, 14. "Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same: that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is the Devil." Here he is represented as taking part of flesh and blood, as, or in the same manner, children do. The obvious meaning is, For as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also took part with them in the same; that is, he was a being composed of flesh and blood the same as the children. This view is confirmed by the last clause of this verse, taken in connection with the verse following, in which nature, he is represented as dying; and as the result of which delivering "them, who through the fear of death; were all their life time subject to bondage."

What nature "was wounded for our transgressions, and bruised for our iniquities?" Was it not his flesh, as the "seed of the woman?" What blood was shed "for the remission of sins?" Was it not the identical blood which had flowed through the veins of Mary his mother, and back through her ancestry to Eve, the mother of all living? Otherwise he was not the "seed of the woman," of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and David; but that he was the literal seed of Abraham is evident from verse 16: "For verily he took not on him the nature of

139

angels; but he took on him the seed of Abraham." The reason why he chose the nature of Abraham in preference to that of angels, is plainly stated in the following verses: "Wherefore in all things it behooved him to be made like unto his brethren; that he might be a merciful and faithful High Priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people. For in that he himself hath suffered, being tempted, he is able to succor them that are tempted."

Observe first. He is represented as taking part of (in) flesh and blood. Second. The same being is represented as dying to deliver them who were all their lives under fear of death. Third. The same person took not on him the nature of angels, but the nature, or seed of Abraham. Fourth. It was necessary he should take the nature of Abraham, 1st. To qualify him for being a merciful High Priest, one who from his near relationship to man, can sympathize for him as angels could not do. 2nd. It is necessary "to make reconciliation for the sins of the people. This implies that no other nature could make reconciliation. The nature of angels, nay his own original nature, would not be a substitute for man; would not make an atonement "for the sins of the people." Man must die to redeem man. 3rd. It was necessary he should suffer, and be tempted as man, to be "able to succor them that are tempted."

"Touched with a sympathy within,
He knows our feeble frame;
He knows what sore temptations mean,
For he hath felt the same."

Herein is our only hope, our only plea, Jesus

140

Christ not only took our nature and died in our stead, but is now representing our nature, with all its infirmities, and with all its heart-rending woes in the upper Sanctuary. Yes, blessed be his holy name for ever and ever! he is now pleading our cause, before his Father's throne, with all the melting love which caused his agonies of death. "Seeing then that we have a great High Priest, that is passed into the heavens, Jesus the Son of God, let us hold fast our profession. For we have not an high priest which cannot be touched with the feelings of our infirmities: but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin. Let us therefore come boldly unto the throne of grace that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need." Heb. iv, 14-16.

Having shown by plain Bible testimony that the Son of God in his highest nature became man, "was made flesh," I next propose to consider that portion of Bible evidence which represents him as a real man. In fact, everything connected

with his history, from his birth to his resurrection, proves that he was a real human being. Read the prediction, "For unto us a child is born;" [Isa. ix, 6;] also its fulfillment. Matt. i, 20-25; ii, 11; Luke i, ii. From this account of his birth, we learn that he was begotten by the "power of the Highest," and was born of Mary, in Bethlehem of Judea, in the reign of Augustus CÆsar.

He came into the world as helpless, and as much dependent upon his parents for support, and instruction, as any child that had ever been born. He derived his sustenance from his mother's breast, and his vitality from breathing the vital air. He

141

"increased in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and man." Luke ii, 52. He had all the sensations flesh is heir to. He was susceptible of heat or cold, hunger or thirst, the same as any other man. If he fasted he was afterward an hungered; if he journeyed long he was fatigued. He was "a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief." He "was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin." He had all the innocent human passions; such as desire: "And he said unto them with desire, I have desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer." Luke xxii, 15. Joy: "Who for the joy that was set before him, endured the cross, despising the shame." etc. Heb. xii, 2. Fear: He "was heard in that he *feared*." Heb. v, 7, last clause; a peculiar human love: "The disciple whom Jesus *loved*." John xiii, 23. Sorrow: "My soul is exceeding *sorrowful* even unto death." Matt. xxvi, 38. And as a mortal, human being, he suffered, died, and was buried; and as a lifeless man he was raised from the dead, on the third day, by the power of the Father: "Now the God of peace that brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus." Heb. xiii, 20.

That Jesus Christ did not lose, or change his real personality, in becoming man, or in the transition from his Divine to his human nature, is evident, first, from the fact that the same term is applied to his human nature, which had previously denoted his Divine nature: and that too, in its most exalted position, and most endearing relation to the Father.

The Father publicly acknowledged him as his beloved Son on the bank of Jordan. "And lo, a

142

voice from heaven saying, *This is my beloved Son*, in whom I am well pleased." Matt. iii, 17. At his transfiguration: "And there came a voice out of the cloud, saying, This is my beloved Son; hear him." Luke ix, 35. "And Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." Matt. xvi, 16. Paul "preached Christ in the synagogues, that he is the Son of God." Acts ix, 20. Not only did the Father, the Son and the apostles, acknowledge Christ to be the Son of God, but the devils acknowledged him to be such. "Thou art Christ the Son of God." Second. That he had the same personality, during his incarnation, that he had before, is equally manifest, from the use of the same singular pronouns to denote both natures; or in other words, pronouns denoting the same identical personality, in both natures. "A body hast thou prepared *me*." Here the pronoun, *me*, represents both natures, before and after his incarnation: there being two distinct natures, but only one personality. Again in his prayer to the

Father: "Glorify thou me with the glory which I had with thee before the world was." *I*, before the world was, and *I*, who was then praying, refer to the same personality; but to the nature he had before the world was, and to the nature he then had.

Again, "Though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor." Here the same *he* who was rich became poor. In this case, we have only one personality, yet two natures and conditions. But how could he change his nature, and yet retain his personality? Ans. Just as easily as our nature can be changed from mortality to immortality;

143

from flesh to spirit, without losing our personal identity. Just reverse the process of making a mortal being immortal, and it would make an immortal being mortal. God can just as easily do the one as the other. In changing man's nature from mortality to immortality, from flesh to spirit, God will simply change the *mode* of his existence, without changing his personal identity. Just so in reference to the Son of God, the Father changed his nature, and, as a natural consequence, the manner of his existence, without changing his personal identity. Hence, it is the same person, who had glory with the Father before the world was, who was born of Mary, in the days of Augustus CÆsar, who was condemned by Pontius Pilate, crucified by the Jews, buried in Joseph's new tomb, rose again the third day, and who is now exalted on the right hand of the throne in the heavens, a Prince and Saviour to give repentance and remission of sins.

We have failed to find in the entire history of the Son of God, from his origin, as "the first born of every creature," to his death, one intimation of the duplexity of his nature; but on the contrary, he is invariably presented as a *unit* being, having but one personality. It having been shown, in a previous part of this work, that man is a unit, in the sense of his being but one man, it follows, as a matter of course, that if the Son of God became a real man, he must have been a unit being. Indeed this was actually necessary in order to his becoming a real substitute for man. One nature cannot be a substitute, in fact, for another and entirely different nature; hence to have any analogy between the means

144

employed, and the end to be attained, Christ must have been a real man, having but one nature, and personality. He must also have died a literal death, as a whole being; for thus were those for whom he became a substitute, condemned to die.

It has been shown that the penalty of God's law, for personal transgression, is the literal death of the whole man; hence for Christ to die in the sinner's stead, as the Scriptures plainly teach he did, he must have died a literal, and matter of fact, death: the intelligent part of his nature must have died. This brings me to investigate, as the next important event in the history of our Lord, the Bible record of his death. Read the entire history of his death, burial, resurrection, and ascension, and you will not find an intimation, of any part of his intelligent, or unintelligent nature, surviving death; no intimation of a soul or spirit which escaped. But did that being, who "*was in the beginning with God*," die? Mark his reply to the men who said, We seek, "Jesus of Nazareth." He said, "*I am he*;" that

is, I am Jesus of Nazareth. Is it not the same *I* that prays to the Father, "Glorify thou me with the glory which I had with thee before the world was!"

When expiring on the cross, he said, "Father, into thy hands I commend *my* spirit, (life,) and having said thus, *he* gave up the ghost"-died. Luke xxiii, 46. Joseph of Arimathea, "went unto Pilate, and begged the body of Jesus. And he took it down, and wrapt it in linen, and laid it in a sepulchre that was hewn in stone, wherein never man before was laid." Verses 50-53. This identical personage arose from the dead. "Upon the first day of the week, very early in the morning, came the

145

women to the sepulchre, to anoint the body of their Lord; and they found the stone rolled away from the sepulchre, and they entered in, and found not the body of the Lord Jesus. And it came to pass, as they were much perplexed thereabout, behold two men stood by them in shining garments; and they said unto them, Why seek ye the living among the dead? He is not here, but is risen. Remember how he spake unto you when he was yet in Galilee, saying, The Son of man must be delivered into the hands of sinful men, and be crucified, and the third day rise again. And it came to pass, that while they communed together, and reasoned, Jesus himself drew near, and went with them. . . . And he (Jesus) said unto them, What things? And they said unto him, Concerning Jesus of Nazareth, . . . how the chief priests and our rulers delivered him to be condemned to death, and have crucified him. And it came to pass, as he sat at meat with them, he took bread, and blessed it, and brake, and gave to them. And their eyes were opened, and they knew him. And they rose up the same hour, and returned to Jerusalem, and found the eleven gathered together, and them that were with them, saying, The Lord is risen indeed, and hath appeared to Simon. And as they thus spake, Jesus himself stood in the midst of them, and said unto them, Peace be unto you. But they were terrified and affrighted, and supposed that they had seen a spirit. And he said unto them, Why are ye troubled? and why do thoughts arise in your hearts? Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself: handle me and see, for a spirit (or an apparition as they supposed him to be) hath not flesh and bones as ye see

146

me have. And when he had thus spoken, he shewed them his hands and his feet." Luke xxiv.

Is there any transition in this whole history, from one person to another? or any intimation of any part of Christ's nature being exempted in this simple narration? Does not the pronoun *I*, represent the same being, when our Lord says, "Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself," that it does where he says, "I lay down my life for the sheep?" and does it not mean the same when he says, "I came down from heaven?" Does not Jesus of Nazareth refer to the same person after his resurrection, that it did before?

The apostles bear united testimony to the literal death of Christ as a unit being. Hear the bold and decisive language of Peter on the day of Pentecost: "Ye men of Israel, hear these words: Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you by miracles, and wonders, and signs, which God did by him in the

midst of you, as ye yourselves also know. Him . . . ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain whom God hath raised up." But we are told that this was only the body of "Jesus of Nazareth" which was "crucified and slain;" that his soul did not die: it went to Paradise on that very day. This theology which teaches that Christ had two distinct natures, at the same time, the one of which died, and the other escaped to realms of bliss, has no foundation in the word of God.

Isaiah, speaking of his death, says, "Yet it pleased the Lord to bruise him; he hath put him to grief: when thou shalt make his *soul* a sacrifice for sin." Isa. liii, 10. How did the Father make his *soul* a

147

sacrifice for sin? Ans. "Because he hath poured out his *soul* unto death." Our Saviour said in his agony in the Garden, "My *soul* is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death." And in this prophecy we are told that his *soul* was made a sacrifice for sin, that it was poured out unto death, or that it died.

David saw his soul in death, and the grave, and predicted that it should not see corruption, nor be left in the grave. Ps. xvi, 10. "For thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, (*Sheol, the grave,*) neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption," Peter quotes this prophecy on the day of Pentecost, and applies it to Christ. Acts ii, 27. "Because thou wilt not leave my *soul* in hell, (*Hades, the grave,*) neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption." Here we are emphatically taught that the *soul* of Christ died, and was buried; and by reference to verse 31, we learn that it had a resurrection. "He (David) seeing this before, spake of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in hell, (*Hades, the grave,*) neither his flesh did see corruption."

In these passages, soul, Christ, and flesh, are convertible terms. Observe, 1st, His *soul* must have been mortal or it could not have died. 2nd. As such, had God withheld his power, his flesh must have seen corruption, the same as that of any other dead man. But lest some should deny that his soul is characteristic of his highest nature, I will select a few passages, in which, in the highest character ascribed to him in the Bible, he is represented as humbling himself and becoming obedient unto death: where the same identical being who had glory with

148

the "Father before the world was," is represented as dying.

Paul, speaking of Christ's highest nature, says, "Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God." Phil, ii, 6. That this verse refers to his Divine nature, all admit, who believe he had a Divine nature; yet it is emphatically declared in the two verses following, that he "made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men. And being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death." Here it is expressly declared that this exalted being who was "in the form of God, and thought it not robbery to be equal with God," humbled *himself*, 1st by becoming man; 2nd, by becoming "obedient unto death, even the death of the cross."

Suppose we should read of Louis Napoleon's making himself of no reputation, and taking upon himself the form of a servant; and being found in fashion as a

servant, he humbled himself and became obedient unto death-would we not understand that the same person who had previously been Emperor of France, humbled himself and died? Just so in reference to Christ; he was the same person in his humiliation and death, that he had been in his exaltation and glory. And in reference to the above passages, it must, I think, be admitted by any unprejudiced mind, that they prove conclusively that the Son of God in his most exalted nature, became man and died. Again, the same Apostle, speaking of the original dignity and pre-existence of the Son of God, says, "Who is the image of the invisible God,

149

the first born of every creature." Col. i, 15. He then ascribes all the works of creation, in heaven and on earth, to him. See verses 16, 17. In verse 20, this same person is represented as making "peace through the *blood* of his *cross*;" and in verse 22, it is emphatically declared that he died. In Heb. i, we have the primeval glory and exaltation of our Divine Master, presented in the most glowing colors. In verse 3, it is said of him: "Who being the brightness of his (Father's) glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power." At the 2nd verse, the creation of the worlds is ascribed to him." In chap. ii, 9, it is declared of this exalted personage, that he was made lower than the angels, and that he "tasted death for every man."

I will conclude the evidence upon this point by quoting one more passage. It is the testimony of the faithful witness himself. Rev. i, 8. "I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, saith the Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty." This is one of the very strongest proof texts of his Omnipotence and Eternity. This is claimed by all Trinitarian writers as being expressive of his highest nature; and yet, it is declared that this identical being died. John says, speaking of the same person: "And when I saw him, I fell at his feet as dead. And he laid his right hand upon me, saying unto me, Fear not; *I am the first and the last: I am he that liveth and was dead*; and behold, I am alive forevermore, Amen. Verses 17, 18, Note 1st. This "Alpha and Omega, the first and the last, the Almighty, actually *was dead*." 2nd. It is the same personality all the way

150

through. It is the same *I* throughout. "I am the first and the last," "I am Alpha and Omega," "the Lord," "the Almighty." "I am he that liveth and was dead; and behold I am alive forevermore, Amen." The same I, is, was, and is to come. Verse 8. Hence we find that it is the same being throughout, though in different states.

We are prepared at this point of the investigation, understand the relation the *sacrifice* of Christy or the *atonement*, sustains to the law of God. In presenting this part of the subject, I shall compare what I understand to be the Bible view, with the two theories upon this point, believed by most of Christendom. They are the Unitarian and Trinitarian views. These views occupy the two extreme points. Many of the most eminent writers, in the Unitarian school, deny the pre-existence of the Son of God, as a real personality; but take the position that he was a good, yea, a perfect man. I would look with the highest degree of admiration upon the

magnanimity and self-sacrifice of a king of spotless purity, just and good, and loved by all his subjects, who, for the forfeited lives of a few rebellious subjects in a remote province of his kingdom, would voluntarily descend from his throne, and exile himself in the garb of the meanest peasant, wear out his life in acts of kindness toward them, and last of all, die the most infamous and ignominious death, to save their lives, and, bring them back in allegiance to his throne. Such an act of disinterestedness and love would fill the world with the loudest songs of praise and admiration; but, however great and praise-worthy such an act might justly appear, it falls almost infinitely below the claims of Jehovah's abused and violated

151

law. I cannot conceive how the life of one man, however good or perfect, or benevolent, could render an equivalent for the forfeited lives of all the millions of the human race, whose characters, in case of perfect obedience, would be equally exceptionss. I cannot conceive how the death of one good man could render an adequate atonement for the lives of so many millions. But, according to, the news of these writers, we have only the death of a good man's body, while all that is noble, dignified, responsible, and intelligent, survives death, may, by this very act, be exalted to higher degrees of bliss and glory.

The Trinitarian view, I think is equally exceptionable. They claim that the Son of God had *three* distinct natures at the same time; viz., a human *body*, a human *soul*, united with his Divine nature: the body being mortal, the soul immortal, the Divinity co-equal, co-existent, and co-eternal with the everlasting Father. Now, none of the advocates of his theory, claim that either his soul or Divinity lied, that the body was the only part of this triple being which actually died "the death of the cross;" hence, according to this view (which makes the death of Christ the grand *atonement sacrifice* for the *sins* of the world) we only have the sacrifice of the most inferior part-the human body-of the Son of God.

But it is claimed that his soul suffered the greater part of the penalty-yet it did not suffer "the death of the cross:" it deserted the body in its greatest extremity, and left it to bear alone the death penalty; hence, the death of the cross is still only the death of a human body. But even admitting that in his highest nature as a human being, he suffered, all of

152

which his nature, as such, was susceptible, during his whole life, and then died the ignominious death of the cross-even then, such a sacrifice would come almost infinitely short of the demands of God's just and holy law, which has been violated by all of Adam's race, (infants excepted,) and trodden under foot with impunity, for so many thousands of years. Of this Trinitarians themselves are sensible; hence, they represent his Divinity as the altar upon which his humanity was sacrificed; and then estimate the intrinsic value of the sacrifice by that of the altar upon which it was offered. But if I understand the theory under consideration, the Divine nature of Jesus Christ had no part nor lot in this matter; for this nature suffered no loss, indeed, made no sacrifice whatever. Suppose a king to unite the dignity of his only son with one of his poorest pheasants, so far as to call him his son, and then should subject this peasant under the character

of his own son, to a life of poverty, privation and suffering, and then crucify him under the character of a malefactor, while his real son enjoyed all the blessings of life, health, ease, honor and glory of his father's court-would any one contend in such case, that because he was called after the name, and clothed with honorary titles of the king's son, and died in this character, that therefore his suffering and death would be entitled to all the dignity and honor of his real son? In this case, all the sacrifice is made by the peasant. The son has no part nor lot in the matter. It is emphatically the offering of a peasant, and worth just as much as he is worth, had just as much dignity, and no more. The same is true in reference to the sacrifice of Christ, according to the above view. His

153

humanity suffered all that was suffered, made all sacrifice that was made; his privation, suffering and death are, therefore, entitled to all the value, dignity and honor, this nature could confer upon it, and no more. Hence, according to this theory, we have only a human sacrifice; and the question still remains to be answered, How can the life of one human being make an adequate atonement for the lives of thousands of millions of others?

So, after all that has been said and written by these two schools, it appears that there is no real difference in their respective theories, in reference to the atonement; both have, in fact, only a human sacrifice: but with reference to their views of the highest nature of the Son of God, they are as far asunder as finitude and infinitude, time and eternity. The former makes the "only Begotten of the Father," a mere mortal, finite man; the latter makes him the Infinite, Omnipotent, All-wise, and Eternal God, absolutely equal with the Everlasting Father. Now, I understand the truth to be in the medium between these two extremes. I have proved, as I think conclusively, 1st, that the Son of God in his highest nature existed before the creation of the first world, or the first intelligent being in the vast Universe; 2nd, that he had an origin; that "he was the first born of every creature;" "the beginning of the creation of God;" [Rev. iii, 14;] 3rd, that, in his highest nature, all things in heaven and in earth were created, and are upheld, by him; 4th, in his dignity, he was exalted far above all the angels of heaven, and all the kings and potentates of earth; 5th, in his nature he was immortal, (not in an absolute sense,) and Divine; 6th, in his titles and privileges,

154

he was "the only begotten of his Father," whose glory he shared "before the world was;" the "image of the invisible God;" "in the form of God;" and "thought it not robbery to be equal with God;" "the likeness of his Father's glory and express image of his person;" "the Word" who "was in the beginning with God" and who "was God." This was the exalted, and dignified, personage, who was sacrificed for the sins of the world-these are the privileges he voluntarily surrendered; and although "rich, for our sake he became poor:" "he made himself of no reputation," and became man; and "being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross," to declare the righteousness of God, "that he might be just and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus."

Here was *real* humility; not a mere pretense or show; here, we behold the amazing spectacle of the well-beloved and "only begotten Son of God," "*the first born of every creature*," voluntarily divesting himself of "the glory he had with the Father before the world," coming down from heaven, his high and holy habitation, and though "rich" becoming so poor that he had "not where to lay his head," the blessed Word who "was in the beginning with God," and who was God, actually becoming flesh, in the ignoble garb of a servant-submitting himself to all the privations, temptations, sorrows, and afflictions, to which poor fallen humanity is subjected; and then to complete this unprecedented sacrifice, we see this once honored, but now humbled-this once exalted, but now abased personage, expiring, as a malefactor, upon the accursed cross; and last of all descending

155

into the depths of the dark and silent tomb-a symbol of the lowest degree of humiliation.

This, *this*, is the sacrifice, the "only begotten of the Father" offered as an atonement for the sins of the world; this is the being who was actually sacrificed, and this the price the Son of God actually paid for our redemption. Hence, in reference to its dignity, it is the sacrifice of the most exalted and dignified being in the vast empire of God; nay, the sacrifice of the King's only begotten Son. In reference to its intrinsic value, who can estimate the worth of God's darling Son? It is, to say the least of it, an equivalent for the dignity, the lives, and eternal interests of the whole world; nay further, it is equal in value to all the moral interest of the whole intelligent creation, and equal in dignity and honor to the moral government of the Supreme Ruler of the Universe. In reference to its nature, it is Divine; hence we have a Divine sacrifice, in contradistinction to the Trinitarian and Unitarian views, which make it only a human sacrifice. In reference to its fullness, it is infinite, boundless. Yes, thank God, there is enough for each, enough for all, enough for ever more; enough to save an intelligent Universe, were they all sinners; and lastly, in reference to its adaptation to man's conditions and necessities, it is absolutely perfect.

Oh! how does all the beauty and glory of the atonement vanish before those theories, which would confine the sacrifice of the Son of God, to the humiliation, suffering, and death of a mere human being. The great difficulty with most writers on the atonement is this: they do not commence this sacrifice at the proper place; they commence with the

156

poverty of our Redeemer's birth, and reason correctly in reference to his subsequent history; whereas they should commence with his highest nature, as "*the only begotten of the Father*," and "*beginning of the creation of God*," and follow him through every degree of his humiliation, from the moment he consented to divest himself of the glory of the Father, to his descent into the depths of the grave. His sacrifice covers the whole ground between these two points. But, by far the greater portion of the sacrifice had been made before his advent in the flesh. It consisted in the Word's consenting to become flesh; in the Divine nature, consenting to become human: in him who was rich voluntarily becoming poor.

I have demonstrated, in another part of this work, that the Son of God in his highest nature, actually became man, and as such he suffered, died, and was buried. This I understand to be the true Bible view of the atonement. The next event in the history of the Son of God is the reward the Father gave his Son for the great sacrifice he made in becoming man, suffering and dying for the salvation of perishing sinners. This brings me to notice,

3rd. The Son of God as he has been *since* his incarnation.

First. In reference to his nature, he was raised from the dead a quickening Spirit. 1 Cor. xv, 45. "And so it is written, The first man Adam was made a living soul, the last Adam was made a *quickening Spirit*." By reference to the context we may learn, that this nature is predicated of Christ in his resurrected state, as the *second* Adam, or the Father of a race of spirits, the same as the *first* Adam

157

is the Father of a race of human, or flesh beings. We are expressly told in the previous verse, in reference to the nature of this race of spirits in their resurrection, that the same *it*, that "is sown a natural body, is raised a spiritual body;" and in Phil. iii, 20, 23, we learn that "these vile bodies shall be fashioned like unto the glorious body" of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Now, if our bodies be made spirits, and if they be like unto the body of Jesus Christ-then his body, in reference to its nature, must be a spirit; but I will notice this point more particularly when I come to notice the relation man sustains to the atonement. Further, in reference to his nature, he was raised immortal, and never having seen corruption, of course, incorruptible. Speaking of himself, after his ascension, he says, "I am he that *liveth*, and was dead, and behold I am alive forevermore. Amen." Rev. i, 18. He is represented as bringing life and immortality to light by his death and resurrection; as being the author and giver of eternal life, which could not be unless he possessed eternal life. As has been shown, he derived eternal life from the Father: his children derive it from him. He was quickened from the dead by the Spirit of the Father: so are all his children. See Rom. viii, 11.

In reference to the difficulties in the way of the Son's being changed from mortality to immortality, from flesh to spirit, the same difficulties may be urged against his children's being thus changed. But they vanish like mist before the rising sun, when considered in the light of Jehovah's power.

Second. In reference to his exaltation, he is represented, 1st, as having all given back by the Father

158

which he had lost by his incarnation. The answer to his prayer supposes this: "And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was." Note, first. "The glory which he had with the Father before the world was," evidently includes the glory of his Divine nature, (as the only begotten of the Father,) as well as the riches, dignity, and honor of this nature. Second. It is the same person or being who is exalted, that had been abased; not one being humbled, and another exalted; hence the only begotten Son of God did not lose his personal identity in all the changes through which he passed. It is the same identical being throughout. 2nd. Not only did the Son

actually receive back all that he had sacrificed by consenting to become man, to suffer and die, but received from the Father, gifts, privileges, glory and honor, above what he ever could otherwise have attained to.

We cannot suppose an intelligent being to make a great sacrifice without having a correspondingly great object in view, and without being actuated by the most sublime motives. I know that some startle at the idea of Christ's being actuated by a love of reward in all he suffered and did; but, as will be seen by all the quotations on this point, he was actuated by motive; and the Father held out, as inducements to sacrifice, the most rich and glorious rewards. As Paul says of him, "Who, for the *joy* that was set before him, endured the cross, despising the shame, and is set down on the right hand of the throne of God." Heb. xii, 2. Here it is emphatically declared that Jesus endured the cross for the joy that was set before him.

159

His ministration as a priest is represented as a glorious privilege, instead of a sacrifice; yea as a part of his exaltation. Compare Acts v, 30, 31, with Heb. viii, 12. "The God of our fathers raised up Jesus whom ye slew and hanged on a tree: him hath God *exalted* with his right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance to Israel, and forgiveness of sins." "Now of the things which we have spoken this is the sum: we have such an High Priest, who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty, in the heavens; a minister of the Sanctuary, and of the true Tabernacle which the Lord pitched, and not man." The analogy between these quotations is seen more forcibly when we consider that remission of sins is connected with his exaltation. Remission is also consequent upon his offering his own blood in the Most Holy Place; for there is the place where his blood is accepted, and there the place where sins are remitted. See Acts iii, 19, 20. "Repent ye therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord, and he shall send Jesus Christ," etc. Here the remission, or the blotting out, of sins takes place during the times of refreshing, and just before he (the Father) shall send Jesus Christ.

It is the work of the judgment to remit sins, or the penalty, which is the same thing: hence we see that, although it is an exalted privilege for Jesus Christ to plead the cause of those for whom he died, in the heavenly Sanctuary, yet it is just as necessary to man's salvation as his incarnation, suffering and death. But on this point I cannot dwell. For evidence on this point, I would refer the reader to Heb.

160

Chaps. viii; ix; x, 18-21; vii, 22-28; iv, 14, 16. That he was not, and indeed could not be a priest while on earth is evident from Chap. viii, 4. For further evidence on this glorious work of our great High Priest, I would recommend the reader to the excellent works of J. N. Andrews and U. Smith, upon this subject.

The following texts of scripture state in plain explicit language that the exaltation of our Lord was the reward of his incarnation, sufferings and death. "Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God: but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was

made in the likeness of man: and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. Wherefore (that is, *became of which*) God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name: that at the name of Jesus, every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father." Phil. ii, 6-11. This exaltation, this name which is above every name, and the Divine homage and adoration of all creatures in heaven, in earth, and under the earth, are titles, rewards, and honors conferred upon him by the Father; because, although in the form of God, he made himself of no reputation, took upon him the form of a servant, humbled himself and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross.

Again, Divine worship is expressly declared to be consequent upon the advent of the first begotten into

161

the world. Heb. i, 6. "And again, when he bringeth the first begotten into the world he saith, And let all the angels of God worship him." If all the angels of God had worshiped him previous to his being brought into the world, what propriety in commanding them to worship him? This implies, at least, that he had not been an object of Divine worship previous to this time; and that this exalted privilege is one of the rewards for the amazing sacrifice he had made to redeem poor fallen humanity. But in the quotation above, such is expressly declared to be the fact. Also Chap, ii, 9. "But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower (or lower for a little while) than the angels, *for the suffering of death*, (i.e., because he suffered death,) *crowned with glory and honor?* etc. Here, his crown of glory and honor is emphatically declared to be the reward of his suffering and death. And in all these quotations it may be seen that it is the same person now exalted who was once abased. *He* was in the form of God and express image of his person; he humbled himself; he died; he was exalted, etc. The *first begotten* was brought into the world, and the *first begotten* is *worshiped* by all the heavenly hosts. So the same Jesus who suffers death is crowned with glory and honor.

But, most of these glories and honors belong to him in his *regal* character as king over all the earth: hence I will notice the last crowning event in the history of our Divine Lord and Master, the highest character in which he is worshiped, and his rule acknowledged by the Father, revered by the world, and respected by an intelligent Universe. The

162

Father offered him as the reward of this unparalleled sacrifice, the dominion of the world. God gave this dominion to the *first* Adam; [Gen. i, 26;] but when he fell the earth fell with him, and his right of dominion passed into the hands of his master, and seducer, the Devil; hence the Devil has been the *prime* ruler of this world from the fall of man to the present time. It devolves, therefore, upon the second Adam to wrest the sceptre from this arch usurper, and bring back this revolted world in allegiance to his Father's throne, when the Son himself will become subordinate to the Father, and reign as king over all the earth, as long as the sun, moon, and stars endure. Of this the Devil was well aware; hence his

mighty effort to seduce the second Adam as he had the first, thinking by this means to supplant the Father in the Supreme rule of earth, and render his only begotten Son subordinate to himself. Hence, he offered him all the kingdoms of the world, and the glory thereof, without the sufferings of many years, and the shameful death of the cross; and, that too, more than eighteen hundred years before the Father had promised these glorious privileges.

The triumph of our great Leader in this instance; is a sure pledge that he will be victorious in the last great conflict with this mighty chieftain, for the dominion of the world. The design of this work will only permit a cursory survey of the regal character, the royal splendor of our promised king. The prophet Isaiah commences with his birth, and does not leave his history until he beholds him seated upon David's throne to order and establish it with justice and judgment forever. Isa. ix, 6, 7. "For unto us

163

a child is born, unto us a son is given, and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace. Of the increase of his government and peace *there shall be no end*, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even forever. The zeal of the Lord of hosts will perform this."

The angel Gabriel announced the same truths to the virgin Mary. "And shalt call his name Jesus. He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest; and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David. And he shall reign over the house of Jacob forever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end." Note, 1st. Where was the throne of David located? Ans. On the earth. 2nd. Has the Son of the Highest ever reigned upon that throne? Ans. No. It must, therefore, be a future event. 3rd. When will this promise be fulfilled? Ans. When the promised king shall return from heaven.

Just before his crucifixion, he compared himself to a nobleman going into a far country to receive for himself a kingdom, and to return. Luke xix, 12. This nobleman was Christ: he went into a far country at his ascension: he receives the kingdom from his Father during his absence, and returns to take possession of it, and reign, at his second advent to earth. Then, and not till then, will God have fulfilled the oath he made to the patriarch David. Peter makes mention of this oath on the

164

day of pentecost, saying, "Men and brethren, let me freely speak unto you of the patriarch David, that he is both dead and buried, and his sepulchre is with us unto this day. 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 up Christ to sit upon his throne." Acts ii, 29, 30. This oath is found recorded in Ps. xxxii, 11. "The Lord hath sworn in truth unto David; he will not turn from it: of the fruit of thy body will I set upon thy throne." Also Ps. lxxxix, 3, 4. "I have made a covenant with my chosen, I have sworn unto David my servant, Thy seed will I establish forever, and build up thy throne to all generation."

Daniel speaking of this glorious reign, says, "I saw in the night visions, and behold one like unto the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him. And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed." Dan. vii, 13, 14. O what an honor is this! Great, great was the sacrifice our Lord made for man's salvation, and unspeakably great is the reward he receives from the Father.

Where now are the magnificent kingdoms of Babylon Media and Persia, Greece and Rome? "Where Nebuchadnezzar, Alexander the great, Hannibal, Scipio, Pompey, Julius, CÆsar, Charlemagne, and Napoleon Buonaparte, with all their costly

165

crowns and glittering diadems, with all their oppressive and diabolical rule? Their kingdoms have long since passed away, and they are now slumbering in the dust; but, glory to God! our King shall live forever, and his kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall stand for ever. Then shall we join in unison with the four and twenty elders which sit before God on their seats, "Saying, We give thee thanks, O Lord God Almighty, . . . because thou hast taken to thee thy great power, and hast reigned." Then shall we join with the redeemed of all ages and generations, in singing a new song, "saying, Thou art worthy to take the book and open the seals thereof: for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood, out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation, and hast made us unto our God kings and priests; and we shall reign on the earth." And the angels shall join in chorus; the number of whom is "ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands," "saying with a loud voice, Worthy is the Lamb that was slain, to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing. And every creature which is in heaven, and on earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb forever and ever." But to behold the King in his beauty, and join with all the angels in heaven, and all the redeemed of earth, in celebrating the praises of our once humbled, but now exalted, King;

166

to share with him in this glorious and triumphant reign, we must comply with the conditions of citizenship in his kingdom. This brings me to notice,

3rd. The relation the atonement sustains to man as a transgressor of the law of God.

From the commencement I have endeavored to show that the plan of redemption is a perfectly rational system, and as such, commends itself to the highest dictates of reason; and at the same time a plan which will maintain all the principles of justice and rectitude, and yet leave the sinner without excuse: a plan in which justice and mercy may meet, and embrace each other, without any compromise of principle, or any sacrifice of dignity or honor. In pursuance of this plan, I will consider,

First. That this plan is in harmony with the free agency of man: it does not curtail a single right he possesses, but leaves the mind free to will, to choose, to act. This plan in every part of the Bible addresses itself to the consent of the human will. Mark the explicit language of Moses, in the ears of the assembled tribes of Israel, "I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing;" therefore "*choose* life that ye may live."

The Father himself condescends to expostulate with the incorrigible sinner, in the following touching language: "Turn ye, turn ye; for why will ye die, O house of Israel?" And our blessed Redeemer in his last lamentation over Jerusalem: "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem! . . . how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye *would not!*" "*Come* unto me and I will give you life."

167

"Why *will* ye perish?" "This is the condemnation that light is come into the world, and men love darkness rather than light because their deeds are evil." All are left without excuse. "The Spirit and the bride say, *Come*. And let him that heareth, say, *Come*. And let him that is athirst, *come*. And whosoever *will* let him take the water of life *freely*." All the commandments, exhortations, and entreaties to faith, repentance and obedience; all the judgments and denunciations for unbelief and disobedience, necessarily suppose the free agency and accountability of the sinner.

Second. It offers the highest motives, as inducements to obedience, which can be presented to an intelligent mind, and is consequently in harmony with the best and highest interests of man. Are riches desirable? it offers treasures ever-during, "where moth doth not corrupt, and thieves do not break through and steal." He who "was rich, for our sake became poor, that we through his poverty might be made *rich*." The very streets of that City "are paved with gold," and the gates are set with pearls.

Are honors, dignity and glory, worthy man's highest ambition? it offers that "glory and honor," such as earth cannot confer upon its most favored sons. Would you envy the legal *heir* to the fleeting Empire of Russia? then remember that the poorest and most obscure Christian who has ever lived, shall be a *joint-heir* with Christ in the dominion of the world; not to reign a few brief years, and then descend from the throne to the silence of the grave, but to reign forever and ever; nay more,

168

if faithful to the end, we shall all be kings and priests, and receive crowns of glory, palms of victory, and spotless robes: in one word, we shall receive an "eternal weight of glory." Are lands and estates more to be desired than all else besides? our heavenly Father offers as the reward of the few sacrifices we are called to make here, "an inheritance which is incorruptible, undefiled, and which shall never pass away." "He that overcometh shall inherit all things." Is health the greatest earthly good? the inhabitants of that land never say, "I am sick;" there shall be no pain nor death in that happy, happy land. "There sickness, sorrow, pain and death, are felt and feared no more." Is good society our chief desire? there are the virtuous and good, the wise and benevolent of all ages and

generations, Jesus Christ our elder brother, and an innumerable company of angels our friends and associates. Are life, youth and beauty, the choicest gifts of heaven or earth? the inhabitants of that blessed country shall live forever, they shall bloom forever in the full vigor of immortal and never-fading youth. In the beautiful and touching language of the poet,

We have heard from the bright, the holy land,
We have heard, and our hearts are glad;
For we were a lonely pilgrim band,
And weary, and worn, and sad.
They tell us the pilgrims have a dwelling there-
No longer are homeless ones;
And we know that the goodly land is fair,
Where life's pure river runs.

They say green fields are waving there,
That never a blight shall know;
And the deserts wild are blooming fair

169

And the roses of Sharon grow.
There are lovely birds in the bowers green-
Their songs are blithe and sweet;
And their warblings gushing ever new,
The angels' harpings greet.

We have heard of the palms, the robes, the crowns,
And the silvery band in white;
Of the City fair, with pearly gates,
All radiant with light.
We have heard of the angels there, and saints,
With their harps of gold, how they sing;
Of the mount, with the fruitful tree of life,
Of the leaves that healing bring.

The King of that country, he is fair,
He's the joy and light of the place!
In his beauty we shall behold him there,
And bask in his smiling face.
We'll be there, we'll be there, in a little while,
We'll join the pure and the blest;
We'll have the palm, the robe, the crown,
And forever be at rest.

But alas! the dark, chilling river of death rolls between the sinner and that goodly land: not the first death; for God has promised to remove that difficulty out of the way; but the second death, which remains still back of this, to overwhelm the defenseless sinner in its oblivious waves. But, glory to God! his well-beloved Son has made provisions whereby that impassable river may be avoided. This brings me to notice,

Third. The reasonableness of that penalty which all the ungodly must finally suffer. God having placed before them, as inducements to obedience, the highest

motives that his infinite goodness could inspire, or wisdom devise; having left their wills free to choose;

170

and such being the character of his moral government, and the rectitude of his law, that he cannot save them without *faith, repentance* and *obedience*; but two courses remain to be pursued: one, to immortalize sin and sinners, to set apart a province in his empire for these hapless and ruined beings; the other, *to let them die*, to let them "*be as though they had not been*, to cleanse his empire from all moral pollution, sin and misery.

To a mind unbiased by prejudice or education, I am persuaded the latter would be, beyond all comparison, the most reasonable. Why should God perpetuate to all eternity an existence which cannot be otherwise than miserable? Is it necessary to maintain the allegiance of his obedient subjects? Are these the chains of darkness which bind them to his throne? Do the pillars of heaven rest upon the tears, and sighs, and groans, and endless agonies of the damned? No! No!! NO!!! The united testimony of all the Bible writers represents the penalty of God's law for personal sin, as being death, literal death. This view reconciles the future destiny of man with the omniscience of God.

To admit, which all who believe in the infinite wisdom of God must, that he knew before he created man, that the great majority of the beings whom he would create, would reject his plan, and be finally and forever lost; even then the highest dictates of reason would say, Create! Create! Look first at the apparently dark side of this picture: God has done all for the sinner he could do in harmony with his nature: he has offered him immortality and eternal life, on the most reasonable conditions: the sinner has

171

voluntarily rejected them, and chosen their opposites; and now he reaps the fruit of his labors. Is he wronged? Has he any right to complain?

Look at this picture from another point: The present life is considered a blessing to most of men. Do not the wicked prize it above all earth besides? Ask the meanest and most debased wretch, what he would take in exchange for the present life; he would point you to the stars of heaven, and say, Let each star represent a diamond of invaluable worth, it were a gift by far too small to purchase this poor life, with all its woes and uncertainties. The present life then, is a blessing to wicked men; and when the final penalty shall have passed upon them, they will "*be as though they had not been*." Eternity will be to them as though they had never been created; they therefore are not wronged by having been created; nay, benevolence would dictate their creation, even though they should only live the present life.

On the other hand; all the millions who have embraced God's plan, and all that have died in infancy, will be saved and happy to all eternity; and this too, as the result of creation. Would not wisdom and benevolence dictate the creation of man upon such principles as these? This prepares the way for considering,

Fourth. The reasonableness of those conditions, by compliance with which, all those difficulties may be averted. I have shown in another part of this work,

that God has made the removal of the penalty of his law for personal transgression, conditional; and that, consequently, none may expect to escape

172

the penalty it threatens, without compliance with the Divinely appointed conditions. It is to the reasonableness of these conditions, I invite attention.

1st. In reference to the nature of these conditions, all the King asks of his rebellious subjects is, to accept him as their rightful King: in other words, to have implicit confidence in him, sincerely repent of their past disobedience, and reform, and render obedience for all time to come. Did any earthly potentate ever offer pardon, to his subjects who had been guilty of treason, on more reasonable terms? Never. To grant pardon without faith or confidence, would jeopardize the security of his throne, and dissolve the bond of union among his subjects; to grant pardon without repentance and reformation, would legalize rebellion, and encourage others to follow the example of the rebels; to grant pardon without a trial, or time for the rebels to prove their loyalty, would endanger the future welfare of his kingdom, and prove to his law-abiding subjects, that he esteems revolution in his kingdom as a very little thing. Hence it is in accordance with the simplest principles of reason, that God should conditionate pardon. To have conditions at all, they could not be more reasonable, in reference to their nature, than those he has prescribed.

2nd. In reference to the terms of pardon, as far as an equivalent from the guilty and the condemned is concerned, it is offered *free*, without money, and without price. The gospel proclamation to all the starving poor is, "Ho, every one that thirsteth, come to the waters, and he that hath no *money*; *come ye, buy*, and eat; yea, come, buy wine and milk without

173

money and without price." Are not these terms reasonable enough? Professed Christians sometimes confer favors upon their poor brethren with so much reluctance, that it destroys the rising emotions of gratitude in the poor man's bosom. Not so with our heavenly Father: his gifts are free as the out-gushings of his own benevolence.

Not only are all the blessings of the gospel free, but all are invited, with the tenderest solicitude, to come and partake. Hear the entreaties of our dear Redeemer: "Come unto me all ye that labor, and are heavy laden; and I will give you rest." O how sweet is rest to the toil-worn pilgrim on life's troubled sea! Then come to Jesus "and ye shall find rest unto your souls." "And the Spirit and bride say, *Come*. And let him that heareth, say, *Come*. And let him that is athirst, come. And whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely." O were such blessings as these ever offered on terms so easy, and so free?

If we were required to make great earthly sacrifices, to pay large sums of money, or to travel in long and mournful pilgrimages to Mecca, as do the deluded disciples of Mahomet, we might then have some excuse for neglecting this great salvation; but when it is offered without money or price, and all are cordially invited to come and partake, what excuse can we urge for neglecting these conditions?

3rd. It is not only free for all, but there is enough for all. On the plenitude of the atonement the Bible speaks in explicit terms. I will only notice, on this point, those passages which declare that Christ died "*for all men*," and speak of his death as an atonement for the sins "*of the whole world*."

174

I have already shown that the phrase to die "*for us*" must signify to die in our stead, as a, sacrificial oblation, by which our sins become remissible, upon the terms of the gospel. Such passages as the following are too plain to need comment: "He (Christ) by the grace of God tasted death for *every man*." "He is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for the *sins of the whole world*?"

Again, our Lord calls himself "the Saviour of *the world*?" John the Baptist, pointing to Christ, says, "Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of *the world*." And our Saviour in his discourse with Nicodemus says, "For God so loved *the world* that he gave his only begotten Son, that *whosoever* believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life."

The unlimited extent of the atonement is not only proved by the above quotations, but by those which declare that Christ, not only died for those who shall be saved, but also for those who shall, or may perish; so that none can urge from their actual condemnation, that they were excepted from any, or all the proffered benefits of the death of Christ Paul says: "And through thy knowledge shall thy weak brother perish *for whom Christ died*." "Destroy not him with thy meat, *for whom Christ died*." "False teachers, who privily shall bring in *damnable* heresies, even denying the Lord *that bought them*, and bring upon themselves swift destruction."

The unlimited extent of the atonement is further, proved by the numerous invitations for *all* to come and partake of its benefits. "Come unto me *all* ye that labor and are heavy laden; and I will give you rest." "Look unto me all ye ends of the

175

earth," etc. "*Whosoever* will come may come." "If *any man* is athirst let him come unto me." Why invite all to come, if only a part could come? To hold out food to a starving man, or water to a man perishing of thirst, when you know that, both are chained so that they cannot reach them, would be the acme of cruelty. But God will not mock his dependent creatures. The fact that all are invited, proves that "*whosoever* will come, may come."

The unlimited extent of the atonement is also proved from the fact that the same conditions are required of all, and the same judgments denounced upon all who neglect those conditions. "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the *wrath of God* abideth on him." "But these things are written that *ye might believe* that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God, and that believing, ye might have life in his name." "He that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God." "He that *believeth* and *is baptized shall be saved*; but he that *believeth* not shall be damned." "How shall we escape, *if we neglect* so great salvation?" "The Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven

with his mighty angels, in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ." So that with God, in reference to the offers of salvation, and in reference to all those who reject his plan, there is no "respect of persons."

The foregoing testimony proves conclusively that the atonement in reference to its extent, or provisions,

176

includes all mankind; but in reference to its application, it includes none except those who comply with the conditions prescribed in the gospel ²¹. This prepares the way for considering,

Fifth. The perfect adaptation of this system to the condition, wants, and necessities of man. Is he poor? it offers durable riches. Is he naked? it offers him raiment clean and white. Is he blind? it offers him eye-salve for his blindness. Is he wounded and bruised? it has a balm for every wound. Is he born to sorrow and disappointment? it offers bliss without alloy and joys that never end. Art thou obscure, unnoticed and unknown? it offers glories that never fade, and honors that never pass away. Art thou corruptible? it offers incorruption. Art thou mortal? it offers immortality and eternal life. Are some too high and some too low, some too rich and some too poor? it elevates the one and abases the other, it causes the one to divide with the other, and thus places all on one grand platform of equality. Art thou a slave? it sets thee free; a prisoner? it proclaims deliverance. Art thou tempted of the Devil? it offers thee a shield to resist his fiery darts. Art thou a sinner? it offers thee pardon on the most reasonable terms. Art thou unrighteous? it offers the righteousness of Christ. Art thou under sentence of death, without a plea, or hope of rescue? it offers a substitute, in every respect adequate to the requirements of the law. Art thou all weakness? it is the power of God unto eternal salvation. In one

177

word, it is just what man needs; and what he must have, to qualify him for communion with the society of Jesus Christ, of angels, or virtuous and good men.

A few more thoughts, patient reader, in reference to what we must do on our part, and what God will do for us on his part, to qualify us for all these blessings and privileges, and I have done, except answering a few objections to the foregoing views.

1st. God requires *faith* as an indispensable prerequisite in order to the reception of the benefits of the atonement. Heb. xi, 6; John iii, 36, 14-18; Mark xvi, 16; i, 15. Faith and confidence signify the same; and we are to continue to believe to the end. Heb. iii, 6; x, 35.

2nd. Repentance is so necessary that there can be no salvation without it. Luke xiii, 1-5; Mark i, 15; Acts ii, 38; xvii, 30; iii, 19. By repentance, I understand simply a change of purpose, whether applied to God or man; and by reformation, conversion, or the fruit of repentance. Hence the apostle Peter says, Repent and be converted; that is, repent and be reformed. A man wills to act, and acts; he changes his will, and his actions change correspondingly.

3rd. Obedience to all the requirements of the gospel is required as equally necessary in order to salvation. The first act of obedience after faith and

repentance, is baptism. Acts ii, 28; Mark xvi, 16; Acts viii, 12; xvi, 30-34; xxii, 16. Then we are required to continue to obey all the requirements of God, to "go on to perfection," to take up our cross and follow Christ; as we have received Christ to walk in him; to be holy, harmless, and innocent as

178

little children. Peter enumerates the Christian graces which we must all have in order to an entrance into the everlasting kingdom. 1 Pet. i, 5-11. The duties of the remnant are stated so explicitly that none can mistake them. Rev. xiv, 12; xii, 17; xxii, 14; James ii, 10, 11, 12.

If we do all these things what will God do for us? Answer,

1st. He will give us his holy Spirit to reprove us "of sin, of righteousness and of judgment; to bear testimony with our spirits that we are the children of God, to take of the things of God and give them to us; in the hour of deep affliction and temptation to comfort us, and make intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered; and finally to quicken the mortal bodies of all the righteous dead, and fashion them like unto the glorious body of our blessed Redeemer." See Rom. viii, 11; Phil. iii, 20, 21.

2nd. He gives the promise of pardon when we believe, repent, and obey; and he will actually remit all our sins, when the judgment shall have set, and our cases shall have been decided.

3rd. He will give sweet consolation in answer to prayer, Matt. vii, 7; xxi, 22; John ix, 31; James v, 16-20.

4th. He will heal all our diseases of body and mind. James v, 13-15; Ps. ciii, 3.

5th. He will feed and clothe us in time of famine, or when reduced to poverty by persecution for righteousness' sake, Luke xii, 22-40; Matt. vi, 25-34.

6th. He will change the righteous living, raise the righteous dead, and give them an everlasting

179

inheritance in his kingdom, the attributes of which are "glory, honor, immortality, eternal life," love, joy and peace in the Holy Ghost.

This is the great ultimatum of God's whole plan. But time would fail me to tell of all the benefits, the privileges and glories of the atonement; nay; had I the tongue of an angel, I could not tell them, or the pen of inspiration, I could not portray the *far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory*, which God has in reserve for his people. In the enthusiastic language of the queen of Sheba, while gazing with wonder and admiration upon the wealth and splendor of Solomon's court, I am made to exclaim, while contemplating the far greater glories of the kingdom of God: "*The half has never been told!*" no, nor ever will be told; "for our joys shall be forever increasing, and our songs forever new." "But as it is written, Eye hath not *seen*, nor ear *heard*, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him."

But above all things, the amazing love of God in the gift of his only begotten Son, demands the loudest songs of adoring angels and redeemed men. And such was its importance that its mere annunciation waked the songs of angels, and confounded the powers of darkness. But poor fallen man is most interested in his offices as Prophet to teach us the ways of life and salvation, and point us

forward to the time when he shall return the *second time* without sin unto the eternal salvation of all his saints, both living and dead; as a glorious *High Priest* to intercede for us, and to plead our cause before his Father's throne with all the melting

180

love which caused his agonies of death; and lastly as a King to rule his enemies with a rod of iron, but his friends with a sceptre of mercy. His prophetic office continued during his incarnation; his priestly during his ministration in the holy places not made with hands; and his kingly will commence with his second advent, and will run co-extensive with the thousand years, added to the unmeasured limits of eternity. Signs in the sun, moon and stars, and among the nations of earth, strengthened by the immutability of prophetic fulfillment, all, all, teach that this great and glorious event is just at hand. Come Lord Jesus, O come quickly, and take to thee thy great power and reign. "Even so, come Lord Jesus." "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all. Amen."

a. The doctrine of Christ's death being accepted as an actual substitute for the personal transgressors of God's law, will be objected to for the following reasons:

1st. The penalty of this law is eternal death: this Christ did not suffer. I have already shown that the threatened penalty is simply death: this Christ did suffer according to the harmonious teachings of the Bible.

2nd. The penalty of this law is a second death: this Christ did not suffer. I have also shown that this penalty in reference to its nature is neither a *first* nor a *second death*, but simply the literal death of the whole man: this Christ did suffer according to the foregoing testimony in the case.

3rd. The penalty of this law *is the endless conscious misery* of the sinner in the flames of hell:

181

this, the advocates of this horrible doctrine will not contend for a moment that Christ suffered.

4th. If "Christ suffered the penalty of the law in the room of the offender, justice demands that the offender be released. If Christ has taken the place, and suffered the punishment due, instead of the offender, the demands of the law are satisfied, and there is no room for forgiveness." These objections, which are deductions from the same premise, grow out of ignorance of the relation of the provisions made for all men in the atonement, and the personal application of those provisions: in other words, by confounding the *atonement* with *redemption*. On this important point I will give an extract which is the best of anything I have seen on the subject.

"Neither is the term *atonement* to be confounded, as is frequently done, with the term *redemption*. Between these two terms there are plain differences; and no one without a perception of these differences, can treat this great subject with lucidness, or accuracy. They differ in object and design, and of course are of a different nature; so that things may be truly affirmed of one, which cannot be truly affirmed of the other.

"First, they differ in *object*. Atonement is offered to God as its object; redemption is purchased or procured for man as its object. Atonement is a sacrifice offered; redemption is a benefit conferred,

"Secondly, they differ in *design*. The design of the atonement is to render God propitious, as the Sovereign Ruler; the design of redemption, to make man everlastingly blessed. Hence,

"Thirdly, they differ in *nature*. Atonement being made to God, and made by a sacrifice of inestimable value, is in its own nature infinite; nor is it possible for us to conceive how its intrinsic worth and glory, or its efficiency and adaptation to its end, could be increased. Its sufficiency is infinite; for who can overrate 'the precious

182

blood of Christ,' or take exact account of his 'unsearchable riches?' Its end was 'that God might be just and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus.' This end is infinitely desirable; for it involves an infinite good, 'glory to God in the highest, on earth, peace and good will to men.' But this end the atonement has accomplished. God is just and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus. Its efficacy, therefore, is complete. It could not be more so. By one offering of himself, says the Apostle, he hath perfected forever them that are sanctified. Heb. x, 14. Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth. Rom. x, 10. Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth. Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died; yea, rather that is risen again; who is also at the right hand of God, and who maketh intercession for us Rom. viii, 33, 34.

"Is not that atonement then in its nature infinite, ³¹ which is sufficient to satisfy God, the infinite Law-giver and Judge, in the remission of sin to every one who cordially confides in it; and which so effectually repairs the injury done by sin as to justify him in the sight of the whole universe for so doing? Can we talk of limits to the value of such a sacrifice? Can we assign bounds to the efficacy of such an expiation? Can we apply terms of measurement to the nature of such an atonement for sin? Is not the covering ample enough to protect a universe from the punishment of sin, were they all in need of its protection, and to resort to it for shelter?

"Redemption on the contrary, is in its very nature, definite. It has an inseparable relation to men, as its object; and therefore in its very nature is limited to the number, for whom its price is paid, in whose behalf it is accepted, and on whom the blessing is actually bestowed. Redemption is not expiation for sin, but the deliverance of men from sin, by means of such an expiation. Hence Christ is said by his own blood to have obtained eternal redemption for us. Heb. ix, 12. Hence, the word redemption is used for pardon, which is our actual deliverance

183

from punishment; ⁴ 1 [Eph. i, 7; Col. i, 14;] for sanctification which is our actual deliverance (from the guilt of sin,-Author) from the dominion of sin; [1 Pet. i, 18; Isa. lix, 20;] and for the resurrection, which is the actual deliverance of our body (person) from the grave, at the last day. Rom. viii, 23; Eph. i, 14; iv, 30. Hence it

is clear that in scripture usage, atonement and redemption differ in their nature; and that the one is the cause, and the other the effect. Atonement is the ground of redemption. Isa. liii, 4-9. Redemption is the result of the atonement Isa. liii, 10-12. The atonement takes effect by changing the relations of God towards the guilty. Rom. iii, 21. Redemption takes effect by changing the relations of the guilty towards God. Rev. xiv, 4. Redemption is a proper subject of prayer; but not the atonement. Ps. xxvi, 11; cxxx, 8. The atonement is definite only in design; but in nature, value and sufficiency, it is infinite, (unlimited,-Author,) and in adaptation to the wants of sinners, universal. John iii, 16. Redemption, on the other hand, is personal in its nature, particular in its purpose and application, and, of course, limited in its extent to the number of those who are actually made partakers of its inestimable blessings by faith in the Redeemer's blood. Acts xx, 28. Eph. v, 25, 27. Titus ii. 14. Gal. iii. 10-14. In a word, atonement is the price paid for the redemption of the church. By the blood of thy covenant, I have sent forth thy prisoners out of the pit in which there is no water. Zech. ix, 11. Redemption is the freedom of the church, which was itself purchased by the atonement. 'For thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood, out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation.' Rev. v, 9."-*Religious Encyclopedia*, p. 145.

Hence we see that there is marked difference between the atonement and redemption. It requires but very little discrimination to see the difference between the provisions which God has made for the salvation of the whole world, and the individual

184

acceptation of those provisions. Suppose a Wealthy prince in a small island of the ocean, should prepare a feast, and make ample provisions for *all* his subjects; and then cordially invite *all* to come and partake; and suppose only about one *fourth* part should accept the invitation, and *actually* partake of the proffered feast: now would any one say, that because only one fourth were actually partakers of this feast, that they were not *all* invited, that provisions were not made for all, and that *all* might not have partaken? This I understand to be a true comparison: God has made ample provisions for the salvation of the whole world; but he has conditioned the personal application of those provisions to the sinner's case; consequently, although there is enough for all, yet none can receive the benefits of these provisions, except those who comply with the prescribed conditions.

This distinction between the atonement, and the personal application of the atonement to the sinner's case, is kept up through the whole Bible. A few examples however, must suffice. The discourse of our Saviour to Nicodemus is right to the point. "And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up: that *whosoever* believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life." John iii, 14, 15. Here is a remedy for all, yet none can receive its benefits except those who believe. In the type, "Moses made a serpent of brass, and put it upon a pole, and it came to pass, that if a serpent had bitten any man, when he beheld the serpent of brass, he lived." Num. xxi, 9. Here was a general

185

and special remedy. All by the simple act of looking might be healed; and yet none were healed except those who did actually look. Will any one say that there was not efficacy in the brazen serpent to heal all, because all would not comply with the conditions?

Again our Lord says in the same discourse: "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him, should not perish, but have everlasting life." Verse 16. Here, although God loved the whole world, and gave his Son to die for all yet none can avail themselves of the benefits of his death, except those who believe. These are the conditions upon which the Father accepted the offering of his Son in our stead. The fact that God has thus conditioned pardon and deliverance, is evidence to every believer in the Bible that he has the best of reasons for so doing.

The same principle is brought to view by Paul in his first epistle to Timothy, chap. iv, 10: "Who is the Saviour of all men, specially of those that believe." In the sense of having made an atonement, or provisions for the salvation of all men, he is the Saviour of all men; but in the personal or individual application of this remedy, he is only the Saviour of them that believe. Hence we may plainly see that the atonement, so far from justifying the sinner by virtue of Christ's death in his stead, only places him in a condition whereby God may grant pardon upon any conditions whatever, much less, to grant a free and full pardon to the incorrigible and impenitent, without any conditions whatever. Those who so fondly cling to this theory

186

as their only hope, will justify in the only wise God, that which they would condemn in any earthly judge. These objections, therefore, are invalid with every friend of the Bible, because they contradict the whole scope of that blessed Book, and only guide for the Christian traveler, o'er this world's dark maze.

To sum up the evidence upon this point, it has been proved conclusively,

1st. That Christ actually made an atonement for the whole world.

2nd. That the application of this atonement to the individual salvation of the sinner, is made conditional.

3rd. That all those who comply with these conditions shall be pardoned, or have their sins actually remitted.

4th. And that all, without exception, who do not comply with the conditions specified, will never receive the pardon, or remission of their sins, but will suffer the penalty for their personal sins, in their own persons. Then flee O sinner to Christ as thy only refuge against the gathering storm! Hasten, while mercy may yet be found, pardon obtained, and salvation secured, Now is the accepted time; now is the day of salvation. To-day if ye will hear his voice harden not your heart, as the Israelites did, in the day of their provocation, and perished. Soon shall the *door of mercy* be closed against you for ever. Soon the *decree* shall go forth, "*He that is unjust, let him be unjust still: and he which is filthy, let him be filthy still: and he that is righteous, let him be righteous still: and he that is holy, let him be holy still.*"

187

b. The position I have taken in reference to the *nature, origin, and incarnation* of the Son of God, will be objected to by many. I am willing to suspend all the Bible objections, which may be urged against these views, upon the evidence therein adduced, except one; that is the supposed evidence of his being *absolutely* equal with the Father, the Supreme and only true God. This view is urged,

1st. From the fact that the highest titles the Father ever claimed are applied to the Son. If this were true, it would be unanswerable; but that it is not, is evident from the following titles of supremacy which are never applied to the Son. I will quote the following from Henry Grew's work on the Sonship, p. 48.

"Although the Son of God. . . is honored with appropriate titles of dignity and glory, he is distinguished from 'the only true God,' by the following titles of supremacy which belong to the 'invisible God' alone.

Jehovah, Whose name alone is Jehovah. Ps. lxxxiii, 18.

The eternal God. Deut. xxxiii, 27.

Most high God. Mark v, 7; Dan. v, 18.

God alone. Ps. lxxxvi, 10; Isa. xxxvii, 16.

Lord alone. Neh. ix, 6.

God of heaven. Dan. ii, 44.

Besides me there is no God. Isa. xlv, 6.

Who only hath immortality. 1 Tim. vi, 16.

The only true God. John xvii, 3.

The King eternal, immortal, invisible. 1 Tim i, 17.

The only wise God. 1 Tim. i, 17.

Lord, God Omnipotent. Rev. xix, 6.

Blessed and only Potentate. 1 Tim. vi, 15.

One God and Father of all. Eph. iv, 6.

The only Lord God. Jude 4.

There is but one God, the Father. 1 Cor. viii, 6.

The God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. 2 Cor. xi, 31."

188

2nd. He exercised power and prerogatives which belong to the supreme God alone. I cannot answer this objection more forcibly than by presenting the Trinitarian view, and Bible view, in contrast. In doing this, I will avail myself of a list of quotations presented by the same author. pp. 66, 67.

CHRIST AND HIS APOSTLES

To us there is but one God the Father. 1 Cor. viii, 6.

My Father is greater than I. John xiv, 28.

Who is the image of the invisible God, the first born of every creature. Col. i, 15. The Son can do nothing of himself. John v, 19.

But of that day, etc., knoweth no man, no not the angels, etc., neither the Son, but the Father. Mark xiii, 32.

All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth, Matt. xxviii, 18.

As thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him. John xvii, 22.

God who created all things by Jesus Christ.-Eph. iii, 9.
The revelation of Jesus Christ which God gave unto him. Rev. i, 1.
For there is one God, and one Mediator between God and man, the man
Christ Jesus. 1 Tim. ii, 5.
Denying the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ. Jude 4.

TRINITARIANS

To us there is but one God, the Father, Word, and Holy Ghost.
The Son is as great as the Father.
Who is the invisible God, the uncreated Jehovah.
The Son is omnipotent.
The Son is omniscient, and knew of that day as well as the Father.
No given power can qualify the Son of God to give eternal life to his people.
Jesus Christ created all things by his own independent power.
The revelation of Jesus Christ from his own omniscience.
There is one Mediator between God and man; who is also the supreme God
and man in our person.

189

Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you by miracles, and
signs, and wonders which God did by him. Acts ii, 22.

For as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life
in himself. John v, 26.

I live by the Father. John vi, 57.

This is my Son. Matt. iii, 17.

That they might know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou
hast sent. John xvii, 3.

That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, . . . and that every tongue
should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father. Phil. ii,
10, 11.

Denying the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ, who is also the only
Lord God, and a distinct person.

Jesus performed his miracles by his own omnipotence.

He is self-existent.

The Son lives by himself.

This is the only true God, the same numerical essence as the Father.

That they might know thee, who art not the only true God in distinction from
the Word whom thou hast sent.

That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow; and every tongue should
confess that Jesus Christ is Lord to his own glory.

3rd. He is called God. It has been shown that the term Son of God is
expressive of his highest nature. Now, that the Son should be called by the
Father's name is not at all unreasonable. By reference to Psalm lxxxii; also, Ex.
vii, 1; xxii, 28; John x, 34, 35, you will find this term applied to mortal men.
Moreover the Son of God in this character calls his father God. Heb. i, 9; John xx,

17; Rev. iii, 12. And in this character, as has been shown, he was begotten and died.

190

4th. I will consider a few of those passages of scripture which are so frequently, and confidently quoted to prove that Jesus Christ in his essential nature, is the *very and eternal God*. In Col. ii, 9, we are told, that in Jesus Christ "dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily." But a few verses before this, the same Apostle tells us, "*it pleased the Father that in him should all fullness dwell.*" Chap. i, 19. This same Apostle represents even the saints as being "*filled with all the fullness of God.*" Eph. iii, 19.

Again in Col. i, 15. "Who is the *image* of the invisible God." The last clause of the same verse says of this very being that he is "*the first born of every creature.*" Also Phil. ii, 6. "Who being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be *equal* with God." The two verses following declare that this very personage became man and died. "I have power to lay it (my life) down, and I have power to take it again." John x, 18. This is considered one of the strongest proof texts; and yet our Saviour confesses in the very next words he utters: "*This commandment* have I received of my Father." I will submit this subject to the investigation of the candid reader, by quoting one more proof text. Rev. i, 8. "I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, saith the Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty." By reference to verses 17 and 18, of this chapter, we may learn that this identical being *was dead*. "*I am the first and the last: I am he that liveth and was dead; and behold I am alive forevermore. Amen.*"

¹ I have been greatly aided in arranging the Bible evidence upon this point, by reference to Watson's Theological Institutes.

² I will notice the point, as to how God can accept a substitute, and yet inflict the penalty, under the head of objections.

³ By infinite, he evidently means absolutely perfect in fullness, efficacy, adaptation, etc.-Author.

⁴ Deliverance from punishment is the result of pardon or the remission of the penalty.-Author.