

THE  
ASSURANCE OF FAITH,  
OR  
CALVINISM  
IDENTIFIED WITH  
UNIVERSALISM.

BY THE REV. DAVID THOM,  
MINISTER, FORMERLY OF THE SCOTCH CHURCH RODNEY STREET, NOW OF  
BOLD STREET CHAPEL, LIVERPOOL.

VOL. II.

Fidei dentur quæ fidei sunt.

BACON.

Sapientiam sibi adimunt qui, sine ullo judicio, inventa majorum probant; et ab aliis, pecudum more, ducuntur.

LACTANTIUS.

LONDON:  
SIMPKIN AND MARSHALL,  
MDCCCXXXIII.

R. Riddick, Printer,  
Liverpool.

## CHAPTER VI.

### ETERNAL LIFE THE GIFT OF GOD ULTIMATELY TO ALL.

Therefore, as by the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one, THE FREE GIFT CAME UPON ALL MEN UNTO JUSTIFICATION OF LIFE.

PAUL's Epistle to the Romans.

Ἡμεῖς, δὲ, τῆς λογικῆς φύσεώς, φαμεν, ὅλης κρατῆσαι ποτε τὸν Λόγον, καὶ μεταποιῆσαι πᾶσαν ψυχὴν εἰς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ τελειότητα. . . Καὶ φαμεν, ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν εἰκός, ὥσπερ ἐπὶ τῶν <έν> τοῖς σώμασι νοσημάτων καὶ τραυμάτων τινὰ τῶν συμβαινόντων ἰσχυρότερα εἶναι πάσης ἱατρικῆς τέχνης, οὕτως ἐπὶ τῶν ψυχῶν εἶναι τι τῶν ἀπὸ κακίας ἀδύνατον ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐπὶ πᾶσι λογικοῦ καὶ θεοῦ θεραπευθῆναι. Πάντων γὰρ τῶν ἐν ψυχῇ κακῶν δυνατότερος ὢν ὁ λόγος καὶ ἡ ἐν αὐτῷ θεραπεία προσάγει κατὰ βούλησιν θεοῦ ἐκάστῳ αὐτήν, ΚΑΙ ΤΟ ΤΕΛΟΣ ΤΩΝ ΠΡΑΓΜΑΤΩΝ ἈΝΑΙΠΕΘΗΝΑΙ ἜΣΤΙ ΤΗΝ ΚΑΚΙΑΝ.

ORIGENES contra Celsum.

It is with extreme regret that, after having travelled so long and so far with Mr. Barclay, I now find myself obliged to part company with him. I say, with extreme regret; on account of the respect almost approaching to veneration in which I hold the man. The high moral worth which, in his personal deportment, he exhibited; and the deep tone of genuine spirituality and ardent piety, springing from an intimate acquaintance with the word of God, which breathes throughout his writings; would of themselves have disposed me to make any [2] sacrifice, rather than be found in the ranks of his opponents. And when in addition to all this I consider, that he has been my best and most efficient EARTHLY instructor in divine things; — that to the doctrine of *the divine testimony, when understood, of itself necessarily, infallibly, and for ever, speaking peace to the conscience*, so admirably developed and demonstrated by him from the scriptures, I owe my emancipation from innumerable popular prejudices and delusions; — and, that it is principally by means of weapons furnished by himself, I have been enabled to combat some of his own positions, and to fight my way to views of truth still clearer than those which he himself possessed; — the pain which I feel in announcing publicly, that I differ from him on a point of the utmost importance, is such, as only those who have been similarly circumstanced can conceive. But the sacrifice of private feeling must be made. Shall I, a follower of *the faithful and the true witness*, allow myself to be surpassed by the Heathen, who could proclaim: *amicus Plato, amicus Socrates, sed magis amica veritas*? Can I forget, that it is my business as a Christian to *call no man master upon earth*? Nay, can I forget, that it was Mr. Barclay's own recommendation to those to whom he had been rendered useful, that they should be as ready to receive farther measures of light from others, as they had shewn themselves to receive a certain measure of it from him? And that the grand reason upon which he founded his recommendation was, the circumstance of no man or body of men having yet "penetrated into [3] *the whole counsel of God*;" and, of there being "more truth yet to break forth out of His holy word." True, we are with much propriety cautioned by him, to "take heed what it is that we receive as truth;" and, by a careful examination, consideration, and comparison with the scriptures, of any new views which may be presented to us, to guard against having error palmed on us under specious pretences.<sup>1</sup> But if really superior views of truth, duly authenticated to be so, should be set before us, however much they may militate against present prejudices, and long-cherished opinions, can we, *as new-born babes desiring the sincere milk of the word, that we may grow thereby*, err in welcoming them with avidity; and in doing all that in us lies to communicate the knowledge of them to others?

<sup>1</sup> See Preface to Barclay's *assurance of faith vindicated*, 1st and 2d editions, towards the end.

These remarks are intended to be introductory to the consideration of a question, which it is

probable has already suggested itself to many of my readers, and which it now becomes necessary to discuss. "If eternal life be *the gift of God*, or be *unconditionally bestowed*, must it not be the portion of *every human being*? It is commonly supposed both by Arminians and Calvinists, that none but believers, or those by whom the divine testimony is apprehended, — whatever sense may be attached by these parties respectively to the term *belief*, — shall partake of everlasting life. But is not *belief*, according to this view of matters, *the condition* of eternal life? and is not eternal life, upon this principle, [4] *conditionally bestowed*, just as decidedly, as if ten thousand or ten million *conditions* of enjoying it were to be interposed? In reasoning with the Arminian, it will not avail the Calvinist to say, that, according to him, eternal life is *not conditionally bestowed*, because *belief here* is, in his apprehension, as much the gift of God as *eternal life hereafter*: for, as the Arminian, while he contends for *good works* no less than *faith here* being essential to *eternal life hereafter*, does not hesitate to admit, that these *good works* flow from *divine grace*, or are *the gift of God*, who perceives not, that although the Arminian increases *the number of the conditions of eternal life*, the Calvinist is actually, as to the principle of *some condition being requisite*, taking up the very same ground with him? The question, be it observed, is, neither as to the number of the qualifications *here* upon which eternal life is conceived to depend *hereafter*, nor as to the way in which we come to acquire these qualifications; but, *are there any such qualifications at all*? To express the matter simply: is there any thing, over and above the fact of their partaking of human nature, requisite to be possessed by mankind *here*, in order to their possessing eternal life *hereafter*? If any such qualification be requisite, call it *faith*, or call it *faith and good works*, — suppose it to be the result of *the unaided efforts of the creature*, or *the free gift of the Creator*, — is it possible, by any distinctions which may be invented, to do away with the fact, that *such a present qualification* must be to all intents and purposes *the condition* of everlasting life?"

[5] To the question thus put, I find myself obliged to answer, that, as eternal life is *unconditionally bestowed upon the children of men*, it must be *bestowed UPON ALL OF THEM*. For if *bestowed hereafter*, only upon those who are possessed of *faith here*, then unquestionably faith is represented to be *the condition* of everlasting life; or, everlasting life, instead of being *unconditionally*, is represented as being *conditionally* bestowed.

Here, of course, I shall be interrupted, for the purpose of being reminded of those passages of scripture, which not merely declare that *he that believeth hath everlasting life*, but expressly exclude from the possession of the privilege *him who believeth not*. And, also, of those passages which denounce *condemnation and punishment* against such persons as *do not believe*. This leads me to observe,

That the passages in question have not been overlooked by me; and that I have had my own share of doubt and perplexity, respecting the way in which they were to be reconciled with those other passages which speak of eternal life *as the gift of God*. After much diligent and prayerful examination of the scriptures *as a whole*, I have been obliged to come to the two following conclusions.

First. That there is a sense, and that, too, a very important one, in which eternal life is *exclusively* conferred on and enjoyed by *those who believe*. And yet,

Secondly, It being impossible for the scriptures as the word of God to contradict themselves, while there is one sense in which eternal life is confined [6] *to those who believe*, there must be another sense in which as *the gift of God* it is conferred on *the whole family of man*.

To this I may add, that the principle so admirably stated and developed by Mr. Barclay, *although I confess never intended by him to apply to my present purpose*, is that which, when followed out, renders the sacred volume in regard to the point in question consistent with itself. God, he argues, after manifesting to his people, that eternal life is *unconditionally bestowed*; and, consequently, after manifesting to them, that it is *their own certain and indefeasible privilege*; can never contradict himself

by manifesting it to them as *conditionally bestowed*: from which he draws the conclusion, that *the conditional promises* made to them must have a reference, not to *eternity*, but to *time*. By applying this admirable principle to the matter in hand, an easy, complete, and satisfactory solution of all the difficulties connected with it, is at once obtained. The fact of eternal life being in one sense *unconditionally bestowed*, implies, that *ultimately it shall be enjoyed by the whole human race*. The fact of its being in another sense *conditionally bestowed*, implies, that *only a portion of the human race shall, while on earth, be admitted to the participation of it*.

But although the possession of eternal life *now* by some, and *ultimately* by all, is the principle which pervades the sacred volume, and enables us to reconcile one class of its statements with another; were I to content myself with the bare annunciation of it, my readers [7] would have but a very inadequate conception of the subject, and of the strength of the position which I have taken up. In particular, their conception of the importance of possessing eternal life *here*, and of *the great and glorious salvation* which is *therewith connected*, would be extremely vague and erroneous. I am under the necessity, therefore, in order to do justice to them and to myself, of treating the subject at considerable length. It is not lightly or thoughtlessly, but after much deliberation and in opposition to the whole current of early and strong religious prejudices, that my present views have been adopted: a circumstance which, in more than one respect, gives me an advantage over those who have taken up views of a similar kind in a traditional way. Perhaps the great advantage which I derive from this is, that *in abandoning the horrid doctrine of future and never ending torments*, I do not find it necessary to run to the opposite extreme, of *confounding the case of the righteous with that of the wicked*. The point which I undertake to prove is, not that *eternal life is IN EVERY RESPECT bestowed on all mankind alike*; but that *there is A SENSE in which everlasting life*, meaning thereby everlasting happiness, *is conferred on the whole family of man*. This I intend to do by shewing, in the first place, that the doctrine of eternal life being *ultimately enjoyed by all*, so far from being merely an inference from *the unconditionality of the privilege*, is actually founded on and borne out by *the general analogy and express statements of the sacred volume*: and, in the second place, that *the ultimate possession of* [8] *eternal life by all*, does not militate against, but is, on the contrary, perfectly consistent with, *the endurance of everlasting punishment by the wicked*. The proof of the former of these positions, shall constitute the subject matter of this; that of the latter, of the following chapter.

THE FIRST POINT, THEN, TO WHICH I INVITE THE READER'S ATTENTION, IS THE MANNER IN WHICH IT IS PROVED, THAT THE WHOLE FAMILY OF MAN ARE DESIGNED ULTIMATELY TO BE PARTAKERS OF EVERLASTING LIFE.

I would here repeat, what has already been hinted at, that the circumstance of eternal life being *unconditionally bestowed*, is of itself sufficient to establish the doctrine of its being *bestowed on all*. If only a certain number of human beings hereafter shall possess eternal life to the exclusion of all others, it must be either *without any reason at all*, or *on the ground of something peculiar to them*. It cannot be *without any reason at all*, for if so, the Supreme Being would act *unwisely*: besides that, those passages of scripture which speak of eternal life as necessarily connected with faith *would be deprived of all significancy*. Nor can it be *on the ground of something peculiar to those who inherit the blessing*, for if so, that *peculiarity* constituting *the condition* upon which they became entitled to it, eternal life hereafter instead of being *the gift of God*, would be a privilege *conditionally bestowed*. Considerations like [9] these force the conviction, that, however *conditional*, — however *dependent on the possession of the principle of faith*, — the enjoyment of eternal life may be *upon earth*, it is impossible from *the conditionality* of the blessing *here*, to infer its *conditionality hereafter*. Nay, as the scriptures expressly declare that eternal life is *unconditionally bestowed*, who that is duly enlightened can help perceiving, that its *conditionality* and *limited enjoyment* here, is a mere accommodation to the present state and circumstances of man; and that, although we are thus aided in our conceptions of it, yet viewed as

*conditional and limited* it must be contrasted with its real nature, which is that of a blessing *unconditionally and unlimitedly enjoyed*? Upon grounds like these I am satisfied, that *the unconditionality of eternal life*, at once and unambiguously points to the fact, of its being ultimately destined for *the whole human race*. But, as I have already stated, I waive for the present any advantage to be gained from this; and proceed to establish my position by other *media* of proof.

Such is necessarily the inconsistency of error with itself, that at this point I might, if so disposed, bring the whole controversy to a close, merely by having recourse to the *argumentum ad hominem*. The opinions generally held, and the admissions generally made by religionists with regard to the wicked hereafter, are, when sifted to the bottom, actually and absolutely fatal to their cause. For instance; almost all of them allow, that the wicked shall have *everlasting existence*: and, a [10] great majority of them, that, at the period of the final judgment, there shall be such a display of the perfections of Deity, *as shall constrain the wicked to acquiesce in, or at all events to apprehend the justice of their sentence*. — Respectable, but superficially-minded men! have you never reflected on the legitimate consequences of these admissions of yours? Are you aware, that they constitute a lever, by means of which the whole of your theory of *never-ending torments* may with the utmost ease be overturned? Perhaps not: and therefore you will excuse me if, for your information and guidance, I submit to you a few hints respecting the subject.

1. The greater part of religionists, constrained by the force of scripture evidence, admit, that *all the human race shall rise from the grave and possess everlasting existence*. As if aware, however, of the consequences to which such an admission naturally conducts them, they have attempted to evade these under shelter of a distinction between *everlasting existence* and *everlasting life*: representing *the former* as being consistent with *everlasting torments*; and *the latter* alone as implying *everlasting happiness*. The weakness and sophistry of this will become apparent, if the following things be considered:

1st: Those who make the distinction in question are unable to shew, that *it has any foundation in the scriptures themselves*. Upon a point of such importance as this, it is impossible for us to rest satisfied with any man's mere *ipse dixit*, or with metaphysical vagaries; [11] and this, too, when the circumstances under which the distinction is brought forward, are calculated to beget a strong suspicion of its having been devised to serve a party purpose. The question to which, before acquiescing in the statements of the popular divines respecting this matter, we are fairly entitled to demand an answer, is, in what part of the sacred volume is *everlasting existence* expressly distinguished from *everlasting life*? Let the passage or passages be produced, and the controversy is at an end. Or, if no such passages are to be found, — and well do the popular divines know that to produce any is impossible, — let them at least shew us *one single passage* in which, substituting the phrase *everlasting existence* for *everlasting life*, would be a mistranslation of the original words; or, in which, independently of the attempted distinction itself, it would affect the sense of the inspired writer? Whenever the distinction between *everlasting existence* and *everlasting life*, shall have been substantiated by evidence derived from the scriptures themselves, *then*, but *not till then*, we shall be ready to listen to any conclusion or conclusions which the *soi-disant* orthodox may think meet to deduce from it. But

2dly: Even supposing it proved, — which it cannot be, — that the scriptures do actually recognise a distinction between *everlasting existence* and *everlasting life*, — before answering their purpose, it will be requisite for those by whom this distinction has been devised to shew, that *everlasting existence* is capable of being separated from *everlasting happiness*. But how is this to be accom-[12]plished? Not merely by *saying that they may be separated*: for *proof*, not *assertion*, is what is wanted. Nor by saying, that in order to *wicked creatures being punished for ever*, it is requisite that *wicked creatures as such shall exist for ever*: for, the assertion that *wicked creatures*, or, which is the same thing, that *wickedness shall exist for ever*, is again *assuming* the very point of which *scriptural proof* is demanded. Nay, to

maintain that *wickedness shall exist for ever*, is actually to hazard an assertion inconsistent with, and in direct opposition to, *scriptural evidence to the contrary of the very strongest kind*. For, passing over a variety of other arguments which might be adduced,<sup>2</sup> is not *everlasting existence*, properly speaking, *an attribute of the Supreme Being*? and *as such* is it not synonymous with *perfect existence*? And is not *perfection of existence* in Him, necessarily connected with *perfection of every other kind*? Who would attempt to separate *perfect existence* in Him, from *perfect wisdom, perfect power, perfect goodness, and perfect happiness*? Now, is there any man so blind as not to perceive the impossibility of reconciling these facts with popular notions of theology? According to the ordinary classes of religionists, beings who *continue wicked hereafter* possess *everlasting existence*. That is, beings who in respect of *moral qualities* are *imperfect*, are nevertheless *perfect* in respect of *existence*! But we have seen, that *perfection of existence* cannot be separated from *perfection of every other kind* in the [13] Creator himself; or, that *perfection in every respect* constitutes *the divine nature*. And if so, is it conceivable, that qualities which *cannot be separated in the Creator himself*, should be *capable of being separated as communicated by Him to His creatures*? Is it conceivable, that the Supreme Being should impart *everlasting or perfect existence*, — which is one of the attributes of *His own perfect nature*, — to beings, all whose other attributes *are absolutely and completely at variance with it*? Our opponents allege, that in the case of *the wicked hereafter*, *everlasting or perfect existence* stands connected with *sin and suffering*, which are obviously qualities of *an imperfect intelligent being*. That is, they suppose a being who has become *perfect* in one respect, to continue *imperfect* in every other: — they suppose a being who has become possessed of *the divine nature* in one respect, to continue possessed of *the nature of the Devil* in every other. But is the existence of such a Being really conceivable? The nature of an intelligent being *imperfect* in every respect, and therefore *consistent with itself*, we can conceive of; for such is the nature of Adam: — and the nature of an intelligent being *perfect* in every respect, and therefore *consistent with itself*, we can likewise form some idea of; for such is the nature of Christ. But who can conceive of a nature destined to last for ever, and therefore *perfect* in respect of *existence*, all the other attributes of which, however, continue *imperfect*? Who can conceive of a *moral-monster*, — a *spiritual chimera*? Is not such a nature as much opposed to the scriptures of truth, as it is to [14] sound philosophy? Strange and inconceivable, however, as the idea at present appears to me to be, let it be once proved from scripture, that *perfection of one attribute* does not necessarily imply *perfection of every other*, and I shall be one of the first to acknowledge, that a being possessed of *perfect existence*, is not therefore necessarily possessed of *perfect happiness*. This, however, is not all: for

<sup>2</sup> For a specimen of these, see a work of the author's, entitled, *Three questions proposed and answered, &c.* Answer to question 3d.

3dly: If a distinction between *everlasting existence* and *everlasting life* could be established; and if it could be shown that *the wicked* possess *the former*, while *the latter* falls to the lot of *the righteous*; it would actually follow, that *the wicked* hereafter are placed in better circumstances, and inherit a higher privilege, than *the righteous*. To effect this *reductio ad absurdum* a very few statements indeed will be sufficient. *Everlasting existence* is not merely, as we have just seen, an attribute of the Supreme Being, but is *the highest* which, by any possibility, we can conceive of or ascribe to Him. JEHOVAH, — the I AM THAT I AM, — that is, *the Being possessed of independent and everlasting existence*, — is His incommunicable name. *Everlasting life*, on the other hand, — if it must be distinguished from *everlasting existence*, — being employed to denote a privilege which is possessed by *those who believe*, of course refers to and signifies, not *the divine nature as it exists in God himself*, but *that nature as it is communicated by Him to His creatures*. Upon the principles of popular religionists, *everlasting existence* being God's nature *as it exists in Himself*, *everlasting life* must be His nature [15] *as communicated*. But, say these theorizers, the wicked hereafter have *everlasting existence*, not *everlasting life*. That is, they have the divine nature *as it exists in the Creator himself*, not that nature *as it is communicated by Him to His creatures*! They are destitute, to be sure, of *the lower attribute*, — but

it is because they are possessed of *the higher*! Now are our opponents prepared in sober earnest to maintain this? The wicked, although possessed of *an essential attribute of Deity*, and thus *standing*, according to their system, *in a closer and more intimate relation to the Supreme Being than the righteous themselves*, are nevertheless subjected to *everlasting torments!!!* Is this their doctrine? If not, what, pray, is it? for, as they deny, that those who live and die wicked *here*, attain to *everlasting life hereafter*; and yet, as they maintain, that such persons have *everlasting existence*, which, if not the same with *everlasting life*, must be *an essential* as distinguished from *a communicated divine attribute*; I know but one other alternative which remains, namely, that the wicked are *annihilated* or *swallowed up in God*, an inference which, I am certain, it is not their intention to deduce. Little, I suspect, have those by whom the various popular theories of religion are supported, allowed themselves to reflect on what is implied in *everlasting existence*: for never, if thoroughly acquainted with the subject, would they have placed themselves in the awkward predicament of being obliged to maintain, in the first place, that intelligent creatures now wicked may hereafter become possessed of *an essential* as [16] distinguished from *a communicated attribute of Deity*; and, in the second place, that *an essential attribute of Deity* may be possessed in connection with the endurance of *everlasting torments*!

Admitting, then, that those who are wicked here have *everlasting existence* hereafter; and yet failing in their attempts to establish a distinction between *everlasting existence* and *everlasting life*; is it not clear, that popular religionists, however unintentionally, admit the fact of all who are wicked here, being destined to possess *everlasting happiness hereafter*?

2. A large majority of popular religionists admit, that at the final judgment such a display of the divine perfections shall be afforded, *as shall constrain even the wicked to understand and acquiesce in, or, at all events, to apprehend the justice of the punishment inflicted on them*. Those, likewise, who entertain this notion place themselves in a false position: for

1st: They become bound to shew that *the divine perfections*, and especially the *divine justice*, may be *understood and acquiesced in* by beings, who nevertheless are the subjects of *everlasting torments*. According to many of those by whom the theory of eternal torments is maintained, the damned in hell are filled with horrible and inexhaustible rage against the holy name of God, and continue to blaspheme it for evermore. Such an idea as this, however, cannot of course be entertained by those who imagine, that the damned, although everlastingly punished, are nevertheless satisfied of and [17] constrained to acquiesce in the justice of their sentence. To suppose intelligent beings satisfied of the justice and propriety of the sufferings inflicted on them, and yet inflamed with resentment against the authority by which these sufferings are inflicted, is, as every man endowed with the slightest particle of common sense perceives, to suppose things which are incompatible and irreconcilable with one another. If, then, it be laid down as a fundamental principle, that the damned hereafter are satisfied of and acquiesce in the justice of their sentence, it follows, as a necessary consequence, that instead of raging against and blaspheming the name of God, they must be patient and submissive *under his mighty hand*. That is, according to the theory which I am now engaged in opposing, God visits with *everlasting torments*, beings who are *completely satisfied of the magnitude and enormity of their offences*, and, therefore, *completely resigned to his blessed will*! But is this possible? Does not the very statement carry along with it its own refutation? It is the grand object of a judicious earthly parent, in punishing his child, to bring him to a sense of his errors; and the moment that this is accomplished the punishment is discontinued: and yet the Father of Spirits, after bringing the wicked to a sense of their misconduct, — the great legitimate end of punishment, — is nevertheless supposed by our ordinary religionists to *continue tormenting them for evermore*! I pity, from the bottom of my heart, the supporters and abettors of the doctrine of eternal torments. How perplexing the dilemma in which they place themselves. The wicked [18] hereafter, either *apprehend the justice of the punishment inflicted on them*, or *they do not*. If they continue throughout eternity *ignorant of the justice which is displayed in their sufferings*, then,

undoubtedly, they may, with the utmost propriety, be represented as *raging against and blaspheming the name of God for evermore*; but in this case they cannot be spoken of as *understanding and acquiescing in the justice of their sentence*. God, under such circumstances, instead of appearing to them *just when He judges them*, must be invested in their eyes with the attributes of a *gloomy and ruthless despot*: nay, the knowledge of His character and perfections being on these principles confined *hereafter* to the righteous, or to the very same class of persons by whom alone it is possessed *here*, — it follows, that the nature and extent of divine manifestation *hereafter*, can in no respect whatever differ from or exceed what it is *here*. If, on the contrary, the justice and other perfections of Deity are at the final judgment displayed to the wicked; and if the necessary result of this is, an acquiescence on their part in the divine procedure towards them; how, I ask, can those persons who have been brought into a temper of mind so suitable and becoming, be subjected to *everlasting torments*? Let the supporter of popular theories, who conceives himself to possess sufficient ingenuity for the task, try to extricate himself from this dilemma if he can. But

2dly: Those who hold, that, although at the final judgment the wicked shall be made *to understand and acquiesce in the divine perfections*, they shall nevertheless be *everlastingly tormented*, are bound to reconcile this notion of theirs with the declarations of scripture, both express and implied, that *the knowledge of God is eternal life*. THIS, says our blessed Lord, is LIFE ETERNAL, THAT THEY MIGHT KNOW THEE, or, as Dr. Campbell translates it, TO KNOW THEE, *the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent*. John 17:3. As it thus appears, on the highest of all authority, that *to know God*, and *to have eternal life*, are synonymous modes of expression, — upon what principles can ordinary religionists represent as *destitute of eternal life*, and consign over to *never-ending torments*, persons to whom, by their own shewing, God, at the last day, vouchsafes to communicate *the knowledge of Himself*? In attempting to evade the force of this question, it will not do to say, that *the knowledge of God* intended by our blessed Lord, is *such a knowledge of him as may be attained to in this present world*; for, unluckily for this mode of arguing, the proposition is a general one. Christ's language is not, that the knowledge of God *here*, or that the knowledge of God *hereafter*, but that *the knowledge of God*, without any qualification, reservation, or modification whatever, *is eternal life*. See 1 John 5:20. Nay, I might with the utmost propriety avail myself of the argument *a fortiori*, and say, if such an *inferior* knowledge of God as can at the utmost be attained to *here*, is entitled to be called *eternal life*, how much more must that *superior* knowledge of Him which, by the admission of antagonists themselves, all human beings shall attain to *hereafter*, deserve the [20] appellation? It will not get rid of the difficulty to say, that God's character may be known *in two or more ways*; for, *as the proposition is general*, in whatever way God's character may be known, *if known at all*, the result must be the same. Nor will it answer the purpose of popular religionists broadly to assert, that *God's character may be known*, and yet that *the persons knowing it may be tormented everlastingly*; for this, *besides contradicting the scriptures*, is *to beg the question*. The only plausible way in which an attempt can be made by my opponents to evade the conclusion upon which I am forcing them, is by alleging, that although at the last day the wicked shall have *some knowledge* of God's character, yet, that either they shall not understand *all the divine perfections*, or, if they understand all of them, that at least they shall not understand them *to their full extent*. But with whatever avidity the prejudiced and the superficial may seize upon such modes of answering my query, and fancy them to be quite satisfactory, they will not abide the test of a rigid examination. For, supposing me to be told, on the one hand, that the wicked at the last day shall have a clear apprehension of *the justice of God*, but not of *the other divine perfections*, I call upon those who hazard such an assertion, to prove the possibility of *any one divine attribute being apprehended*, apart from and independently of *the apprehension of the others*. Or, supposing my religious opponents to attempt to evade my conclusion by telling me, on the other hand, that, although at the last day the wicked shall have *some knowledge of all the divine* [21] *perfections*, they nevertheless shall not understand them *to their full extent*, I then enquire, in the first



place, if they mean to say, that *any intelligent creature* can ever by any possibility *exhaust* or *fully comprehend the divine perfections*? and, in the event of their answering in the negative, as they must do, my second enquiry is, seeing that, as by their own admission it appears, *all intelligent creatures* can at the very utmost possess only *a limited knowledge of God*, in what respect do the wicked hereafter, *with a limited understanding of the divine perfections*, differ from the righteous? The fact is, that, with all the aids which the most bare-faced sophistry can supply, it is utterly impossible for any man, professing to believe the scriptures, who admits, that such as live and die wicked *here*, have an understanding of the divine perfections vouchsafed to them *hereafter*, to get rid of the conclusion, that they have likewise *everlasting life*. Let it be supposed, that the wicked remain throughout eternity *ignorant of God*, — that they have hereafter vouchsafed to them *no knowledge of His character and perfections*, — and, however strange and unscriptural in reality the idea of *everlasting existence* apart from *the knowledge of God* may be, I readily admit, that *if it were possible* for intelligent beings to be so situated, *they might be tormented and might blaspheme the name of God for ever*: but the moment it is supposed, that, at the final judgment, *they are made to understand and acquiesce in the divine perfections*; or, in other words, that *the knowledge of God is then imparted to them*; as it necessarily follows, upon [22] scriptural principles, that they are then made partakers of *everlasting life*, by what possibility can they be the subjects of *everlasting torments*?<sup>3</sup>

<sup>3</sup> Notwithstanding what is said in the text, I freely admit, that there is one species of *torment*, (if *torment* it can be called), to which those who live and die *wicked here*, shall be subjected *everlastingly hereafter*. To this, more particular allusion will be made in a subsequent part of the Essay. In the mean time, the reader curious to know what the *torment* in question is, may consult Matthew 5:43-48, and Rom. 12:20,21.

When any man allows himself seriously to consider the immediately preceding statements, can he fail to perceive, that by admitting the wicked to have *everlasting existence*,<sup>4</sup> and *to understand and acquiesce in the divine perfections hereafter*, popular religionists are, however unintentionally, supporting a doctrine which, in so many words, they profess to abhor. *Everlasting existence* and *the knowledge of God* are, as scripture points out to us, equivalent expressions for *eternal life*; and, therefore, to admit that the wicked hereafter possess *the one*, must be, if words have any meaning at all, to admit likewise that they possess *the other*. Upon the shewing of our opponents themselves, consequently, the case is decided against them.

<sup>4</sup> Time wasted is *existence*, used is *life*:  
And bare *existence*, man, to *live* ordained,  
Wrings and oppresses with enormous weight.

So says or sings the Poet of Night; and those who are desirous to establish a distinction between *existence* and *life*, are welcome to all the advantage which they can derive from this prettily-pointed antithesis. I have yet to learn, however, that a mere poetical flight, is to be received as equivalent to a declaration emanating from the Supreme Being himself.

But I scorn to rest my cause merely on the concessions of antagonists. That cause has its foundation [23] laid broad and deep in the scriptures themselves; and ill would it become me, under such circumstances, to have even the appearance of resting it on the bare, — the reluctant testimony of man. *To the law and testimony of God*, therefore, I make my appeal: knowing, that to its unerring dictates all will be disposed to bow, in whose minds the Holy Spirit has by the manifestation of the truth taken up His abode. What, then, say the scriptures in reference to this important subject?

The answer to this question I shall attempt to give, by adducing, in the first place, such arguments of a scriptural kind, in favour of the ultimate happiness of the whole human race as may be denominated *presumptive*; and, in the second place, such as are *positive and direct*. In stating and marshalling them, I shall be as concise as perspicuity, and a desire to shew the full strength of my position, will admit. Some of my readers may think that the proofs adduced by me might, without any disadvantage to my

cause, have been much curtailed: — those only who have thoroughly investigated the subject, can form any conception of the necessity of a full exhibition of its evidences; and of the number of them which a due regard to brevity will constrain me to omit.

### I. Presumptive Arguments.

Let me direct the attention of my readers to such scriptural arguments, for the final happiness of the whole human race, as may be fitly denominated *presumptive*.

[24] There is a class of *presumptive arguments* in favour of the ultimate happiness of all mankind, which I confess have produced a strong impression on my own mind; and which I think well entitled to the attention of those who acknowledge the force of analogy, and the typical character of the scriptures. I allude to those which are derived from the state, circumstances, and destiny of the Jewish people. It has been long seen and admitted by divines, that *the Jews* constitute a lively type of *the whole body of believers*; and that, in what has happened, and is happening to *the former*, we may trace, as in letters written by a sunbeam, the history of *the latter*. Now, without denying or wishing to disparage this, — nay, admitting the truth of it to its fullest extent, — I would take leave to remark, that there is a description of analogies connected with the Jewish people, which, although less observed, is not on this account the less real and important. If the Jews, viewed under certain aspects, are seen to be the type of *believers in every age*, viewed under other aspects, they will appear to be the representatives of *the whole human race*. In nothing, perhaps, is *the manifold wisdom of God* more conspicuous, than in its rendering its instruments subservient to the accomplishment of more than one purpose; and of this, the Jews, as typifying *man in general*, as well as *believers in particular*, afford a splendid specimen. That the Jews are, in certain respects, a type of *the whole family of man*, is a proposition of the truth of which, did my limits permit and were the doing so the grand object of my work, I could [25] bring forward numerous striking proofs. But as I am well aware, that arguments drawn from the typical nature of persons and things, however well founded, and however accurately stated and defined, are, in the estimation of many, little else at the very best than mere efforts of imagination; and as, independently of all such arguments, I have in store abundance of a kind more likely to be generally understood and relished; I shall content myself with only suggesting two or three hints, respecting the Jewish people, to such as may be inclined to prosecute the enquiry into their typical character farther, — and then pass on.

1st: During the subsistence of the Mosaic Economy it was not every Jew that was permitted to enter the Holy Place. To such only as were invested with the Levitical and Priestly characters, was this privilege conceded. The great body of the Jewish nation were allowed to approach no nearer than the inner court of the Temple. But was this exclusive system of things always to continue? No; it was all along intended, that it should, in due time, be succeeded and superseded by another and a higher one. — And are there no remarkable analogies, connected with *the whole human race*, suggested by all this? Does not the High Priest entering within the vail, suggest to us the great High Priest Christ Jesus entered into heaven itself? — do not the other Priests admitted into the Holy Place, suggest to us believers, even upon earth, admitted into the enjoyment of God, seated with Christ in heavenly places, and privileged through him *to offer up spiritual sacri-[26]fices*? — and do not the rest of the nation, — obliged to remain in the court without, — unable to offer sacrifices themselves, — and only benefitted by the sacrifices offered by others, — suggest to us the great majority of the human race excluded, while on earth, from any admission into and actual participation of spiritual privileges and blessings? But the Mosaic Dispensation, implying this exclusive system of things, was in due time to be superseded by another, in which the whole Israel of God were to be invested with the priestly character, — were to be permitted to draw nigh, — and were to be qualified *to offer up sacrifices acceptable to God through Jesus Christ*. And is not this calculated to suggest to us, that the present time system of things, in which *the great bulk of mankind* are excluded from the knowledge and enjoyment of God, is

coming to an end? and that it is to be succeeded by another, in which *all the human race* will be admitted to that knowledge and enjoyment; and in which, all being put upon the same footing, exclusive privileges will be unknown? See 1 Corinth. 15:22-28; Philip. 2:10,11; 1 Timothy 2:4,6; 1 John 2:2.

2dly: One remarkable feature of the Jews was, the expectation of this singular people, that their exclusive privileges as a nation would never come to an end; and, that under the Dispensation of the Messiah, no less than under that of Moses, they would have blessings conferred on them, in which the Gentile world should not be allowed to participate. To remove this deep-rooted and inveterate prejudice of theirs, was the object [27] of many of our Lord's parables and discourses; Luke 15 and 16, &c.: and it will be found assailed in a great variety of ways in the writings of the apostle Paul; Rom. 3, 4, &c.: 9, 10, 11, &c.; Ephesians 2, 3, &c. How strikingly did the Jews, in their notions of what was to take place under the Dispensation of the Messiah, — agree with the great bulk of modern religionists, in their notions of what is to take place in a future state of existence. When we find the former shuddering at, and shrinking back from, the idea of the vile Gentiles becoming, in New Testament times, *fellow-heirs, and of the same body, and partakers of God's promise in Christ by the gospel*; — when we find them stoning Stephen, and well nigh tearing in pieces the apostle Paul, merely for intimating, and that too, in the most guarded manner, that in the kingdom of Christ the distinction between Jew and Gentile was to be done away with, and that both were to be admitted into this kingdom upon exactly the same footing; — is there not something more than fancy in concluding, that the narrow-mindedness of the Jews, in respect of privileges *to be enjoyed in time*, was intended to be emblematic of the narrow-mindedness to be exhibited by persons calling themselves Christians, in respect of the privileges *of an eternal state*? One thing is certain, that whether or not the one be admitted to have prefigured the other, the analogy exists. As nothing offended the Jews more, than declarations or even suggestions, that the Gentiles should be put on a level with them during the reign of [28] the Messiah; so nothing offends our modern religionists more, than declarations or even suggestions, of the whole human race being ultimately *delivered from the bondage of corruption, and brought into the glorious liberty of the children of God*. Not more horrified and indignant were the Jews at the bare idea of *the former*, than are the Pharisaical professors of modern times at that of *the latter*. And if there be an analogy, as it is clear there is, in the feelings with regard to *Gentiles*, and with regard to *the whole human race*, cherished by *Jews*, and *professing Christians* respectively, — is it not a good presumptive argument, that there shall be an analogy likewise in the respective results? If, notwithstanding the dislike and opposition of the Jewish people, the Gentiles were actually admitted, on a par with themselves, into the New Testament kingdom, — may it not follow, that, notwithstanding the opposition and dislike of professing Christians, the unbelieving world shall ultimately be put on a level with them in the heavenly glory? If the result in the former case shewed, that the Jews, under the influence of narrow and debasing views of the divine character, had mistaken the divine purposes *in regard to time*; may not the result in the latter case equally shew, that persons calling themselves Christians are, under the influence of similar views, mistaking the divine purposes *in regard to eternity*. That *their eye is evil*, while God is *good*. Let the person who would apprehend the full force of this presumptive argument, ponder carefully [29] Christ's parable of *the labourers hired for a penny a day*, recorded Matthew 20:1-16.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>5</sup> I observe that this argument had struck Jeremiah White, who, although cursorily, thus takes notice of it in his work *on the restoration of all things*: "This ransom for all, is that which the Mystical *Jews* can no more bear now, than the literal *Jews* could bear of the *Gentiles* to be taken into the Covenant of *Abraham*," &c.

3dly: Putting aside the various oppressions undergone by the Jewish people, and their deliverances from them; the Babylonish captivity and the restoration from it; — events which, when examined into, will be found to speak a language of the most interesting and instructive kind; — there is one circumstance connected with the Jews too striking, both in itself and in the results to which analogically it seems to point, to be allowed to pass without notice. During the long period which has

elapsed since the death and resurrection of the Lord Jesus, very few of the Jewish nation, comparatively speaking, have believed in him as the long-promised Messiah; and in the guilt contracted by their fathers *in nailing him to the accursed tree*. The Jews, as a nation, have now, for eighteen hundred years, been manifesting the most bitter and uncompromising hostility to Jesus of Nazareth and his cause. But if numerous and delightful prophecies contained in the scriptures are to be believed in, (and believed in they must be by all who receive these scriptures as divine), there is a period approaching, when the Jews as a nation will throw down the weapons of their rebellion, — acknowledge the claims of the crucified Jesus, — and enter [30] thereby into the enjoyment of New Testament privileges. In other words, God who, at the time of the first proclamation of the gospel and in succeeding ages, has, by the manifestation of the truth to their consciences, *been having mercy on a part of the natural Israel*, — has promised, that ultimately, by the same means, *He will have mercy upon them all*. Who can understand this, without having presented to his mind a most beautiful analogy? Few of the Jews, as a nation, believe and are saved, previous to the period spoken of by the apostle as that of *the bringing in of the fullness of the Gentiles*; and yet, at that period, *all Israel* as a nation turn to *the great Deliverer and are saved*. Rom. 11:25-32. Who can think of this without suspecting, that the case of the Jews *as respects time*, may be designed to be a figure of the case of the whole human race *as respects eternity*? That but few Jews saved temporally, previous to an era which prophecy has defined by representing *the fullness of the Gentiles* as then *having been brought in*, and the whole Jewish nation saved at that era, — may be emblematic of but few of the human race saved in a much higher sense previous to the era denominated *the consummation of all things*, and of the whole human race saved at that era? *God having concluded the Jews* as a nation *in unbelief*, that *he might have mercy upon them all*; how fair the inference, reasoning analogically, that *he has concluded* the whole family of man *in unbelief*, that in like manner, although in a much higher sense, *He might have mercy upon all of them*? There is something so very remarkable in the [31] analogy just suggested, that if there were nothing else in scripture to satisfy me of the Jewish nation being, when viewed under certain aspects, the type of the whole human race, this of itself would be sufficient to do so.

As I have already remarked, however, it is not my intention to dwell on the fact of *the Jewish people* being, in certain points of view, the type or figure of *the whole human race*, and the consequences which follow from this fact: and, therefore,

I proceed to the statement of *presumptive arguments*, in favour of the ultimate happiness of all mankind, of another and more general kind.

1. The scriptures represent God as *the Parent of the whole human race*. Instead of adducing, in proof of this, texts which might be liable to a charge of ambiguity, I shall confine myself to a single passage which every candid man must acknowledge to be decisive. It is taken from the speech delivered by the apostle Paul before the assembled Areopagites and philosophers at Athens. *In him we live, and move, and have our being; as certain also of your own poets have said, for we are also his offspring*. FORASMUCH, THEN, AS WE ARE THE OFFSPRING OF GOD, *we ought not*, &c. Acts 17:28,29. No man can be ignorant, that a very large proportion, if not the whole, of the auditory to whom the speech, of which these words constitute a part, was addressed, consisted of persons who, so far from believing that Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah, [32] cherished towards him, and his accredited messenger, sentiments of the most thorough and undisguised contempt. *What will this babbler say?* was the question which they put to one another respecting Paul; and indicates the spirit with which they proceeded to listen to his apology. Inveterate, however, as was the hostility of these men to the cause which Paul was engaged in advocating, he admitted, that they were correct in regarding themselves as *the offspring of God*: drawing the conclusion, by which he attempted to fasten conviction upon their minds, from this very principle. FORASMUCH, THEN, *as we are the offspring of God*, &c. But if it be once established, as it must be if the apostle spoke by inspiration, that the whole human race stand to

God in the relation of *His offspring*; or, which is the same thing, that God stands to them in *the relation of a Parent*; does not the ultimate happiness of the whole human race flow from this as a necessary consequence? It is too obvious to require proof, that we can only conceive of the parental character as possessed by the Supreme Being, by understanding what is implied in the parental character as it exists among men. But, however severe the chastisements which he may find it necessary to inflict on *his offspring*, is not their good the aim of *the earthly parent*? and as the whole human race are, by the admission of the apostle Paul, *God's offspring*, however severe the chastisements to which they may be subjected, if the analogy hold, must not *their* good be the object at which *as their parent* God is aiming? Again, although it is but too true, that [33] *some* earthly parents exhibit a sad want of natural affection in their treatment of their offspring, no man of good sense and correct feeling would hesitate to stigmatize this as, to use no harsher phrase, *an imperfection in them*. And if so, does it not become us, when thinking and speaking of God as standing to the whole human race in the relation of *a parent*, to take care, that we do not place Him *below the level of His creatures*, by ascribing to Him what, even if imputed to them, *would argue imperfection on their part*? That we do not ascribe to Him attributes, which would necessarily constrain us to conceive of Him, as *the inferior of His creatures*? This, however, is the very consequence upon which the doctrine of eternal torments runs us. God, say the supporters of the popular theory, will, without intermission or end, inflict the most dreadful sufferings on a large proportion of the human race. In other words, He will shew Himself throughout eternity, their deadly and inveterate foe: and yet, if the whole of them be *His offspring*, how can this be? If it be justly accounted an imperfection in an earthly parent to be even *destitute of* affection towards *his offspring*, — and if that man would actually deserve to be stigmatized as a brute, who should entertain *sentiments of positive hatred* towards them, — is it very complimentary to the Supreme Being, to represent Him as cherishing towards *a vast number of His offspring*, feelings which we should be ashamed to ascribe to *any earthly parent whom we respected*? God represented as *inferior* [34] in parental affection *to His creatures*! How *wonderfully like*, this, to the practice of the heathens, who clothed their deities with such attributes as placed them *even below the level of the correcter part of human beings*; Isaiah 40 and 41; Acts 17:29; Rom. 1:23-28: — but how *wonderfully unlike* to the reasonings of our blessed Lord, who, from the acknowledged disposition of earthly parents to shew kindness to *their offspring*, argues, *a fortiori*, as to how much stronger must be the disposition of their Heavenly Father to do good to *His*. *If ye, then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children*; HOW MUCH MORE *shall your Father which is in heaven give good things to them that ask Him*? Matt. 7:11. The ordinary ideas of religionists respecting God would almost tempt one to suspect, that mankind had purposely sought out for, not the best, but the most unamiable and implacable specimens of human nature which could be procured; and, after having found them, had fallen down and worshipped them. Nay, should we be far wrong, were we to define *idolatry* to be, the tendency of human beings, after degrading Deity *below the level of themselves*, to pay homage to *this workmanship of their hands or minds*? But although it may suit the "untutored Indian," after investing *his god* with the attributes of the Devil, to endeavour, by every artifice, to avert from himself the fancied displeasure of *this creature of his own imagination*, does it become the professing Christian to copy him in his notions and practices? Although it might [35] suit a heathen poet, to represent one of his deities as

aeternum servans sub pectore volnus,<sup>6</sup>

and as setting no bounds to the indulgence of her rancorous and revengeful feelings, does it become the followers of *the Lamb*, to be guided in their views of *the living and true God*, by such low and debasing sentiments? Blessed be thy name, Heavenly Father! for preserving us from such delusions; and for satisfying us, that as the whole human race are *Thine* offspring, Thou canst not cherish towards them *less* affection, than a judicious and respectable earthly parent is found to cherish towards *his*!

<sup>6</sup> Virgil. *Aeneid*, book 1.

2. Views of God as eternally tormenting some of His creatures, become exceedingly suspicious from this fact, that *they can be easily traced up to, and shewn to have their origin in, the natural state and circumstances, — the ignorance and prejudices of the human mind.* What is one of the grand characteristic traits of mere human nature, according to the word of God? An inspired apostle has informed us, that the *carnal mind*, or, *mind of the flesh*, that is, the natural human mind, *is enmity against God: that it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be.* Rom. 8:7. In other words, man's mind naturally hates God; or, if the language be disliked, is in a state of enmity or hostility to God. After having ascertained this to be the state of man's mind in relation to God, does it not strike us, that we have discovered in this very fact, the source of [36] the popular notion, that God cherishes everlasting hatred towards a large proportion of his intelligent creatures. If man's mind naturally is, as scripture shews it to be, in a state of hostility to God, is it not possible, nay is it not an extremely fair presumption, that in supposing God to cherish hostile feelings towards human beings, man has fallen into the awkward, and yet natural mistake, of *ascribing his own character to God*? Is it remarkable, if I hate any person, (and scripture tells me that naturally I hate God), that I should suspect that person to hate me? Let the man who finds any difficulty in apprehending the force of the present argument consider, that, by an obvious and well-known law of the human mind, *until new and higher ideas of any subject are imparted to us*, we necessarily conceive of that subject *according to the ideas which we already have*; and that, by the scriptures themselves, this principle is frequently recognized. Until God is pleased to reveal to me *what He really is*, if I hear Him spoken of, I must conceive of Him *according to the ideas with which my natural observation and experience supply me*; and hence, in the 50th Psalm, the wicked, or persons who are ignorant of God's real character, are charged with *thinking that He is altogether such as they themselves are*; verse 21st. But men's minds naturally are in a *state of enmity to God*. And not only so, but men naturally are *the enemies of one another*; for the apostle Paul, when enumerating some of the leading qualities of human nature, speaks of mankind, previous to the knowledge of the truth, as *living in malice and envy*, [37] *hateful and hating one another.* Titus 3:3. This being the case, unless God be pleased to reveal to him His own character, by what means can any man conceive of it, except by regarding it as analogous to his own? And as man's character naturally is, *to hate God and hate his fellow men*, is it to be wondered at, if in his attempts to conceive of God, he should suppose Him to cherish the same hateful sentiments and propensities, which, he is conscious, exist in himself? In supposing God *to hate human beings*, is not man actually supposing God to feel towards *them*, as he himself does? But does the correspondency between man's natural feelings towards his fellow men and the character which he ascribes to God, when he supposes Him to inflict eternal torments on intelligent beings, afford any proof of that character being a correct one? On the contrary, are not these very facts, of *enmity to God and man* being naturally the characteristic and predominant feelings of our minds; — of our requiring to judge of God naturally *according to the principles and feelings which we have*, and *not according to those which we have not*; — and of all mankind thus naturally and necessarily *regarding God as an object of terror*, — well calculated to beget suspicion in the minds of the reflecting, that the doctrine of *God's tormenting His creatures throughout eternity* may have no other origin, than *the feelings and ignorance which are natural to men themselves*. If the minds of men naturally were enlarged and enlightened; or, if the dread of eternal torments to be inflicted on themselves were strengthened in believers of the truth; [38] I cheerfully admit, that *either*, and still more that *both* of these circumstances, would form a strong presumptive argument in favour of the truth of the popular doctrine. But as the facts are exactly the reverse; — as the minds of men naturally are dark, carnal, and contracted; — and as the effect of apprehending God's character as *love*, or, as *what it really is*, is *to cast out fear*; — is it not the fitting conclusion from these premises, that the doctrine of eternal torments *must be without any foundation in truth*: unless men are prepared to maintain, that *views of God which avowedly exist in connection with ignorance of what He is*, afford a fairer criterion of his character than *those which are the result of knowledge*.

3. The preceding reasoning is confirmed, by a consideration of *the principle on which Christ exhorts his disciples to love their enemies*. *I say unto you, love your enemies; bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you and persecute you; THAT YE MAY BE THE CHILDREN OF YOUR FATHER WHICH IS IN HEAVEN: for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil, and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just, and on the unjust.* Matt. 5:44,45. Now, apart from all the glosses which men are so apt to introduce into the interpretation of the sacred volume, what is the plain common-sense meaning of this passage? Why this, that it is the bounden duty of the disciples of Christ, as the children of God, to imitate their Heavenly Father; and that, as God loves *His* enemies, it is therefore obligatory upon [39] them, if they would imitate Him, to love *their* enemies likewise. But who are *the enemies of God*. *A part* of the human race, or *all* of them? Scripture, in answer to this, informs us, that the human mind itself being *enmity against God, all mankind*, therefore, are by nature *the enemies of God*; and that all human beings, who are not reconciled to God by the belief of the truth, continue throughout life *alienated from Him, and enemies to Him, by wicked works*. But although all mankind *are as they come into the world*, and although all who believe not *continue throughout life*, the enemies of God, is God, therefore, the enemy of any of them? If the language employed by our blessed Lord in the above exhortation be worth any thing, He cannot be so: for it is expressly declared, without any reserve, limitation, or exception, that *God loves His enemies*. Nay, so completely is the exhortation based upon the principle, of *the total absence from the mind of God of enmity towards any of His creatures*, that it might, with the most perfect propriety, have been couched in the following terms. "You who are my disciples, are permitted *to hate none*; because He, whose children you are, and whom you are bound to imitate, *hates none*." Conceive of some popular preacher, whose doctrine it is that God *hates*, and, therefore, *visits with everlasting torments*, a large proportion of intelligent beings, handling the text in question. Would it be possible for him, think you, upon his own avowed principles, to reconcile it either with logic or with common decency? "As the children of God, it is incumbent on you TO [40] IMITATE YOUR HEAVENLY FATHER," must, of course, be admitted by him to be its fundamental position. But as God, in his opinion, hates with an implacable and everlasting hatred, and will, as the effect of this, torment in the most dreadful manner, without intermission or end, a vast number of the human race, — *ergo*, the disciples of Christ are bound, in imitation of their Heavenly Father, to cherish the most intense hatred towards, and to assist to the utmost of their power in tormenting, all whom they have reason to regard as *His* and *their* enemies! Who can deny, that this, although certainly inconsistent with both the language and the spirit of our Lord's exhortation, is a fair, *a necessary inference* from the premises laid down by them? If God *hate any human beings*, and if I, as Christ's disciple and God's son, *am bound to imitate God*, of course I am bound to *imitate Him in hating those who are the objects of His hatred*. "No, no," say my opponents, "we are bound to love our enemies, and to leave vengeance against *His* enemies to God." Well, then, this just enables me to catch you on the other horn of the dilemma: for what, in this case, becomes of our obligation *to imitate God*? If you say that although *God hates His enemies*, we nevertheless are bound *to love ours*; are you not contradicting the Messiah who enjoins us *to imitate God*? nay, when you assume that *we may love our enemies*, and yet maintain that *God necessarily hates His*, are you not modestly paying human beings the compliment of *possessing more benevolence than God*? Let the exhortation in question be examined ever so minutely, and it will be [41] found, that it is only on the principle of *all enmity* existing on the part of the creature, and *none* on the part of the Creator; or, in other words, that it is only on the principle of God's intention being finally to subdue *the enmity of His creatures*, by reconciling them through Christ to Himself; that our Lord's language has any meaning, emphasis, or value. On the contrary, the moment that God is supposed to cherish sentiments of irreconcilable hatred towards any of *His* enemies, our obligation to imitate Him requires, that instead of loving and forgiving *our* enemies, we should cherish towards them sentiments of the most deadly and irreconcilable hatred likewise.

4. A strong presumptive argument in favour of the ultimate happiness of all mankind is *the complete sameness of the nature which human beings possess*. As I am free to admit, that any real difference subsisting among the members of the family of man *naturally*, would have struck me as inconsistent with the view which I have adopted; so I find myself irresistibly impelled by a consideration of the sameness of the nature and character of human beings while upon earth, to draw a conclusion as to the sameness of their ultimate destiny. Is there any one professing to regard the scriptures as divinely inspired, who will venture to deny *the thorough sameness of the nature* possessed by all mankind? Hath not God *made of one blood, all nations of men, for to dwell on all the face of the earth?* Acts 17:26.<sup>7</sup>

[42] But if, as descended from one common ancestor, we possess a nature which in all of us is exactly the same, is it too much to suppose, that beings whose connection with each other is thus so close and intimate *here*, shall have a similarly close and intimate connection with each other *hereafter*? If, from its thorough sameness in all of us, human nature may fitly and fairly enough be regarded as constituting *one grand whole*, can we err greatly in supposing, that *as a whole* it shall ultimately be disposed of; or, in other words, that the destiny of the various parts of which it consists, shall be ultimately one and the same? With a view to get rid of my conclusion, however, it may be alleged, that the nature of all mankind *here*, is not the same, — some of them according to scripture being *righteous*, and some of them *unrighteous*. Instead of meeting this objection, which is a mere quibble, with a direct counter-statement of my own, I would beg leave to enquire of the persons proposing it, if they have ever perused and reflected on, the sweeping declaration of the sacred volume, that *there is none righteous, no not one?* Rom. 3:10. If they have not, I would respectfully submit this declaration, with a number of others of a similar kind, to their notice. But if *the whole family of man* are thus by God's own authority proved to be *unrighteous*, the puzzling question immediately arises, how can any of them be spoken of as *righteous*? Instructed by what the apostle says, in the same chapter from which the above extract is taken, the Christian finds no difficulty whatever in reconciling statements, which at first sight [43] appear to be self-contradictory and incongruous. All mankind as partakers of human nature are *unrighteous*; and yet, such of the human race as believe in the testimony which God hath given concerning Himself, become *righteous by this their faith*. Although believers are, like the rest of mankind, *unrighteous by nature*; nevertheless *the righteousness of God, by faith of Jesus Christ, is unto all and upon all them that believe*. Rom. 3:22. But do such persons *become righteous*, by parting with, or ceasing to possess, the *unrighteous nature* which, in common with the rest of their fellow men, they bring into the world along with them? No, most assuredly; while upon earth they retain *the human and unrighteous nature* which they originally had, and that too *in all respects the same as it formerly was*; the only difference between them and the unbelieving world, while both continue upon earth, being, that believers, having implanted in them *the principle of faith*, thereby possess, along with *human nature*, the earnest of a *superior and righteous nature*. Believers, while in the body, do not stand contrasted with unbelievers, by the one possessing *only* a righteous, and the other *only* an unrighteous nature: but the contrast is this; while believers as well as unbelievers, during their earthly career, both possess *exactly the same unrighteous nature*, the former, in addition to this, and as controlling this, possess *by faith* the first fruits of a *righteous nature*, which the latter do not. Believers, then, are *righteous*, not as *human beings*, but *by faith*; that is, by a principle which is an anticipation, earnest, or foretaste of *the* [44] *divine nature*. 2 Peter 1:4. This being the case, how much is my present argument strengthened by these facts? For, if no man, — no, not even a believer, — can become righteous, during his abode upon earth, *as a human being*, or *partaker of human nature*; and yet, if this *thorough and incurable unrighteousness of human nature* in him *while here*, does not interfere with, and prevent his attaining to, the possession of a *perfectly righteous nature hereafter*; why should *the thorough unrighteousness of human nature* in any other man *while on earth*, prevent him likewise from *becoming thoroughly righteous in a future state*? That to the one is conceded an anticipation of what he is afterwards to receive, while from the other this anticipation is withheld, does not in the slightest degree affect the argument: for, in the first place, although a person of rank and influence should intend



at some future period to bestow a particular mark of his regard upon a number of individuals, it is not necessary that he should inform all of them beforehand what his intentions are; and, in the second place, although Christians do *by faith* possess the earnest of *good things to come*, yet in no respect whatever, except *in their possession of this principle*, and *in the peculiar effects which flow from it*, do they cease to be influenced by the ordinary principles and propensities of humanity. These things being considered, can it be denied, first, that from the circumstance of believers possessing *the earnest of everlasting life exclusively*, it does not necessarily follow, that they shall possess *everlasting life itself exclusively*; and, [45] secondly, that as Christians, except in so far as they possess the earnest of everlasting life, and are brought under its influence, are to all intents and purposes *mere human beings*, — the elevation of persons, who are thus *by nature and of themselves mere human beings*, to the possession of everlasting life, lays the foundation of a strong conclusion from analogy, that all who are possessed of human nature *here*, shall attain to the possession of everlasting life *hereafter*?

<sup>7</sup> *Of one blood*. Not *of two bloods*, as must have been the case if Eve had derived her origin *directly* from God as Adam did; but *of one blood*, — Eve, no less than other human beings, having derived her existence from Adam.

5. This reasoning receives confirmation from the fact, that *the nature which the Son of God took hold of, is that which is common to every human being*. That the Messiah was *manifested in the flesh*, — that he *took hold of flesh and blood*, — no man professing to revere the authority of scripture will venture to deny. *God<sup>8</sup> was manifested in the flesh*; Tim. 3:16: — *Forasmuch, then, as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same*; Heb. 2:14: — also, Rom. 8:3; Phil. 2:7,8; 1 John 4:2,3; &c. That the nature called in these and similar passages of scripture *flesh*, and *flesh and blood*, is *the nature common to the whole human race*, is a point which, let the moral and intellectual powers be ever so much perverted by unscriptural theories, I should conceive it impossible to dispute. Has not God of *one blood*, or *nature*, made *all the family of man*? and in what respect, then, can human nature, [46] whatever varieties it may exhibit, essentially differ *in any one man*, from what it is *in another*? But if *flesh and blood*, or *human nature*, be thus the same *in all*, who can help perceiving, that the Messiah, in assuming the nature of *any one human being*, was, from the perfect identity of the nature possessed by *every one of them*, necessarily assuming the nature *of all*? And if he assumed *a nature common to all*, can we help concluding, that it was for *a purpose common to all*? To allude to a remark made under the immediately preceding head, as *human nature*, by whatever number of individuals it may be possessed, constitutes *one grand whole*, — is it not a fair presumption, that *as a whole* it must have been assumed, and that *as a whole* it will be disposed of? It will not do, according to the practice of Calvinists and men of a similar stamp, to attempt to evade my conclusion, by saying, that human nature in man *now*, is something essentially different from what it was in Adam *before he transgressed*; and, that the human nature which Jesus took hold of, was that nature, not *as it now is*, but *as it existed in Adam previous to the fall*: for, this would be both to beg the question, and to subvert the very foundation of the sinner's hope.<sup>9</sup> It would be to beg the question, for in what part of scripture is human nature, *as it now exists*, declared to be *essentially different from what it was in Adam, as he issued from the hands of God*? I allow that, when first created, *it had not actually transgressed*; but as it was created *capable of transgressing*, wherein, [47] pray, does it differ essentially from human nature at the present moment? The scriptures expressly declare, that Adam was *of the earth, earthy*, from his very origin; Gen. 2:7; compared with 1 Cor. 15:47: — that instead of coming to possess an inferior nature *in consequence of his first transgression*, his first transgression was merely *the first proof, or manifestation*, which he gave of his *already possessing* an inferior nature; 1 Cor. 15:46; — also, Rom. 8:3, &c. — and that, as possessing this inferior nature, or *as originally and essentially of the earth, earthy*, he stands contrasted with the second Adam, *whose essential character it is, that he is the Lord from heaven*. How, under such circumstances, can human nature *now*, differ *essentially* from human nature *as at first created*? — But not only so, to assert, that the Messiah did not take hold of human

nature *as now possessed by man*, is also to subvert the foundation of the sinner's hope; and this even by the shewing of Calvinists themselves. For if, as they properly enough maintain, it is only by means of the union subsisting between Christ and those whom he loves, in consequence of his having assumed their nature, that they are saved; and yet, if the nature which he assumed was not the nature *which they have*, but a nature *which* by the terms of the supposition *they have not*; then, what community of interests can there exist between *him* and *any of the human race*? If believers of the truth came into the world with a nature different from, and superior to, that of other men; and if it was this different and superior nature which the Messiah [48] assumed; then I might be able to understand, and acquiesce in, the view of matters entertained by Calvinists. But if, even by the admission of Calvinists, the nature of a believer is originally the same with that of an unbeliever, — both naturally being *dead in trespasses and sins*; — and if it is upon the fact of Christ having assumed my nature that my hope of eternal life ultimately rests; then, as the man who alleges that Christ assumed *a perfect nature*, virtually alleges that *it was not my nature* which he assumed, he necessarily subverts the foundation of my hope. It is true, that human nature was *not sinful in the Son of God*, — he, by the very circumstance of his assuming it, *having rendered it sinless in himself*; — but it is equally true, that it was a nature *sinful in us*, and not a *sinless nature* that he assumed. Rom. 8:3, &c. Still farther, it is no valid objection to my reasoning under this head, that *the first fruits of the divine nature are possessed only by a few*: for he who employs it forgets, that the present question respects, not *the nature which Christ essentially had*, but *the nature which he assumed*; and, that, although it is very true that but few while here share with him in his own essential nature, my argument is, that *a community on his part with all in the nature which they originally have here*, points to *a community on the part of all with him in the nature which he essentially has hereafter*. Now, the complete identity of the nature which Christ assumed, with the nature originally possessed by the whole family of man, has, I think, been sufficiently and satisfactorily proved. And [49] if so, what can hinder the conclusion? If he assumed *a nature common to all*, could it have been for any other purpose than *one common to all*? It is acknowledged, that he has glorified the human nature which he personally assumed. But a nature capable of being glorified *in one*, is surely capable of being glorified *in all*; and, seeing that it is a nature common to him, not *with a few*, but *with the whole of the family of man*, that he has glorified *in himself*, does not his glorification of that nature *in himself*, look extremely like an earnest of his ultimately glorifying it *in all*? To repeat the remark more than once already made, having assumed human nature *as a whole*, how appropriately does it seem to follow, that he will dispose of it *as a whole*? And how consistent all this analogical reasoning with his own declaration, *and I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me*; and with the apostle Paul's argument, in the 15th of 1st Corinthians, that from *his own personal resurrection*, necessarily follows *the resurrection of all*? verses 21, 22.

<sup>8</sup> Or, if our biblical critics will have it so, *who*, or *he was manifest in the flesh*: it being enough for my present purpose, that the person spoken of appeared in *flesh*, or *human nature*.

<sup>9</sup> It would be, also, contrary to fact.

6. A strong presumptive argument in favour of the position which I am labouring to establish is, that *many statements and reasonings, contained in the sacred volume, which are generally supposed to prove the enjoyment of future happiness by believers exclusively, are, on examination, found to be so constructed, as actually to prove the future happiness of all*. A very remarkable specimen of this kind of reasoning is the fifteenth chapter of first Corinthians throughout. Almost all the conclusions in it, at which the apostle arrives, are [50] deduced from analogy. Because *Jesus died and rose again* he infers, that those who believe, being conformed to him in dying, shall be conformed to him likewise in rising again. But as *death* is common to *the whole human race*, if the argument from *the death to the subsequent resurrection of believers* be a valid one, it must be equally valid to argue from *the death to the subsequent resurrection of unbelievers*. A mode of reasoning which the apostle himself evidently sanctions, when he declares, that *as in Adam ALL die, even so in Christ shall ALL be made alive*: verse

22. Here I anticipate encountering the objection: "true, we are disposed to grant, that from the resurrection of Christ, the apostle infers *the resurrection of the whole human race*: but we deny, and defy you to prove, that he infers *the resurrection of all to everlasting happiness*." This objection I might fairly enough dismiss as a mere quibble, and that even according to the shewing of my opponents themselves. For, if they admit, as they must do and as I have supposed them to do, that, in the earlier part of the chapter, the apostle is proving *the resurrection of all the dead*, — I might content myself with calling upon them, in the first place, to shew me, why he should have been at such pains to prove that *all the dead shall be raised*, if for a purpose to be realized *only in a part of them*? and, in the second place, supposing him, *argumenti causa*, to treat of *a part of the dead only* in the latter part of the chapter, I might call on them to have the goodness to point out to me, where he discontinues speaking of *the dead as a whole*, and begins to [51] limit his observations to the fate of *the righteous dead only*? But I abandon this mode of answering the objection, although perfectly legitimate, because I have it in my power to shew the objectors, that, in the prosecution of the analogical reasoning which runs throughout the chapter, the arguments which are employed by the apostle to prove the doctrine of future happiness are as applicable *to all*, as they are *to any one class of human beings*. In order to render my statement more definite and intelligible, let me confine my own attention, and that of my readers, to a single passage. *The first man is of the earth, earthy; the second man is the Lord from heaven. As is the earthy, such are they also that are earthy; and as is the heavenly, such are they also that are heavenly. And as we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly*: verses 47-49. Now, who perceives not at a glance, that the reasoning in these verses, as well as in those which precede and follow, is as capable of being applied to *the whole human race*, as to *a part of them*? If in consequence of there existing *an earthly man* and *a heavenly man*, there are intelligent beings *here* like the one, and there shall be intelligent beings *hereafter* like the other; and if *the same intelligent* beings who are *here* like the one, are destined to be *hereafter* like the other, — on the ground of its being suitable and becoming, that *they who have borne the likeness of the one*, should also *bear the likeness of the other*, as is clearly the scope and meaning of the apostolic argument; — then, who can deny, that a conclusion [52] drawn *analogically* from the possession of the image of the earthy *here*, to the possession of the image of the heavenly *hereafter*, is as forcible when applied to *the whole*, as it is when applied to *a part of the family of man*? If it be a good reason for *believers* being like Christ *hereafter*, that they are like Adam *here*, as the apostle argues, — it is an equally good reason for *unbelievers* having conceded to them the same privilege. As *the whole human race* bear Adam's image *here*, it is certainly fitting, upon the apostolic principle, that *the whole human race* should bear Christ's image *hereafter*. The force of my present argument may be apprehended by the most illiterate, if they will but exercise a small degree of reflection. Supposing the apostle to have here assigned a reason or reasons for any bearing the image of Christ *hereafter*, which could only apply to *a part of the human race*; — for instance, supposing him to have said, *as or because we have borne the image of the earthy, and in part likewise the image of the heavenly here*; or simply, *as or because we have borne in part the image of the heavenly here; therefore we shall bear fully the image of the heavenly hereafter*; — then I grant, that although *the rest of mankind*, even under such circumstances, would not have been *formally* excluded, yet such reasoning would at least *have afforded no argument* for *their* ultimate happiness. But when on the contrary we find, that the inspired writer has studiously, as it were, employed an argument, or rather a series of arguments, which, so far from being confinable to *a part*, is applicable to *the* [53] *whole of mankind*, can we, from *such universal premises*, help drawing a *universal conclusion*? Besides, if in addition to what the apostle says in the particular passage to which I have been directing the attention of my readers, we find him arguing in the context from the body being sown natural *here*, to the fact of its being raised spiritual *hereafter*, and triumphing in the prospect of what is now corruptible and mortal, becoming afterwards incorruptible and immortal; and if we happen to know, that natural, corruptible, and mortal bodies are common to unbelievers with those who believe the truth; shall we venture groundlessly to shackle and confine the apostolic reasoning,

and, from premises which as stated in the sacred volume *take in all*, draw a conclusion which *takes in only a part*? I have insisted on what goes before merely by way of a specimen: for it is truly astonishing, and utterly inconceivable by any except diligent students of God's word, how many passages of that blessed book, relative to a future state of felicity, which are commonly interpreted in *an exclusive sense*, or *as applicable to believers only*, are so constructed, as, when examined into, to be found to yield arguments of the most valid and convincing kind for *the future happiness of the whole human race*.

7. There is, perhaps, scarcely any one trait of human nature more remarkable, than *man's inability to derive real and abiding satisfaction from present enjoyments; and the irrepressible tendency of his mind to look forward to, and anticipate satisfaction from, events which are still future*. This circumstance, indeed, is what chiefly [54] distinguishes our species from the inferior animals. While with the indulgence of their appetites the brutes are satisfied, man, although possessed of earthly and sensual propensities in common with the brute, finds that the gratification of these, to whatever extent it may be carried, never does — never can, in reality, satisfy him. Let *his corn and his wine* be ever so much *increased*; let him surpass all his neighbours in wealth, or reach ambition's highest pinnacle, treading successfully in the footsteps of a Cræsus or an Alexander; — even under such circumstances, his desires, so far from being gratified, are but the more powerfully prompted and stimulated, — his feelings of dissatisfaction, so far from being removed, are but the more powerfully quickened and inflamed. Let his earthly enjoyments be what they will, — like the horse-leech, *give, give*, is still his unappeased and unappeasable cry. This feeling is not confined to a few; — it is characteristic of the whole family of man. It exists equally in old and young — rich and poor — savage and civilized — learned and illiterate — Pagan, Mahometan, Jew, and Christian. Its effects are so obvious, that they have attracted the notice of the enquiring and philosophical in every age. To the illustration of it, Horace has devoted his satire, beginning:

Qui fit, Mæcenas, ut nemo, quam sibi sortem  
Seu Ratio dederit, &c.<sup>10</sup>

In regard to it, the great British moralist<sup>11</sup> thus beautifully and pointedly expresses himself: "Such is the [55] state of life, that *none are happy but by the anticipation of change*: the change itself is nothing; when we have made it, the next wish is, *immediately to change again*." And led to speak of it, by the nature of his subject, the noble and highly-gifted author of *Childe Harold*, soaring, if possible, above himself, exclaims:

We wither from our youth, we gasp away —  
Sick — sick; unfound the boon — unslaked the thirst,  
Though to the last, in verge of our decay,  
Some phantom lures, such as we sought at first —  
But all too late, — so are we doubly curst.  
Love, fame, ambition, avarice — 'tis the same,  
Each idle — and all ill — and none the worst —  
For all are meteors with a different name,  
And Death the sable smoke where vanishes the flame.<sup>12</sup>

Thus have writers of eminence spoken of those cravings after something else, and something future, — that aching void even amidst the greatest profusion of present enjoyments, — cravings, and a void, which nothing earthly can supply — of which every human being is by the very constitution of his nature sensible. But can this feeling of dissatisfaction with *present*, and craving after *future* enjoyments, have been implanted in man in vain? Upon scriptural, no less than upon philosophical principles, I am entitled to say that it cannot. This *craving after future enjoyments*, is, I admit, only an instinct; but, like every other instinct, *it must have an object, and must be destined to receive its appropriate gratification*. If the possession of any instinct by the inferior animals implies, that it is the divine

intention to gratify it; — if, from the circumstance of *the young lions roaring* [56] *after their prey, and seeking their meat from God*, which is in them *an instinctive feeling*, we are taught by the scriptures themselves to argue, that *He will give them their meat in due season*; Psalm 104:21,27,28; Psalm 145:15; — upon the same principle, surely, — nay, *a fortiori*, on account of man's superiority to the brutes, — are we entitled to conclude, from the fact of God's having implanted in man *an instinctive feeling* of dissatisfaction with present and desire after future enjoyments, that *it* likewise shall be gratified. Psalm 145:16. See 1 Corinth. 9:9,10. What, however, can gratify these instinctive longings of man? We have seen that the greatest abundance of earthly possessions and enjoyments is unable to do so; and what then remains, but that enjoyments of a kind superior to those which he is capable of attaining to *here*, await him *hereafter*? In other words, admitting that instincts are implanted by God in his creatures, for the purpose of being gratified; and that in man there exists the instinctive desire of happiness; to what other conclusion does his inability to rest satisfied with *the things of time* point, but to his ultimately deriving complete happiness or gratification from *the blessings of eternity*? Let the exact nature of my present argument be observed, and let me not be represented as holding sentiments which I utterly loathe and disclaim. While I hold the inability of any man to be satisfied with present enjoyments, and the uniform and irrepressible tendency of the human mind to desire something ulterior; and while I hold likewise, that this [57] feeling existing *in all*, points to the ultimate happiness *of all*, as its suitable and appropriate gratification, I do not hold that *any* man by nature *intentionally* longs after immortality. *Life and immortality are brought to light only by the gospel*; and therefore, he only that knows the gospel, knows what the instinctive feeling, of which I am speaking, is tending towards. By denominating this feeling of dissatisfaction with *present*, and desire after *future* enjoyments, which is common to all men, *a mere instinct*, it has been my express object to distinguish it, from *that intelligent desire of immortality*, which dwells only in the mind of *the child of God*. It is as impossible for unbelievers, as it is for believers, to derive real and abiding satisfaction from earthly enjoyments; Isaiah 55:1; — it is as characteristic of the minds of the one, as it is of those of the other, to tend towards, and anticipate satisfaction from, something still future; — but there is a wide difference in every other respect between them. This tendency in the mind of the unbeliever is *merely instinctive*, — in that of the believer, besides being *instinctive*, it is also *rational* and *intelligent*. The unbeliever, although disappointed in all his past expectations of deriving real and substantial happiness from earthly enjoyments, still, from knowing no better, seeks in the same, or in similar enjoyments, for an object which is constantly eluding his grasp: the believer, on the other hand, having derived from *the character of the Creator revealed to him*, that satisfaction, which *naturally*, and *in vain*, he had sought for in *the creature*, continues to repair to the Creator, [58] for a larger measure of that happiness, a certain degree of which he already enjoys. The longings of the former, although, in so far as they are *instinctive*, they point beyond "this diurnal sphere," yet, in so far as they are *intelligent*, terminate in this present world: the longings of the latter, *and of the latter only*, besides *their instinctive nature*, have, likewise, *intentionally* and *intelligently*, for their object, *life everlasting*. How impossible, then, to confound the believer, acquainted with the object towards which even *the instinctive feelings* of his mind are pointing, — with the unbeliever, conscious of *the same feelings*, but ignorant of their tendency! To confound a principle, *the nature of which is understood*, — with a principle, which is in those who feel it *a mere instinct*! And yet, as when brought to the knowledge of the truth ourselves, and satisfied by the manifestation of the divine character to us, we found out what it was that, in the days of our ignorance, our minds had been tending to, — how obvious the conclusion, that *the knowledge and enjoyment of God*, as *the result* to which *the tendencies of our own minds pointed* even when we ourselves had not attained to it, is also *the result* to which *the same tendencies*, under similar circumstances, *are pointing in all*.

<sup>10</sup> Q. Horat. Flac. Serm. Lib. 1. Sat. 1.

<sup>11</sup> Dr. S. Johnson.

8. One of the strongest presumptive arguments, against the popular doctrine of *eternal torments*, is, that *it is inconsistent with justice*. Justice consists in meting out to intelligent beings, *exactly what is their due*. And shall not God as the judge of all the earth, in his dealings towards men, *do right*? Gen. 18:25. [59] Shall He, who has imparted notions of justice to the minds of His creatures, be Himself found defective in the possession and exhibition of a quality, which he has enabled them to apprehend and appreciate? Psalm 94:8-10. "We are at one with you, as to the general principle," say my antagonists; "and we are only following out this principle, when we maintain the necessity of the sins of men being visited with everlasting torments." This, of course, I deny; and to the proof of your assertion I challenge you; certain that, in the event of your making the attempt, nothing but defeat and discomfiture await you. "Sin is an infinite evil; and, therefore, deserves to be visited with infinite suffering, as its appropriate punishment." I deny both your premises and your conclusion. I deny your premises. In what part of the sacred volume is sin declared to be *infinite*? "No where, we admit, in so many words: but the cross of Christ shews it to be so. That which only the Son of God, — *the infinite being* manifested in the flesh, — could take away, *must itself be infinite*." Strange mode of reasoning! "That *must itself be infinite*, which it was competent to an *infinite being* to bring to an end."<sup>13</sup> My good friends, have you ever allowed yourselves to reflect on the meaning of language? *Infinite* signifies that which is *boundless*, or *incapable of being brought to an end*. But sin, according to your own shewing, *has been taken away*, or *brought to an end*, — in so far at least as respects some [60] of the human race. Sin, then, by your own admission, cannot be *infinite* or *boundless*. "One *infinite*," say you, "alone could take away another *infinite*." How absurd! Why, would it be possible for the merest tyro in dialectics, — nay, would it be possible for a mere child, if unperverted by theological vagaries, — to help reasoning thus: "Sin *has been taken away*, or *brought to an end*: *ergo*, sin is not *infinite*." One thing certainly I am disposed to grant, and you are welcome to the full benefit of my concession, that *what an infinite being manifested in the flesh alone could take away*, must be *something most awful*, — *most heinous*, — *most revolting*, in the sight of God. That sin, from the circumstance of its having required *the Son of God* to overcome it, must possess an enormity, such as no created mind can fully or rightly apprehend. But, that *what has been overcome*, — that *what has been brought to an end*, — must be *infinite*, or *incapable of being brought to an end*, — is one of those conclusions, which I should have conceived it utterly impossible for any mind, pretending to ordinary sanity, to be capable of coming to. And yet, if the *infinity of evil* be abandoned, — as abandoned it must be, if the glorious doctrine of the cross of Christ be admitted, — what becomes of the inference deduced from it? If the fact of *sin having been taken away by the Son of God* proves, that, in spite of all its enormity and malignity, it is nevertheless *finite*, — then, *as finite*, upon the principles of my antagonists, justice requires that it shall be visited with *finite punishment*. — Driven from this position, my [61] antagonists are ready to take up another: "Man has it in his power to choose his own lot; and having chosen evil with all its consequences, and eternal torments among the rest, it is but just that he should be kept to his choice." These positions, likewise, I deny; and to the proof of them, I challenge their asserters. Where is it declared that man chose his own lot? Was he not perfectly passive in his creation? Genesis 2:7. Was not an earthy nature conferred on him by God himself? 1 Corinth. 15:45,47. Were not the tree of knowledge of good and evil, — the woman, — the serpent, — all of divine creation likewise? and was not the whole series of events, which issued in the first transgression, of divine arrangement? Genesis 1, 2, and 3. And has not God himself, by the mouth of the apostle Paul, sanctioned the conclusion to which all these facts conduct us, by declaring: that *the creature was made subject to vanity*, NOT WILLINGLY, *but by reason of him who hath subjected the same*? Why, if mankind were a set of beings who had existed previous to their appearance upon earth; and if, under the influence of inveterate malignity of disposition, they had clothed themselves with flesh, that they might thereby have an opportunity of violating God's law, thwarting his counsels, and frustrating his purposes; the utmost that, under such supposed

circumstances, (monstrous and impossible I admit them to be), they could have endured, would have been *everlasting torments*. But the fact is, that not one of these supposed circumstances holds true concerning human beings. They had no [62] pre-existence; — they did not place themselves in this present world; — they did not bestow upon themselves the nature and constitution which they have; they did not expose themselves to the temptations by which they are beset and surrounded; — and, above all, they were *originally* not *deceivers*, but *deceived*. And after this, is the monstrous proposition to be thrust down my throat, that He, of whom it is declared, that *justice and judgment are the habitation of his throne*, can, consistently with *justice*, treat beings, all the circumstances of whose lot have been arranged by a power superior to theirs, as if these circumstances had been of their own selection and arrangement? But even if I should grant, as *in a modified sense of the terms* I am willing to do, that man did choose<sup>14</sup> his own lot, — on what scriptural grounds can it be proved, that he chose as his portion eternal torments? It is true, that from the moment of the issuing of the prohibition, recorded Genesis 2:16,17, *life and death were set before him*; and that as *a continuance of the life originally conferred on him*, was to be the result of continued obedience, so he was warned to expect *a forfeiture of this life*, as the result of transgression. But who, without travelling out of the sacred record, will venture to affirm, that he was warned to expect *eternal torments* as that result? and I have yet to learn, that it is consistent with justice, to inflict on a criminal a punishment different from, and greater than, that which the law has previously denounced. Besides, that torments to be endured for [63] ever in another state of existence, could not have been the import of the original threatening, is conclusively proved by this, — that not *torments hereafter*, but *sufferings here terminating in death*, constitute *the sentence itself*, as formally pronounced by Him, who must be supposed to have been somewhat better acquainted with His own intentions, than any of His creatures can reasonably pretend to be. Genesis 3:16-19. And if, then, what justice demanded, according to God himself, was *suffering while this present life lasted*, and in process of time *the termination of this present life itself*, who will have the impious audacity to maintain, that *it demanded more*? — Thus let my adversaries propose in support of their favourite notion what arguments they please, the infliction of *eternal torments* is seen to be inconsistent with the divine justice. *Divine authority* has informed me, that *the wages of sin*, or *what sin deserves*, or *what it is consistent with justice to inflict upon sin*, is *death*; Rom. 6:23: and it will require something more than *human authority* to satisfy me, that *this is untrue*.<sup>15</sup>

<sup>13</sup> That *must be infinite*, which — is proved *not to be so*, by *having been taken away*! Bah!

<sup>14</sup> *After being created, and thereby possessed of an earthy nature*, observe.

<sup>15</sup> The author's work, entitled, "Three questions proposed and answered," &c., may be consulted by those who wish to see this argument more fully prosecuted.

9. *Unless everlasting life be conferred ultimately upon the whole human race, how can the attributes of justice and mercy be reconciled with each other, and each be exhibited in the highest perfection?* It is acknowledged by all, whose opinion in a matter of this kind is worth attending to, that *His glory*, or *the manifestation of Himself*, or *the shewing forth of His* [64] *perfections*, is the object which God is aiming at, in the whole scheme of creation, providence, and grace. It is acknowledged by the same parties, that one divine attribute cannot jostle, interfere, or be inconsistent with another; and that, consequently, any system of religion which pretends to enhance one of these attributes at the expense of another, is by that very circumstance proved to be unscriptural and unfounded. Upon these principles, then, it is clear, that God must intend to shew that His justice is strictly consistent with His mercy, and to exhibit both in the highest perfection. But how can this object be accomplished, if the ordinary doctrine of *eternal torments* be correct? Justice is *giving to an intelligent being what is his due*; mercy is *giving to him what is not his due*. To these definitions, no reasonable exception, that I am aware of, can be taken. Now *the wages of sin*, or *what man as a sinner deserves*, being *death*, — the *perfection of justice* requires, that *the whole human race shall be deprived of a life, which by transgression they have forfeited*. And the perfection of justice is actually thus exhibited: for all

mankind, either in the ordinary way, or by undergoing a change similar to that of Enoch and Elijah, are constrained *to part with their present existence*. But if *the perfection of justice* be exhibited in thus giving to all mankind *what is their due*, where are we to look for *the perfection of mercy*? In giving eternal life to *a part of the human race*? I grant, that in this there would be a display of *mercy*, aye, and of *great mercy* too; but would it be *perfect mercy*? *Mercy* is, as the very [65] term implies, *what man does not deserve*; and, as such, it uniformly stands contrasted with, *justice*. 'Tis *not by works of righteousness which we have done*, or as an act of justice, but *according to His mercy, that God saves us*. Titus 3:5. But if *the perfection of justice* can only be seen, in God's giving to all men *what is their due*, can *the perfection of mercy* be seen, except in His giving to all men *what is not their due*? And if *eternal life* be clearly *what is not their due*, — if to *eternal life* they cannot advance *the smallest claim of right*, — wherein, pray, can the *perfection of mercy* be more clearly exhibited, than in *conferring upon all of them eternal life*? O! how dreadfully inconsistent with itself, the popular system, when scrutinized with any minuteness! "The divine *justice and mercy*," say its supporters, "are *thoroughly harmonious*; and are exhibited in *the highest perfection*, in God's dealings with *the children of men*." True; but how, according to them, are the perfection and self-consistency of these attributes displayed? *The divine justice*, in assigning to *finite* beings *infinite* torments as the desert of their transgressions, — in opposition both to matter of fact, and the express language of scripture, which evince, that *sufferings here*, and *the forfeiture of this present life*, are what their iniquities deserve? And *the divine mercy*, in assigning to a very small number of the human race *everlasting life*, — in opposition to all those passages of the sacred volume which, by representing that blessing as *the gift of God*, or as *unconditionally bestowed*, shew, that *it must ultimately be destined for all*? [66] That is, if one may be excused something like a pun in reference to a subject so serious, the divine *justice and mercy*, instead of being in their opinion *perfect*, are, on the contrary, the one *pluperfect*, and the other *imperfect*! In punishing sin, God *exceeds the claims of justice*, — in bestowing eternal life, he *comes short of the demands of mercy*! Thus, except by assigning *too much*, or *too little*, to the one, or to the other, it is found impossible to make these attributes harmonize. And can a system which thus fails in representing the divine attributes as *perfect*, — a system which exhibits not even *the slightest approximation to consistency*, except by *allowing one attribute to encroach on the province of another*, — be deserving of reception as true? — But this is not all. It is plain that the divine attributes can never appear to be *perfect*, while they appear to be *unsatisfied in their requirements*. And yet, that *justice and mercy* remain *unsatisfied to eternity*, is the very essence of the popular system. According to scripture, justice is satisfied<sup>16</sup> by the death of human beings, — *the wages of sin is death*; — and mercy is satisfied by conferring everlasting life upon them, — *the gift of God is eternal life, through Jesus Christ our Lord*. Thus justice and mercy, *by having their respective claims satisfied*, are both exhibited in the scriptures *in a state of perfection*. But, according to the various popular creeds, God continues tormenting the great bulk of human beings for ever, *because he never can in their case satisfy his justice*; and by thus excluding such per-[67]sons from happiness for ever, he of course *never satisfies his mercy*! Why is it that men will still continue their support to systems as consistent with truth, which, by exhibiting the divine attributes as *unsatisfied*, necessarily exhibit them as *imperfect*? And besides all this, let me ask my antagonists, in what way *justice and mercy* can be displayed in *the highest conceivable state of perfection*? In *the salvation of believers only*? or, in *the ultimate salvation of all*? Surely not in the salvation of believers only: for, although justice and mercy are exercised towards them, in the strictest consistency with the respective claims of each other, still there is one point of light, viewed in which, *mercy*, in their case, seems mixed up with *justice*, and *justice* with *mercy*. In giving to them the first fruits of eternal life *here*, *mercy*, although *not encroaching on*, is nevertheless *exercised along with justice*; — and in giving to them eternal life *hereafter*, although there is properly speaking the triumph of *mercy*, still, as having by the *present* possession of *the first fruits* of the privilege, acquired a sort of claim to the *future* possession of *the whole*, there is something likewise of the semblance of *justice*. It is, then, to the case of an unbelieving world that we must look, for a display of *justice and mercy quite*



*unmixed with each other*; and brought out, consequently, *in the highest conceivable state of perfection*. And there, upon the system which I hold but upon no other, is that display to be found. Unbelievers, as undergoing the stroke of death, without partaking *while here* of the first fruits of eternal life, are the subjects of [68] *pure justice*; — and so, as having no claim whatever upon God, — as having not even *the earnest* of eternal life, — they are certainly the fittest objects for the display of *pure mercy*. If *mercy* be the giving of favours to those who can pretend no right whatever to them, who so fit to be the recipients of such favours, even by the shewing of antagonists themselves, as *an unbelieving world*? Thus, then, viewed in every point of light, the perfection of justice seems to demand *the death of all*; and the perfection of mercy *the everlasting life of all*. The man who shall be able to prove, that the divine attributes of *justice* and *mercy* may be exhibited in the highest conceivable perfection, and in the strictest harmony with each other, without implying the satisfaction of the one *by the death*, and the satisfaction of the other *by the everlasting life of the whole family of man*, will deserve to be hailed with acclamation by the popular party, — *whenever he makes his appearance*.

<sup>16</sup> *Not exhausted*, as will afterwards be shewn.

10. This last argument may be followed up by observing, that, *according to the sacred volume, the reign of sin is not co-ordinate with, but subordinate and subservient to, the reign of grace*. Perhaps I shall be better understood if I say, that, according to scripture, sin and grace are not both to continue reigning *together*, and *everlastingly*, over *two distinct classes of mankind*; but sin is to reign over human beings *for a limited period*, that thereby grace may reign over them *for evermore*. How thoroughly inconsistent, *this subserviency of the reign of sin to the reign of grace* is, with the ordinary doctrine of *eternal torments*, may be shewn, in the shape [69] of a few brief reflections on the following passage of scripture. *Moreover the law entered, that the offence might abound: but where sin abounded, grace did much more abound: that as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life, by Jesus Christ our Lord*. Rom. 5:20,21. In this passage, which is the summing up of the foregoing argument, three distinct propositions are laid down; each preceding one leading to, and constituting the ground-work of, that which follows. First. *The law entered, that the offence might abound*. That is, God gave law to man, not, as is commonly but erroneously supposed, *that man by dint of his natural principles and faculties might obey it*; but *that the inability of man, by dint of his natural principles and faculties, to obey it, might be made thoroughly manifest*. Rom. 8:3,7,8; compared with 1 Tim. 1:8-10. Secondly. *Where sin abounded, grace did much more abound*. That is, *the abounding of sin* in human beings, which has been brought out and made manifest by *the entering of law*, — *without which, of course, there can be no transgression*, — is not *an end*, but *a means to an end*: the end being *the superabounding of grace* in human beings, by the work of Christ. This proposition, *where sin abounded, grace did much more abound*, is, *of itself*, sufficient to prove the universality of the love of God to man: for, let it be admitted, as it must be, that the intention of the apostle, in the proposition which immediately precedes, is to represent sin as abounding *in the whole family of man*, in consequence of the possession by *every human* [70] *being* of a nature evinced *to be thoroughly sinful by the entering of law*, — then, as *the superabounding of grace* takes place *where sin* has abounded, it is evident, if words have any meaning at all, that grace must superabound *in the very same individuals*, in whom sin had abounded; that is, *in the whole family of man*. The word *where*, which occurs in this passage, clearly implies the corresponding relative *there*. But how can grace superabound *where sin* has abounded, unless those who are the subjects *of the one*, are also the subjects *of the other*? If the sphere of the triumphs of *grace*, be co-extensive with the sphere of the previous triumphs of *sin*, every thing is distinct and intelligible. But, as *the whole family of man* is the sphere of the previous triumphs of sin, how, unless *the whole family of man* be rescued by grace from sin's victorious grasp, can it with truth or propriety be alleged, that there is *a superabounding of grace*, *where there had been a previous abounding of sin*? If only *a part* of the human race are delivered from sin's reign, *the rest* of them continuing subject to it for ever, would not the apostle have more fitly

expressed himself, had he reversed the position of his words, and said: *where sin much more abounds, there grace only abounds?* But, thirdly, it is to the proposition which follows, that I would particularly direct the attention of my readers. *That as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life, by Jesus Christ our Lord.* We have already observed, that each of the two preceding propositions is so stated, as to pave the way for that [71] which follows. In the first proposition, *the entering of law* is declared to be subservient to *the abounding of sin*. In the second proposition, *the abounding of sin* is stated to be subservient to, and co-extensive with, *the superabounding of grace*. In the third proposition, there is explained to us, how it is that *the abounding of sin*, is rendered subservient to *the superabounding of grace*; and that *the superabounding of grace*, in respect of its subjects, comes to be co-extensive with *the abounding of sin*. It is in consequence of the reign of the one being *limited*, or *extending only to death*, — and that of the other being *unlimited*, or extending to *everlasting life*. In order to apprehend the force of this, let it be supposed, on the contrary, that the reign of sin is *unlimited*; or, that instead of reaching *only to the termination of this present life*, it reaches *into eternity itself*; implying either *the utter annihilation*, or *the everlasting torments*, of those who are here subjected to its sway. Why, the moment that such a supposition is made, does not the question suggest itself to the mind, if *the reign of sin* be *unlimited*, what opportunity can there be for *the reign of grace*? The subserviency of a *limited* to an *unlimited* reign, is easily conceivable; and the reign of grace, as extending to a life which never ends, is of course *unlimited*: but if the reign of sin likewise be *unlimited*, how can grace ever ascend her throne? The idea of two *infinite*, or *unlimited* monarchies, plainly involves in itself an absurdity; and, therefore, if an *unlimited monarchy* be ascribed to sin, is it not at once, and necessarily, exclu-[72]sive of, because inconsistent with, *the unlimited monarchy* of grace? With the utmost propriety and advisedly, then, the apostle, instead of declaring, that the reign of sin reaches to *eternal death*, or is *unlimited in its extent*, — which would have been to bar completely the reign of grace, — has declared, on the contrary, in the most explicit terms, that sin's reign *reaches only to death*; or, that it is *limited in its extent*: this very circumstance of *the limitation of its reign*, constituting the means of, and affording the opportunity for, *the unlimited reign of grace*. But *the reign of sin*, being thus *limited in its extent*, and thereby subservient to *the unlimited reign of grace*, must be so in respect of all. For, if sin could reign unto *eternal death* in the case of any of the family of man, whether *by annihilating them*, or *by inflicting on them everlasting torments*, — then, in the first place, it would exercise an *unlimited sway* over such persons; and, in the second place, instead of being, as the words of this passage shew that it is, a *means to an end*, it would, in their case, become itself an *end*. But, in the first place, how can sin exercise an unlimited sway over *any*, except on principles, on which it must exercise an unlimited sway over *all*? Nay, why speak of the sway of sin as *unlimited*, if from it *any* can be withdrawn? and, in the second place, why, by representing the reign of sin as an *end* in the case of *any*, and not as a *means to an end* in the case of *all*, ascribe to sin, in the case of *any*, a *sovereign and independent dominion* of its own? Plain must it be, to every correctly-judging and scripturally-enlightened [73] mind, that the reign of sin is necessarily and essentially *limited*; and that, as by this very circumstance, sin is of the nature of a *means to an end*, it never has reigned, and never can reign, *except in subserviency to the reign of grace*. And if so, how obvious that sin, instead of reigning as an independent monarch in any case, — which it would do were it to reign eternally over any of the family of man, — on the contrary, reigns over every human being, merely in dependence on, and in subserviency to, the glorious and triumphant reign of its rival over every human being likewise. Point me out, then, any one over whom sin reigns, and you point me out one over whom grace is destined to reign; and as sin reigns over *the whole family of man*, by depriving them of the life that now is, so, in order to shew that its reign is not *sovereign* but *subordinate* and *subservient*, it is requisite, that grace likewise should reign over *the whole family of man*, by conferring on them everlasting life.<sup>17</sup> Let any person try to explain these words of the apostle, respecting the superabounding of grace *where sin has abounded*; and the connection between the abounding of sin *by its reign unto death*, and the superabounding of grace *by its reign unto everlasting life*; upon any other

principle than this, of the superabounding of grace *in all mankind*, the very persons in whom sin has abounded, — and the subserviency of *the reign of sin unto death*, which is confessedly over *the whole family of man*, to *the reign of grace unto everlasting life*, over *the whole family of man* [74] likewise, — and see what nonsense he will make of the passage.<sup>18</sup>

<sup>17</sup> See 1 Corinthians 15:22, &c.

<sup>18</sup> Had my limits permitted, it would have gratified me here to have introduced, from the work of Jeremiah White, *on the Restoration of all Things*, the whole of the striking, — the eloquent, — the scriptural comment of that able and excellent man, on this interesting passage. As it is, I cannot deny myself the pleasure of presenting to my readers his closing observations.

"This then is the ultimate end of the law, of sin, of death, in the eternal design, and in the eternal event, — *the superabounding of grace*. Grace is the beginning of the design; and the end of the work, a transcendency of grace. Grace lays the scheme of the laws of sin and death, that through these darknesses, blacknesses, and contrarieties, it may bring forth itself more triumphantly, with a more transcendent sweetness and glory: that it may swallow up the deformity, the guilt of sin, the terrors of the law, the horrors of death, into the beauties of a divine righteousness, into the joys of an eternal life, in the bosom of an eternal love, overflowing all with a superabundant boundless excess. Thus, as hath been said, *sin reigns unto death*; but sin and death came in by the law. — The law, together with these, is brought in, in the way and passage to the grand design, which is the reign of free grace, of a divine love, by a divine righteousness, unto eternal life.

"In the garden of the divine providences, and the divine works, every root, every principle, hath its free scope, and its full force to unfold itself in all its several virtues, forms, and degrees, until it bring forth itself in its last and ripest fruit. Sin reigns unto death.

"Thus a divine wisdom and power sets one thing over against another, displaying itself through all variety, that he who cometh after the King Immortal and only Wise, may find nothing to add to His work. But *grace*, the incorruptible beauty, and purest sweetness of the Godhead, is the beginning, the way, and the end of the whole work, of the whole design. Thus grace runs all along, undefiled, unmixed, irresistible, through all variety and contrariety, from the beginning to the end; sweetly, wisely, strongly, taking hold of all His works. It bringeth forth itself through all, it giveth measure and weight unto all, it bindeth up all at last into one most divine harmony, into one most harmonious image of itself, and of the divine essence; it turneth all into itself, as an endless glory to itself.

"Who then, that is acquainted with God, and knoweth Him as He is, Love, can imagine, that God hath set up mutability, earthliness, a capacity of sinning and dying, — that he hath suffered any thing of evil, of sin, of death, to come in upon that which is earthly, frail, and fading, and to leave his creation to be swallowed up and devoured by sin and death? — No. He hath permitted all this; but *with a design to stamp upon it the image and impression of eternal love and glory; — to bring in Jesus Christ, and eternal life by Him, in greater pomp and glory, with greater power and force, with greater joy and gladness, with a more transcendent victory and triumph*. As sin and death were not brought in at first, so it is as certain they shall not be the end; for *grace is the beginning of all, — and the end must be grace also*.

"And now, if we stumble at any part of this contrivance, it is because we cannot in one view behold the work of God, from its beginning, in its whole progress, unto its end. If we could in one view behold all His methods — how full of heavenly harmony are they? — In what divine order are the links of the golden chain of His contrivance of grace fastened one to another, or within one another? — ALL IS LOVE, from the beginning to the end; but it proceeds from the beginning to the end in so divine an order, as makes a pure and incorruptible beauty and majesty to shine forth from the whole, a most heavenly and divine melody to sound from all parts of it, charming and ravishing the pure senses of all holy and heavenly spirits."

[75] 11. The fact of *all who do not believe that God hath given to them eternal life, rendering themselves obnoxious to the charge of making God a liar*, constitutes another strong presumptive argument in favour of the ultimate happiness of the whole human race. The charge in question is contained in the following remarkable passage. *He that believeth on the Son of God, hath the witness<sup>19</sup> in himself: he that believeth not God, HATH MADE HIM A LIAR, because he believeth not the record<sup>19</sup> that God gave of his Son. And THIS IS THE RECORD,<sup>19</sup> that God hath given to us eternal*

*life: and this life is in his Son.* 1 John 5:10,11. The latter part of this passage has already been quoted, for the purpose of proving, that *the belief of the divine testimony*, is not *the belief* [76] *of an abstract proposition*, but *of a subject in which the person believing sees himself to have a personal and necessary interest*. And the reason of this we have shewn to be, that *whatever is to any man evidence of a testimony being divine*, is, at the same time and from the very nature of the case, *evidence to him likewise of his own personal interest in that testimony*. The whole passage, however, taken in connection, is now quoted in order to prove, that *eternal life must ultimately be the portion of the whole human race*. Let it be observed, that the very record or testimony to be believed in is, *that God hath given TO US eternal life, and that this life is in his Son*; and that the man who does not believe *this record or testimony*, is charged with *making God a liar*. In other words, a charge of falsehood is brought against God, by every man who refuses to believe, that *God hath given to him personally eternal life*. But if it be not true, that such a person *has a personal interest in eternal life* previous to his believing that he has it, how can his personal interest in eternal life be itself the subject matter of the testimony which he is called upon to believe? And if the subject matter of the testimony proposed to the belief of every man, to whose ears it comes, be not *an abstract proposition*, but *a blessing in which he himself personally has an interest*, how, supposing God to be true, can this be the case, *unless it be a fact that every man has an interest in the blessing*? Nay, unless it be the import of the divine testimony, that God gives eternal life to every man, and that consequently, every man has an interest in the [77] blessing, *how can those who do not believe that they have eternal life be chargeable with making God a liar*? If God have declared it to be his intention to give eternal life *only to those who believe that they have it*,<sup>20</sup> then, *those who do not believe that they have it*, so far from making Him a liar, *are, in reality, crediting His testimony*! For, as according to this hypothesis, it is really the import of His testimony to restrict the enjoyment of eternal life *to those who believe that they have it*, then, *those who do not believe that they have it*, in the suspicions which they cherish respecting God's ultimate intentions towards them, *are taking a perfectly correct and scriptural view of their situation*! — As the subject is certainly a difficult one, perhaps a little amplification will render it somewhat more intelligible. Let me put the following plain question to every reflecting reader. Is it the divine testimony, that eternal life is to be the privilege only of a few of the human race, or, that it is ultimately to be conferred on all of them? If the answer be an adoption of the former alternative, viz. that eternal life is to be confined to those who believe, then, I ask, how, upon this principle, can any man make God a liar? The subject matter believed in, when the divine testimony comes to be credited, is, as appears from the passage before us, that *God hath given to me or to us*, the person or persons believing, *eternal life*. But, *if I do not believe that God hath given to me eternal life*, then, as, according to the system which I am now en-[78]gaged in combating, *it is perfectly true that eternal life does not belong to me*, is it not plain, that according to this system, *instead of making God a liar*, I am, on the contrary, *holding Him to be true to His word*! In not believing that I have an interest in eternal life, as, according to this system, it is perfectly true that I have no interest in it, then, according to it, I AM BOTH HOLDING WHAT IS TRUE, AND HOLDING GOD TO BE TRUE! Indeed, so far from its being possible for any man *to make God a liar*, on the hypothesis of *eternal life being destined only for those who believe*, the man who believes that *he has eternal life*, and the man who does not believe that he has it, are, on this hypothesis, both equally crediting the divine testimony! But, in answer to my question, let the other alternative, that God in proclaiming eternal life *to be His gift*, is proclaiming His intention *to confer it ultimately upon all*, be adopted, and every difficulty is at once removed. The man who, believing it to be the divine record or testimony, that eternal life is *the gift of God or unconditionally bestowed*, believes that *God hath given eternal life to himself personally*, has *the witness in himself*; or, in plain English, *the divine testimony has become a testimony to him*. On the contrary, the man who does not believe that eternal life is *the gift of God*, but supposes that it is *conditionally bestowed*, finding it impossible under such circumstances to believe that *God hath given to himself personally eternal life*, has not *the witness in himself*; or, the divine testimony concerning eternal life *as freely bestowed*, and therefore *as bestowed*

[79] *on himself*, is not a testimony to him. It is true, that God by declaring eternal life to be *unconditionally bestowed*, has declared *his interest*, and *the interest of every human being in it*; but by *his not believing it to be unconditionally bestowed*, and by *his not believing consequently his own personal interest in it*, he makes *God a liar*; — because he does not believe *what God has actually declared*, and *what continues true notwithstanding his unbelief*. How consistent, then, with itself, on the principle of the ultimate happiness of the whole human race being the import of the divine testimony, does this remarkable passage of the apostle John appear to be. Some of the human race believing it to be the divine record or testimony that eternal life is *unconditionally bestowed*, and believing, consequently, that *it is bestowed on them*, have *the witness in themselves*; or, realize that divine record or testimony *in reference to themselves personally*. On the other hand, vast numbers of the human race, who hear the same divine record or testimony, not believing that *they themselves personally have eternal life*, although it is the import of God's testimony that *it is His intention to bestow it upon them*, — by their *not believing what God hath actually declared*, are justly chargeable with *making Him a liar*. On what hypothesis, then, except on this of its being the import of the divine testimony that *eternal life is destined for all*, can the man *who refuses to believe that eternal life is destined for him*, bring a charge of falsehood against God?<sup>21</sup>

<sup>19</sup> It is the same Greek word μαρτυρία which, in this passage, and in the context, is rendered *witness* and *record*. Perhaps it would have been as well if the English word *testimony* had in all cases been employed. Of one thing I am certain, that, had this been done, the mere English reader would have been spared a great deal of perplexity.

<sup>20</sup> A thing perfectly true in one sense, namely, in so far as respects *the present possession* of eternal life.

<sup>21</sup> The following interesting narrative, extracted from the auto-biography of Mr. John Murray, the Father of Universalism in America, will serve to illustrate, as well as to relieve the dryness of the present argument. It may be proper to premise, that Mr. Murray, at the period referred to in the narrative, was residing in London, — that he was then a fiery Calvinist, — and that the Mr. Relly, spoken of in it, was a celebrated preacher of Universalism, in the British metropolis, about sixty or seventy years since.

"I had heard much of Mr. Relly; he was a conscientious and zealous preacher, in the city of London. He had, through many revolving years, continued faithful to the ministry committed to him, and he was the theme of every religious sect. He appeared, as he was represented to me, highly erroneous; and my indignation against him, as has already been seen, was very strong. I had frequently been solicited to hear him, merely that I might be an ear-witness of what was termed his *blasphemies*; but, I arrogantly said, I would not be a *murderer of time*. Thus I passed on for a number of years, hearing all manner of evil said of Mr. Relly, and *believing all I heard*, while every day augmented the inveterate hatred, which I bore the man, and his adherents. When a worshipping brother, or sister, belonging to the communion" (Mr. Whitfield's) "which I considered as honoured by the approbation of Deity, was, by this deceiver, drawn from the paths of rectitude, the anguish of my spirit was indescribable; and I was ready to say, the secular arm ought to interpose to prevent the perdition of souls. I recollect one instance in particular, which pierced me to the soul. A young lady, of irreproachable life, remarkable for piety, and highly respected by the Tabernacle congregation and church, of which I was a devout member, had been ensnared; to my great astonishment, she had been induced to hear, and having heard, she had embraced the pernicious errors of this detestable babbler; she was become a believer, a firm, and unwavering believer of universal redemption! Horrible! most horrible! So high an opinion was entertained of my talents, having myself been a teacher among the Methodists," (Wesleyan,) "and such was my standing in Mr. Whitefield's church, that I was deemed adequate to reclaiming this wanderer, and I was strongly urged to the pursuit. The poor, deluded young woman was abundantly worthy our most arduous efforts. *He, that converteth the sinner from the error of his way, shall save a soul from death, and shall hide a multitude of sins*. Thus I thought, thus I said, and, swelled with a high idea of my own importance, I went accompanied by two or three of my Christian brethren, to see, to converse with, and, if need were, to admonish this simple, weak, but, as we heretofore believed, meritorious female. Fully persuaded, that I could easily convince her of her errors, I entertained no doubt respecting the result of my undertaking. The young lady received us with much kindness and condescension, while, as I glanced my eye upon her fine countenance, beaming with intelligence, mingling pity and contempt grew in

my bosom. After the first ceremonies, we sat for some time silent; at length I drew up a heavy sigh, and uttered a pathetic sentiment, relative to the deplorable condition of those, who live, and die in unbelief; and I concluded a violent declamation, by pronouncing, *with great earnestness, He, that believeth not, shall be damned.*

"And pray, sir," said the young lady, with great sweetness, "Pray, sir, what is the unbeliever damned for not believing?"

"What is he damned for not believing? *Why, he is damned for not believing.*

"But, my dear sir, I asked what was that, which he did not believe, for which he was damned?"

"Why, for not believing in Jesus Christ, to be sure.

"Do you mean to say, that unbelievers are damned, for not believing there was such a person as Jesus Christ?"

"No, I do not; a man may believe there was such a person, and yet be damned.

"What then, sir, must he believe, in order to avoid damnation?"

"Why, he must believe that, Jesus Christ is a complete Saviour.

"Well, suppose he were to believe, that Jesus Christ was the complete Saviour of others, would this belief save him?"

"No, he must believe, that Jesus Christ is his complete Saviour; every individual must believe for himself, *that Jesus Christ is his complete Saviour.*

"Why, sir, is Jesus Christ the Saviour of any *unbelievers*?"

"No, madam.

"Why, then, should any *unbeliever* believe, that Jesus Christ is his Saviour, *if he be not his Saviour?*"

"I say, he is not the Saviour of any one, until he believes.

"Then, if Jesus be not the Saviour of the *unbeliever*, until he *believes*, the unbeliever is called upon to believe a lie. It appears to me, sir, that Jesus is the complete Saviour of *unbelievers*; and that unbelievers are called upon to believe the truth; and that, by *believing, they are saved, in their own apprehension, saved from all those dreadful fears*, which are consequent upon a state of conscious condemnation.'

"No, madam; you are dreadfully, I trust not fatally, misled. Jesus never was, and never will be, the Saviour of any unbeliever.

"Do you think Jesus is your Saviour, sir?"

"I hope he is.

"Were you *always* a believer, sir?"

"No, madam.

"Then you were once an unbeliever; that is, you once believed, that Jesus Christ was not your Saviour. Now, as you say, he never *was*, and never *will be*, the Saviour of any *unbeliever*; as you were once an *unbeliever*, he never can be your Saviour.'

"He never was my Saviour, till I believed.

"Did he never die for you, till you believed, sir?"

"Here I was extremely embarrassed, and most devoutly wished myself out of her habitation; I sighed bitterly, expressed deep commiseration for those deluded souls, who had nothing but head-knowledge; drew out my watch, *discovered it was late*; and, recollecting an engagement, observed it was time to take leave.

"I was extremely mortified; the young lady observed my confusion, but was too generous to pursue her triumph. I arose to depart; the company arose; she urged us to tarry; addressed each of us in the language of kindness. Her countenance seemed to wear a resemblance of the heaven, which she contemplated; it was stamped by benignity, and when we bade her adieu, she enriched us by her good wishes.

"I suspected, that my religious brethren saw she had the advantage of me; and I *felt*, that, her remarks were indeed *unanswerable*. My pride was hurt, and I determined to ascertain the exact sentiments of my associates respecting this interview. Poor soul, said I, she is far gone in error. True, said they; but she is,

notwithstanding, a very sensible woman. Ay, ay, thought I, they have assuredly discovered, that she has proved too mighty for me. Yes, said I, she has a great deal of *head* knowledge; but yet she may be a lost, damned soul. I hope not, returned one of my friends; she is a very good young woman. I saw, and it was with extreme chagrin, that the result of this visit had depreciated me in the opinion of my companions. But I could only censure and condemn, solemnly observing: It was better not to converse with any of those apostates, and it would be judicious never to associate with them on any occasion. From this period, I myself carefully avoided every Universalist, and *most cordially did I hate them.*" *Life of Rev. John Murray*, pages 91-93, Boston, 1816.

A work of the Mr. Rely spoken of in the above extract, entitled, *Union, or a treatise of the consanguinity and affinity between Christ and his Church*, a work which was referred to in a preceding note, will, if consulted, be found to throw great light on the argument prosecuted in the text. See from page 110 to page 117, of the New York edition, 1812.

[80] 12. A presumptive argument, in favour of the ultimate happiness of the whole human race, arises from [81] those passages of scripture, which declare *God's hatred of evil. Thou art of purer eyes than to behold evil, and canst not look on iniquity*; Habak. 1:13; and a variety [82] of kindred texts, proving the loathsomeness of sin in God's sight, will readily suggest themselves to the diligent student of the sacred volume. Strange to tell, [83] from the very fact thus substantiated, has been drawn a conclusion, exactly the reverse of that to which it leads. Because God hates evil, *therefore*, say the popular clergy and their adherents, *He will visit with eternal torments all the workers of it.* I cheerfully admit, that if intelligent beings could exist *loving and practising wickedness for ever*, such beings would, from the very necessity of the case, — from the very constitution of their nature, — *be tormented for ever.* But, unfortunately for the popular system, to infer *the doctrine of everlasting torments*, from the fact of *God's hatred of evil*, belongs to that species of logic which is commonly denominated a *non sequitur*. The legitimate inference from God's hatred of evil is, that *He will destroy it.* For, what mankind hate, they cannot look upon, — they endeavour by all means to put away from them, — they cannot be satisfied without effecting the destruction of. Now as God, when addressing intelligent beings with a view to be understood, must employ language in the sense in which it is employed among themselves, when He informs them that *He hates sin*, He must mean them to understand, that *the destruction of it* is the object at which He is aiming. But the accomplishment of this object is not consistent with the ordinary doctrine of eternal torments. For, *eternal torments* implying the eternal existence of *evil beings*; and the eternal existence of *evil beings* implying the eternal existence of *evil itself*; in maintaining the doctrine of *eternal torments*, men necessarily maintain, that God, instead of *destroying evil*, imparts to it *everlasting existence!* [84] Would to God, that the popular divines and their followers could but lay aside their prejudices, and allow themselves to reflect calmly and maturely on this subject. It is admitted on both sides, that *God hates evil*; nay, that terms are not *to be found strong enough to express the abhorrence with which He regards it.* Well, say the adherents of the popular creed, what more emphatic expression of *His hatred of evil* can God afford, than tormenting everlastingly *hereafter*, those who are chargeable with the commission of it *here*? And is this, alas! all that such persons have learned from the scriptures respecting the matter? When God by the mouth of the inspired apostle informs us, that *the wages of sin is death*, is it not the evident, the undeniable import of His words, that *evil tends to self-destruction*, and not *to the perpetuation of itself for ever*? And yet, in the teeth of this, are we to hear mere fallible mortals asserting, that *what God hates with a perfect hatred*, He nevertheless *confers everlasting existence upon*; and thus *keeps before His eyes for evermore*? Besides, when such persons venture to tell us, that, *in the everlasting torments of the wicked, God's hatred of sin principally appears*, have they forgotten the language which scripture employs respecting *the cross of Christ*? Nay, have they forgotten the language which, *when convenient*, they themselves are accustomed to employ respecting *the same subject*? Who such sticklers, in words at least, as many of them, for *the glory of the divine perfections shining forth, principally, in that of Christ, which was finished on Mount Calvary*? [85] And if, by their own oft-repeated admissions, God's

hatred of sin is *principally conspicuous there*, why contradict themselves, as well as contradict the word of God, by representing God's hatred of sin as *principally conspicuous in circumstances*, which, *if they could exist*, would render *the cross of Christ of none effect*? No, blessed be God's name, the import of the atonement unquestionably is, that *He abhors sin*, aye, and *abhors it, too, to an extent, such as no created understanding can adequately fathom*: but the import of the atonement likewise is, that *sin hath been taken away*; a fact utterly inconsistent with *the eternal existence of sin*, and its *eternal reign over a portion of the human race*.<sup>22</sup>

<sup>22</sup> I here again refer, for a fuller development of my views in reference to this subject, to the third part of my "Three questions proposed and answered," &c.; in which I have treated of it at considerable length.

13. The argument upon which I have just been insisting may be materially strengthened by shewing, that *the destruction of evil, which I have merely deduced as an inference from God's hatred of it, is actually in the scriptures stated to be the very purpose for which the Messiah came into the world*. All evil, and all the effects of evil, are, it is admitted, to be traced to the Devil as their author. Genesis 3:1-6,14,15; John 8:44; 2 Corinth. 11:3; 1 John 3:8. But the Devil and his works, it is expressly declared, *either are destroyed, or are destined to be destroyed*. The destruction of the Devil himself is thus announced. *Forasmuch, then, as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same*: [86] *that, through death, HE MIGHT DESTROY HIM THAT HAD THE POWER OF DEATH, THAT IS, THE DEVIL*. Heb. 2:14. The following passage informs us of the destruction of his works. *For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, THAT HE MIGHT DESTROY THE WORKS OF THE DEVIL*. To those who are acquainted with the subject, it will appear almost superfluous for me to remark, that *the immortality, or eternal existence of the Devil*, and *his subjection to never-ending torments along with the wicked*, constitute leading articles of the popular creed. Such being the case, a passage which, like that first quoted, proves, that the Devil himself, instead of being *destined to live and suffer torments forever*, is, in reality, to be *destroyed*, by removing one of the main pillars of what is falsely called *orthodoxy*, has a direct tendency to impair the stability of the rest of the edifice. For, if the Devil himself, the grand agent in the perpetration of evil, is not to suffer in "the raw head and bloody bones" style, imagined by those who have never yet stepped out of the nursery of popular prejudices, — what reason have we to think, that everlasting torments shall be inflicted on those who at the utmost are merely his victims? But suspicions inspired by the fact of *the destruction of the Devil himself*, are converted into certainty, when we learn, on the same infallible authority to which we are indebted for our information respecting *his own destruction*, that *destruction impends over his works* likewise. *For this very purpose*, says the apostle John in the latter of the passages just quoted, *was the son of God manifested, that he might* [87] *destroy the works of the Devil*. The works of the Devil, it appears from the context of this passage, as well as from a great variety of other passages of scripture, are *sin, suffering, and death*. 1 John 3:4-15. Also Genesis 3:1-19; Rom. 5:12, *to the end*; &c. Now, as it is expressly asserted that the Son of God was manifested *for the purpose of destroying these works*, it will not be denied, by any man who respects the authority of the sacred writings, and is satisfied that all the divine purposes shall be fully accomplished, that the Son of God *actually does destroy them*. But if *sin, suffering, and death*, the works of the Devil, are destroyed, how can *sin, suffering, and death* exist for ever? If the express purpose of the Son of God's coming into the world was, as John has informed us, that *he might destroy sin, suffering, and death*, how can we, without grossly contradicting the inspired apostle, represent the Messiah as *conferring upon sin, suffering, and death, everlasting existence*, — thereby instead of *destroying*, in reality *everlastingly confirming them*? The same apostle, in the book of Revelation, declares, that *he heard a great voice out of heaven, saying, Behold the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them, and they shall be His people, and God himself shall be with them, and be their God. And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; AND THERE SHALL BE NO MORE DEATH, NEITHER SORROW, NOR CRYING, NEITHER SHALL THERE BE ANY MORE PAIN: FOR THE FORMER THINGS ARE*



PASSED AWAY. *And He that sat upon [88] the throne said, Behold I MAKE ALL THINGS NEW.* Rev. 21:3-5. But, according to the notions of religion current among mankind in general, these representations are utterly false; for *sin, suffering, and death*, instead of *passing away with this present state of things*, as is here clearly intimated, actually acquire through the instrumentality of the Son of God, what otherwise they could not have done, *everlasting existence, and everlasting dominion, over a large portion of the human race*. If this is not to *make Christ the minister of sin*, I know not what the expression means. From the scriptural facts just stated, and the conclusions to which they inevitably lead, it is clear to my mind, that there is something incompatible with the fulfilment of the divine purposes, in the ordinary notion of *never-ending torments* being undergone by any of the human race. — Still farther; assuming it as an axiom, that *the purpose for which the Son of God was manifested was to destroy the works of the Devil*, there is another way of working the theological problem, and arriving at our conclusion, so very simple and convincing, that I cannot help submitting it to my readers. All the suppositions which can be made respecting a resurrection of the dead, reduce themselves to *the five following*. A sixth cannot be found. 1st. There shall be no resurrection of the dead at all. 2dly. All the dead shall be raised, but for the purpose of being miserable for ever. 3dly. A part of the dead only shall be raised, the rest of them continuing in their graves for ever. 4thly. All the dead shall be raised, a part to [89] be happy, and the rest to be sinful and miserable for ever. And, 5thly, all the dead shall be raised to be happy for ever. The first and second suppositions, that *there shall be no resurrection of the dead*, and that *all the dead shall be raised to be miserable*, I dismiss without a single remark in the way of refutation; as no man who pretends to pay *any* deference to the sacred volume will be found to maintain either. The third supposition, that *only a part of the human race shall be raised, the rest of them continuing in their graves for ever*, — or, what is commonly called the annihilation scheme, — is put down by the fact, that *if any intelligent beings, nay, if a single intelligent being, could be annihilated, or could remain under the power of death for ever, then death, one of the works of the Devil, would not be destroyed*.<sup>23</sup> The fourth supposition, that *all the dead shall be raised, but only a part of them to happiness, the rest being destined to sin and suffer for ever*, — which is the orthodox belief, — is liable to a similar objection as the third; seeing that it represents *sin and suffering*, which are two of the works of the Devil, as *receiving everlasting existence and confirmation from*, instead of *being destroyed by*, the Son of God.<sup>24</sup> We are thus forced, absolutely forced, upon the fifth hypothesis, that *all the dead shall be raised to be happy for ever*; a hypothesis which carries the evidence of its truth upon the [90] very face of it, when we consider, that according to it alone are *all the works of the Devil destroyed*. Death is destroyed; for, *all are raised to everlasting life*. Sin and suffering are destroyed; for, *all are raised to holiness and happiness for ever*. Sin receives its wages from all *in their death*: *grace* manifests itself in its glorious freeness and fulness to all, *by destroying in all sin and death, and by conferring upon all everlasting life*. Let any man overturn this statement by scriptural facts and reasonings if he can. But let him who makes the attempt remember, that if, on the one hand, with a view to avoid supporting the doctrine of *the eternity of sin and misery*, he shall represent Christ as *raising believers only*, and as consequently *annihilating the unbelieving world*, he does so at the expense of denying the *destruction of death*:<sup>25</sup> and that, if on the other hand, with a view to avoid supporting the doctrine of *annihilation, or the eternity of death*, he shall represent Christ as *raising a part of the human race to be eternally sinful and miserable*, he does so at the expense of denying the *destruction of sin and suffering*. This Scylla and Charybdis of Theologians, no man can steer clear of, but he who admits the complete destruction of [91] *sin, suffering, and death*, — the works of the Devil,<sup>26</sup> — in consequence of the Son of God ultimately conferring *holiness, happiness, and everlasting life, upon the whole family of man*.

<sup>23</sup> Besides contradicting such passages as, *All that are in the grave shall hear his voice, &c.* John 5:28; *there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and of the unjust, &c.* Acts 24:15; and many others.

<sup>24</sup> Besides contradicting a number of passages to be afterwards specified.

<sup>25</sup> Not having perceived this, when I wrote and published my "Three questions proposed and answered," I have there stated, that I was at a loss *as to what was to be the fate of unbelievers*. That *eternal torments*, as implying *the eternal existence of evil*, were out of the question, I was fully satisfied; but whether *annihilation*, or *ultimate happiness*, awaited those who here are wicked, was to me, for a considerable while, a matter of uncertainty. Blessed be God, that a prosecution of my researches into the sacred volume, in process of time, was the means of conducting me to my present sentiments.

<sup>26</sup> The Greek words ὁ διαβολος, literally translated, signify *the accuser*.

14. I would close my list of presumptive arguments for the ultimate happiness of all mankind, with a reference to the oft-repeated prophecies and declarations of the sacred volume, *respecting wickedness and the wicked coming to an end*. The remarks which I have already made have, I presume, rendered it quite unnecessary for me to prove at length, that *the everlasting existence of punishment*, must imply *the everlasting existence of wickedness and the wicked*, as *the cause and subjects of such punishment*: and that, therefore, *the termination of wickedness and the wicked*, must imply, likewise, *the termination of punishment*. But it so happens, that the scriptures abound with passages asserting, or implying, *the temporary duration both of sin and sinners*. How inevitable from this the conclusion, as to *the termination of punishment likewise*.<sup>27</sup> — That the minds of my readers may not be distracted by a multiplicity of quotations, in proof of *the temporary duration of evil and those who perpetrate it*, I will content myself with setting before them a few of these, which are contained in the Book of Psalms. *O! let the wickedness of the wicked come to an end*; Psalm 7:9. *Yet a little while, and the wicked shall not be*; 37:10. *Let the sinners be consumed out of the earth, and let the [92] wicked be no more*; 104:35. Nay, the language employed in some other places is, if possible, still stronger and more explicit. *All the wicked will he destroy*; 145:20. *Thou hast destroyed the wicked, thou hast put out their name for ever and ever*; 9:5. The import of all these statements, declarations, and prophecies, plainly is, that *the existence of wickedness and the wicked is not to be eternal*; or, that *there is a period approaching when there shall be neither wickedness nor wicked*. But, according to the various religious theories by which the minds of mankind in general are drugged and stupified, *the wicked are to be subjected to everlasting torments in a future state of existence!* That is, instead of *wickedness and the wicked coming to an end*, or, in the beautiful and expressive language of scripture, *being no more*, they are, if popular religionists are to be credited, *to endure and be perpetuated throughout eternity!* Evil, instead of being *temporary in its duration*, and *finally superseded by the triumph of grace and goodness*, as the passages of scripture quoted, and the nature of the case, shew that it must be, — is, on the contrary, in the apprehension of the great mass of popular religionists, *to exist and triumph over a large proportion of the family of man for evermore!* So very decidedly are the passages which I have quoted from the Book of Psalms, at variance with the ordinary doctrine of eternal torments, that I might almost have set them down among the *direct and positive arguments for the ultimate happiness of the whole human race*, were it not that, *taken by themselves*, it must be confessed, there [93] is nothing to hinder them from being employed by an advocate for *the annihilation scheme*. But whatever may be thought of *the positive value* of such passages, at all events their *negative value* in the present controversy is unquestionable; seeing that, by laying down as a fixed position *the temporary duration of evil or wickedness*, they stamp falsehood upon the popular doctrine of *never-ending misery*. It is to no purpose for the supporters of the popular doctrine, to attempt to invalidate the force of my present argument, by alleging: "that, even if their views should be obnoxious to the charge of *representing wickedness as eternal*, in opposition to scripture, my views are chargeable with *representing the wicked as living for ever*, in opposition to some of the very passages quoted by me from the Book of Psalms, which prophesy or declare, that *they shall be destroyed for ever*." A charge like this comes with a dreadfully bad grace from those who, by their own admission, so far from believing that *the wicked shall be destroyed for ever*, hold it as one of the dogmata of their creed, that *the wicked AS SUCH shall exist for ever!* Who, so far from believing that *the wickedness of the wicked shall come to an end*, hold, that *wickedness comes to an end here*, only that *it may be confirmed, and perfected, and clothed with*

*everlasting existence hereafter!* But the fact is, that their charge, triumphantly as it may be urged, *attaches not to me*. I do not hold, that *the wicked, as such, shall exist for ever*. If I did so, I should talk absurdly, as well as unscripturally; for, in that case, I should represent beings who *as wicked* are [94] possessed of a nature *fitted only for temporary duration*, as also *possessing an attribute* which can belong only to beings *who are pure and perfect*. No; the doctrine of *the everlasting existence of the wicked as such*, is not *my doctrine*, but *that of my opponents*: and it does argue no small share of cunning and effrontery on their part, first, to charge me with holding their own unscriptural notions, and then, on the supposition that I do so, to attempt to involve me in consequences resulting only from their own misrepresentations. What I do hold, as will afterwards more fully appear, is, that *wickedness by its very nature tends to destruction*; — that *the descendants of Adam are all naturally wicked*, and that *such of them as continue throughout life to be so, shall be destroyed*; — that *the destruction of such persons as wicked is not with a view to their annihilation, but to their new creation or reproduction as righteous*; — and that *as righteous, or as the descendants of the second Adam, all those who originally were wicked and destroyed as the descendants of the first Adam, shall have everlasting life*. Now, to whatever objections this view of matters may be liable, at all events it cannot be charged with the absurdity of representing *the wicked AS SUCH to live for ever*.

<sup>27</sup> In one sense only. In another sense their punishment is everlasting.

## 2. Direct and positive arguments.

The next topic upon which I am to insist is, the arguments in favour of the ultimate happiness of the whole family of men, which may be denominated *direct and* [95] *positive*. These consist of *passages of scripture, in which the salvation of all is expressly asserted*.

It may be proper, here, to prepare the minds of my readers for a result, which to some of them may be startling, because in a great measure unexpected. Judging *a priori* we should say, that *a single explicit declaration of the sacred volume* on any subject, must infinitely outweigh, and must produce a conviction infinitely stronger than, *human reasonings however legitimate and however conclusive*. And where the mind has, by divine teaching, been properly trained to submission of its own wisdom, and of its own rash, presumptuous, and aspiring thoughts, to the dictates of inspiration, such unquestionably will be the case. But I am much mistaken, if the impression produced on the minds of many, *by direct and positive declarations of scripture with respect to the ultimate happiness of all*, will not actually be found to be slighter, than *what has been produced by some of the foregoing reasonings*. How is this to be accounted for? On principles the most simple and obvious. Taking, as the ground-work of our conclusion, the ordinary practice of religious instructors and professors, who can deny, that the great use of scripture, in the estimation of most of them, is not so much *to teach the mind and will of God, as to afford the person studying it an opportunity for the display of his own tact and ingenuity?* Hence the object of such a person is, not *to know what scripture does say*, but *to try if, by any efforts of his, he can accommodate* [96] *its language to his own preconceived notions*. Let the word of God ever so distinctly declare any fact or doctrine, if that fact or doctrine shall happen to contradict some favourite and long-cherished theory, his first object is to explain away, or, by some means or other to get rid of, the refractory statement. Need it excite surprise if, by long perseverance in practices of this kind, — and who can say that he is altogether guiltless of them? — a habit of voluntarily shutting the eyes to truth, should in due time come to be acquired; and if the most striking passages of holy writ, should after a while fail to produce upon the mind any impression whatever?<sup>28</sup> And is there not something of righteous retribution in all this? When the first question which the mind, when directed towards any particular passage of the sacred volume, proposes to itself is, not *what the passage may mean*, but *how it may be tortured and explained in such a way as to agree with some favourite creed*, can we be surprised at the Supreme Being, as the fitting expression of his displeasure at such contemptuous treatment of his most blessed word, consigning over those who are chargeable with it to [97] ignorance

and self-delusion? Scripture itself represents God's *sending men strong delusion, that they should believe a lie*, as one of the necessary results of *their not receiving the love of truth, that they might be saved*. 2 Thessal. 2:10,11. And can any thing be conceived more deplorable, than that the most glorious and soul-reviving views of the divine character, should be set before men continually, without in the slightest degree either entering their understandings, or affecting their hearts? Now, by no texts of scripture are the minds of the majority of my readers less likely to be impressed, than by those which I am about to quote. Most, if not all of them, have been adduced and insisted on *usque ad nauseam*, as proof texts in the controversies which, at different times, have sprung up, and been carried on, between Calvinists and Arminians. Intent on establishing their own particular system, it has never been made a question by the advocates on either side, how much truth there might be in the system of their antagonists; but merely, how they might most ingeniously answer, and most plausibly evade, the objections brought against their own. They have approached to the consideration of the texts referred to, not with the meekness and docility of little children, desirous to learn, and prepared to acquiesce in, the revealed will of their Heavenly Father, — but prepossessed with certain notions respecting their meaning, and determined to maintain these at all hazards.<sup>29</sup> And is it to be supposed, that the spirit of partisanship was confined to the [98] Calvinists and Arminians of a former day? Is it not rather to be suspected, that it may have reached, and contaminated, many of those who look over these pages? One can scarcely point out a single native of Great Britain, whose mind has been deeply and seriously impressed with a sense of religion, who has not, at some period of his career, enrolled himself on the one side, or the other, of the Calvinistic and Arminian controversy. And if so, what person answering to this description dare say, that he himself is not an instance of the effects necessarily produced on the mind, by the above mentioned abuse of the sacred volume? Trained myself from my earliest years in the school of Calvin, and for a long time so devotedly attached to the religious system of that eminent divine, that I would listen to nothing uttered in disparagement of it, I have learned, from that best of all teachers *experience*, how those who are similarly circumstanced *must* feel, in regard to the views propounded and advocated by me in this work. I have learned, especially, how little I have to expect, from a bare statement of the truths of God's own word, to a prejudiced and bigoted world. I am about to adduce the plain, emphatic, and unequivocal declarations, of *Him who cannot lie*. But what reason have I to hope, that persons who, during a large proportion of their lives, have, either as teachers or taught, been occupied in twisting, torturing, and perverting the language of inspiration, will all at once lay aside old and confirmed habits, *and receive with meekness the engrafted word of God*? None whatever. A result so much to [99] be desired is, I am aware, in most cases out of the question. Nothing but the same divine power which enlightened my own mind, can enlighten the mind of a thorough-going partisan of either of the two great rival sects. While, therefore, justice to myself, — to my readers, — and to the cause which I have espoused, — renders it imperative on me, to adduce some strong and pointed texts of scripture, in proof of *the ultimate happiness of the whole human race*, the conviction that I address these to minds blunted to the impression which the language of the Supreme Being should invariably produce, has determined me to dwell on this part of the subject as briefly as possible. If a few individuals, more spiritually enlightened, and consequently less prejudiced than their neighbours, shall glance over these pages; and if, to their minds, the texts quoted shall indicate *God's intention ultimately to save all*; such individuals will find no difficulty to discover, in the sacred volume, abundance of other texts, pointing the same way, and possessed of the same meaning.<sup>30</sup>

<sup>28</sup> Il faut, Monsieur, que vous sachiez, que dès qu' on s'est mis dans la tête de defendre de certains sentimens, seulement parcequ'ils sont reçûs communément dans la société ou l'on est né, on est capable de tout digerer, et de prendre les choses du monde les moins vrai-semblables, pour des verités manifestes. Cette passion fait sur l' esprit, le même effet que la fièvre fait sur le corps: la fièvre fait perdre le gout, et empeche qu' on ne puisse juger sainement de saveurs, et cette passion ôte a l' esprit ce discernement, qui fait que l' on reconnoit ce qui n' est pas d' un auteur, et ce qui est veritablement sorti de sa plume. — *Sentimens de quelques Theologiens, sur l' histoire critique du vieux Testament composée par le P. Richard Simon, de l' Oratoire.*

(Par Le Clerc). *Tieme lettre*, page 147. 1685.

<sup>29</sup> See Appendix I.

<sup>30</sup> To all who are inclined to prosecute their investigations, into the effects likely to result from making preconceived notions the test of the meaning of scripture, I would recommend a careful perusal of Archbp. Whately's remarks *on the love of truth*, in his *Essays on some of the difficulties in the writings of St. Paul*.

The same reason which has induced me to make but few quotations from scripture, has prevailed with me to confine these quotations still farther. Instead of proving *the ultimate happiness of the whole human race* by texts which might be obnoxious to a charge of ambiguity, I shall do so by adducing a few passages which [100] establish unequivocally the *interest of all in the work of Christ*.

But previous to this, it will be necessary for me to set myself right with my readers, by laying before them a brief sketch of the sentiments which I hold, respecting *the nature of Christ's work*.

So busy has misrepresentation been, that I am well aware of my being at the present moment regarded by many, and some of these, too, persons whom I esteem, in scarcely any other light than that of a disciple of Socinus. Now, while I acknowledge the obligations, under which I lie both to Socinians and Arminians, for certain modifications of my views occasioned by reflecting on some of their leading positions; and while I am perfectly willing to bear all the obloquy which, in the opinion of the religious world, should attach to the sentiments which I actually do hold; I beg leave to disclaim being either a Socinian or an Arminian; and to protest against being held amenable for doctrines which others, either wilfully or ignorantly but at all events falsely, have chosen to impute to me. I believe in *the atonement of Christ Jesus*; — I am satisfied, that *that atonement owes its efficacy to the divine nature and character of him by whom it was made*; — and I know *no way in which any of the human race can be saved, except through an interest in the blood which was shed by the Son of God*. But because I believe what scripture has said respecting this subject, it does not follow, that I should also believe all the crude and undigested no-[101]tions which man may have chosen to propound respecting it, even although he may plead in behalf of these a scriptural origin. I must use my eyes, — my ears — and my understanding, — in order to find out, by an examination of the sacred volume itself, whether his statements be true; and if true in the main, whether they may not admit of, nay even require, some modification or qualification. The necessity of exercising caution in our statements of *the doctrine of the atonement*, will probably appear, from pushing our investigations into the subject a little farther.

The common idea is, that the Lord Jesus died *in the stead*, or *as the substitute*, either of a part, or of the whole of the human race. Now, while so far from denying, I glory in the fact of the sufferings and death of the Son of God having been undergone by him, *in behalf and on account of the family of man*, and of their being *the only channel through which life and immortality could have flowed to them*, — the following considerations, which I do not choose to disguise from myself and others, constrain me to perceive, that *vicarious and substitutionary*, are terms which must be applied to *the work of Christ* with certain modifications.

1st. If the sense in which the Messiah died as our substitute be, that *he underwent sufferings which we otherwise must have undergone*, then the antithesis requires, that *he must now be enjoying a blessedness which we otherwise must have enjoyed*! For, is it not evident, that as certainly as there may be *substitution in regard to suffering*, so certainly also there may be [102] *substitution in regard to enjoyment*. The idea, it may be said, is unusual. Granted. But if I can, without difficulty, suppose Jesus to have suffered and died *in my stead*, why should there be any greater difficulty in my supposing him to enjoy happiness *in my stead* likewise? If I can suffer *by proxy*, may I not enjoy the heavenly glory *by proxy* likewise? And yet, the admission of this, would completely subvert the hope of the enjoyment of eternal life by the believer himself personally! If then the popular sense attached to the phrase, *that Christ suffered and died as our substitute*, be neither more nor less than an indirect and insidious method of complimenting away the personal hope of the Christian, how necessary to be on our guard

against the rash and unadvised employment of it. But,

2ndly, If it be insisted, that *the sufferings and death of Christ* were in the full extent of the term *substitutionary*, the question immediately occurs, *then why are the human race subjected to sufferings and death?* Had Christ, in suffering and dying, been in the strictest sense and fullest extent of the word *a substitute*, then, if language has any meaning at all, must not those *for whom he was substituted*, — these *for whom he suffered and died*, — have themselves been *exempted from sufferings and death?* Nay, as *death* is in the scriptures expressly declared to be *sin's wages*, — and as all the human race, in having taken from them the life that now is, thus receive *what is their due*, — how can this be rendered consistent with the popular notion, that the Messiah, *in their stead* and *as their substitute*, underwent [103] *what is their due?* There is something which outrages all our notions of justice in the doctrine commonly broached and maintained, that punishment for the same offence has been inflicted both *on the substitute*, and *on the actual transgressor*. That the actual debtor should be discharged *on paying the debt himself*, is what I can understand; and that the debtor should be discharged *on account of the debt having been paid by his surety*, is what I can understand likewise; but how, consistently with justice, *the same debt* can be exacted, both *from the actual debtor*, and *from the surety*, is what, I confess, surpasses my comprehension.

The truth is, all the blundering and floundering of the popular divines, respecting *the vicarious* or *substitutionary* character of the Messiah's sufferings, arise from their having originally taken up a false position; and from the dread of the bugbear Socinianism having since determined them at all hazards to maintain it. They have assumed, *that man's transgressions deserve MORE than the forfeiture of this present life!*<sup>31</sup> Now it is perfectly true, that if the transgressions of human beings deserve *more than the loss of this present life*, whether *annihilation*, or *never-ending torments*; and if, notwithstanding this, any human beings *are raised to the enjoyment of eternal life*; something like the idea of the Messiah having undergone *annihilation*, or *eternal torments* in their stead, must be conceived of, in order to furnish out *even the shadow of a reason* for God's extending His favour to them. "Then," according to [104] the author of a very valuable critical work, now lying before me, whose language is a pretty fair specimen of the notions commonly entertained by the popular divines in regard to this subject, "we can understand what is meant by God's *making him who knew no sin to be sin for us*, namely, that through his sufferings we might be justified; that is, acquitted and released WITHOUT UNDERGOING THE PUNISHMENT STRICTLY DUE TO SIN, or without any mistrust of God's purity and justice."<sup>32</sup> But it happens most unfortunately for this notion of Christ's atonement benefitting us, in consequence of the wages of sin being *annihilation*, or *eternal torments*, — and in consequence of Christ having undergone in our stead *what is equivalent to the one, or the other of these*, — that it is impossible to reconcile it with *the truth and justice of God*. With *His truth*; for can He have threatened, what He does not intend to execute? Can He have threatened *annihilation*, or *eternal torments*, to the family of man, as the fitting meed of transgression, and can He, without compromising the spotless veracity of His character, refrain from inflicting upon them what they have incurred? With *His justice*; for, can it ever require more than its due? or, after requiring it, can it recede from its demands? Can the strictness of its claims, under any circumstances whatever, admit of being passed from or dispensed with? Oh! no. The common notion of the Lord Jesus *having undergone, what we otherwise must have undergone*, proceeds upon [105] a mistaken view of the subject. It supposes God, after having made certain demands, *to have receded from the strictness of these*, in consequence of the work of Christ. This, however, is not, — cannot be, true. The atonement does not exhibit to us one divine perfection exercised at the expense of another. It does not

set at odds heaven's jarring attributes;  
And, with one excellence, another wound.

Young's *Night Thoughts*.

It is not "the language of scripture and reason, that *God's goodness should be modified by His justice*;"<sup>33</sup> nor, that "a sacrifice for sin," is solely, "a sacrifice wisely and graciously appointed by God, the moral Governor of the world, to expiate the guilt of sin, *in such a manner, as to avert the punishment of it from the offender*;"<sup>34</sup> even although an Archbishop of the [106] Established Church, should vouch for the truth of the statements. No; the atonement of Christ Jesus, is the wise and gracious method by which our Heavenly Father exhibits to us *all His attributes*, and especially *His attributes of justice and mercy*, exercised *in the fullest extent*, and yet *in the strictest harmony*. There is in it no exhibition of justice in the slightest degree abating the strictness of its demands, — no modification of goodness by justice,<sup>35</sup> — no averting from the transgressor the punishment which he has merited. But what appear in it are, the claims of justice satisfied *to the fullest extent*, — goodness *unmodified by justice*,<sup>35</sup> and yet *not in the slightest degree interfering with it*, — and mercy, so far from requiring that punishment should be averted from the transgressor, *actually requiring*, [107] *and rendered consistent with, the infliction of it upon him*. The atonement is not, as the popular divines would have it to be, a virtual declaration on God's part, *that His justice originally exacted too much from man*, — which it would be, *if after having threatened as the desert of sin, annihilation or eternal torments, He could depart from the strictness of His demands*; — but it is, on the contrary, a manifestation of *the utmost strictness of the exactions of His justice being perfectly compatible with the salvation of the sinner*, which it is, by *allowing death as the desert of sin to be inflicted upon all*, and by nevertheless *becoming the means of eternal life being extended to all*. In one word, God, in the atonement, is not seen *passing from the strictness of His threatening*, — *thereby compromising His truth and justice*; — but in it He appears *rendering the complete execution of His threatenings to the guilty*, consistent with *the extension of His mercy to them*, or, in the language of inspiration itself, *just, and yet the justifier of the ungodly*.<sup>36</sup>

<sup>31</sup> In opposition to Gen. 2:16,17; 3:19. Rom. 5:12, 6:23, &c.

<sup>32</sup> Nares' *remarks on the version of the New Testament edited by the Unitarians*, 2d edition, page 167.

<sup>33</sup> Magee *on the atonement*, Sermon 1st, London, 1801, pages 31, 32.

<sup>34</sup> Ditto, ditto, page 40. I cannot resist embracing this present opportunity of acknowledging the information and pleasure, which I have derived from the perusal of Archbishop Magee's masterly performance. To those who are commonly denominated *candidates for the holy ministry*, it is truly invaluable. That I dissent *in toto* from its author on many points, is most true; and that I particularly deplore the *conditional*, the merely "natural notions" of the subject, which induced him to represent the sacrifice of Christ as an expedient, whereby "God's fallen creatures might be again taken into His favour, *on their making themselves parties in it*," page 41, it is due to my own character for consistency to mention. But it would be worse than foolish, were I, on this account, to attempt to depreciate the very superior talents, the singular learning, evinced in the sermons themselves, and still more in the numerous and copious notes with which they are accompanied. Every person desirous to see reduced to a narrow compass, the *merits*, or rather *demerits* of the notions concerning *the atonement*, commonly entertained by Arians and Socinians, will find his wishes there completely gratified. Indeed, the mass of learning, on a variety of interesting topics, accumulated and condensed in Dr. Magee's work, is perfectly astonishing. Would to God, that this eminent man, now, alas! no more, while he so happily exposed the errors of others, had not himself fallen into errors, as gross and unscriptural, as any of those which he assailed. How melancholy to think, that he seems never to have risen higher in his views of the atonement, than to conceive of it as a scheme, which enables God to save man *by abating somewhat of the strictness of His claims*; and which, instead of rendering the salvation either of the whole or of a part of mankind absolutely certain, *merely furnishes human beings with the means, if they so please, of saving themselves*! — Were it not for the knowledge which we have, that men are in the constant habit of employing terms to which they attach little or no meaning, how apt should we be to conclude, from such a sentence as the following, that the learned Archbishop had possessed a tolerably distinct idea of the truth. "The High Priest also seems to have been selected for the solemn services of this day, as more adequately representing *the whole assembly*, in whose name he sacrificed and supplicated forgiveness; and, therefore, more properly typifying him, who, representing *the whole human race*, was to procure redemption by his blood for *the whole assembly of mankind*." Note 26, Sermon 2d, page 372.

<sup>35</sup> Men's views of divine truth may be modified in proportion as their minds become more and more enlightened, but one divine attribute can never be modified by another.

<sup>36</sup> "I suppose, first, that no one will deny that a sovereign prince, in shewing mercy to a capital convict, may either grant him a remission of all punishment, or may leave him subject to some lighter punishment: *of course, he will allow that the Almighty may act in either of these ways, with respect to sinners.* — II. I equally suppose, that no person, who is versed in the bible, will deny, that many instances occur there of *God's remitting the essential guilt of sin, and the eternal punishment due to it,* and yet leaving a temporary punishment to be endured by the penitent sinner. Thus, for example, *the sentence of spiritual death and everlasting torments, was remitted to our first father upon his repentance,* but not that of corporal death," &c. Milner's *end of religious controversy*, letter 42d, page 199, London, 1824. This is the language of a dignitary of the Roman Catholic church. With what amazing coolness, does he attack *the unchangeableness, the veracity, and the justice of God!* And Adam's repentance, too, the cause of God's thus, in the opinion of the learned prelate, *making Himself a liar!* But this is not all. The Bishop is pleased, facetiously no doubt, to assume, that "of course" all his statements, in reference to this matter, will be acquiesced in by Protestants! Verily, every day we live, we have more abundant reason to be satisfied, that the Church of Rome is not merely herself *thoroughly corrupt*, but is, likewise, *the source of almost every corruption, doctrinal and practical, existing among Protestants.* Rev. 17:5.

[108] But how is it, that in *the atonement or reconciliation*,<sup>37</sup> God appears rendering *the complete execution of the punishment threatened upon the sinner*, compatible with *his salvation*? Simply in the light of the fact, that He by whom the atonement was made, was *God manifest in the flesh.* 1 Tim. 3:16.<sup>38</sup>

<sup>37</sup> The Greek word καταλλαγή translated, *atonement*, Rom. 5:11, signifies *reconciliation*.

<sup>38</sup> I care nothing about the verbal criticisms concerning this passage, arising from different readings of the Alexandrine and other manuscripts, in which our theological small fry have chosen to disport themselves. The word may have been ὅς, or it may have been θεός. Οὐκ ὅτιδα. — 'οὐ μοι μελει. This one thing I know, that before the discovery of its having been originally written ὅς could be rendered available to Socinian purposes, the New Testament, as a whole, would require to be re-modelled.

Sufferings and death are *sin's wages*, Gen. 3:16-19; Romans 5:23: and, therefore, we ordinary human beings, as sinners, satisfy divine justice, *by suffering and dying*. But when the question comes to be, how are human beings, after *satisfying justice*, to *satisfy mercy* likewise? it will be found to be absolutely impossible, without understanding and taking into account the divine nature of the Messiah, to return a suitable answer. For, although death so far satisfies justice, that in the event of mercy being out of the question, justice would have no more to demand, — yet, if mercy is to be exercised as well as justice, it must be through a [109] medium; and a being, who by dying comes to an end, cannot be that medium. The medium cannot be *a nonentity*. It must be a being who has independent existence; — a being who, although dying, yet cannot come to an end. In one word, it must not be a being who can *satisfy justice* merely by *dying*, but one who, if I may so express myself, can *exhaust justice*, and *exhaust death*, by his *perfect righteousness of character*, and by his *possessing an existence over which death has no control*. Still farther, he must be a being to whom we are inseparably united, seeing that, otherwise, his death would be a matter in which personally we could have no concern. Now is there any being, save one, in whom these various *desiderata* meet? Certainly not. He who is *the living one*, — He whose characteristic it is that He possesses *independent, unchangeable, and everlasting existence*, — He who is *the living and the true God*, — is alone qualified to interpose as our Saviour. And this, blessed be his name, it is the object of the scriptures to inform us that Jesus has done. He is one with us, for *in him we live, and move, and have our being*. He is one with us, for *he hath been manifested in our nature*; — he *hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows*. He is one with us, for *he hath submitted to that death which all of us undergo*. At this point it is, that our hopes of life everlasting begin. Although he died, he died not, as we do, *personally sinful*; — he died not, as we do, *because he could not help dying*; — he died not, as we do, *unable by his own power to raise himself up again*. No; he



died after having exhibited [110] perfect righteousness of character in our nature, — he died, because he chose to lay down his life, — he died, able, whenever he pleased, to resume his life again. He died, not that *he might avert the stroke of justice from us*, — for that would have been to interfere with his Heavenly Father's threatenings, — but that, as possessing our nature, a nature condemned in us and voluntarily assumed by him, *he might satisfy justice along with us*. But he not merely *satisfied justice*, — a thing which by dying we ourselves who are personally guilty do, — he also did, what we who are personally guilty cannot do, he *exhausted it*. His spotless life, consummated by his voluntary death, was, to the very letter, *all that justice had to require*. When he died, not a single thing in the way of obedience, or as the expression of perfect love to God and man, remained unfulfilled. Obedience was *complete*. Justice, therefore, was *satisfied*. But, glorious fact, it was *more*, — it was *exhausted*. The death of the criminal could *satisfy it*; — perfect obedience, terminating in death, alone could *exhaust it*. But another step remained to be taken. Jesus having *exhausted justice by his obedience unto death*, required, before his death could be rendered of any avail to us, to *exhaust death itself*. A dead man, *as such*, could be of no service to other dead men. What a flood of light here bursts in upon our minds. He who died on Calvary was not *an ordinary human being*, but *the Son of God clothed with human nature*.<sup>39</sup> As such, he had an *ex-[111]istence*, independent of *that which he possessed in common with us*. Over this independent existence of his, death neither had, nor could have, any control. And this, because it was *eternal existence*; the essential character of Jesus being, that he was *the great I AM*. But as Jesus in *dying*, in *sacrificing the existence which he had in common with us*, neither affected, nor could affect *his own essential, independent, and eternal existence*, it must be obvious to the least reflecting, that *death in him came to an end*; — that *death by him was exhausted*; — that, in scriptural phraseology, *he swallowed up death in himself*. When Jesus *the living one* died, death was, as it were, *engulphed in the ocean of life*; its destruction was thereby *necessarily accomplished*. Hence the resurrection of Jesus from the dead. And this, not *to an existence like that which through dying he had brought to an end*, but, as the conqueror, the destroyer [112] of death in himself, *to the power of an endless life*. But he is *one with us*, and we are *one with him*. His resurrection, therefore, is likewise our resurrection; and as he rose again, not to a life like that which he had possessed upon earth, but to the enjoyment of eternal life, — to the enjoyment of eternal life he raises up us likewise. Thus does it appear, that we live for ever, not as having naturally any principle of eternal life in ourselves, — not as naturally deserving such a privilege, — but as one with, or inseparably united to the Being, *whose perfect righteousness of character entitled him to eternal life as his reward*; and *whose essential possession of eternal life, enabled him to exhaust or swallow up death in himself*. Such, then, is the nature of *the atonement*, or *reconciliation*, effected by Christ Jesus. It is not *an averting of the punishment deserved and threatened from the guilty*; but it is *the reconciling of those who naturally were guilty*, — who naturally were *alienated and enemies in their mind by wicked works*, and who as such were deservedly punished with death, — I say, it is the *reconciling of such to God, in the body of Christ's flesh through death*, by *presenting them, as risen with Christ*, and as consequently possessed of his nature, *holy, and unblameable, and unreprouvable in God's sight*. Coloss. 1:21,22. O! the glory of the divine perfections, as these shine forth in the cross and resurrection of Christ Jesus. Well might the poet, contemplating the amazing theme, and rapt by the nature of the subject, give vent to his feelings in such impassioned strains as these:

[113] Oh the burst gates! crush'd sting! demolish'd throne!  
 Last gasp of vanquish'd Death. Shout earth and heaven!  
 This *sum of good* to man: whose nature, then,  
 Took wing, and mounted with him from the tomb.  
 THEN, THEN, I ROSE; then first *humanity*  
 Triumphant pass'd the crystal ports of light,  
 (Stupendous guest!), and seized eternal youth,  
 Seized in *our* name. E'er since, 'tis blasphemous

To call man mortal. Man's mortality  
Was, then, transferred to death; and heaven's duration  
Unalienably seal'd to this frail frame;  
This child of dust.

Young's *Night Thoughts*; Night 4th.

<sup>39</sup> It is this fact, which explains the amazing agonies undergone, in the prospect of death, by the Son of God. He was not subjected to these sufferings, that he might undergo an equivalent for the anguish endured by those *who are eternally tormented*, as many have absurdly supposed; but he endured these excruciating tortures, because, *as a pure and holy being, it was contrary to his nature to die*. Death, which is *natural to us sinful creatures*, was, *to a sinless being like him, perfectly unnatural*; and, therefore, *if natural as it is for us to part with life*, we suffer so much in doing so, *a fortiori*, how much more intense must have been the agonies of him who, in parting with life, *did violence to his nature*? It has often been pleaded, that the possession of the divine nature by Christ Jesus, was absolutely necessary *in order to his resurrection from the dead*; but, at the present moment, I do not remember having met with any work in which it is stated, that the possession of the divine nature by him, was equally necessary *in order to his dying*. And yet if, in addition to the fact that none but a divine being *could have had a right to dispose of his life*, we consider, that, *as pure and holy*, death in the case of the Lord Jesus *was perfectly unnatural*, — that it implied on his part *the doing of violence to his nature*, — it must be evident, that his being divine, was just as necessary *to his dying*, as it was *to his rising again*. See John 10:17,18.

The view which I have now given of the atonement, completely removes the objections already alluded to. It shews us the Messiah suffering and dying, not *instead of the guilty*; — an idea which is quite at variance with the fact that *the guilty suffer and die themselves*, and which is calculated to excite suspicion *as to their personal existence hereafter*, — it being just as conceivable that a person should live and enjoy happiness for ever *instead of another*, as that he should suffer and die *instead of another*; — but, it shews us the Messiah suffering and dying *in common*, or, *along with the guilty*;<sup>40</sup> thereby, leading us, analogically, to the conclusion, that those who now are guilty, are destined to live and enjoy happiness hereafter, *in common*, or, *along with him*. Besides, it shews us the Messiah effecting the release of human beings as debtors to divine justice, not *by his paying the debt in the way in which they themselves do it*, but *by his paying that debt in a way in which they never could have done it*. The debt which [114] men owe to justice is *obedience*, and the only payment which they have to tender is *punishment*; — the Messiah, however, as man pays the debt, *in the very way, and to the full extent, required*; and, in consequence of the perfect oneness of the debtors with himself, imparting to them the benefit of his payment, he discharges them, not from the obligation to pay it in the only way in which they can do so, viz., *by punishment*, but from the necessity of paying it in the way in which they cannot do so, viz., *by personal obedience*. Or, to express myself somewhat differently. The system advocated by me, does not represent the Messiah, *if regarded as a surety*, as paying *the same debt* which those who are personally guilty do; and God as thereby exacting payment of *the same debt*, both from *the surety* and from *the debtor himself*; — a mistake which those who hold the ordinary notions of the atonement necessarily commit: — but it shews us the human race, *as personally guilty*, paying *the debt of punishment* which they have incurred; and the Messiah, *as personally righteous*, paying *the debt of obedience*, which he has voluntarily undertaken: the payment of *both debts* being absolutely necessary in order to render consistent with justice *the discharge of the debtors*; but the payment of *the latter debt* by the Son of God himself, being that alone, with which, *as having exhausted the claims of justice*, and *as having been the act of a being with whom the human race are one*, the release of all the debtors, properly speaking, stands connected.

<sup>40</sup> He was numbered WITH the transgressors. Isaiah 53:12.

[115] It will be obvious, still farther, if due attention has been paid to my statements, that upon the principles which I hold, there is no interference of one divine attribute with another. According to all

the human systems of the atonement which I have consulted, justice is more or less modified by mercy, — mercy more or less modified by justice. If, notwithstanding the atonement of the Son of God, the doctrine of eternal torments be maintained, this consequence becomes apparent even to the least intelligent mind. But according to the system which I have been engaged in developing, mercy does not begin to assert her claims, *until* the claims of justice have been fully satisfied. Justice, I have shewn, is *run out*, — is *absolutely exhausted*, — before mercy begins to exercise her sovereignty. Mercy, properly speaking, first appeared in the resurrection of the Son of God, — in conferring upon the personal body of the Messiah, assumed by him in the womb of Mary, a heavenly nature, and the enjoyment of everlasting existence. But mercy, in his case, was not displayed, until every demand of justice, even to the minutest iota, had been satisfied. *It is finished*, said the Messiah, when bowing his head, he *dismissed his Spirit*; and *then*, but *not till then*, was there an opportunity afforded for the exercise of mercy, in his own case, without any infringement on the rights of justice. And so with regard to those whom he saves. Justice in their case receives her due; — all of them paying the debt to justice which by transgression they have incurred; — and *then*, but *not till then*, are they prepared to become [116] the recipients of mercy, and to enjoy God for evermore hereafter. Whether, then, is more worthy of reception, a system which, by representing the Messiah *as having undergone something which we otherwise must have undergone*, represents God as compromising His attributes, in the very fact of bestowing upon us everlasting life; or a system which, by representing us *as undergoing all that we deserve to undergo*, and yet *as raised to the possession of everlasting life by our union with him who, by his obedience unto death, hath swallowed up death in victory*, exhibits to us *God's justice uncompromised, and yet the sinner saved*.<sup>41</sup>

<sup>41</sup> See Appendix K.

To sum up all that has been said in reference to this subject. I cannot better express the sentiments which I hold with respect to the atonement, than in the following words of Archbishop Magee; premising, that as *the enormity of sin* becomes visible only *in the light of that sacrifice which shews sin taken away*, the atonement understood, so far from exciting *any* alarm in the conscience, must be the means of removing, and removing for ever, *all* alarm from it. "What expedient could have been devised more suitable than that which has been adopted? The sacrifice of the Son of God for the sins of men — proclaiming to the world, by the greatness of the ransom, the enormity of the guilt — and thence, at the same time, evincing, in the most fearful manner, God's utter abhorrence of sin, in requiring such expiation; and the infinity of his love in appointing [117] it."<sup>42</sup> Or, if a declaration of mere human origin be objected to, take my sentiments in the following language of two inspired apostles. *God hath made him to be sin FOR US, who knew no sin; THAT we might be made the righteousness of God in him.* 2 Cor 5:21. *Christ also hath once suffered FOR sins, the just FOR the unjust, THAT he might bring us to GOD.* 1 Peter 3:18.<sup>43</sup>

<sup>42</sup> Sermon 1st, *on the atonement*, page 18.

<sup>43</sup> *For*, ὑπερ. That *for*, in the two passages last quoted, signifies, *in behalf*, or *on account of*, and not *instead of*, will, I think, be obvious to every candid and reflecting mind. Those who are accustomed to attach weight to the opinions of Schleusner, are referred to the remarks of that eminent scholar, in his lexicon, under the word ὑπερ, definitions 4th and 5th. See Appendix L.

After these remarks concerning *the nature of the work of Christ*, — which will appear an uncalled-for digression only to those whose acquaintance with the subject is superficial, — to those who have never suspected its innumerable relations, and wonderfully complicated ramifications, — I now proceed to shew, that *the interest of the whole human race in the work of Christ*, is directly and expressly asserted in various passages of scripture. Inspired declarations shall be quoted to prove, first, that the object of Christ in coming into the world was *to save all*; secondly, that he laid down his life *for all*; and, thirdly, that he is now engaged in preparing for the ultimate application of his redemption *to all*.

First. The object of Christ's coming into the world was, that *he might save the whole human race*. This is asserted by himself, in the two following passages: [118] *God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but THAT THE WORLD THROUGH HIM MIGHT BE SAVED*. John 3:17. *And if any man hear my words and believe not, I judge, or condemn, him not; for I came not to judge, or condemn, the world, but TO SAVE THE WORLD*. John 12:47.<sup>44</sup> Is it possible for language so clear and explicit as this, to be wrested from its genuine meaning, and explained away? Our blessed Lord, having twice given us his authority for believing, that he came not *to condemn* but *to save the world*, is there to be found a single human being foolhardy enough to assert, that what he himself declares *to have been his object in making his appearance upon earth*, was *not, in reality, his object in doing so*? But every one who admits, that *to save the world* was the object of the Messiah's being *manifested in the flesh*, must admit, likewise, that *this object shall be accomplished*: unless he be prepared to adopt, and maintain, the infidel proposition, that, either through the opposition of his creatures, or, through some defect in his own arrangements, the Creator may be frustrated in his designs! An alternative this, which of course no man, who has any adequate conceptions of the immutability and sovereignty of that being, whose character it is the business of the sacred volume to reveal, will venture to embrace. If, then, God sent His Son, not *to condemn*, [119] but *to save the world*, we may rest assured, that *the world by him shall be saved*. And if, as we have just seen, the salvation wrought out by the Messiah consists in his destroying death by his own death; and in his thereby rescuing from the powerful, and otherwise interminable sway of death, those who were originally the subjects and thralls of that gloomy tyrant; then, as the object of the Messiah's coming was *thus to save the world*, the world *shall be rescued from death's bondage*. And, as God cannot "palter with us in a double sense;" as He cannot

keep the word of promise to the ear,  
And break it to the hope;

He cannot mean to intimate to us, that his saving *the world*, is merely, as *the orthodox* maintain, his rescuing that world from *the bondage of death*, that he may consign it over to *a worse bondage throughout eternity*: but must intend us to understand, that his *saving the world*, is his *conferring a benefit upon it*, even *life with his Son for evermore*. — Hitherto, I have without any hesitation assumed the term *world*,<sup>45</sup> in the passages quoted, to signify *the whole human race*.<sup>46</sup> In the unbiassed mind, I cannot conceive the possibility of its calling up any other idea. Nor is it by cavilling and sophistry, that I am to be induced to alter my opinion. It will not do for opponents to allege, — as some commentators, puzzled how to reconcile the language of our blessed Lord with their own preconceived notions, [120] have done, — "that *world*, in both the passages quoted, has different significations, according as the terms *salvation* and *condemnation* stand connected with it: *the world* which is *saved*, not being *the world* which is *condemned*, or *all mankind*; but being *believers only*." Nay, "that in the former of these passages, the term *world* has actually three different meanings: *the world* into which God has sent His Son, being *the material universe*; *the world* which he came not to condemn, being *the whole human race*; and *the world* which he saves, being *his own people*." For, besides that all this is a bare-faced begging of the question, and represents God as, like a juggler with his cups and balls, trifling with the understandings of those whom he addresses, it so happens, that the distinction contended for, has not the shadow of a foundation in the phraseology of either of the passages quoted. Suppose me to read the former of them thus: *God sent not his Son into the world*, or, among mankind, *to condemn the world*, or mankind; *but that the world*, or mankind, *through him might be saved*. And the latter thus: *I came not to judge*, or condemn, *the world*, or mankind; *but to save the world*, or mankind. Does not the fact, that so far from requiring to suppose a single alteration in the meaning of the term *world*, in the different members of the two sentences quoted, I am able to understand it in the same sense throughout, — and that sense one, which is strictly consistent with its meaning, both in profane authors, and in other passages of scripture, — of itself afford a most decided and satisfactory [121] proof of the correctness of my interpretation? And if, in addition to this, we take into account the fact, that one reason why

Jesus *came not to condemn the world* was, that *the world*, or mankind in general, *was under condemnation already*, — does not the proof, that *world* here signifies *mankind in general*, rise almost to certainty?<sup>47</sup> The truth is that men, aye, and some of these sensible men too, would never have had recourse to *mere assertion* in a case of this kind, if they could have adduced *arguments* in support of their peculiar notions. How strong must be the influence of prejudice and party spirit, when it can induce those, who are unable to help perceiving and acknowledging, that *the world* among whom Christ came was *the human race*, and that *the world* whom he found condemned was *the human race*, — to prefer doing violence to language, as well as to their own consciences, rather than admit, that the world whom Christ saves is *the human race likewise*. But are we to permit men to put an [122] arbitrary meaning of their own, upon language which the Holy Ghost himself has condescended to define? Certainly not. If, as all must allow, the same term is applied to those *whom Christ came to save*, which is applied to those *whom he found condemned*; and if those whom he found condemned were *the whole human race*; then, in spite of all that petty cavilling criticism can say, we are authorised, nay absolutely compelled to draw the conclusion, that those whom he came to save were *the whole human race likewise*.

<sup>44</sup> It is the same Greek verb, κρίνω, which is translated *judge* in this passage, and *condemn* in the former. Dr. Campbell employs *condemn*, as the translation of the word in both passages. By Schleusner κρίνω is considered equivalent in both cases to *punish*. See his Lexicon, ap. verb. No. 6.

<sup>45</sup> κόσμος.

<sup>46</sup> Vid. Schleusner, ap. verb. κόσμος, No. 6.

<sup>47</sup> Although it is true that Jesus *did not come to condemn the world*, yet there is a sense in which the condemnation of those who believe not *has been aggravated by his coming*. John 3:18-20. This appears in the fact, that every man who hears of Christ without believing in him, has thereby a light thrown upon his natural transgressions, so much stronger than that to which they would otherwise have been subjected, that *the sense of condemnation*, in which, properly speaking, *all condemnation consists*, is in him necessarily increased. See verse 19. Perhaps the proper way of viewing and expressing the matter is, not that the condemnation of any human being has in reality been aggravated by Christ's coming, — in which case *Christ would have come to condemn the world*, — but, that the amazing extent of the condemnation under which human beings naturally do labour, and which otherwise would have remained unknown, has, in consequence of his coming, been brought to light and made manifest. *They are condemned already*.

Secondly. The voluntary submission to death of the Son of God, by which, as we have seen, *he swallowed up or exhausted death*, and *became the channel of conveying everlasting life*, took place in behalf of *the whole family of man*. A few quotations from scripture will suffice to prove this point. *He is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for the sins of THE WHOLE WORLD*. 1 John 2:2. *Who gave himself a ransom FOR ALL*. 1 Tim. 2:6. *For, therefore, we both labour and suffer reproach, because we trust in the living God, WHO IS THE SAVIOUR OF ALL MEN, specially of those that believe*.<sup>48</sup> 4:10. *We see Jesus who was made a little lower than the angels, for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honour; that he, by the grace of God, SHOULD TASTE DEATH FOR EVERY MAN*.<sup>49</sup> Heb. 2:9. [123] But, not to fill my pages with extracts which any one that pleases may read in the sacred volume itself, the following language, selected by me as one of the mottos of this chapter, is so explicit and unambiguous, that I am content to peril the cause which I advocate upon it alone. *Therefore, as by the offence of one, judgment came UPON ALL MEN to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one, the free gift came UPON ALL MEN unto justification of life*.<sup>50</sup> Rom. 5:18. Strange to tell, these plain and straightforward declarations of the word of God, have produced no other effect on the minds of the generality of religious characters, than a disposition to try what ingenuity can effect, in explaining away their meaning. Were it not that the subject is rather too serious to permit the indulgence of such a feeling, much [124] amusement might be derived from a consideration of the glosses, to which both Arminians and Calvinists have had recourse, in order to make the language of

the passages quoted, and of others couched in similar terms, bend to their respective systems. To take one of the passages quoted, 1 John 2:2, by way of an example. "The death of Christ was a propitiation for the sins of the whole world, or *of every man*," says the Arminian; "but whether *any particular individual* of the family of man is to have a personal interest in that event, *must depend entirely on his acceptance of the terms, on which eternal life is proposed to him*." "The death of Christ was unquestionably a propitiation for the sins of the whole world," says the Calvinist; "but by the term *world* here, we are to understand *believers of the truth*, and not *mankind in general*." It is in vain to suggest to the former, that, by his gloss, the necessity for the death of Christ *as a propitiation* is completely superseded; seeing that, upon his principles, every man who attains to the enjoyment of eternal life, is, in reality, *his own Saviour!* And it is equally in vain to suggest to the latter, that by the expression, *not for our sins only, but also for the sins of the whole world*, the apostle, although distinguishing between *those who had like precious faith with himself*, and *mankind in general*, intended nevertheless to intimate, that what constitutes *a propitiation for the one*, constitutes also *a propitiation for the other*. No; Arminians and Calvinists are both contented to blunder on: the one reducing the propitiation of Christ to *a mere name*, by representing that [125] which scripture ascribes to *the finished work of the Creator*, as after all *performed by the creature himself*; and the other perverting the language of the apostle, by representing him as ascribing *limited wisdom, power, and love, to the Creator!* The minds of both are *earthly*, and, therefore, *limited to natural apprehensions of the divine character*; but they evince the state in which they are in different ways: the *earthly, natural, and limited* minds of the one, being unable to conceive how God can save *any man freely*; and the *earthly, natural, and limited* minds of the other, how God can save *all men*. Uninfluenced by the erroneous notions and practices of both, it is the business of us who know the truth, to take scripture as it lies before us; and amidst all our attempts to explain its language, and comprehend its meaning, to be ever on our guard against contending for one view, or one attribute of the divine character, at the expense of another. The first principle which we are bound to carry along with us, and act upon at every step of our researches and investigations into the sacred volume, is, that we ourselves are beings *of limited understandings*, to whom a being *of unlimited understanding* is, through the medium of human language, *condescending to submit certain views of his character*. A second principle, indeed a conclusion from the other, is, that as one grand distinction between our minds, and the mind of God, consists in this, that ours are *limited*, and that His is *unlimited*, it clearly follows, that language which, literally interpreted, would imply *the limitation* of the divine attributes, must be under-[126]stood as accommodated to *the limited structure, and modes of thinking, of our minds*; whereas language which represents these attributes as *unlimited*, must be understood as *according to the reality of things*. Hence, although we may rightly enough suspect, that expressions concerning the divine attributes, which, literally taken, are *limited* in their import and application, may after all have *a wider range* than at first sight they appear to have; we are never entitled to give *a limited scope* to expressions concerning those, which carry upon the face of them *an unlimited signification*. If I meet with passages of scripture which intimate, that God cherishes love towards *His believing people*; while I am satisfied of the truth of this, I may rightly enough suspect, that His love is in reality of *a more comprehensive nature*, than it would be if confined to *those who know His name here*: but, if I meet with passages which intimate that He cherishes love towards *all mankind*, I am not entitled to *put limits* upon the meaning of such passages, and to represent His love as in reality of *a less comprehensive nature*, than He himself has represented it to be. Thus, then, as a being *of limited understanding*, addressed by a Being *whose understanding is unlimited*, in the first place, I must learn to distinguish between language accommodated to the natural structure of my mind, and therefore *limited*; and language calculated and intended to let in upon me a glimpse of the reality of things, and therefore *unlimited*: and, in the second place, I must remember, that it is not *by standing still at lower and less comprehensive* [127] *views of the divine attributes*, but *by having my mind enlarged so as to take in more comprehensive views of these*, that my mind becomes more and more assimilated to the mind of God himself. As a follower of the Lamb, I rejoice in the love

borne towards myself, and my fellow believers. *Behold what manner of love the Father hath bestowed UPON US, that WE should be called the Sons of God.* 1 John 3:1. But however enlarged may be the views of the divine character, implied in the knowledge of *the love which God hath borne towards us in particular*, these views are nevertheless susceptible of still further enlargement. There is afforded to us a certain measure of the knowledge of God's love, when we are informed that *God loved us, and*, as the manifestation of His love, *sent His son to be the propitiation for our sins*: but there is afforded to us a still larger measure of that knowledge, when we are informed, that *he is the propitiation not for our sins only, but also for the sins of the whole world*. Who can deny, that to regard Jesus as *a propitiation for our sins only*, is to take *a more limited view* of the extent of the divine love, than to regard Jesus as *a propitiation for the sins of the whole world*? And, if the principle be correct, that *limited views of the divine character and attributes*, are accommodated to *the limited nature of the human mind*; whereas *unlimited views of these* are according to *the reality of things*; can we have any difficulty in determining, whether passages which represent God's love to be *unlimited*, are to be explained by such as appear to represent it to be *limited*; or, [128] passages which appear to represent it to be *limited*, are to be explained by such as represent it to be *unlimited*? Whether passages in which truth is brought out *in the way of accommodation to our limited faculties*, are to explain those in which it is set before us *according to the reality of things*; or, *vice versa*? I should feel ashamed of myself, were I to suppose it necessary to return a formal answer to these questions. How much more sensibly as well as scripturally, then, do men act, when, instead of exerting a perverted ingenuity in attempts to explain away the meaning of passages, in which *the world or mankind in general* are spoken of as *interested in the work of Christ*; and to bring them within the scope of other passages which, *literally interpreted*, have a *limited signification*; they, on the contrary, take all the passages of scripture which appear to give *limited views of the love of God*, and seek for their explanation in those other passages, which speak of *that love as in reality unlimited*.

<sup>48</sup> The ordinary Calvinistic comment upon this text, that σωτηρ here signifies not *Saviour* but *Preserver*, has too much the air of having been got up to serve a purpose, to produce any impression upon a reflecting mind. It is only not quite so bad, as the Arminian notion of Christ being the *Saviour* of immense numbers, *whom, nevertheless, he punishes with eternal torments*.

<sup>49</sup> The Greek phrase here is merely ὑπὲρ παντός. But what other English word than *man* can, with propriety and consistently with the scope of the apostolic argument, be supplied? Would not objections of a kind much stronger than those which have been brought against the word which our translators, who certainly were neither Arminians nor Universalists, have made use of, lie against any other that could be suggested? Unless, indeed, the phrase ὑπὲρ παντός mean, *on account of every thing*, and be understood to have been employed by the apostle for the purpose of intimating, that, by the death of the Messiah, *every thing that exists* has been rescued from *the bondage of corruption*, Rom. 8:21, Rev. 21:3-5; a version which would render the meaning *still more universal* than at present it appears to be. As it is not to my present purpose, I pass over, with simply mentioning it, a remarkable reading of this verse, which is found in some manuscripts, and is of great antiquity, χωρὶς θεοῦ, instead of χάριτι θεοῦ.

<sup>50</sup> It is of no consequence to my present argument, whether we read this passage as it stands in the common version, or translate it, as is done by M'Knight: *as through one offence, sentence came UPON ALL MEN to condemnation, even so through one righteousness, sentence came UPON ALL MEN to justification of life*: for the important fact, that εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους, *upon all men*, occurs in both parts of the contrast, is not, by any variety of rendering, to be got over. M'Knight's admissions, when commenting on the 19th verse, are worth attending to.

Thirdly. That the work in which Christ is now engaged, has for its object ultimately *the salvation or happiness of the whole human race*, is expressly asserted in such passages of the sacred volume as the following. *He must reign till he hath put ALL ENEMIES under his feet.* 1 Corinth. 15:25. *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.* 2 Corinth. 5:18,19. *Having made known*



unto us the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure, which he hath purposed in himself; [129] *that in the dispensation of the fulness of times, he might gather together in one ALL THINGS in Christ, both WHICH ARE IN HEAVEN AND WHICH ARE IN EARTH, even in him; in whom ALSO WE have obtained an inheritance, &c.* Ephesians 1:9-11. *For it pleased the Father that in him should all fulness dwell, and, (having made peace by the blood of his cross), by him to reconcile ALL THINGS unto himself.* Coloss. 1:19,20. *Wherefore 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; — and that EVERY TONGUE should confess, that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.*<sup>51</sup> Phil. 2:9-11. *This is good and acceptable in the sight of God OUR Saviour; who will have ALL MEN to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth.*<sup>52</sup> 1 Tim. 2:3,4. From these passages, taken together, we gather the following most important truth. That the object at which God is aiming, and which, through the work of Christ, He is engaged in accomplishing, is the saving [130] of *the world, or mankind*; and this, by the reconciliation of *the world, or mankind*, to Himself. It is impossible, consistently with any regard to the rules of fair reasoning and sound criticism, to represent the subjugation of *all enemies* — the reconciling of *the world* — the reconciling of *all things* — the causing of *every knee* to bow, and of *every tongue* to confess to God — and, above all, the will of God that *all men* shall be saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth — as intimating nothing more, than an intention on God's part to reconcile, and save, *only a few of the human race*. "But," it may be alleged, "the whole human race are not reconciled and saved. Many of them never hear the word of reconciliation at all; and of those to whose ears it comes, numbers attach no credit to it. How, then, can your view of the meaning of the texts quoted by you be correct?" I grant cheerfully, that *the whole human race* are not reconciled and saved *while on earth*. No man can be reconciled and saved, except *by being brought to the knowledge of God's character*; and the knowledge of God's character is *confined now to a very few*. But when I find the inspired writers declaring, that it is God's intention to reconcile and save *all mankind*, instead of allowing the fact of that event not taking place *here* to militate against my belief of *the divine purpose being accomplished*, I merely conclude, that what is not carried into effect *now*, God will carry into effect *at some æra or period still future*. And, Oh! how beautifully constructed, and how well arranged, with a view to this result, are all the parts of the glorious [131] system, which the Messiah is now engaged in administering! The moment we understand, that *the ultimate reconciliation of the whole human race* to his Heavenly Father, is the object at which Jesus is aiming, how clearly do we perceive the reason, why, at the period of his ascending up on high, *he did not bring this present world, or present state of things, to an end*. The complete manifestation of himself constitutes the means by which the world is *ultimately to be reconciled unto God*; — but this complete manifestation of himself requires *a progressive diffusion of knowledge, or a progressive advancement of his kingdom upon earth*; — therefore, had Jesus, brought this present world to an end, at the time when he took his seat on his Father's throne, as he would thereby have left himself destitute of *that gradual development of his character, which was to take place through the medium of the New Testament Dispensation*, he would actually have deprived himself of *the very materials, which it was requisite for him to employ, in the reconciliation of the family of man*. With the utmost propriety, therefore, is God said to be *even now reconciling the world, or, all mankind, unto Himself*. He is not only *now reconciling one human being after another* to Himself, *by the manifestation of the truth to the consciences of individuals*; but, *by every addition which He is thus making to the number of His believing people here, no less than by every other step which He takes in the course of His adorable providence*, He is furnishing Himself with materials for *complete self-manifestation*, and consequently for *the complete reconciliation* [132] *of every human being to Himself hereafter*. Every descendant of Adam, brought to the knowledge of the truth upon earth, is not only thereby *personally reconciled to God*, but he becomes, likewise, a part of the very materials, by which it is God's intention finally *to manifest His own character to the whole human race*; and thereby, finally, *to effect their reconciliation to Himself*. Most appropriately, therefore, does the language of the inspired writer, that *God is in Christ reconciling the world, and reconciling all*



*things unto Himself*, indicate the progressive nature, and progressive development of the glorious scheme of salvation; and admirably adapted for *the complete reconciliation of the world ultimately*, does the work in which the Messiah is now engaged appear to be. A world originally, without a single exception, opposed to him, is subjected to his sway; — to some of this world, *even now*, he makes himself known, thereby, *even now*, reconciling *them* to God; — and at last, after his almighty power, and other attributes, have been exhibited to as great an extent as they can be, during the subsistence of this present world, — by the universal diffusion of divine truth, and by the subduing to himself of *men of every kindred, and tribe, and people, and nation*, — he brings this present state of things to an end; and employs the manifestation of himself which he had afforded *here*, as the means of manifesting himself *to all*, and thereby of reconciling *all* to his Heavenly Father *hereafter*. Must not Calvinists who, by their creed, are such decided sticklers for the fulfilment of the divine purposes, be [133] constrained to admit, that as, according to the views which I hold, the will of God *to save all men*, and *bring them to the knowledge of the truth*, is in no respect whatever frustrated, — which it must be on their own system, no less than on that of their friends, the Arminians, — I am, at least, entitled to the credit of not representing God *as willing, or intending, what He does not perform*.

<sup>51</sup> Let me entreat the reader to examine carefully Isaiah 45:22,23, from which this passage in Philippians is a quotation.

<sup>52</sup> Or, *who WILLETH that ALL MEN be saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth*. Ος παντας ανθρωπους ΘΕΛΕΙ σωθηναι, και, κ. τ. λ. The force of the *θελει, willeth*, is lost in our version. Dr. M'Knight labours hard to prove, that the word here signifies, not *willeth*, but *commandeth*. Laying out of view various other objections which I have to the position of the learned and industrious critic, it is sufficient in confutation of it to observe, that the 3d and 4th verses of this chapter, contain the motive to the performance of the duty exhorted to in the 1st and 2d; and that if it be not the divine will *to save all*, we are deprived of the inducement *to pray for all*; it never certainly being the duty of any man, to pray for that *which is notoriously opposed to the will of God*.

## [134] CHAPTER VII.

### ETERNAL PUNISHMENT HOW COMPATIBLE WITH ETERNAL LIFE.

The truth is, that as life and death, mercy and wrath, are matters of mere understanding or knowledge, *all men's salvation*, and *some men's perdition*, are things so opposite, *that whatsoever doth affirm the one, must necessarily deny the other*. GOD HIMSELF CANNOT EFFECT BOTH, OR DETERMINE THAT BOTH SHALL BE.

HOOKE's Ecclesiastical Polity.

There are more things in Heaven and Earth, Horatio,  
Than are dream'd of in your Philosophy.

SHAKSPEARE's Hamlet.

Enough has been said for the establishment of my position, that *it is the ultimate destiny of the whole human race, to possess everlasting life, and thereby to enjoy everlasting happiness*. But as yet only half my work has been accomplished. There are many parts of scripture which appear to be at variance with the view which I [135] have been presenting, and the current of popular opinion runs strongly against it. It becomes necessary for me, therefore,

IN THE SECOND PLACE, TO SHEW, HOW IT IS, THAT PASSAGES OF THE SACRED VOLUME, WHICH EITHER DIRECTLY ASSERT, OR INDIRECTLY IMPLY, THE FINAL HAPPINESS OF THE WHOLE FAMILY OF MAN, ARE RECONCILED WITH OTHER PASSAGES

OF THE SAME BOOK, WHICH MAINTAIN THE EVERLASTING PUNISHMENT OF THE WICKED.

As a suitable introduction to this part of the subject, and in order to obviate all misapprehensions with regard to my meaning, I readily make the following concessions.

1. That only he who believeth on the name of the Son of God *hath everlasting life*. If it is the declaration of our blessed Lord, that *God sent not His Son into the world to condemn the world*, it is his declaration likewise, that God's object in giving His Son was, that *whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have everlasting life*. And in the spirit of this latter declaration, the beloved apostle has laid it down as an incontrovertible position, that *he that hath, or believeth on, the Son, hath life; and he that hath not, or believeth not on, the Son of God, hath not life*. 1 John 5:12. Nor are we left without an explanation of the reason of this great diversity in the state and circumstances of believers and unbelievers; for the Lord Jesus, in his [136] intercessory prayer to his Heavenly Father, has given us to understand, that *eternal life* actually consists in *knowing*, or believing in, *the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom He hath sent*. John 17:3. See also 1 John 5:20. Since, then, *none possess eternal life*, but *such as possess the knowledge of God*, which is communicated to the mind through the knowledge of Christ Jesus, John 14:7,9; and since *all do not possess this knowledge of God*; it incontestibly follows, that *all do not possess eternal life*.

2. I admit, that at the consummation of all things, there will be *a final judgment of the whole human race*. I say *final* judgment; for God's condemnation of the wicked, and approbation of the righteous, is not confined to "the winding up of the drama of this world's history." From the beginning of time until now, and from henceforward until time shall be no more, God has been, is, and will be, *judging the world in righteousness*. A judgment of condemnation accompanied the first transgression of our common progenitors, the judgment having been pronounced, by their own consciences applying to themselves the righteous threatening issued to them by God, while they were in a state of innocence; — a judgment of approbation was the result of their believing the first promise, in which the certain and complete victory of the woman's seed, over the serpent and his seed, was unconditionally proclaimed to them. Since their time, the state of matters has been exactly the same. The posterity of Adam, as soon as they are capable of apprehending the distinction between good [137] and evil, are all self-convicted of violating the dictates of their own consciences, whether more or less enlightened; and are all constrained, thereby, to pronounce upon themselves sentence of condemnation. *Their consciences bear witness* to the fact, that these *thoughts* of theirs which sometimes *excuse*, are just as frequently found *accusing* them. Rom. 2:15. On the other hand, such of Adam's posterity as are brought to apprehend *the truth as it is in Jesus*, being satisfied, that *God hath made him who knew no sin to be sin for them*, — that *Jesus hath taken away sin by the sacrifice of himself*, — and that *they are washed from their sins in his precious blood*, — are satisfied likewise, that, notwithstanding the number and enormity of their transgressions, *they are freely accepted in the beloved*, and thus, being *justified by faith, they have peace with God through the Lord Jesus Christ*. Now the final judgment is neither more nor less, than the ratification of the judgments pronounced in their own consciences, by unbelievers and believers respectively, during the period of their abode upon earth. He whose conscience remains the seat of condemnation while he is an inhabitant of this world, will find that this condemnation was no vain matter, when standing before Him who occupies the throne; — while he whose conscience, enlightened by the gospel, *even now* pronounces him to be approved and accepted of in God's sight, on the footing of his union with the Son of God, will have this sentence of approbation and acceptance reiterated *hereafter*, by his Divine Master.

[138] 3. I have no hesitation in admitting, that *the wicked shall be everlastingly punished*. This admission I make, not in an ambiguous and equivocal sense, but *understanding the word everlasting in its ordinary and literal acceptance*. It is impossible for me to overlook the fact, that in the very same

sentence in which everlasting duration is predicated concerning the happiness of the righteous, everlasting duration is ascribed likewise to the punishment of the wicked. Mat. 25:46. And if no period can be assigned when there shall be a termination of the one, no more can any period be assigned when there shall be a termination of the other. Far be it from me to depreciate the labours of those able and learned men, who have proved by an irresistible mass of evidence, that the Words עולם and αἰώνιος, translated *everlasting*, frequently have in the scriptures *a limited extent of meaning*.<sup>53</sup> That *everlasting* is ascribed to *the Old Testament dispensation*, — to *the possession of the land of Canaan by the Jews*, — and to *the hills*, — all of which we know, either *have come*, or *will come to an end*. But I beg leave to observe, that in every one of these cases, the subjects of which *everlasting duration* is predicated, *although limited in themselves*, are employed *as the types of, and as connected with, something which is in reality unlimited*. The Old Testament dispensation was not merely the type of the New, but of a state of existence which is future and permanent; — the possession of the land of Canaan by the Jews typified not merely New Testament privileges, but the last-[139]ing pleasures and enjoyments of the heavenly state; — and not only the hills, but the whole of *the heavens and the earth which now are*, by their permanence hitherto, serve to shadow forth, and are destined at some period yet future to be changed into, *new heavens and a new earth*, which are to be created *superior to the possibility of dissolution*. This, then, being the case, although I am well aware that there is a sense, and that a very important one too, in which the happiness of the righteous, and the punishment of the wicked, may both be spoken of as *everlasting*, with a reference merely to *the certain and abiding connection* which subsists between *righteousness and peace* on the one hand, and *sin and misery* on the other, *during the passage of human beings through this present state*, — I am nevertheless obliged, as a man of candour, and as acquainted with the scriptures, to admit, that the term *everlasting* is *properly* applicable to a state of things *which cannot know any termination*, — a state of things in *which neither the happiness of the righteous, nor the punishment of the wicked, shall come to an end*.

<sup>53</sup> See Appendix M.

Some of my readers, who have advanced thus far, will, it is probable, here be tempted to throw down my book, exclaiming; "After such admissions as these, what can the man be contending for? Has he not conceded to us our main positions, and what more can we desire? Besides, can the sentiments of a person who thus deliberately stultifies himself, be worth troubling ourselves any farther about?"

[140] Stop, my good friends, I pray you, and try for once at least in your lives to reflect. Are you never to get rid of that superficial mode of treating the scriptures, — of that childish kind of divinity, — which, because it has obtained a glimpse of some particular view of the character or procedure of the Supreme Being, is ready to fancy, forsooth, that it has reached the *ultima Thule* of theological discovery? Has it never struck you, that the stores of divine knowledge contained in the scriptures are, from their very nature, perfectly unexhaustible;<sup>54</sup> — that the discovery of any one relation in which the Creator stands to His creatures, however important it may be, should, instead of superseding farther enquiry, be the means of encouraging and stimulating to increased and more ardent researches; — and that the effect which his amazing knowledge of the divine character had upon an inspired apostle was, not to induce him to slacken his exertions, or stop short in his career, but *to count not himself to have already attained, or to be already perfect*; and, under the influence of this consideration, *to forget those things which were behind, and to reach forth unto those things which were before*?<sup>55</sup> Or, if the example of an inspired apostle should have but little weight with you, permit me to remind you of the fable in which two knights, after quarrelling respecting the colour of a shield, — the one contending that it was white, and the other as strenuously insisting that it was black, — are represented as, to their great [141] surprise, making the discovery, that it was actually of both colours: and permit me farther to ask you, if, as its moral, this fable can have failed to suggest to you the idea, that there may be more things in religion, than have hitherto "been dream't of in your philosophy?" But supposing myself to address readers who are rather more teachable, and whose heads are of a somewhat more logical cast, than are

those of the classes of religionists with whom one is commonly brought into contact, I now proceed to set before them *what is actually implied* in the foregoing admissions.

<sup>54</sup> Psalm 36:5,6; Ephes. 3:17-19.

<sup>55</sup> Phil. 3:12,13.

1. I have admitted, and proved from scripture, that *none but those who believe on the name of the Son of God HAVE everlasting life*. I now remark farther, that if such human beings as do not believe the truth are destined to exist in this present world only, the fact of their not believing the truth is *of itself* conclusive as to *the impossibility* of their ever, under any form or circumstances, *possessing everlasting life*. But the moment it is understood, that *those who now believe not* are to exist in a future state as well as *those who now believe*, the fact of the *former* not possessing eternal life *here*, does not *of itself* constitute a sufficient warrant for our concluding, that they shall not, because they cannot, possess eternal life *hereafter*. For, it is only in the event of the circumstances in which those who do not believe the truth exist *here*, being in all respects and precisely the same as those in which they shall exist *hereafter*, that we are authorized to apply to them [142] *as existing in a future state*, a principle which, without doubt, is applicable to them as existing in this present one. To explain myself a little more fully. I am free to admit, that if, at the close of time, unbelievers were to be raised from their graves *exactly* as they died, — with bodies and minds *exactly* such as those which they possessed while on earth, — it might be argued with propriety, that as they were ignorant of God, and consequently not possessed of eternal life *while on earth*, so they might, under the circumstances supposed, continue ignorant of God's character, and consequently destitute of eternal life, *in a future state*. But, although we are fairly entitled to argue from certain circumstances *hereafter*, to a state of things similar to that which stands connected with the same circumstances *here*, yet the moment that any of the circumstances *hereafter* are supposed to be different from what they are *here*, that moment must we, if possessed of any capability of reflection or reasoning, perceive, that from *different circumstances*, it is impossible to argue to the *same result*. If the unbelieving world, instead of being raised from their graves *exactly* as they die, with bodies and minds *exactly* such as they have while on earth, are, on the contrary, by the admission of our antagonists themselves, destined to be raised with *bodies fitted to exist for ever*, — which certainly as at present constituted *their bodies are incapable of doing*, — and with *minds fitted to comprehend vastly more than they are now capable of comprehending*, who sees not, that although, circumstanced as they are upon earth, unbe-[143]lievers do not understand the character of God, and consequently do not possess eternal life, it does not follow that, differently circumstanced as they shall be in a future state, they shall then be equally incapable of attaining to that blessing?<sup>56</sup> It is the knowledge of this fact which obliges me to express myself, as scripture itself does, that *he who believeth HATH everlasting life*; a proposition which, although negatively equivalent to a declaration that *he who believeth not HATH NOT everlasting life*, nevertheless *of itself* concludes nothing as to such persons *having or not having* everlasting life in a future state; but leaves that matter to be ascertained and settled otherwise. In admitting, that *only those who believe have eternal life*, my language has a reference to *this present state*, and to *this present state merely*.

<sup>56</sup> I scarcely know a theological work exhibiting greater metaphysical acuteness than *Butler's analogy of natural and revealed religion*; nor one which, being constructed upon *natural principles*, and having succeeded in bringing down truth to the level of *the natural mind*, has necessarily obtained more admirers. But notwithstanding all the sagacity, and amazing closeness of reasoning, by which it is distinguished, how trifling do many of its most laboured conclusions appear to the Christian to be, when he considers, that whatever *analogies* may exist between time and eternity, the *contrasts* between the one and the other are much more striking, and much more frequently insisted upon in the word of God.

2. I have admitted, in consequence of numberless declarations to that effect contained in the sacred volume, that *there is a future and final judgment of the whole human race*. In this admission it is implied, first, that every member of Adam's family is, at a period yet future, to appear before the throne

of God, *to be judged for the deeds done in the body*; and, secondly, that a sentence agreeable to, and confirmatory of, the [144] sentence of approbation or condemnation pronounced already in the court of conscience, during the period of men's abode upon earth, is to pass on them, when assembled on that interesting and solemn occasion. Those who, through faith in the divine testimony respecting the character and work of the Messiah, enjoyed the conviction of acceptance with God *here*, shall have this conviction ratified *hereafter*; while those who, through ignorance of and unbelief in the declarations of the gospel, remained obnoxious to a sense of condemnation *here*, shall have this condemnation likewise ratified *hereafter*. So far, both my Arminian and Calvinistic readers, will be able to go along with me. But they are not prepared, I suspect, for a view of the subject which I am now about to suggest to them; and this, through the medium of the following questions: Does a sense of condemnation *under all circumstances*, and *necessarily*, imply *a dread of the divine displeasure*? Or, *are not circumstances conceivable*, in which the strongest and most decided sense of condemnation *may stand connected with*, nay, *may flow from*, *such a discovery of the divine character as reconciles the mind to God*? I have admitted, it will be observed, *the condemnation hereafter* of those *who now believe not*; nay, I admit, that *their condemnation hereafter is final and complete*; but what I want to know is, does this *final and complete condemnation of theirs*, necessarily imply *their everlasting subjection thenceforward to the marks and effects of the divine displeasure*? Now, whether my antagonists have or have not observed the fact, it is [145] nevertheless true, that not only *are circumstances conceivable*, but that *there actually are circumstances* connected with this present world, in which *the highest state of condemnation implies*, not *the continuance*, but *the removal of a sense of the divine displeasure*. — To confine myself to two of these. — The experience of every man, who has been brought to the knowledge of the gospel, furnishes us with one proof of the truth of this position. In a natural state, his mind was the seat of condemnation, in consequence of his inability to avoid violating the dictates of natural conscience; and yet the sense of condemnation in him, however keen, was never complete; having been, from time to time, blunted and modified, by the excuses which conscience was continually suggesting in its own behalf, Rom. 2:15. The first complete view of *his own state of condemnation* which he ever had, was actually *at the moment of his believing the gospel*, and *through the medium of his believing it*. The same blood of Jesus which, when believed in by him, *spoke peace to his conscience*, by shewing him *all his transgressions by means of it washed away*, also carried home *a sense of thorough condemnation to his mind*, by shewing him *the dreadful enormity of sin as having required such an expiation*. Whatever, therefore, might have been *his sense of condemnation formerly*, strange to the natural mind as the proposition may appear, it was actually nothing in comparison of *the sense of condemnation produced in him, by the first view imparted to him of the finished work of Christ Jesus*. Thus, then, in the case of every person [146] brought to the knowledge of the gospel, it appears most remarkably, that *the strongest sense of self-condemnation* which can be felt upon earth, so far from implying *the continuance of the divine displeasure*, actually implies *the removal of it*: for, observe, that it is by the very same view of God's character which *shews His displeasure taken away*, and thereby *pacifies the conscience*, that *this complete sense of self-condemnation* is produced. — A second instance of *complete self-condemnation*, implying, not *the continuance*, but *the passing away of the divine displeasure*, is set before us in those scriptures which respect the future history of the Jews. We are taught by prophecy to look forward to a period when, *as a nation*, the Jews shall acknowledge Jesus of Nazareth, whom their fathers crucified, to have been the long promised Messiah. But is this national acknowledgement of theirs, to be attended with no compunctious visitings, — no feelings and expressions of self-condemnation, — on their part? So far from that, in almost every passage in which their future voluntary subjection to the Lord Jesus is spoken of, grief, remorse, and the deepest self-humiliation, on account of their long protracted and uncompromising opposition to his claims, are represented as characterising them at that eventful period. At present they are, in some respects, self-condemned; as witness their oft repeated confessions of having incurred the divine displeasure by their offences: but this is nothing in comparison of that

sense of self-condemnation, which shall be the result of their conviction, that Jesus of Nazareth is the Messiah. [147] Joyful as, in reality, the removal of the veil from the hearts of Israel shall be, God has declared, *that they shall come with weeping, and that with supplications will he lead them*, Jeremiah 31:9; and that *when they look on him whom they have pierced, they shall mourn for him*, Zechar. 12:10. Let it be observed then, that, in the case of the Jews likewise, *the sense of complete self-condemnation*, is to spring from *the very same view by which their consciences are pacified*. — It being thus evident, from what happens to every private Christian, when he is brought to the knowledge of the truth, — and likewise from what is to happen to the Jews, when as a nation they shall be convinced of Jesus of Nazareth being the Messiah, — that *the clearest apprehensions of the divine justice*, and *the completest self-condemnation* on the part of men *while on earth*, so far from implying *a sense of the continuance of the divine displeasure*, on the contrary imply a view of God as *taking iniquity away*, — as *receiving graciously and loving freely*, Hosea 14:2,4; what, pray, is the inference to which, analogically, we are conducted, respecting *the condemnation at the final judgment of those who now are wicked*. I admit, that the apprehensions of the divine justice then attained to by them, shall be of the clearest and distinctest kind; and that the sentence of self-condemnation, so frequently pronounced upon them by their own consciences while on earth, shall then be completely ratified and confirmed to them: but, if analogy be worth any thing, can these clear views of justice, — can this complete sense of self-condemnation, — [148] be consistent with *a sense of the continuance of the divine displeasure towards them*? Why, if what happens to believers upon earth, and what is to happen to the Jews, are to guide us in coming to a decision with regard to this matter, we must conclude, that *a complete view of God's justice*, and *a complete sense of self-condemnation*, can only, at the final judgment, be carried home to the consciences of those who now believe not, *by their, then, attaining to the knowledge of God's real character*; or, in other words, *by their, then, being enabled to see Him cherishing sentiments of love towards them, through His Son*. — But, if unwilling to yield to analogy, will my opponents have the goodness, if they can, to answer, consistently with scripture and at the same time with their own theory, the following questions: — Can any sinful intelligent being acquire *complete* apprehensions of the divine justice, (and without acquiring *complete* apprehensions of this attribute, he cannot perceive *the full extent* of his own guilt and condemnation), without becoming acquainted likewise with the other divine attributes, or with the divine character as a whole? and can any such being become acquainted with the divine character, which is LOVE, without finding it to speak peace to his conscience? Nay, as *the knowledge of God* is expressly declared *to be eternal life*; John 17:3; 1 John 5:20; can any intelligent being *become acquainted with the divine character*, and yet *continue destitute of eternal life*? — These questions, surely, well deserve the consideration of the serious and reflecting mind. And, after considering [149] them, and pondering on the views exhibited under this present head, can any truly candid and Christian individual fail to perceive, that, although in admitting *the future and final judgment of those who now are wicked*, I undoubtedly admit the fact of *there being passed upon them hereafter a sentence of condemnation, corresponding to and confirmatory of the sentence of condemnation already passed upon them in their own consciences*; yet, as *a sense of complete condemnation* when it occurs in the mind of any individual upon earth, so far from implying *the continuance of the divine displeasure*, implies *the passing of it away*, as springing from *the introduction of the knowledge of God into the conscience*,<sup>57</sup> so, reasoning analogically, *a sense of complete condemnation hereafter*, being the result of *the introduction of the knowledge of God's character*<sup>57</sup> *into the minds of those who now are wicked*, must imply, not *the continuance thenceforward of marks and effects of the divine displeasure*, but *their complete and everlasting removal*.<sup>58</sup>

<sup>57</sup> Which is eternal life, John 17:3

<sup>58</sup> The whole of the last paragraph in the text may be thus condensed: *a sense of complete condemnation* can only be introduced into *the conscience of a sinful intelligent being*, by means of the introduction into *his conscience* of *a sense of complete justification*.

3. I have admitted, that *the wicked shall be everlastingly punished*, — taking the word *everlastingly* in its ordinary signification. At this point, my antagonists, fancying that they have got me into a cloven stick, will perhaps exclaim: — "By this admission, you exclude the possibility of the final condemnation of the wicked, being rendered consistent with the removal of the divine dis-[150]pleasure from them." *Fair and softly*, my good friends, I again entreat you. When any one is brought to the knowledge of God's character upon earth, the individual being, as we have seen, *self-condemned*, to what is it that *this self-condemnation of his attaches*? To his new state and sentiments? Certainly not; but to the state in which he formerly was, and to the sentiments which he formerly entertained. And so, when the Jews, as a nation, shall be prevailed on to abandon their opposition to Jesus of Nazareth. They shall perceive, not certainly that *as believers they are condemned*, but *the state of condemnation under which, while opposed to Jesus' character and claims, they laboured*. In other words, it is *by believing the truth*, that both private Christians and Jews *are enabled to see themselves condemned*; but it is to them, not *as believing the truth*, but *as previously not having believed it*, that *the condemnation is seen by them to attach*. Can these examples fail to suggest to the mind *the nature of the condemnation, of which, at the final judgment, those who are now wicked shall be conscious*; as well as *the nature of everlasting punishment*? Those who *here* are wicked, shall *hereafter* perceive themselves condemned, not on account of the nature which *they shall then possess*, but on account of the nature which *while on earth they possessed*. We have already seen, that it is only in the light of the divine character understood *hereafter* by the wicked, that it will be possible for them to form any adequate conceptions of the magnitude and enormity of the guilt which attached to them as human beings; — but the [151] understanding of the divine character by them *hereafter* implies, that *they shall then be possessed of the divine nature*, John 17:3; — how clear, therefore, the conclusion, that it is only *when possessed of the divine nature, or of a nature to which condemnation cannot attach*, that those *who now are wicked* shall be able to apprehend *the condemnation which attached to them when possessed of human nature*. And are we not hereby furnished with a hint, respecting *the nature and subjects of everlasting punishment*? When ordinary religionists think of *the unjust or wicked living hereafter*, the idea always running in their heads is, that *they shall live hereafter as unjust or wicked*. This springs partly from the ambiguity of language; but chiefly from *the low, natural views* of the subject, which *the natural mind* is continually prone to take up. But is there a single passage in the sacred volume, which warrants the notion of *the unjust or wicked, as such, living for ever*? Who are *the unjust or wicked*? The apostle Paul, in the third chapter of his epistle to the Romans, verses 10-20, answers, *the whole human race*. *There is none righteous, no, not one*. *Injustice and wickedness*, then, are terms synonymous with *human nature*. See Rom. 8:5-8. But is *human nature* to live for ever? No, most assuredly; and this, not only the scriptures, but even our adversaries themselves, being judges. According to scripture, our blessed Lord *sacrificed human nature, or brought it to an end in himself*; rising from the dead with *human nature glorified, or changed in himself into the divine nature*; [152] and this for the purpose of *glorifying human nature, or changing it into the divine nature, in the case of others*. 1 Cor. 15:44-50. Phil. 3:21. 1 John 3:2. And not only so, but even our adversaries themselves indirectly admit, that *human nature is not to live for ever*. For, in maintaining, that those who now are wicked *shall live for ever*, they mean unquestionably, that they shall exist hereafter possessed of a nature *fitted to live for ever*, — which human nature obviously is not. If, with a view to evade the force of this, they say, that although human nature *as at present constituted* is unfit to live for ever, it may nevertheless *by being differently constituted* become capable of everlasting existence, — do not they perceive, that *what comes to be possessed of properties and qualities different from those of human nature*, ceases thereby *to be human nature*? Let them represent the matter in whatever way they please, to one or other of the following alternatives I force them: either, that *human nature exists again hereafter as now, that is, only for a time*; or, that *what is now human nature exists hereafter, possessed of different properties and qualities, and therefore a different nature*. And, if a *different nature*, let them point out, if they can, in what part of scripture we are informed of *any nature existing for ever*, except

*the nature of the Lord Jesus.* Exodus 3:14; Coloss. 1:17; 1 Tim. 6:16; Rev. 1:8,18; &c. Throughout the scriptures, we find mention made of the nature of *the earthy*, and of the nature of *the heavenly*; and of those who now *bear the nature of the earthy*, bearing hereafter *the* [153] *nature of the heavenly*: but where, pray, do the inspired writers speak of those who now *bear the nature of the earthy*, bearing hereafter a *tertium quid*, — a nature *which is not the nature of the heavenly*, and *which, nevertheless, lives for ever*? Thus, then, are we shut up, nay, absolutely forced to the conclusion, that *human nature does not exist for ever*; but that *beings, now possessed of human nature, exist for ever hereafter possessed of the divine nature*. And are we not thus enabled to perceive *both the nature and subjects of everlasting punishment*? Since *human nature* neither exists, nor can exist hereafter, *being changed into the divine nature*, is not *human nature* everlastingly destroyed? And in the everlasting destruction of *human nature*, can we fail to recognize *its everlasting punishment*? No *unjust or wicked person*, that is, no *person possessed of human nature*, (for we have seen that *injustice* and *wickedness* are terms synonymous with *human nature*), *lives for ever*; the *unjust or wicked*, as such, being thus *everlasting punished*, by being *everlastingly destroyed*. It is true, they are not *punished hereafter*, by being *everlastingly tormented*; but is *torment* the only kind of *punishment* to which an intelligent being can be subjected? Would to God, that our religionists could but be brought to comprehend the fact, of the same intelligent beings possessing two different natures; and consequently being treated in two different ways. As descendants of the first Adam, *mankind are unjust and wicked*, and as such are *the subjects of punishment*; as descendants of the second Adam, *they are righteous and holy*, and [154] as such are *the objects of divine approbation*. The nature which they have as connected with the first Adam, is subservient to and superseded by the nature which they have as connected with the second. Thus they who, *as wicked*, are *punished with everlasting destruction, from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power*, 2 Thess. 1:9, compared with Gen. 3:24; on the contrary, *as righteous*, have everlasting life conferred on them, in virtue of their union with the Son of God. While, then, I admit, that *the wicked* as such are to be *everlastingly punished*, as I find that all who are possessed of *human nature* are *the wicked*, and that *this nature* is to be *everlastingly destroyed*, — in the *everlasting destruction of human nature*, by its being *swallowed up in the divine nature*, do I recognize the *everlasting punishment of wickedness and the wicked*.

My readers have thus been put in possession of what is implied in the admissions made by me, respecting *the present enjoyment of eternal life by believers of the truth only*, — *the final approbation of the righteous, and condemnation of the wicked*, — and *the infliction of everlasting punishment upon the wicked*. The limitation of eternal life to believers *here*, is, I have shewn, *of itself* conclusive, neither one way nor another, respecting the existence of the rest of the human race *hereafter*; — the circumstance of a future and final judgment of the whole human race, I have shewn *of itself* implies *the future existence of all*, just as the circumstance of the wicked hereafter understanding the extent of their condemnation [155]tion, and being satisfied consequently of the justice of it, *of itself* implies *their possession hereafter of a nature different from, and superior to, that which they possess here*; — and the everlasting punishment of the wicked, or of Adam's natural posterity as such, Rom. 3:9-19, in order to be rendered consistent with the exhibition of divine mercy, I have shewn to imply, *the everlasting destruction of them as wicked, or of the nature which they inherit from their earthly head, by its being changed into, and thereby everlastingly swallowed up in, another and a higher nature derived by them from the Son of God*. Now the views which, in explaining myself with regard to my admissions, I have thus suggested, must, if correct, have their foundation in scripture, and be susceptible of proof from its statements and declarations. And such, indeed, is the case. The double character which the only intelligent beings with whom we are acquainted bear; *wicked* in their present and inferior state, or as possessed of the nature of the first Adam; and *righteous* in their future and superior state, or as possessed of the nature of the second; — the double fate to which they are exposed; to *everlasting punishment* as *wicked*, and to *everlasting life* as *righteous*; — and the fact of their punishment as



wicked being actually *rendered everlasting*, in consequence of their receiving *hereafter* a nature, which *everlastingly* swallows up and destroys the nature which they have *here*; — constitute the key, by which much of the language of scripture, which is otherwise obscure and unintelligible, is opened up and explained; and by which *everlasting* [156] *punishment* is shewn to be perfectly compatible with *everlasting life*.

But this is not all.

So complete, on the system advocated in these pages, is the compatibility between *the fact of the wicked undergoing eternal punishment*, and *their ultimate enjoyment of eternal life*, that I am able to admit, I may even say contend for, *the doctrine of eternal torments*. Nay, start not, gentle reader. I repeat, *eternal torments*. *Torments*, not confined to a limited period, but *absolutely without end*. And, if thou art a believer of the truth, I do not despair of carrying thee along with me, in my subsequent statements.

In setting about the proof and illustration of my admission that *the wicked are eternally tormented*, my only *postulate* is, that the declarations of the sacred volume shall be received as conclusive, with respect both to *the wicked*, and to *the everlasting torments which they undergo*. *The wicked*, as has been shewn already from Rom. 3:10, &c., compared with Job 15:14; 25:4; Psalm 14:1-3; 53:1-3, &c., are *the whole family of man*. Not *one*, or *a few*, or even *the majority of them*, but *the whole of them, without a single exception*.<sup>59</sup> This, no one professing to hold the scriptures in reverence, will be bold enough to deny. "But how, granting the case to be so, can the human race, upon your principles, be *eternally tormented*?" The great difficulty which I experience in answering this question, [157] springs from the merely natural and one-sided view of the subject, which almost all classes of religionists concur in taking. The only *torments* of which they appear to suspect even the existence, are those which human beings, under the influence of passion, and from the desire of vengeance, are accustomed to inflict on one another. And yet, is this, in reality, the only species of *torments* which can be conceived? Has God nowhere suggested the possibility of mankind *tormenting* one another, after a totally different fashion? and more than suggested, that *the torments* which He would have men to inflict on their fellow men, are of the same nature with those of which He himself renders intelligent beings the subjects? The man who has not observed this, must have read the scriptures, hitherto, to very little purpose. And he who, having observed it, can still allow himself to pander to popular prejudices, by representing the *torments* which God inflicts on his creatures, as of the same nature with those which the feeling of vengeance prompts to in a mere man, will find in the reproaches of his own violated conscience, the appropriate punishment which such double-dealing deserves. But what is the nature of the *torments* to which God subjects sinful creatures? From our blessed Lord, and the great apostle of the Gentiles, we derive the most ample and satisfactory information, with regard to this matter. The former, in Mat. 5:44,45, a passage already quoted and reasoned from, thus exhorts his disciples: *I say unto you, love your enemies; bless them that curse you, do good to* [158] *them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you. That ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven; for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust*.<sup>60</sup> In the same spirit, and in language similar to that of his divine master, the apostle Paul thus exhorts the Christian, Rom. 12:20,21: *If thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him drink: for in so doing thou shalt heap coals of fire on his head. Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good*. Who can peruse the two passages quoted, without at once perceiving, that it is the object of the speakers in both of them, to exhort us, as God's children, to imitate God? And this, especially, in our treatment of sinful men? Nay, that it is their object to suggest to us, a mode of *tormenting* those by whom we have been injured, different from, and superior to, that to which the feelings of mere human nature prompt us? And now comes the all-important question. How is it that God, according to both passages, deals with those who trespass against Him? Does He *torment* them, in the ordinary, vulgar

sense of the word *torment*? Does He visit their *crimes* with *sufferings* which, if inflicted by Him, would sanction *the worst atrocities* ever perpetrated by men upon their fellow men?<sup>61</sup> If he does, [159] then it is our bounden duty, as imitators of Him, to treat, in a similar manner, those who trespass against us. But is not the very reverse of what has just been supposed the fact? and is not the object of the Holy Ghost, in both passages, to inform us that it is so? "Love *your* enemies," says the Son of God; "and thereby shew yourselves to be the children of Him who loves *His* enemies." "Treat *thine* enemy kindly," says the apostle; "and thereby, as metal is fused by a fire strong enough for the purpose, so melt down or overcome *his* evil by *thy* good." But as *goodness* is *the divine nature*, Mat. 19:17; and as what *goodness* communicated to *the creature* can effect, must be capable of being effected still more decidedly by *goodness* residing in *the Creator*; how obviously is it the meaning of the apostle's exhortation, that *in overcoming evil with good* we should strive to accomplish *in an inferior degree*, what God himself necessarily accomplishes *in a superior degree*? And yet, were not the sufferings of sinful men *here* of the nature of chastisements, and were not these sufferings followed by the gift to them of life everlasting *hereafter*, how could *their evil* be overcome by *the divine goodness*? Could sinful beings provoke God, as one man may provoke another, — could they induce Him to act the part of a vengeful tyrant, as, by all popular systems of religion, it is supposed they do, — instead of *evil* being overcome by *good*, would not *good* evidently be overcome by *evil*? The nature of God would, under such circumstances, be overcome by the nature of man! The superior would [160] be overcome by the inferior! Who knows not, that to be angry — to cherish the desire of vengeance — is, even among human beings, regarded as the part, not of power, but of weakness? That, in those disputes which are perpetually occurring in the ordinary intercourse of society, the man who allows himself to be provoked, gives so far thereby the advantage to his antagonist? And yet, when will intelligent beings be brought to see, that a feeling, the indulgence of which displays weakness in the creature, can never, if indulged in, be regarded as consistent with power in the Creator?<sup>62</sup> No, no. God, it is certain from His own word, *torments* sinful creatures, but He *torments* them in a way worthy of Himself. He *torments them for ever*, but it is by loading them with benefits, — by persevering in doing them good, in spite of their continued and increasing enormities, — and by, at last, absolutely overwhelming them with His grace, by raising them to the possession of everlasting life. He has proclaimed that *vengeance is His*, and doubtlessly He does avenge Himself on transgressors. But in taking vengeance, as in every other act of His, He appears different from, [161] and superior to, the children of men. The same divine nature which, in the expiring Messiah, prompted, not feelings of enmity, but the prayer, *Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do*, ensures, necessarily, the forgiveness of the guilty. While human beings, by cherishing resentment towards *their* enemies, betray *their* weakness, resentment towards *His* enemies finds no place in the bosom of *the Most High*.<sup>63</sup> Love, love alone, flames forth from the throne of the Eternal. It seizes upon the guilty culprit. It subjects him to its efficacious process. It disregards his ingratitude; or, rather, it takes occasion from every fresh display of that hateful feeling, only to burn the more intensely. Like coals of fire heaped up, with a view to the fusion of the harder metals, its object being to melt down the opposition of the criminal, it is content with nothing short of that result. At last it succeeds. The enemy is converted into a friend. Brought, at last, to *bear the image of the heavenly*, he is filled with shame and self-reproach, on account of the evil committed, and the base ingratitude exhibited by him, while *bearing the image of the earthy*. The consciousness of previous misconduct, — the sense of present inability to make any return for the goodness, of which he has all along been the subject, — remain throughout eternity sources of *torment*, (if, to effects flowing from such causes, the word *torments* can with propriety be applied), to the sinner *saved by grace*. Such are *the torments* to which *the wicked* are *everlastingly* subjected. Being the result, not of [162] *evil*, but of *good* — not of *resentment*, but of *love* — not of *weakness*, but of *power* — they serve effectually to distinguish *the vengeance of the Creator*, from *that of the creature*. Who, then, professing to admit, that *God's ways are higher than our ways*, and *His thoughts than our thoughts*, will venture to maintain, that any other *torments*, besides those inflicted by *continued, inexhaustible, overcoming love*, can,

consistently with His revealed character, emanate from the Supreme Being?

<sup>59</sup> The Son of God excepted, of course.

<sup>60</sup> Read, along with these, the three following verses.

<sup>61</sup> Must crimes be punished but by other crimes,  
And greater criminals?

Enquires Lord Byron, in the person of Manfred. Yes, say popular religionists of almost all descriptions. The scriptures themselves indignantly answer, no.

<sup>62</sup> Properly speaking, I mean; because the Creator might, in a way of accommodation to the capacity of the creature, be represented as cherishing angry feelings towards sinful men. Those, however, who remember, that representations of God as angry, occur chiefly in the Old Testament scriptures; and that God was obliged, if I may so express myself, to speak to and deal with the Jews as persons, spiritually considered, in a state of infancy and childhood, see Matthew 19:3-9; Galatians 3 and 4, &c.; will perceive, at a glance, that views of the divine character which were adapted to a dispensation of an inferior kind that has passed away, can never be quoted as applicable to that superior dispensation which has succeeded.

<sup>63</sup> See Rom. 5:8-10.

So much for my admissions.

I have now prepared the way for a direct statement of my theory, respecting the mode of reconciling *the everlasting punishment of the wicked*, with *their possession of everlasting life*. Hitherto, I have been acting merely on the defensive. I have been shewing merely how it is, that views and principles which must be acknowledged to have their foundation in the word of God, and which, owing to our education and early acquired prejudices, appear at first sight to militate against my sentiments, are found, in reality, to contribute towards their confirmation and support. But a more important task now devolves upon me. I must now point out directly what my theory is. I must state it in such a way, as that no intelligent and spiritually-minded individual, shall be able to misconceive its nature and bearings; or shall be unable to apply it to the demolition, either in whole or in part, of the various imperfect and hastily-got-up systems, which now occupy the attention of the religious world. — Besides, I am particularly desirous to shew my Calvinistic friends, the glorious purposes to which, upon scriptural principles, *the election of the people of God* is subservient. Well do I know, that *the doctrine of election* constitutes the strength of the Calvinistic cause. But it is also the side on which it is most exposed. Nothing can be more obvious to the enlightened Christian, than that God, before the foundation of the world, made a selection, from among the children of men, of a limited number, to know His name, and shew forth His praise, Rom. 8:29,30; — that to His free will, sovereign grace, and everlasting purpose alone, this election falls to be traced, Eph. 1:5-9; 1 Peter 1:2; — that the number of persons elected is susceptible, neither of increase, nor of diminution, Mat. 13:11,14,15; John 10:14,15,26-28; 17:9,10; Rom. 9:18-24; 11:7-10, &c.; — and that, in no respect whatever, on the will of the creature, but solely and exclusively on that of the Creator, depends *the calling of the elect out of darkness, into marvellous light*. John 1:13; Rom. 9:16; James 1:18; 1 Peter 2:9. Nay, farther, nothing can be plainer, from the whole strain of the sacred volume, than that to the members of *the election of God* alone, appertain the privileges of *the heavenly kingdom*. Luke 12:32; 1 Cor. 6:2,3,9-11; 1 John 5:4,5; Rev. 20:4-6, &c. But, at this point, the Christian possessed of more enlarged views of divine truth than usually fall to the lot of his fellows, is obliged to stop. Calvinism represents [164] election *as an end*, whereas, according to the scriptures, it is *a means to an end*. Eph. 1:10. The choice of a limited number of the human race, to be the antitypes of the Jews of old, and in that capacity to be the means of introducing a higher and more glorious state of things than now exists, is the solution of the chief difficulties which occur in the sacred writings. James 1:18. It is to the statement and development of this view, in the portion of my work which immediately follows, that I would particularly invite the attention of the serious, candid, and reflecting reader. If disposed to suspect the imperfect range of his present measure of spiritual knowledge, and to bow to the revealed authority of Him who is *Lord of the conscience*, it may be, that

before finishing what I have endeavoured to condense in seven propositions, and the scriptural illustrations and proofs with which these propositions are accompanied, there will have been imparted to his mind such an enlarged and self-consistent view of divine truth as, previous to this time, he has been an utter stranger to.

The propositions themselves, briefly expressed, and as briefly illustrated as possible, are as follows.

#### FIRST PROPOSITION.

Soul and spirit, which are commonly regarded as synonymous terms, and are employed as such in ordinary conversation, have totally different meanings annexed to them in the sacred writings.

Ψυχη, soul, besides signifying *life, living principle, and person*, will never be found *as a distinctive word* [165] to signify more than *natural mind or principle*; whereas πνευμα, *spirit*, when used *distinctively*, clearly denotes *supernatural mind or principle*. There is one passage which establishes this distinction in a way so very striking, that it can scarcely have failed to attract the notice of even the most superficial and unthinking. I mean 1 Corinth. 15:45, taken in connection with the foregoing and following contexts. The apostle, after having laid it down, in the 44th verse, as an incontrovertible position, that *there is a natural, animal,*<sup>64</sup> or *soulical body*, and that *there is a spiritual body*, proceeds in the 45th verse to assign, as a reason for this, the fact, that there are two different persons, both of whom he denominates *Adam*, spoken of in the scriptures; the one *a living SOUL*, and the other *a quickening or life-giving SPIRIT*. The bearing of the 45th verse, upon the latter part of the 44th, is evidently this; that the nature and constitution of the *minds* of the two Adams being perfectly different, these *minds* necessarily required *bodies* perfectly different, as their appropriate residences and receptacles. Let us throw out of view, however, *the purpose* for which this remarkable distinction between *soul* and *spirit* is introduced by the apostle, as what we have ado with at present is *the distinction itself*. *Soul*, or *natural mind*, is here clearly laid down, as the utmost extent of the principles possessed by *the first Adam*, at the moment of his creation, Gen. 2:7; while *spirit*, or *supernatural mind*, is just as clearly laid down, as the essential and distinguishing property of [166] *the second Adam*. If, notwithstanding the distinction thus made by the apostle, any man shall be foolhardy enough to assert, that *the first Adam*, as he came from God's hands, possessed *spirit*, or *spiritual principles*, such a person necessarily involves himself in the following awkward consequences. 1st. He does away with that distinction between *the two Adams*, which constitutes the very basis of the apostle's argument. Instead of *the first Adam* having originally possessed *spirit*, we are informed, that he was, as he came from the hands of his Creator, only *a living soul*, and *of the earth, earthy*; and on the same authority we learn, that it was *the second Adam* who, by his very nature, was *a quickening spirit*, and *the Lord from heaven*. 2ndly. If, as Calvinists and Arminians commonly do, we suppose, that *the first Adam* was originally *spiritual*, — that by transgression he forfeited *spiritual principles*, — and that *spiritual principles* thus forfeited by him have been restored by Christ, *the second Adam*, — how does this agree with the apostolic declaration: *Howbeit, that was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural; and afterward that which is spiritual?* verse 46. According to this supposition, the reasoning of the apostle should have been: *Howbeit, that was first which is spiritual; and, having become natural, it was afterwards rendered spiritual again!*<sup>65</sup> The truth is, that so far from the apostle Paul, or the other sacred writers, [167] ascribing to *the first Adam* originally the possession of *spirit* or *spiritual principles*, — and representing Christ as restoring these *spiritual principles*, after they had by our great progenitor been forfeited, — they, on the contrary, ascribe to *the first Adam*, at his formation, the possession of *pure soul*, or *pure natural principles* merely; and represent him as having forfeited by transgression *the purity* of his *soul* or *natural principles*: not that *soul*, or *natural principles*, might be restored to *their pristine purity* through *the second Adam*, but that the worthlessness of *mere natural principles*, even at the very best, having through *the first Adam's* misconduct been made manifest, a way might be opened up for the conferring of *spirit*, or *supernatural principles*, through *the second*.<sup>66</sup>

<sup>64</sup> Archbishop Newcome's translation.

<sup>65</sup> The object of the first part of my *Three questions proposed and answered*, is to shew the absurdity of supposing, that *God restores through Christ, what Adam lost*.

<sup>66</sup> See Appendix N.

## SECOND PROPOSITION.

All mankind, as they come into the world, possess merely souls or natural minds, and natural bodies.

This is one of those propositions which, at first sight, appear to lie beyond the reach of controversy; and which ordinary readers, therefore, are apt to set down as perfectly uncalled for and unnecessary. And yet, strange to tell, there is scarcely any one proposition the import of which, and the consequences flowing from which, are less likely to be understood than this; and scarcely any one, therefore, which demands and deserves a more attentive consideration. If the whole [168] human race bring with them into the world merely *souls* or *natural minds*, then, it evidently follows, that they cannot by birth be possessed of *spirits* or *spiritual minds*; *spirit*, as we have just seen, being a principle of a *supernatural kind*. It was the character, the very distinctive feature of *the first Adam*, — and that too even in his original state, — that he was merely *a living soul*, Gen. 2:7, 1 Cor. 15:45, and *of the earth, earthy*; and, as it is expressly declared, that *as is the earthy, such are they also that are earthy*, 47, — or, as is *Adam*, such are *the human race*, his natural descendants, — it is abundantly manifest, that *living soul* is the highest attribute which can be predicated of *the first Adam's descendants*, in their natural state. But here, in order to obviate all cavilling, a difference between *the first Adam*, and *his descendants*, falls to be noticed. *The first Adam*, although, as he proceeded from the hands of his Creator, only *a living soul*, or possessed only of *natural principles*, possessed this *soul*, or these *natural principles*, in a state of *purity*; whereas *we his descendants*, although, likewise, merely *living souls*, or possessing merely *natural principles*, at the period of our birth, — and thereby in so far conformed to the image of our first parent, — nevertheless inherit these *souls*, or these *natural principles*, in an *impure* state. The difference between *the first Adam*, as he came from God's hands, and *his descendants*, as they are born into the world, is not, that the former originally possessed *spiritual principles*, which he afterwards forfeited, and that the latter possess *natural principles*, as the result of [169] this forfeiture; but, that *the same natural principles*, which were conferred upon the former *pure*, reach the latter in an *impure state*. Would to God, that this scriptural fact were but thoroughly understood; for if so, what a mass of blunders respecting the original state and circumstances of human beings, and the nature of the gospel, would at once be swept away. — If I have been successful in conveying my meaning, the proposition which I am now maintaining will be seen to be, that mankind do not come into the world possessed of *natural principles*, in consequence of our first progenitor having by transgression forfeited *spiritual* or *supernatural principles*; — but that the *principles* which they bring with them into the world, are the very same *natural principles* which Adam possessed from the moment of his creation, with the single exception of these principles not being now in the state of *purity*, (of *natural* and *creature purity*, I mean), in which they were originally conferred. Calvinists and I agree in holding, that mankind, as they come into the world, are possessed of *natural principles* merely; and that they are then totally destitute of such as are *spiritual* or *supernatural*: but we differ, among other things, in this, that Calvinists represent the possession of *natural principles* by mankind *now*, as arising from the forfeiture of *spiritual principles* by Adam *when he first transgressed*, and profess, consequently, to regard the conferring of *spiritual principles* upon any of the human race *now* as of the nature of a *restoration*; whereas I maintain, that *spiritual* or *supernatural principles* are, by their very nature, [170] incapable, when once possessed, of being lost or forfeited, — that neither Adam, nor any of his posterity, originally possessed, or can possess *them*, — and that it was not previously, but subsequently to the fall, that *spiritual principles* were, for the first time, conferred upon *Adam himself*, just as it is subsequently to the period of their birth, that *spiritual principles* are, for the

first time, conferred upon *any of his posterity*.

### THIRD PROPOSITION.

Soul, whether understood to signify natural life, or natural mind as connected with natural life, like every other mere natural principle, is not of itself immortal.

*The immortality of the soul* is a doctrine which almost every man professing religion takes for granted, and yet there is not a single passage in the sacred volume which can be adduced in support of it. *The immortality of spirit*, or *the immortality of soul converted into spirit*, is a scriptural doctrine; but the notion of *the immortality of soul*, or of *natural principles as such*, is perfectly abhorrent to the whole strain and tenor of God's most blessed word. It is a doctrine which, with the utmost ease, might be shewn to have derived its origin from the heathens. Let me ask any candid and well-informed Calvinist, if he believes in *the immortality of the body*, and he will certainly answer me in the affirmative. But let me ask him, if he believes in *the immortality of the body*, in its *present natural, or flesh and blood state*, and he will just as certainly [171] answer in the negative. His language will be, "it is only in consequence of *this corruptible putting on incorruption, and this mortal putting on immortality*, that it acquires a never-dying existence. *Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God*; and, therefore, it is only in consequence of what is now *flesh and blood*, assuming *another and a higher form*, that it can do so." What is this, but just in other words to say, that although a *natural body* when changed into and clothed with a *supernatural form*, that is, when it ceases to be a *natural body*, shall live for ever, yet that while it continues to be merely a *natural body*, it is *unfitted for everlasting existence*. A similar answer to a similar question respecting *the immortality of the soul* would, if Calvinists were thoroughly-reflecting men, necessarily be returned by them: "The soul is *immortal*, but it is not immortal *as soul*." The mind of man *as soul* is *not immortal*; for, immortality stands connected with it, not *as soul or natural mind*, but *as changed or converted into spirit or supernatural mind*. Now, if all men, as we have just seen, bring with them into the world merely *souls or natural minds*, and *natural bodies*; and if, as we have likewise seen, *souls or natural minds* are, no more than *natural bodies*, of themselves *immortal*; — is it not abundantly obvious, that as those, whose *minds* as well as *bodies* continue *natural* during their earthly career, undergo no alteration, and, therefore, do not become *immortal here*, they must undergo the requisite alteration in order to their becoming *immortal hereafter*? Nay, if *immortality, or never-dying* [172] *existence*, no more belongs to *soul or natural mind as such*, than it does to *natural body as such*, — if, on the contrary, it belongs only to *spirit or supernatural mind*, and to *what is possessed of spiritual qualities*, — is it not still further obvious, that *the soul or natural mind*, as well as *the natural body*, may be destroyed? And, consequently, that all who while on earth possess no more than *soul or natural mind*, and *natural body*, may *perish or be destroyed*? John 3:15,16; 5:24; 11:25,26; *by contrast*. The fact which I have thus set down in the shape of a conclusion, is not merely implied in all those passages of scripture which put a negative upon the idea of *eternal life*, or a *never-dying principle*, abiding in *the natural man*, but it is asserted in so many words by Christ himself. *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*. Mat. 10:28. Strange to hear those, who make a profession of religion, persist in maintaining, that *the soul is by its very nature immortal*, (as capable of *being converted into spirit*, it unquestionably is so), and that *it is impossible to destroy it*; and yet to hear him, whose followers such persons profess to be, laying it down as one of the grand distinctions between *the power of man*, and *the power of God*, that the former reaches only to *the destruction of the body*, whereas the latter extends to *the destruction of the body and soul*; or, *of the whole person*, when possessed of no more than *soul or natural principles*.<sup>67</sup> It [173] will not do for opponents to have recourse to quibbling, and to say, either, that the Lord Jesus, although he allowed *God's power to destroy the soul*, did not mean to assert that *this power would ever be called into exercise*; or that the term *destruction* when applied to *the soul*, means something totally different from

what it does when applied to *the body*. For, the former quibble is answered by observing, that our blessed Lord *was not in the habit of stating hypotheses which had no foundation in fact*; and that if God's actually destroying the soul in any one case be denied, *the force of the contrast, and the value of the warning, are rendered completely nugatory*: and the latter by observing, that although *destruction of soul*, may in some respects differ from *destruction of body*, there must nevertheless be some sense in which the term *destruction* is capable of being applied to *both*; and what that is, but that *both may cease to exist under their present form*, is more, I confess, than I can conceive. From the mode of expression adopted by the Redeemer, *destruction* must be something which befalls *the soul* equally with *the body*: but this cannot be torments *immediately succeeding death, and previous to the resurrection of the body*, for, omitting other objections, of such torments *the body* could not be a partaker; nor can it be torments of *soul and body* inflicted subsequent to *the resurrection of the body*, for, *the bodies* raised, and *the minds* by which they are occupied, being *immortal*, and *both bodies and minds* consequently being no longer *natural*, must be *incapable of torment or suffering*. The [174] *destruction of soul and body*, therefore, as an event equally befalling both, can have no other conceivable meaning, than *the termination of the existence of both soul and body*; or, to express myself somewhat more accurately, *the bringing of their existence to an end under their present form*; and, as shall immediately be shewn, *the exclusion of those who, while here, possess only such natural principles, from enjoyments of which those only participate who, while here, have had conferred upon them the first fruits of spiritual principles*. I beg it here to be understood, although, in what I am now to say, I am to a certain degree anticipating what is afterwards to be stated at greater length, that, agreeably to scripture, I distinguish between *destruction* and *annihilation*. Mere *soul* or *natural mind*, and *natural body*, are capable of being destroyed, and are destroyed at death; but they neither are, nor can be annihilated. As destroyed, they cease to exist in their present form; — and their existence under any other form is for a while suspended: — but, as inseparably connected with the Son of God, their *destruction* in their present form, so far from being equivalent to their *annihilation*, is subservient to their afterwards *re-appearing, and being re-produced, in another and a higher form*.<sup>68</sup>

<sup>67</sup> To be satisfied of this, read the context.

<sup>68</sup> It may be interesting to some of my readers to be informed, that the doctrine of *the immortality of the soul* was denied, nay even ridiculed, by the celebrated Luther. In his work entitled, *Assertio omnium articulorum Martini Lutheri, per Bullam Leonis X. novissimam, damnatorum*; or, a re-assertion of all the points condemned by Pope Leo's Bull of 1520; after repeating article 27, *certum est, in manu ecclesiæ non esse statuere articulos fidei*, &c., he adds, by way of explanation: *Permitto tamen quod Papa condant articulos fidei, et suis fidelibus, quales sunt, panem et vinum transubstantiari in sacramento; essentiam Dei nec generare nec generari; animam esse formam substantialem corporis humani; se esse Imperatorem mundi, et Regem cæli, et Deum terrenum; ANIMAM ESSE IMMORTALEM; et omnia illa infinita portenta in Romano sterquilinio Decretorum; ut qualis est ejus fides, tale sit Evangelium, tales et fideles, talis et Ecclesia, et habeant similem labra lactucam, et dignum patella sit operculum*. Luth. Oper. Tom. 2, p. 307, Edit. 1600.

Thus did that truly eminent man rank the doctrine of *the immortality of the soul* among the other abominations which, to use his own coarse but emphatic expression, are to be found in *the Romish dunghill of Decrees*. His *annotationes in Ecclesiastem*, published in 1532, bring out his ideas more fully in reference to this subject. Those who are curious in such matters, will find some very extraordinary statements in his comment upon the 5th, 6th, and 10th verses, of the 9th chapter of the book just named. The edition consulted by me is that published at *Jena*, 1603. See Appendix O. Although I coincide with Luther in rejecting the doctrine of *the immortality of the soul*, I regret that he does not appear to have seen *clearly*, the scriptural distinction between *soul and spirit*; nor that necessary consequence of the fact, that *believers of the truth* are distinguished from the *mass of mankind*, by the former possessing, in *the first fruits of the spirit, a present principle of immortality*.



There are some human beings to whom, during their earthly career, spirit or spiritual principle is communicated; or, to express myself somewhat differently, there are some human beings, whose minds, originally natural like the minds of others, become possessed of a spiritual, supernatural, and immortal principle, during their abode upon earth.

This change, and the very important effects and consequences which result from it, are recognized in every page of the sacred writings. The change itself is what characterises, or distinguishes from the rest of the world, *the people of God*. It is represented as *springing from* [176] the manifestation of *the character of God*, which is *love*, as consisting in the implantation thereby of *the principle of love*, or *the divine nature*, in the mind, — and as *issuing in* a controlling influence exercised over a man's natural views, passions, and propensities. A careful perusal of the eleventh chapter of the epistle to the Hebrews, will furnish the enquiring reader with a brief but well-defined sketch of the nature of this divine principle, and of the triumphs achieved by it in Old Testament times. The New Testament scriptures are full of the distinction, between the state of the mind ignorant of the truth *as merely natural*, and its state enlightened by the gospel *as possessed of the earnest or beginnings of supernatural existence*. The apostle Paul, in the 2d chapter of 1 Corinthians, 14th verse, brings out this distinction by informing us, that *the natural man*, ψυχικός άνθρωπος, the man possessed merely of a soul or natural mind,<sup>69</sup> *receiveth not the things of the spirit of God*. The apostle James points it out as one of those features which distinguish *the wisdom of man*, from *that wisdom which descendeth from above*, that the former is *earthly, sensual*, ψυχική, such as the soul or natural mind can attain to, *devilish*. James 3:15. And the apostle Jude, after having in his short epistle [177] made some remarks on the gross misconduct of certain individuals, assigns, as the reason for it, in the 19th verse, that such persons are *sensual*, ψυχικοί, possessed merely of souls or natural minds, *having not the Spirit*. In Heb. 4:12, *the word of God* is represented as being *quick and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword; piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul*, ψυχῆς, natural mind, *and spirit*; that is, the word of God, by its enlightening energy, enables every man to whose conscience it is carried home *in demonstration of the spirit and of power*, as possessed of the superior principle, to distinguish between what belongs to *the soul or natural mind*, and what on the contrary is *of supernatural origin*. Compare this with 1 Cor. 2:15: see also 1 Thessal. 5:23. But it is not on the authority of short and insulated passages merely, that the distinction in question is found to rest; for there are large portions of the sacred volume which, except in the light of it, are absolutely unintelligible. What, for instance, can any candid man make of the epistle to the Romans in general, and of the eighth chapter of that epistle in particular, if the distinction between *all men* as possessing, at birth, merely *souls or natural minds*, and *natural bodies*, — and *some men* as undergoing, while on earth, *a supernatural change of mind*, by the manifestation of the character of God to their consciences, — be thrown out of view? Is it not the import both of the epistle, and of the chapter referred to, that *all men* naturally are condemned; but that to *some men*, as possessed of *the spirit*, there is no condemnation, Rom. 3:19, and [178] 8:1: — that *all men* naturally have *the minding of the flesh*, φρόνημα τῆς σαρκός, and consequently are *not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be*, Rom. 8:6,7, (see the margin); but *that the righteousness of the law*<sup>70</sup> *is fulfilled in some men*, even in those *who walk not after the flesh, but after the spirit*: — and that *all men* naturally *live after the flesh, and are subject to the spirit of bondage*, Rom. 3:9-19; see also Eph. 2:1-3; but that to *some men* it is given *to live after the spirit*; and that this spirit is in such persons *a spirit of adoption, whereby*, as knowing upon the infallible authority of God himself that they are His children, *they cry Abba, Father*. Rom. 8:15. In a word, are not all men represented as being naturally *destitute of the spirit of Christ*? and yet, is not the possession of this spirit represented as being so essential, — so indispensable to the existence of a vital union upon earth between Christ and any human being, — that, *if any man have it not*, he is expressly declared to be *none of Christ's*? Rom. 8:9; see also 1 John 5:12. These things being so apparent, what man, professing to regard the scriptures as the word of God, can maintain, on the one hand, that any human being naturally has *spirit*, or *spiritual*



*existence?* or, can deny, on the other, that the very essence of the change which takes place, when the truth is believed, is *the communication of a spiritual principle to the mind*? This change, however, while the Christian is upon earth, is, be it [179] remembered, limited to his mind: for, *the body is or continues dead, because of sin*; although *the spirit is life, because of righteousness*. Rom. 8:10. Nor is it a change which, during his abode upon earth, implies the destruction of *natural passions and propensities*; or of *the workings of the soul or natural mind*: for, as it is not *the full possession*, but merely *the earnest or first fruits of the Spirit*, which the believer on this side of the grave attains to, his *natural propensities*, and *natural mind*, which stand inseparably connected with his *flesh*, still exist to distress, perplex, and annoy him;<sup>71</sup> and the utmost extent of the triumph over these *natural propensities*, and over this *natural mind*, to which while on earth he can attain, is to bring them *under control*; or, in the expressive language of scripture, to *crucify the flesh, with its affections and lusts*. Gal. 5:24. The expulsion, destruction, or swallowing up of *soul or natural mind*, by *spirit or supernatural mind*, takes place not *here* but *hereafter*.

<sup>69</sup> *Animal man*, says M'Knight. That the Dr. had but a very imperfect idea of what is meant by the phrase, may be seen by comparing his remarks on verse 14th, with those on verse 15th. — Vid: Schleusner. ap. verb. ψυχικός def. 2. By the way, in going over Schleusner's explanation of πνεῦμα, one is struck to observe the suspicions which, in spite of himself, he could not help cherishing, as to the word in 1 Cor. 15:45, denoting *the divine*, as contradistinguished from *human nature*.

<sup>70</sup> Which, from Rom. 13:8-10, we discover to be *the existence and operation of the principle of love*.

<sup>71</sup> See Rom. 7, from verse 13th, to the end.

#### FIFTH PROPOSITION.

The belief of the truth, in which the earnest of the Spirit consists, is, in all who possess it, the principle of immortality.

As it is characteristic of the great bulk of mankind, that they are in reality *dead while they live*, so it is the privilege of those to whom by faith the Spirit has been imparted, and in whom by faith that Spirit dwells, that [180] *they live now, henceforth, and for ever. They never die*. The reason why mankind in general possess a mere dying existence, we have seen to be, that their *minds*, as well as their *bodies*, are merely *natural*; — they are *soulical*, or possessed of souls merely, *not having the spirit*, Jude 19; — and that all that is *natural*, whether *mind* or *body*, is fast tending to destruction, or must, under its present form, speedily come to an end. But as our blessed Lord has informed us, that *God is a spirit*, or, literally, that *God is spirit*,<sup>72</sup> John 4:24, it is evident, that *spirit* or *spiritual principle* is *the divine nature*; and, as it is essential to *the divine nature to last for ever*, it is evident, likewise, that in so far as any one is *spiritual*, or is a *partaker of the divine nature*, he must be possessed of a *principle of everlasting duration*. It is on account of his thus *partaking of spirit*, or *the nature of God*, that natural death can be neither *the termination*, nor yet even *the suspension of the Christian's existence*; and, that *during the intermediate state*, as well as *throughout eternity itself*, he must be *alive*, and in a *state of conscious being*. And is not what I have thus stated as *a mere inference from certain scriptural premises*, the actual import of *numberless direct scriptural declarations*? The belief of the truth, which is the first communication of *spirit*, or *spiritual principles*, is represented as *a resurrection*, — not of course of *the body*, but of *the mind*. *I*, says Christ, *am the resurrection, and the life; he that believeth in me, THOUGH HE WERE DEAD, YET SHALL [181] HE LIVE*. John 11:25. In strict conformity with the view thus presented by his divine master, the apostle Paul, when speaking of believers, declares in one passage, that even already *they ARE RISEN WITH CHRIST, through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead*; and that, although formerly *dead in their sins*, God *HATH QUICKENED THEM together with him*, Coloss. 1:12,13; and, in another, that *having quickened them together with Christ*, God hath even already *RAISED THEM UP together with him, and MADE THEM SIT together with him in heavenly places*. Ephes. 2:5,6. But the belief of the truth is spoken of,

not merely as *a resurrection*, but as *a resurrection to an endless life*. Thus, in the passage just quoted from John's gospel, Christ, after declaring, that he who believes, although formerly dead becomes alive, immediately adds, *and whosoever liveth and believeth in me SHALL NEVER DIE*. 11:26. This spiritual resurrection of the Christian by faith, and his acquisition thereby of an immortal principle, is a favourite doctrine, both of our blessed Lord, and of his apostles. It is inculcated by the former *directly* in such passages as, *he that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, HATH everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation, but IS PASSED FROM DEATH UNTO LIFE*, John 5:24; and *he that believeth on me HATH EVERLASTING LIFE*, John 6:47: and *indirectly* in his answer to the petition addressed to him by the dying thief, *verily I say unto thee, TO-DAY shalt thou be with me in paradise*. Luke 23:43. It is directly asserted by [182] John the Baptist, *he that believeth on the Son HATH everlasting life*, John 3:36; and by John the beloved apostle, *he that HATH the Son, HATH life*. 1 John 5:12. It is also evidently the import of the declaration of the apostle Paul, that for believers *to be absent from the body, is to be PRESENT WITH the Lord*, 2 Cor. 5:8; and it is clearly implied in his own *desire to depart, and to be WITH Christ*, which he considered *far better* than to continue in the flesh. Phil. 1:23. See likewise 1 Peter 1:3-5, &c. &c. Nor is the *spirit*, or *spiritual and immortal principle*, thus imparted by faith, a restoration of the *pure soul*, or *natural principle*, which Adam, as he came from the hands of God, possessed. For, whatever *soul* or *natural principle* in its state of *purity* might imply, one thing is certain, that it did not imply *immortality*, or *endless duration*. The event has proved, that *soul*, however *pure*, is capable of being forfeited, and thereby of coming to an end. But *spirit* once possessed cannot be lost, — *spirit* never dies, — and therefore *spirit* is not what Adam originally had. As has been frequently shewn already, the life originally bestowed on Adam, was a life to be continued to him *conditionally*; whereas the life bestowed on us through Christ, is ours *unconditionally*. The *conditionality* of Adam's *natural* existence, rendered it to him *uncertain*; — the *unconditionality* of the *spiritual* existence which we have through Christ, renders it to us *absolutely certain*. The understanding of this last fact is what shews us, why *the belief of the truth* must be an *abiding principle*; or, why it is *a principle which can* [183] *never come to an end*. It endures for ever; because, seeing eternal life bestowed upon me *unconditionally*, and therefore *certainly*, there is in my mind *a principle which excludes the supposition, that any thing can occur by which it is possible for me to be deprived of it*. And it endures for ever; because, seeing God to bestow eternal life *unconditionally*, being a discovery of His having *certainly* bestowed it *upon myself*, there is necessarily produced in my mind *love to Him*, 1 John 4:19; and as *love*, being *the divine nature*, id. verses 8 and 16, must *last for ever*, — *love to God, as having first loved us* is, therefore, in my mind, and in the mind of every one by whom it is possessed, *a principle of everlasting existence*.

<sup>72</sup> Πνεῦμα ὁ θεός.

#### SIXTH PROPOSITION.

The resurrection of the just takes place, or the bodies of believers are raised and rendered spiritual, at the period of Christ's second coming; believers, then, in their whole persons, becoming possessed of the principle of immortality.

We have already remarked,, that the bodies of believers, while they are upon earth, continue *dead because of sin*; and this, notwithstanding that their *spirits are life*, or are alive, *because of righteousness*. Rom. 8:10. And, in reference to this state of matters, we find the apostle, when speaking of the views, feelings, and prospects, of himself, and of those who were one with him by faith, declaring, *we ourselves also, which have* [184] *the first fruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body*. Rom. 8:23. Now the scriptures abound with intimations, that what believers thus wait, and long, and hope for, shall in due time be realized to them. Not indeed at the moment of natural death; for, although the *minds* of the just being spiritually enlightened, and supernaturally changed, during their earthly career, can *never die*;

and are *absent from the body, to be present with the Lord*; nevertheless their *bodies* descend to the grave, and *see corruption*, like the bodies of other men. Nor at the period of *the consummation of all things*; for, in that case the believer would, *in regard to the resurrection of his body*, be put upon a level with the unbeliever; and any *peculiar* divine enjoyments by the former *in his whole person*, would consequently be out of the question. Those, then, in whom by faith *the spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead* is now *dwelling*, look for and anticipate the approach of a period, — *subsequent to that of their natural dissolution, and previous to that of the consummation of all things, or resurrection of the unjust*, — when *he that raised up Christ from the dead, shall also quicken their mortal bodies, by his spirit that dwelleth in them*. Rom. 8:11; see Luke 14:14. Nor shall they look and long in vain. *Their life, it is true, is, for a time, hid with Christ in God; but when he who is their life shall appear, then shall they also appear with him in glory*. Coloss. 3:3,4. The Saviour has promised his people, that *he will come* [185] *again to them*, to put them, as respects *body*, as well as *mind*, in possession of his own blessedness; and *unto them that*, notwithstanding the delay in fulfilling his promise which has already taken place, continue, with the eye of faith and hope, still to *look for him, shall he appear the second time, without sin, unto salvation*. Heb. 9:28. This second coming of Christ is, then, not for *the general resurrection of the dead*,<sup>73</sup> but for *the resurrection from among the dead*<sup>74</sup> of the *bodies* of those who, while on earth, had implanted in their *minds*, the principle of a spiritual and everlasting existence, through *faith in his name*.<sup>75</sup> It is to this *first resurrection*, Rev. 20:5,6, — *this resurrection of the just*, Luke 14:14, — that the hopes and desires of the followers of the Lamb have, in every succeeding age, been specially and powerfully directed. Rom. 8:23-25. It is to *this resurrection*, that our blessed Lord pointed the attention of the Sadducees, in his answer to their query, recorded Mat. 22:24-32; — it is of *this resurrection*, that the apostle Paul treats in 1 Thessal. 4:14-18; — and it was of *this resurrection*, that the apostle John had a vision; [186] Revel. 20:4-6. It is a *resurrection* which has it for its special object, to ensure an entire conformity between the *great head of the church*, and *his members*. The Lord Jesus, who suffered upon earth both *in mind and body*, having *with both* entered into his glory, it is his revealed intention, that those who *in mind and body* are sufferers with him *here*, shall *in both*, likewise, be sharers with him in his glory *hereafter*. Rom. 8:17, with the context. See also 2 Cor. 1:5-11, &c. But how can the enjoyment of *future blessedness in their whole persons* along with their Head as a *peculiar* benefit, be conferred upon those who are undergoing *present sufferings in their whole persons* along with him in a manner *peculiar* to themselves, except by their bodies being raised from the grave at some period *subsequent to the present*, and yet *previous to that at which the bodies of the rest of the dead shall be raised*? The *first resurrection*, or *resurrection of the just*, takes place, therefore, for the purpose, among others, of raising us who believe to the full enjoyment of our privileges as *kings and priests* with our divine master. Rev. 1:6; 1 Cor. 4:8; Rom. 12:1; Heb. 13:15,16; 1 Peter 2:9; 5:10; &c. *As he overcame, and sat down upon his Father's throne; so he granteth to us who overcome with him, to sit down with him likewise on his throne*. Rev. 3:21; 21:7.<sup>76</sup> In this kingdom of Christ we are to share with him, till *the period of the consummation of all* [187] *things; or as long as he shall possess it himself*. 1 Cor. 15:25, and 28, compared with 23, and 24. In the language of John, in the book of Revelation, we are *to reign with him a thousand years*. Rev. 20:4; with Psalm 90:4, and 2 Peter 3:8. This kingdom of his, and ours, is *on or over the earth*. Rev. 5:10. Our blessed Head is now engaged, — and shall till *the end*, 1 Cor. 15:24, continue to be engaged, — in the work of subduing the earth, and all that it contains, to himself; and in this glorious and delightful occupation we, during the period of our reign, shall engage with him. Nor shall the work be discontinued by him, or by us as co-operating with him, until the object of the kingdom which we share with him, having been fully accomplished in the complete subjugation of all things, *that kingdom shall be delivered up to God, even the Father; — that God may be all in all*.<sup>77</sup> 1 Cor. 15:24,28. Can any thing be conceived more delightful and exhilarating to the mind of the Christian, during the period of his earthly career, than the prospect of the privileges and enjoyments which await him, at the [188] period of Christ's second coming? The resurrection of his body *now vile, in the likeness of his divine master's glorious body*; — the privilege of *sitting down with*

*Jesus upon his throne*, and of being joined with him, in the administration of the affairs of his heavenly kingdom; — and the certainty of witnessing the complete subjugation of all things ultimately to the Messiah; — a result necessarily involving in it *the destruction of sin, suffering, and death, the works of the Devil, and the enemies of both God and man*. It is true, that the exact period for the accomplishment of the prophecies which respect *the second coming of Christ*, and *the introduction of the just into his kingdom, by their resurrection from the dead*, no man knows or can know; seeing that *the Father hath reserved the times, and the seasons, in his own hand*: but knowing, as we do, that, however long our triumph may be delayed, *our suffering with our Head here*, shall, as a matter of certainty, be followed by *our reigning with him hereafter*; and knowing, likewise, that the second coming of Christ, at what ever period it may take place, shall be sudden and unexpected, resembling the approach of *a thief in the night*; what reason have we, on the one hand, to wait patiently for the event, and, on the other, to be always in a state of watchfulness and preparation for it.

<sup>73</sup> Called in scripture, ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν. See Acts 24:15. 1 Corinth. 15:12,13,21, &c. in the Greek.

<sup>74</sup> Called in scripture, ἀνάστασις ἐκ νεκρῶν. Compare Luke 20:35, with 1 Corinth. 15:12,20, &c. in the Greek.

<sup>75</sup> Of course, also for the purpose of changing completely into his own glorious image *the bodies*, as well as *the minds*, of such believers as shall, at the period of his second coming, be found alive. 1 Cor. 15:51,52; 1 Thessal. 4:15,17. Such persons shall not, however, *prevent*, or *get before the dead in Christ*; for, the latter *shall rise first*: and then shall they *who are alive and remain, be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air*. 1 Thessal. 4:15,16,17.

<sup>76</sup> *This is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith*, 1 John 5:4. Compare this with Heb. 11 throughout; and 12:1-4 verses.

<sup>77</sup> The same idea may be expressed by saying, that Christ *then* shall cease to reign *as Mediator*, and shall *thenceforward* reign *as God* for evermore. Perhaps a still better, because a more scriptural way of conceiving of the matter is, that *God is manifested* in three different ways, stages, or degrees. First, *as man* in time; secondly, *as reigning Mediator* during the intermediate state; and, thirdly, *as God* throughout eternity. Corresponding to which three ways, stages, or degrees, of manifestation, are the three ways, stages, or degrees in which the manifestation is enjoyed by intelligent beings. First, *very partially* by the different members of *the family of faith*, as they spring up *scatteredly* in successive ages and generations; secondly, *in a very high degree* by the members of *the same family*, when they are *united* in the heavenly kingdom; and, thirdly, *in the highest degree of all*, by *the whole human race*.

## SEVENTH PROPOSITION.

At the period of the consummation of all things, there shall be a resurrection to life and happiness of those who, during their abode upon earth, continued [189] destitute of that knowledge of God's character, which is possessed by His believing people; the principle of immortality being then, for the first time, communicated to them.

I say, *at the consummation of all things*, Acts 3:21;<sup>78</sup> for, although the common idea of religionists is, that *a never-ending, and unchanging state of things*, immediately succeeds *the present*, the idea is not sanctioned by scripture. The word of God makes us acquainted with, first, *time*; secondly, *an age, period, or æra, which immediately succeeds time*; and thirdly, *neverending and unchanging duration*.<sup>79</sup> *Time* beholds sin and death reigning, and grace only in its beginnings; — *the period which succeeds time*, beholds sin and death partially overcome, and grace reigning in the case of the family of God; — *never-ending duration*, which is the winding up of the whole, beholds sin and death destroyed, and grace completely triumphant by means of its reign over all. It is at the end of *time*, which is also the end of this present state of things, that *the bodies* of the saints are raised; — but it is at the end of *the period, or æra, which immediately succeeds time*, or of what has been sometimes denominated *the intermediate state*, that there takes place the resurrection of *the rest* of the children of men, — the resurrection, in their case, being the communication of life to *their minds*, as well as to [190] *their*

bodies.<sup>80</sup> That there is a *second*, as well as a *first resurrection*; — that such of the human race as are not interested in the *first resurrection*, are the subjects of the *second*; — and that the *second resurrection* does not take place *till the expiry of Christ's kingdom*, into which by the *first resurrection* the saints are introduced; — are all of them propositions set down, in the most explicit terms, in the 20th chapter of the Book of Revelation. There certain persons are declared to be *blessed and holy*, as *having part in the first resurrection*, and as *reigning with Christ a thousand years*, verse 6; while with respect to the *rest of the dead* it is declared, that *they lived not again until the thousand years were finished*, verse 5. That is, the Saints, or those who are believers of the truth, being raised; and living and reigning with Christ during the period of his mediatorial kingdom, called a thousand years; — which is evidently a definite, put for an indefinite number, 2 Peter 3:8; — at the expiring of this period, but not till then, the rest of the dead are raised likewise. The apostle Paul evidently alludes to the same distinction, between the *first* and the *second resurrections*, [191] in 1 Cor. 15th; when, after having declared that *as in Adam all die, so even in Christ shall all be made alive*, verse 22d, he immediately subjoins, *but every man in his own order: Christ the first fruits; afterwards they that are Christ's at his coming*; — *then cometh the end*, &c.; verses 23d and 24th. But, not to multiply direct quotations from scripture in proof of this matter, how obvious must it be to every reflecting mind, that if, as has been shewn, there is to be a *resurrection of the just at Christ's second coming*, — and if, besides, there is to be a *resurrection of the unjust*, — there is no period to which, with any regard to propriety and consistency, the latter event can be assigned, except the *consummation of all things*. And is it no recommendation of this view, that it completely explains, as well as reconciles with one another, all those passages of scripture, which represent the *unrighteous* as excluded from the *kingdom of God*? How often have the ordinary systems of Universalists been taxed with making no distinction, between the fates of the *righteous* and the *wicked*; and how lame, in general, have been the answers returned to objections of this sort? One class of Universalists<sup>81</sup> fancy, that they have sufficiently answered them by alleging, that *the wicked shall suffer for a limited period hereafter, as a means of bringing them to the knowledge and love of God*; overlooking the facts, that it is not by *intensity of suffering*, nay, that it is not by *suffering at all*, but by *the manifestation of the divine character as love*, that any intelligent [192] being is *changed and spiritualized*, John 17:3; 2 Cor. 4:6; 1 John 4:8-10,19; — and, that as *death* does not lead to *suffering*, but *suffering* leads to and terminates in *death*, Gen. 3:17-19; Rom. 6:23; therefore, *suffering*, with *sin* from which it proceeds, must be confined to *this present world*, or *present dispensation of things*. Rev. 21:4,5. Another class of them<sup>82</sup> fancy, that they get rid of such objections by alleging, that *the difference between the state of believers and unbelievers upon earth, constitutes all that is intended by the enjoyment of Christ's kingdom on the part of the one, and exclusion from it on the part of the other*; overlooking the facts, that *everlasting life* is represented as the *future*, because the *present possession* of those who believe; — that although the *confinement of sin and suffering to this present world*, undoubtedly excludes the idea of *future punishment by torments*,<sup>83</sup> it does not exclude that of *future punishment by privation*; — and that unless believers are raised hereafter to the enjoyment of *peculiar privileges* with their Head, their conformity to him is incomplete: nay, overlook the fact, that all those passages of the sacred volume which promise a reign with Christ hereafter, only to those who suffer with him here, are, upon their principles, left without receiving their fulfilment. But the moment it is understood that the *unrighteous*, or *unbelieving part of mankind*, although *ultimately saved* by [193] being *created anew* at the consummation of all things, have *neither part nor lot in those blessings which the Messiah showers down hereafter, only upon such as here hope and wait for his appearing*; — and that the *righteous* or *believers alone* live and reign with Christ during the *thousand years*; — how wonderfully, and accurately, do we see fulfilled all those scriptures which intimate, that the *unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God*. It is true, the *unrighteous* are not *tormented* after death, as popular theories suppose; for, as while *naturally alive*, being merely *soulical*, they had *no principle of spiritual and everlasting life abiding in them*, so, until the consummation of all things or end of Christ's kingdom, they have *no existence at all*. They are excluded from Christ's kingdom, therefore, by the fact



of their not possessing *a principle of divine and spiritual life*; the only principle by means of the possession of which *any intelligent being can enter into it*. John 3:3,5. But existence, aye and everlasting existence too, they shall ultimately have; for, it is the glorious office, and destined triumph of the Redeemer, to subdue even them unto himself. And this, not by raising them, at the consummation of all things, in *the transgressing and rebellious nature which they now have*; — for that would be, instead of subduing them, *to confirm their opposition to himself for ever, and to render himself accessory to, and the minister of, the everlasting existence of sin*, Galatians 2:17; — but by raising them, although they lived and died possessed of a nature which inspiration has declared to be *enmity against* [194] *God*, in the possession of a nature *thoroughly subjected to the will of God*, and therefore *thoroughly conformed to his own*. Now let any man, having the slightest pretensions to ordinary understanding, ask himself: whether in raising persons who have *a sinful nature here, with the same sinful nature hereafter*; or in raising persons who have *a sinful nature here, with a sinless nature hereafter*; the display of power, wisdom, and benevolence be greater? and, by the answer to the question, let the whole matter be decided. If beings whose *nature is sinful here*, are to be raised with *the same sinful nature hereafter*, it must be, because there exists on the part of him by whom they are raised, either *want of power*; or *want of inclination*, or, perhaps, *want of both*, to effect *a change in their present nature*. But can there be *want of power* to effect this change, on the part of him who declares concerning himself, that *all power is given unto him in heaven and in earth*, Mat. 28:18; and concerning whom it is declared by the Psalmist, and the Apostle, that *all things are put under his feet*, Psalm 8, and Heb. 2:8; nay, who shews what he is capable of, by the change which, according to the acknowledgment of all, he effects in the case of believers of the truth? And can there be on his part *want of inclination*, when we consider, that his *love is boundless*, — that it has *a breadth, and length, and depth, and height*, — *which pass knowledge*? On the other hand, if beings *whose nature is sinful here* are to be raised to the possession of *a sinless nature hereafter*, do we not, in this *complete conquest of sin*, — in this *rendering* [195] *of the entrance of sin, subservient to its destruction by the reign of grace*, — and in this *ultimate elevation of all the sons and daughters of humanity, to the enjoyment of holiness and happiness*, — see *power, wisdom, and benevolence* displayed, in the highest degree in which it is possible to conceive of each of these attributes, and, consequently, in a way which renders them perfectly consistent with one another? There can be no doubt respecting the answer which must be returned, by every candid, reflecting, and spiritually-enlightened man. And, oh! how admirably adapted for the accomplishment of God's designs of love towards all, are the means which He is employing. The final subduing of all things to himself by the Messiah, is not to be *the result of brute force*; but of *such a manifestation of the divine character, as shall be productive of a complete change of mind in the whole intelligent creation*. The righteous, who shall have been in possession of the heavenly felicity with their Head during the thousand years' reign, shall, at the consummation of all things, be manifested to those who are now wicked, as objects of the divine approbation, in the very act of raising the latter; and shall thus constitute one of the grand means of imparting to them *such a knowledge of God*, as *while it convicts them of the extent of their previous guilt, and satisfies them of the justice of their previous condemnation*, shall likewise *subdue them to God*, and *become in them a principle of life everlasting*. Isaiah 55:3; compared with John 5:25, and 28. Those who are then raised, seeing the righteous to be the objects [196] of *divine approbation*, and themselves, as previously wicked, to have been justly the objects of *divine condemnation*, — how interesting to think, that thus the light of *the knowledge of the glory of God*, till then unenjoyed by them, for the first time *shines into their minds*! That *the divine glory, or the manifestation of the divine character*, which, during the existence of this present world, illuminates the understandings of *but few*, — and which, during the intermediate state, is confined to those who are *the redeemed from among men*, — is thus, at the consummation of all things, carried out to its greatest possible extent by *enlightening the minds of all*! Thus is *God glorified* or made manifest, *in or through his saints, and admired in or through them that believe*, by the manifestation of his character *through his Son*, — and *through those who, by faith in his*

*Son, are one with him, — to the rest of the intelligent creation; and thus are all intelligent creatures, as being made partakers of the divine nature, brought to the enjoyment of everlasting felicity: even while, as Adam's descendants, and as partakers of Adam's nature, the same intelligent creatures are punished with everlasting destruction, from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power. 2* Thessalonians 1:9.

<sup>78</sup> See the Greek, and Dr. Campbell's note on Mat. 17:11.

<sup>79</sup> Some observations, in reference to this subject, will be found under the head of appendix M.

<sup>80</sup> It is but recently that, in the period during which our Lord continued dead, and in his resurrection from the grave *on the third day*, I have been enabled to perceive a lively type of the period during which mankind as a whole continue dead, and of their being ultimately raised from the grave *at the consummation of all things*. *After two days*, says Hosea, *will he revive us: in the third day he will raise us up, and we shall live in his sight*, 6:2. The great majority of mankind continue dead in time, 1 John 5:12; — they continue dead during *the period of Christ's reign, or the intermediate state*, 1 Cor. 6:9,10; Rev. 20:5, &c. &c.; — it is not till *the third day, or period, or æra*, that they are *raised up, and live in God's sight*.

<sup>81</sup> The followers of Winchester, Murray, Chauncey, Douglas, &c.

<sup>82</sup> Messrs. Ballou, Balfour, and other writers of the *modern* American school of Universalism. See Appendix P.

<sup>83</sup> Vulgarly so denominated. See ant: pp. 156-162 of this volume.

I have thus given, at some length, a view of what appears to me to be the system proposed in scripture with respect to *the present state*, and *future destiny*, of the children of men. This system may, however, be both shortened and simplified.

[197] The following statement will, I hope, be found to convey a tolerably distinct idea of my meaning.

The fundamental principle with which I set out, is the fact recorded, or implied, in every page of the sacred volume, that *the whole human race* naturally are *wicked*. Rom. 3:9-19; 5:12; &c. The *justice* of God is displayed in visiting these *wicked ones* with *death* as their appropriate *punishment*. *The wages of sin is death*. Rom. 6:23. But their *punishment* is likewise *everlasting*. Mat. 25:46; &c. Their *everlasting punishment* cannot consist in *everlasting torments*;<sup>84</sup> for this would imply that *wickedness is everlasting*, and that Christ instead of *destroying*, actually *confirms the works of the Devil*; which, of course, cannot be. How, then, can *the punishment of human beings as the wicked* be rendered *everlasting*? Only by their being *everlastingly destroyed*. But how can they be *destroyed* more than they are by *dying*? Only by their having their *present nature*, swallowed up in *another nature*, which, as *everlasting*, shall render their existence hereafter as wicked beings *absolutely impossible*.<sup>85</sup> But as the only *everlasting nature* which we know, or can conceive of, is *the divine nature*, Exodus 3:14; 1 Tim. 6:16; &c. therefore, it must be, by their having their wicked nature *here*, changed into the divine nature *hereafter*, or by their having their wicked nature *everlastingly destroyed*, by their [198] being *ultimately raised in the likeness of the Son of God*, that *the punishment of the wicked or human beings as such*, which originally and properly is *death*, can, consistently with the whole tenor of scripture, be converted into *everlasting punishment*. And yet, delightful thought! it is in this very fact that *mercy* is displayed; or that God appears to be *the Saviour*, as well as *just*. For, thus have they, who as descendants of the first Adam are *wicked* and therefore *justly condemned*, conferred upon them, as descendants of the second Adam, the character of *righteous*; — a character in which they stand before the throne of God *justified and accepted*.

<sup>84</sup> Commonly so called.

<sup>85</sup> This is *the second death*. Rev. 20:14, &c.; also Gen. 3:15, and 1 Cor. 15:54.

The whole secret then is, that *the same intelligent beings*, are presented to us *in two different*

situations, and bearing two different characters.<sup>86</sup> Originally, they are *wicked* or *sinful*. Genesis 2, 3, &c. As *wicked* or *sinful* they die, — *death* being *sin's wages*. Rom. 6:23. But they are also *raised from the grave*; and *the nature* conferred upon them at the period of their resurrection being *immortal*, or *the nature of Christ*, Rom. 6:9, Rev. 1:17,18, the *punishment* which they incur as *wicked*, is thereby rendered *everlasting*. And this, because *the wicked nature* which they originally have, being swallowed up in *the righteous nature* which they afterwards come to possess; and there being thus no possibility of their original nature ever existing again; they as *wicked* are *everlastingly punished*, by being *everlastingly destroyed*. This *everlasting punishment* of *the wicked*, or of *Adam's descendants as such*, by [199] conferring upon them hereafter *everlasting life*, is gradually accomplished:

<sup>86</sup> 1 Cor. 15:49.

1st. By the Son of God appearing *in the likeness of sinful flesh*, with a *mind* which, instead of being *soulical*, was *spiritual*; and, in consequence of his possessing this *spiritual mind*, by his, first, sacrificing his *personal body*, and *the life which he had in common with us*, and, secondly, rendering his *personal body and life* entirely *spiritual*, by his resurrection from the dead.

2ndly. By his conferring upon some of the children of men, in every succeeding age, *the first fruits of spirit*; or, by his imparting to their minds, originally *soulical* like the minds of others, the beginnings of *spiritual principle*: and by his giving to them, as they partake with him in the possession of a *spiritual principle* by their *minds*, also to partake with him in a *spiritual resurrection* of their *bodies*. In other words, the leaven of *the divine nature*, if I may so express myself, which originally leavened *the personal body and life* of the Messiah himself, succeeds next in leavening, first, *the minds*, and afterwards *the bodies*, of a few chosen, and specially favoured individuals, from among the family of man. And this, by the communication to these selected ones *here*, of *the knowledge of God's character*, through the medium of the communication to them of *the knowledge of the Messiah*, John 14:7,9, &c.; this *divine knowledge*, as a *spiritual principle*, being followed in due time by *the spiritualization of their bodies*; Rom. 8:11,23; Phil. 3:20,21; &c. [200] The conferring of *spiritual minds and bodies* upon the elect, leads,

3dly. To the communication of spiritual principle ultimately to *the rest of the children of men*. The leaven of *spirituality*, or *the divine nature*, John 4:24, (to keep up a simile already employed), having leavened, first, *the personal body of the Messiah*, and afterwards *the minds and bodies of his people*, at last, by means of this previous process, *leavens the whole lump of humanity*.<sup>87</sup> Or, to drop metaphor, the character of God first manifested *to the Messiah*, and then through him *to his people*, is, ultimately, through the Messiah and his people, manifested *to all*. This principle of divine manifestation is, according to scripture, a principle of everlasting life, in these different orders<sup>88</sup> or classes of individuals; John 6:47-58; John 17:3; 1 John 5:20; Isaiah 55:3; with John 5:25,28,29. Nor does the conferring of this principle interfere with *the justice of God*, in taking hold of, and visiting punishment upon, these different orders or classes, in so far as they are possessed of the nature of the first Adam; for the display of *mercy*, always implies the previous exercise of *justice*. The Lord Jesus, by taking hold of our condemned nature, although personally guiltless, virtually subjected *himself*, or, rather, *our nature in himself*, to the stroke of death; which accordingly he underwent, Rom. 6:10; 8:3; &c.: — his people, in so far as they are possessed of *soul and body*, or *human nature*, [201] are subjected to death likewise; that which lives everlastingly in them being, not *natural* or *soulical*, but *supernatural* or *spiritual principle*,<sup>89</sup> John 11:26, &c.: — and the rest of the human race rise ultimately to the enjoyment of everlasting life, through *the forfeiture of all that they naturally possess*.<sup>90</sup> Mat. 10:28.

<sup>87</sup> Mat. 13:33.

<sup>88</sup> 1 Corinth. 15:23.

<sup>89</sup> I may here remark, that the existence, in every age, of *faith*, or *the knowledge of God's character* upon earth, has been, is, and ever will be, the only connecting link between time and eternity.



<sup>90</sup> The process insisted on in the three preceding paragraphs, is set before us, in 1 Corinth. 15:20-28, particularly in verses 22-24.

Such, then, is the system which scripture proposes to us. The same intelligent beings *punished* as *wicked*, and yet *made partakers of everlasting life* as *righteous*. Nay, what is particularly remarkable, and what by the natural mind is absolutely incredible, their *everlasting punishment* as *wicked*, carried into effect, by their having *everlasting life* conferred upon them. And the grand medium, through which the whole of this is accomplished, discovered to be, *the progressive communication of the principle of everlasting life*, by *the progressive manifestation of the divine character*. Who, upon scriptural grounds, can overturn this?

That the system which I advocate, viewed as a whole, is new, or, at least, that it is one not generally received, can never be regarded by any reflective person, as even the shadow of an argument against it. That it is susceptible of additions, modifications, and corrections, — that the outline which I have, perhaps, rudely sketched, [202] may be afterwards more ably filled up, — being a charge to which every view of *the unlimited mind of God*, proceeding from *the limited mind of man*,<sup>91</sup> is necessarily obnoxious, can, of itself, be no proof of the system not being superior to any which has gone before it; however much it may operate, and justly operate, against its author, and those by whom it may be adopted, regarding it as *absolutely perfect*. It is, as tried by *the word of God*, that it must stand or fall; and to that word, therefore, and to it alone, as *the court of ultimate resort*,<sup>92</sup> does its author make his appeal. Shew me that I am erroneous *in part*, (*in whole*, I know, as to a certain degree *divinely taught*, John 6:45, Rom. 8:16, &c., I cannot be), and, so far from being displeased, I thank you; and either add the views suggested by you to my system, or, by means of them, correct any errors into which I may have fallen. But it will not do to tell me, upon any authority short of that of God himself, that I am wrong. My mind, which in matters of religion, submits to *God's authority*, will not submit to *that of man*. — To shew opposers the strength, — the scriptural strength, I mean, — of the system which I propounded, I am willing to go, at any length they please, into the proof of it. I know well the power of prejudice, and the difficulties which truth has to encounter in making its way into the mind; and, therefore, I am willing to leave no stone unturned, — no efforts untried, — where there is even the feeblest pros-[203]pect of my being serviceable to my fellow men. There are two different ways in which I shall endeavour to bring the proofs of the preceding system to bear upon the consciences of opposers: 1, by directing their attention to some remarkable positive assertions of it contained in the sacred volume; and, 2, by shewing that it is actually the doctrine broached in passages, which are commonly quoted as furnishing some of the strongest arguments for the popular theory.

<sup>91</sup> *Creeds, confessions of faith*, and *articles of religion*, among the rest.

<sup>92</sup> See Westminster Confession of Faith, chap. 1, *sections penult. et ult.*

#### First Series of Proofs.

The preceding theory is confirmed, by some remarkable assertions of it contained in the sacred volume. — With a view to avoid swelling out the size of the work, I will confine myself to a very few of these:

1st. Believers of the truth do not constitute *the whole harvest* of the intelligent creation which God is to gather in, but merely *the first fruits* of it. One or two plain and explicit declarations to this effect, on the part of the inspired writers, will, I presume, be enough to substantiate my position. *Of his own will begat he us with the word of truth, that we should be* A KIND OF FIRST FRUITS OF HIS CREATURES. James 1:18. *These*, says the author of the Book of Revelation, speaking of the persons whom he had seen standing with the Lamb on Mount Zion, *these are they which follow the Lamb whithersoever he goeth: these were redeemed* FROM AMONG MEN, *being* THE FIRST FRUITS UNTO GOD, AND TO THE LAMB. Rev. 14:4. With the circum-[204]stances alluded to in both the

passages quoted, every student of the Old Testament scriptures must be familiar. In the 23d chapter of Leviticus, at the 9th and following verses, we find God commanding the children of Israel, on their arrival in the land which he was to give them, on the morrow after the Paschal Sabbath annually, to wave before him, or present to him, *a sheaf of the first fruits of their harvest*, in token of their admission, that the whole harvest belonged to him: and he promises, verse 11th, to accept of the sheaf, thus waved, or presented, on their behalf. Understanding this, we perceive at once why it is, that Christ, and his believing people, are so frequently, in the New Testament, represented as *first fruits*. As the priest of old presented the wave sheaf before the Lord, and as it was accepted by him in token of his accepting and blessing the whole harvest, so the Messiah, who is the antitype as well of the priest as of his offering, presented himself when he rose from the dead, on the morrow after the Paschal Sabbath; and presents his people who are one with him, when they rise from the dead at his second coming, as first fruits unto his Heavenly Father: and has his offering of the first fruits accepted, in token of the ultimate acceptance of the whole harvest. And what, pray, is this harvest? Christ, and his believing people? Were any man to say so, he would talk absurdly; for he would represent the Messiah, and his church, as being *the first fruits of themselves*; that is, of course, as not being *first fruits at all*! He would confound *the first fruits* with *the harvest*! If the pas-[205]sages above quoted are allowed to speak for themselves, no difficulty whatever attaches to the subject. Every man qualified to translate his Greek Testament knows, that the passage in the Book of Revelation may be fitly and fairly rendered, *these were redeemed*, or bought, *from among men, first fruits*, that is, first fruits from among men, *to God and the Lamb*: but if so, what other construction can we put upon the word than this, that *men are the harvest*, of which *the redeemed from among men, are the first fruits*? Again; as James declares concerning those who with himself had been *begotten by the word of truth*, that they were *a kind of first fruits of God's creatures*, — the only point requiring to be ascertained is, what is here the meaning of the word *creatures*? Had the original word been κτισις, there would have been no difficulty whatever in the case; for, by the admission of Schleusner, Parkhurst, Hedericus, and other eminent lexicographers, that word signifies, in more than one passage of the sacred writings, *a human creature*, or *the rational creation*.<sup>93</sup> But as the word which the apostle has chosen to employ is κτισμα, about the meaning of which, critical authority is not so explicit, we are obliged to pause before coming to a decision. In 1 Timothy 4:4, and Rev. 8:9, two other passages where it occurs, it signifies *creatures in general, whether animate or inanimate*; a circumstance which, from a perusal of both these texts, must be evident even to the mere English reader. But in Rev. 5:[206]13, — the only other place where, besides the one in question, it is to be met with, — can the action ascribed to *every creature* by the inspired writer, be supposed to have been performed by any but *rational and intelligent beings*? And if there employed in the sense of *intelligent creature*, may it not in James 1:18, have *the same signification*? But not to insist upon this, though I were to grant that in James' epistle, the Greek phrase, τῶν κτισμάτων, translated *creatures*, signified *creatures in general*; — and that the intention of the apostle was, to speak of believers of the truth as presented to God in the character of first fruits of *the whole creation*, finally presented to him, and accepted by him, in its changed and glorified state; — why, even then, my argument so far from being weakened, would be strengthened: for, if *believers* are presented to God *as the first fruits of ALL his creatures*, then, certainly, *a fortiori*, as *the first fruits of his rational and intelligent creatures*.<sup>94</sup> If, then, according to one apostle, those *who follow the Lamb whithersoever he goeth*, or, are his believing people, are *first fruits from among men*; and if, according to another, we who believe, in being *begotten by the word of truth*, become *a kind of first fruits of God's creatures*, — whether we understand that phrase to signify *his creatures in general*, or *his rational creatures in particular*; — am I chargeable with rashness, in proposing *the whole family of man* as *the harvest* of which be-[207]lievers are gathered in as *the first fruits*; and in arguing from God's *present acceptance* of the one, to his *ultimate acceptance* of the other? The man who would overturn my present reasonings, must be prepared to shew, first, that the privilege of being *begotten by the word of truth*, belongs not to *the whole*, but only to *a part of believers*; or, secondly, that although

creatures are *the harvest*, of which *believers* are *the first fruits*, God's accepting *the latter*, does not imply, that he will accept *the former*; or, thirdly, that Christ and his people may, without talking absurdly, be spoken of as *the first fruits of themselves*. If he shall fail, — as fail he must, — in his attempts to prove any, or all of these counter positions, what remains for him, but to admit the conclusion, to which I have found myself constrained to come?

<sup>93</sup> Vid. partic. Schleusner, ap. verb. def. 3. — See also M'Knight, notes on Rom. 8:20,22.

<sup>94</sup> See a quibbling note of Dr. M'Knight's, on this verse. James 1:18. No. 3. His translation of the verse is in the same spirit. The man evidently felt himself diffculted.

2dly. It is the divine intention *to create anew*, every thing that belongs to this present system of things; and to exclude from *the new creation*, all the properties and qualities of *the old*. This purpose of God was announced by the prophet Isaiah, six centuries before the birth of Christ, in the following animated strain: *Behold, I create new heavens, and a new earth; and the former shall not be remembered, nor come into mind*, 65:17, &c. This and similar prophecies were fulfilled *in part*, or rather *typically*, by the advent of the Messiah, and the superseding of the Old Testament Dispensation by the New; but their *complete*, or rather *antitypical* accomplishment is still future, and is thus spoken of by John in the book of Revelation: *And I heard a great voice [208] out of heaven, saying, behold the tabernacle of God is WITH MEN; and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them, and be their God. And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain: for the former things are passed away. And he that sat upon the throne, said, behold, I make ALL THINGS NEW*. Rev. 21:3-5. I deem it absolutely impossible for language to be more explicit than this is, with respect to the two following connected facts. First, the creation anew, in a higher form, of every thing which had been previously created in a lower one; and, secondly, the absence, nay the exclusion from the new creation of all the properties and qualities of the old. First. *All things* are represented by the inspired writer as *made* or *created anew*. *Behold I make all things new*. No man who pretends to cherish the slightest reverence for the sacred volume, will venture to deny, that *the heavens and the earth themselves* are to be *created anew*; for, besides the declarations of Isaiah and John to this effect, the language of Peter, in the 3d chapter of his second epistle,<sup>95</sup> is so pointedly explicit, as to put [209] the divine purpose in regard to this matter, beyond the reach of doubt or controversy. Strange to tell! however, the same persons who, without hesitation, admit God's power and intention at some future æra to create anew *inanimate nature*, are found staggering at the idea of his creating anew at the same æra *rational and intelligent beings*! As if the same power which could *re-create* the one, could not also *re-create* the other; nay, as if the phrase, *I make ALL THINGS NEW*, were not so comprehensive as evidently to include *the one*, as well as *the other*. But the most remarkable circumstance connected with this matter, and what renders the dulness and inaptitude of mankind, where spiritual things are concerned, most conspicuous is, that when we examine the preceding context of the passage in which the words just quoted occur, it is *chiefly*, I should rather say *exclusively*, of *human beings*, and of *the change which is to take place upon them*, that the heavenly voice is found to be speaking.<sup>96</sup> It is in the teeth of this fact, that the same persons who admit *the universality* of the language, *I make all things new*, when applied to what is *inanimate*, allow themselves to dispute its *universality* when applied to *the family of man*! "Intelligent beings," say they in their usual oracular way, "who are wicked *here*, must continue wicked *hereafter*! God cannot create *them* anew!" And yet, God's language is, *behold, I make ALL THINGS new*! And it is concerning *mankind in general*, as having *his tabernacle with THEM*, and as *dwelling with THEM*, and as *wiping away [210] all tears from THEIR eyes*, and so on, that, at the very moment of employing these words, he is speaking! But stop! every supporter of the popular theory is not, it seems, to be ranked among the contradicters of the doctrine, that *all things, without exception, are finally to be made new*; for, some of them, it is said, admit, that the words quoted are fulfilled in the case of the wicked, by their being invested, at some future æra, with *an everlasting*,

instead of *a transient existence*: although, according to them, this *superior existence* is to be conferred upon such persons, not *for their benefit*, but *to enable them to undergo everlasting torments!* Upon the minds of those who have adopted this notion, it becomes proper for me now to enforce attention to *the second fact* already stated, viz., that from *the new creation* are necessarily excluded all the properties and qualities of *the old*; or, that all things being made new, *the former things will have passed away*. According to those whose sentiments I am opposing, the wicked may *be made new*, and yet, may possess *the same wicked nature*, and exhibit *the same wicked character*, which they did while upon earth; nay, according to them, they may *be made new*, and yet may continue to have *sin, suffering, and sorrow*, for their inseparable attendants throughout eternity! That is, according to them, *the former things do not pass away!* But John declares it to have been the language of *the voice which he heard from heaven*, that when the period should arrive for God's *dwelling with men*, (observe, not *one class* or *description of men*, but *men in general*, without [211] any limit or qualification), he should *wipe away all tears from their eyes*; and that there should be *no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, &c.*: the reasons for this being, that *the former things* should then have *passed away*, and that *all things* should then have been *made new*. Now, how can I, as an honest man, and satisfied that the divine testimony is in all respects consistent with itself, reconcile these declarations with the popular theory? That theory, properly enough, because scripturally, rejects *the annihilation scheme*; maintaining, in opposition to it, that *the reign of death comes to an end*, and that, therefore, *there is a resurrection of all the dead*: but avoiding Scylla, it shipwrecks its votaries upon Charybdis; for, instead of causing them to acquiesce and rejoice in the prospect set before them by the inspired writer, that there shall be *no more sorrow, nor crying, nor pain*, it ventures to contradict the divine record by maintaining that *sorrow, and crying, and pain shall continue for ever*; — instead of leading its votaries to rejoice in the prospect of *the former things passing away*, it inspires them with a kind of morbid pleasure, derived from indulging in the gloomy anticipation of *the sufferings of the wicked*, which certainly rank among *the former things*, being clothed with *everlasting duration!* Is it nothing in favour of the system which I have embraced, and which I am endeavouring to inculcate, that instead of standing opposed to, it is confirmed in all its parts by, the heavenly voice which was heard by John; — that it proceeds upon the principle of *all things being made new*, and of *sin, [212] suffering, sorrow, and death, the former things*, being all confined to this present state, and *passing away* along with it?

<sup>95</sup> *But the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night; in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat; the earth also, and the works that are therein shall be burnt up. Seeing, then, that all these things shall be dissolved, &c.* 2 Peter 3:10,11. Nevertheless we, according to his promise, look for new heavens, and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness: verse 13. Allusions, by no means obscure, to the same thing, may be observed in 1 Corinth. 3:13-15; 2 Thessal. 1:7-9; Heb. 11:3, &c. &c.

<sup>96</sup> *Behold the tabernacle of God is WITH MAN, &c.*, to the end of the 4th verse.

3dly. According to scripture, mankind as a whole, *have been subjected to sin, suffering, and death*, not that they may continue under the sway of these tyrants for ever, but that *there may be a display of the divine character, both in their subjection to, and emancipation from them:*<sup>97</sup> and, according to the same infallible authority, some human beings are, even on this side of the grave, *delivered from the bondage of corruption, as to their minds, by the belief of the truth*, not that they alone and exclusively may enjoy God for ever, but that *they, along with their divine head, may become the means of ultimately manifesting the divine perfections to the rest of their fellow men*; thereby ultimately introducing their fellow men into the possession of that blessedness, of the first fruits of which *now*, and of a larger measure of which *at the period of Christ's second coming*, they themselves, by sovereign grace, *are and shall be* partakers. This doctrine is, in all its parts, brought out, stated, and illustrated, in the eighth chapter of the epistle to the Romans; in a passage which, upon any other principles than those just proposed, is utterly unintelligible; but which, explained on those principles, is

seen to be clear, self-consistent, and satisfactory. As the whole passage must be taken together, my readers will, I presume, have no objections to my indulging in [213] a sort of commentary upon it. Instead of beginning at the nineteenth verse, as is commonly done, it will be necessary for us, in order to perceive the connection of the whole, to go back as far, at least, as the middle of the seventeenth. — But before proceeding to my comment, I deem it proper to suggest, that there are two things connected with the passage, both well deserving of consideration. First. The contrast between *the creature*, and *the sons of God*, announced originally in the 19th verse, hinted at in the 21st, and repeated in the most emphatic manner in the 22d and 23d; and, secondly, the circumstance of the *revelation, manifestation, or glorification of the sons of God*, (whatever these phrases may signify), being an object of interest and instinctive desire, because a source of future advantage, to *the creature*. If these things be considered, it will be found, that the whole scope and interest of the passage, turn on the meaning of the Greek word translated *creature*.<sup>98</sup> Now it is not of the slightest consequence to my present argument, whether the word be understood to signify, *the natural creation in general*, or *mankind in particular*.<sup>99</sup> If *the former*, then in the [214] advantages which are to redound to *the creation in general*, at the period and by means of *the manifestation of the sons of God*, *mankind* being a part of *that creation* must, as a matter of course, have their share. If *the latter*, we are enabled to perceive the interest of the whole human race in that event more directly. That the Greek word κτισις employed here, and translated *creature*, signifies *the rational and intelligent creation, or human beings*, is evident to me, from the two following, among other considerations: 1st. That the same word denotes unquestionably *an intelligent being* in such passages as, Mark 16:15, *Preach the gospel to every creature*, παση τη κτισει; and Coloss. 1:23, *the gospel — which was preached to every creature*, εν παση τη κτισει. Perhaps also Heb. 4:13, affords a proof of this. Even the mere English reader can perceive that, in the two former passages, *rational creatures*, and not *the brutes*, must be intended.<sup>100</sup> 2dly. The actions and desires here ascribed to *the creature*, are such as *naturally* belong to, and can be predicated of, *rational and intelligent creatures*; but can only, *by a strong figure of speech*, be ascribed to *inanimate creation*, or the *brutes*.<sup>101</sup> It is on grounds such [215] as these, that Dr. M'Knight, and some other eminent critics and commentators, have understood κτισις, and πασα η κτισις, in this passage to signify, *the intelligent creation, and every human being*.<sup>102</sup> — Let us now take up and consider each of the parts of which this passage consists, in succession. Verse 17th. *If so be that we suffer with him, that we may be also glorified together*. Having stated, says the apostle, that we who believe are *heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ*, I have now to observe, that the inheritance, in which we participate with our divine master, is one of sufferings here, and glory or manifestation hereafter. Verse 18th. *For I reckon, that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us*. That is, I regard our present sufferings for Christ's sake, as a part of our joint inheritance, with him; because, the following glory cannot be enjoyed without them; and because so speedily are these sufferings to be followed by the glory, and so completely will that glory swallow up and annihilate them, that it is impossible to consider them as, in the slightest degree, detracting from its value and desirableness. They are like something put into a scale so very light, that, when an attempt is made to balance them against what is put [216] into the opposite scale, they will not for a single moment abide the trial, but at once kick the beam.<sup>103</sup> These sufferings, therefore, are with the utmost propriety spoken of by me as *an inheritance, or something advantageous and beneficial*. And if I be asked, adds the apostle, my reason for speaking in such rapturous and decided terms of the value of the glory, in which the saints participate with their head; and for holding in such contempt the sufferings, which must precede their attainment of it; I have no hesitation in assigning as my reason for doing so, verse 19th, the fact, that *the earnest expectation of the creature waiteth for the manifestation of the Sons of God*.<sup>104</sup> I give you, as if the apostle had said, the measure of the value and importance of this glory, revelation, or manifestation which believers, as the Sons of God, are hereafter to partake of with their head, when I inform you, that towards it, as ultimately *a manifestation to them*, 2 Thess. 1:10, *the outstretching of the neck, or the earnest and irrepressible longings of the whole rational and intelligent creation* are

directed. Not that this longing *in them* is *intelligent*, for it is *in all*, except believers, *merely instinctive*;<sup>105</sup> but that this instinctive longing, — this pointing to, — this tendency towards, — the manifestation of the Sons of God, on the part of all rational beings, does exist; and that to the Sons of God themselves, it furnishes one of [217] the best ideas which, while upon earth, they are capable of acquiring, with respect to the importance of the privileges conferred upon them by their head. Here, even, believers are the Sons of God; but the world sees them not, — acknowledges them not, to be so:<sup>106</sup> — by that same world, however, shall their dignity be seen and acknowledged hereafter; and, strange to tell! it is towards this very event, — the honouring of those whom they now despise, — that the instinctive tendencies of the world are directed. But as these tendencies of the world necessarily imply, that the manifestation in question is to issue in their benefit, how can this be when we consider, that the world is sinful and condemned? To this the apostle answers, verses 20th and 21st, *for the creature was made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of him who hath subjected the same in hope; because*<sup>107</sup> *the creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption, into the glorious liberty of the children of God.* The reasons, says the apostle, why *the creature*, or *great bulk of human beings*, shall, notwithstanding their sinfulness and condemnation, be delivered or emancipated, from their present state and circumstances; and why they exhibit to the spiritually-enlightened mind the earnest of this future deliverance of theirs, in their present instinctive longings after it, are twofold: First. That no human being voluntarily placed [218] himself in his present state, or voluntarily subjected himself *to vanity*,<sup>108</sup> that is, to *sin*, *sufferings*, and *death*, things, in themselves, necessarily *vain* or *transient*. Had mankind been demons; that is, had they existed previous to their appearance upon earth, and clothed themselves with flesh, for the purpose of sinning, and thereby introducing disorder into the course of the divine administration; then, indeed, might future punishments, of the most awful description, have been their lot. But when, so far from this being the case, we know, that the nature which human beings have, they did not confer upon themselves; — that in the reception of it, they were perfectly passive; — it is obviously impossible for God, consistently with justice, to punish human beings, (supposing such to exist), with *more than death*; seeing that *more than death* is the punishment of beings, who should voluntarily assume humanity for the purpose of sinning. And, secondly, deliverance from evil and its consequences, is ultimately to be the lot of all human beings, because, in subjecting them to *vanity*, i.e. *corruption*, or *evil*, God's intention was, by so doing, to manifest his character:<sup>109</sup> and as this purpose required, that the subjection in question should merely be temporary, therefore, whenever the purpose for which they are employed as instruments shall be accomplished, their deliverance shall take place. Besides, this de-[219]liverance of them from the bondage of corruption, — this resurrection of them from the grave, and emancipation of them from the consequences of evil, — is not for the purpose of allowing any circumstance of their former state to attach to them; but to introduce them into the same liberty which the children of God enjoy: a liberty imparted by means of, and consisting in, divine glory or manifestation; nay, communicated ultimately to *the creature, or mankind in general*, by means of its previous communication to *the sons of God*. And in order to prove demonstratively, adds the apostle, that *the creature*, or *intelligent creation*, must ultimately, in the way stated, be emancipated *from corruption*, — from sin and its consequences, — I desire to draw attention to a fact known by all of us, verses 22d and 23d, *that the whole creation, or every creature*,<sup>110</sup> *groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now: and not only they, but ourselves also, which have the first fruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body.* That is, it being a fact known to us, that *all intelligent beings* are, during the period of their abode upon earth, in a state of the most intense anguish, I inform you, that this fact actually points to, — that the import of this fact actually is, — their future deliverance; it being inconsistent with the nature of things, that a state of suffering, should ever be the ultimate state of any intelligent being: nay, a state of suffering actually implying, that it is subservient to some other state; a [220] circumstance proved by the fact, that the anguish now endured by *the rational creation*, is like that of a female in the pains of parturition; intense, indeed, but speedily to be succeeded by relief;

see John 16:21:<sup>111</sup> and if any doubt shall remain respecting this matter, it will be removed by considering, that even we who believe, and, as believers possessing the first fruits of the Spirit, have our minds freed from all distressing anxiety about futurity, — even we endure intense anguish, from the redemption of our body not yet having been carried into effect, and the outward circumstances in which we are placed: this anguish *in our case* not only proving, that so far from having attained to *our* ultimate state, we are yet in a state preliminary and subservient to it, — but also involving in it the general principle, that suffering *in no case whatever* can be connected with *the ultimate state of any intelligent being*; but must *in every case* be subservient to *such an ultimate state*. And that this is not *the ultimate state* of us who believe, supposing any man to be foolish enough to call my averment in question, is proved by the fact, verse 24th, that *we are saved by hope*, &c. — But here I close my commentary, it being quite unnecessary, for the purpose of my present argument, to carry it farther.<sup>112</sup>

— If any man [221] shall dispute the correctness of my paraphrase, I would ask him the following question: Is not the Greek particle γάρ,<sup>113</sup> which occurs at the beginning of the 18th, [222] 19th, 20th, 22d, and 24th verses, always employed in *causal* reasoning? and how, except as pointing out *the cause* or *reason* of some thing going before, can the use of it in each of these places be accounted for? It is in vain to suppose with M'Knight, that the word in this passage shifts its signification; in the 18th verse having the sense of *however*, in the 22d that of *besides*, and only in the 19th and 20th denoting *for*: for an arbitrary and random method of translating like this, besides being inconsistent with common sense and sound criticism, is, in the passage before us, quite unnecessary; the *causal* meaning of the word being suitable, nay absolutely demanded, in every case where it occurs. But not to insist on this; — upon what principle, except that of *the future manifestation of the sons of God* here spoken of, being a manifestation to *the creature* or *human beings*, are we to account for the instinctive interest which *the creature* is represented as taking in it? For, if not a manifestation to *the creature*, it must be a manifestation either *to God*, or *to themselves*. *To God*, of course, it cannot be. *To themselves* it cannot be; for, it is represented in the context as the *present* privilege of the sons of God, that their character is *even now* manifest to themselves. *They have the Spirit now witnessing with their spirit, that they are the children of God*; verse 16th. What then remains, but that it must be a manifestation to *the creature itself*? a view which agrees admirably with the idea of *the creature* signifying *the intelligent creation*; and which, as implying some advantage to be derived from the manifest-[223]tation, agrees admirably, likewise, with the anxious, although instinctive interest, which *the creature* is represented as taking in it. Besides, unless *the manifestation of the sons of God* is to be to *the creature*, or *the now unbelieving part of intelligent beings*, on what grounds, and in what respect, can *this manifestation* be stated as a *reason* for the proposition contained in the 18th verse? *The glory afterwards to be revealed in or to us* who believe, is represented as more than a compensation to us for all the sufferings which, while passing through this present world, we are called on to endure; and the proof of this afforded to us is, that the glory to be revealed to us, is the object of the instinctive longings and tendencies of *the creature*: but how can the latter proposition prove the former, except on the principle, that we, who are now despised and disliked by mankind in general, in consequence of their not understanding our characters, 1 John 3:1, &c., shall afterwards be throughout eternity the objects of their respect and love, in consequence of our being manifested to them, as the favoured ones of the Lord, and as sharers with him in his heavenly felicity? 2 Thess. 1:10. Again; understanding the word *creature* to signify in this passage *mankind in general*, upon what principles, except those which I advocate, can the 20th and 21st verses be interpreted? The Calvinist and the Arminian agree in maintaining, that the wicked shall so far be delivered from the bondage of corruption at the consummation of all things, as to be then invested with immortal bodies: but how, with all their quibbling and [224] special pleading, can they get rid of the broad and unqualified assertion, that this deliverance of the wicked from the bondage of corruption, is not for the purpose of their being consigned over to a bondage infinitely worse, but for the purpose of their being introduced into the same liberty which the children of God enjoy; a liberty consisting in *glory* or *manifestation*? In a word, I challenge any divine, let his learning and talents be

what they may, to produce an interpretation of this passage *consistent with itself*, and *consistent with the scope of the rest of the chapter and epistle of which it forms a part*, which shall differ materially in its principles, and leading features, from that which I have just presented.

<sup>97</sup> Let the Christian reader ponder well the doctrine laid down in John 11:4,15; and Rom. 11:36.

<sup>98</sup> Or *creation*, as in the 22d verse; the word so translated there being, as a glance at the Greek Testament will shew, the same word κτισις which in the other verses is rendered *creature*.

<sup>99</sup> The opinion of Origen, that κτισις here signifies *the bodies of Christians*, and that the phrase is employed to distinguish them from τεκνα του θεου, which, according to him, denotes, *their minds or souls*, Grotius very properly dismisses, by observing, that it is *nimis Pythagorice, et non ex more Pauli*. A critical perusal of the whole passage, and particularly a comparison of the end of verse 23d, with the contrast between verse 22d and the beginning of verse 23d, will suggest other reasons for rejecting Origen's notion.

<sup>100</sup> Although Parkhurst, in the meanings which he assigns to κτισις, does not refer *directly* to the passages before us, in proof of the word sometimes signifying *a human creature*, or *the rational creation*, he does so *indirectly* by suggesting a comparison between the phrase πασα η κτισις, in Rom. 8:22, and the corresponding phrase in Coloss. 1:23.

<sup>101</sup> Grotius who regards the word κτισις to signify here *material creation*, or *the universe which we behold*, is obliged to admit, that it can have this meaning only by a *prosopopoeia*, or *personification*; and endeavours to support his opinion by a reference to the highly figurative language of the Old Testament scriptures, in which the actions and feelings of *intelligent beings*, are ascribed to *inanimate objects*.

<sup>102</sup> See M'Knight on Rom 8:20,22. I may be permitted here to repeat, what has already been remarked, that even although κτισις shall be understood to signify *the creation in general*, as contradistinguished from *the Sons of God* or *believers*, the conclusion which I am labouring to establish will remain unaffected.

<sup>103</sup> This is the view which Grotius takes of the meaning of the verse.

<sup>104</sup> *Patifactio filiorum Dei, id est, tempus illud cum omnibus apparebit esse filies Dei, qui nunc sint quidem, sed non putantur esse.* Grotius.

<sup>105</sup> See what is observed, under the head of my 7th presumptive argument for the universal happiness of man, at page 53.

<sup>106</sup> Nunc sunt quidem, sed non putantur esse.

<sup>107</sup> Dr. M'Knight ends the 20th verse, without taking in the words *in hope*; and begins the 21st, by translating it, *in hope that even the creature itself, &c.*

<sup>108</sup> See Psalms 39:6, and 89:47. *Inconstancy* and *mutability* are ideas which we find ourselves obliged to attach to the word ματαιοτης. Grotius explains it as used, *primum, quod tota rerum universitas vicibus et interitioni sit obnoxia.*

<sup>109</sup> How could His sovereignty, otherwise, have been known?

<sup>110</sup> See the Greek.

<sup>111</sup> Grotius observes, respecting the word συνωδινει, *travaileth together*, nempe ut liberentur. Est translatio sumpta a femina quae, cum magno dolore ac gemitu parturit, expectans ut onere liberetur.

<sup>112</sup> For the sake of enabling my readers more readily to apprehend the apostolic argument, in the passage commented on, I have resolved to submit to them the following compendium of it. Let them remember, that whenever the verse begins with the word γαρ, *for*, it assigns the reason of what goes before.

Rom. 8:17. The inheritance of believers is, sufferings with Christ here, and glory with him hereafter.

Verse 18th. The reason for my representing sufferings as a part of the inheritance of believers, and consequently as a matter of advantage to them, is, first, that they ensure the following glory; and, secondly, that the following glory is so very great as completely to swallow up and annihilate them.

Verse 19th. The reason for my asserting, that the glory in question must be so great as to accomplish all this, is, that towards it, as destined ultimately to benefit them, the instinctive longings and tendencies of the unregenerate part of the intelligent creation are directed; it being impossible that any result short of that which I have stated, can be connected with an event, which stirs up the sympathy, and excites the interest, of



the family of man.

Verses 20th and 21st. The reason why the unregenerate part of intelligent beings, experience these instinctive longings and tendencies, towards the ultimate glory or manifestation of the sons of God, as an event which is to redound to their advantage, is, that intelligent beings did not voluntarily place themselves in their present state and circumstances; and that they are employed by God as instruments for the accomplishment of certain purposes, with the accomplishment of which stands necessarily connected the hope or prospect of their deliverance.

Verses 22d and 23d. The reason for the deliverance of the unregenerate part of intelligent beings from the bondage of corruption is, that this bondage implies the endurance of intense sufferings, and that a state of suffering cannot be the ultimate state of any intelligent being; a position proved by these facts, first, that the state of the intelligent creation at present is that of a female in childbirth, enduring pangs of the sharpest and most acute kind, but with the prospect in due time of complete relief from them; and, secondly, that deliverance being the issue to which the intense anguish undergone by believers themselves, in connection with their bodies and outward circumstances, evidently and avowedly points, or, in other words, the sufferings undergone by believers *of themselves* proving that they are not in their ultimate state, of course a similar interpretation must be put upon the sufferings undergone by the unregenerate portion of mankind.

Verse 24th. The reason why it is apparent that believers are not now in their ultimate state, is, that they are now living *by hope*, &c. &c. See appendix Q.

<sup>113</sup> In our version properly translated *for*.

### Second Series of Proofs.

Extraordinary as the proposition at first sight may appear, it is nevertheless true, that the system which I am endeavouring to establish, is best proved by passages of scripture, which are generally quoted and relied on, as furnishing the strongest arguments for the popular theory. Let me illustrate this by a few examples:

1st. Few texts are more frequently quoted, in proof of the popular theory, than those which represent the number of persons who have eternal life, as being extremely limited. *Enter ye in at the strait gate, — because strait is the gate, and narrow is the way, which leadeth unto life, and FEW THERE BE WHICH find it.* Mat. 7:13,14. *Fear not LITTLE FLOCK; for it is [225] your Father's good pleasure to give YOU the kingdom.* Luke 12:32. The parable of the sower, Mat. 13, Mark 4, Luke 8; — the language of the apostle Paul, Rom. 9:27-29; — and the declaration of the apostle Peter, that *few, that is, only eight souls* or persons *were saved* from the waters of the deluge, 1 Peter 3:20; — are likewise triumphantly referred to, and pleaded, as affording evidence the most conclusive of the correctness of the popular system. "Behold," exclaims the Calvinist, "in passages such as these, the condemnation of your sentiments." I hope it will not be deemed harsh in me, if I observe, that by the use of such language, Calvinists betray their total ignorance, not merely of my system, (which of course is but a trifling matter), but, what is of far more importance, of the purpose for which the texts founded upon by them, have obtained a place in the sacred volume. They are so far correct, that the number of those who *have* eternal life is, and ever will be, comparatively speaking, small; aye, smaller than they themselves have any conception of: but they are completely at fault when they pretend to assign *the final cause*, (or *causes*), of the extremely limited number of believers; although some parts of their own theory, if duly considered and followed out, might have conducted them to it. The import of Calvinism is, *God saves some here, that He may save some hereafter!* According to it, "God brings a very limited number of persons to the knowledge of the truth *here*, as an indication or proof of its being His intention to confer eternal life only upon this same very [226] limited number of persons *hereafter*; — He restricts His interference in behalf of the human race *here*, as a proof of His intention to restrict His interference in their behalf *hereafter*; — He affords a *limited* exhibition of wisdom, power, and love *here*, in subserviency to an equally *limited* exhibition of the same qualities or attributes *hereafter!*" But how, in reality, stands the matter? That the number of persons who, while on earth, become possessed of the

first fruits of eternal life, is extremely small; — that the divine interference in behalf of the family of man, is now exceedingly restricted; — and that the manifestation of the divine attributes in time, is very limited; — are propositions which, so far from disputing, we at once and cheerfully concede. But instead of deducing from them the inferences which Calvinists and other classes of religionists do, a careful perusal of the sacred volume, as a whole, enables us to perceive, that in consequence of a very small number of persons, while on earth, being brought to the knowledge of the truth, the two following important ends are answered: *First*. Attention is thereby directed to *what man cannot do*. Such is our natural inaptitude to acquire the knowledge of divine truth, that nothing but the reiterated inculcation of the same views, under every possible variety of form and expression; — that nothing but *line upon line, precept upon precept, here a little, and there a little*; — is fitted to convey to us the requisite instruction. Nay, even this *of itself* is not sufficient; for in order to the lessons thus afforded taking effect, the same Being who inspired His servants to commit [227] them to writing, must himself condescend *directly and immediately* to become the teacher of them, by *opening the eyes of the understanding*, to understand their meaning. Luke 24:45; John 6:44,45. This *utter inability* on the part of man to confer upon himself the understanding of divine truth, it is one of the objects of God, in His word, continually to bring, and keep, before the mind. Observe, I do not say *the difficulty*, but *the utter impossibility* of man's conferring upon himself this knowledge. And, so important is this distinction, — so little does it deserve to be regarded in the light of a piece of mere verbal criticism, — it is at this very point, actually, that one of the grand differences between *the mere natural*, and *the supernaturally-enlightened mind*, begins to make its appearance.<sup>114</sup> The *mere natural mind* in reading such a passage as that in Mat. 7, *strait is the gate, &c.*, immediately interprets it as denoting *the very great difficulty* of any man's becoming a Christian; and, under the influence of this delusive impression, sets about practising itself, and recommending to others, *the most strenuous efforts, in order to the removal of the obstacles which, it supposes, stand in the way of its attaining to the privilege*. The nature of the views thus entertained, and of the efforts by which they are reduced to practice, has been beautifully and emphatically described by the apostle Paul, when accounting for the obstinate resistance of his countrymen to [228] the gospel which he proclaimed. *They being ignorant of God's righteousness, and going about to establish their own righteousness, have not submitted themselves unto the righteousness of God*. Rom. 10:3. In opposition to all these self-righteous notions and practices, those who have been *supernaturally enlightened* are enabled to perceive, that instead of its being *merely difficult*, it is *absolutely impossible*, for any man to make himself a Christian. *Faith*, — like *eternal life*, of which it is *the earnest, and first fruits*, — they perceive to be not *the result of any efforts of man*, but *the gift of God*; and this, in the light of *their own personal possession of the privilege*. It is as *believing the gospel*, and as thereby seeing *Christ to be the end of the law FOR RIGHTEOUSNESS* to themselves and *every one that believeth*, that they see their own efforts to recommend themselves to the divine favour as, so far from having been *crowned with success*, in reality *set aside and superseded*. Now, by what practical expedient, think you, was this *utter inability* of mankind to confer upon themselves the belief of the truth, most likely to be reduced to a lesson, and kept before the mind? By *every man*, or, at least, by *the great majority of men* who hear the gospel, believing it? I trow not. The fair, — the necessary conclusion from the fact of *all*, or of *most of those* who heard the gospel believing it, would have been, that the belief of it was a matter *within the compass of the natural powers and faculties of man to achieve*. Even the ordinary experience of mankind informs them, that what is *common* ceases to be *valuable*; and if *faith*, [229] therefore, had been as *common*, as *the proclamation of the testimony* upon which, wherever it exists, it is founded, how could it have been fitly denominated *precious faith*? 2 Peter 1:1. What *fact*, then, can be conceived more happily adapted to embody *the principle of the utter inability* of man, by dint of his natural powers and faculties, *to bestow faith upon himself*, — than this, that of those to whose ears the proclamation of the gospel is conveyed, but a *small number* receive any impression whatever from what they hear? and that of those who are impressed, but a *mere sprinkling* understand the meaning of

what is proclaimed? And what lesson can be conceived more happily to embody both *the fact*, and *the principle*, than the parable of the sower? Out of four classes of persons addressed, the *first receive no impression at all*; — the impression made upon the second class, is not merely *natural*, but *transient*; — the impression made on the third class, although *more lasting*, is after all but *natural*; — and the fourth, or smallest class of all, are the only persons, out of the whole, by whom *the truth* proclaimed is, by the result, shewn to have been *understood*. The three former classes are left to the operation of *the principles of human nature*, and, therefore, however much impressed *upon natural principles* by what they hear, they *never attain to the understanding of it*; — the last class *understand what they hear*, but this only in consequence of their being *supernaturally enlightened*.<sup>115</sup> So far as I have gone, the more systematic class of Calvinists will, it is probable, [230] be disposed to acquiesce in my statements. It now, however, becomes necessary for me to inform them, and my readers in general, that not only is *the smallness of the number saved*, intended and calculated to teach *the impossibility of man's bestowing faith upon himself*; but, *secondly*, to teach likewise, that what *man cannot do, God can do*. Had *the great majority* of those who hear the gospel believed it, the divine purpose to teach, by means of a very valuable practical lesson, *man's inability of himself to believe*, would necessarily have been frustrated. And yet, if *none* had believed the gospel, we should have wanted a proof of *the power of God* to accomplish in regard to the mind, what obviously transcends *the power of man*. By the fact, then, of *a very few individuals* believing the gospel, we are taught, in one and the same lesson, *the powerlessness of man*, and *the power of God*. Men naturally puffed up in their own conceits, and abounding in the fancied wealth of their own righteousness, illustrate Christ's simile of *the camel* unable to *pass through the needle's eye*; — a few human beings, stripped by divine grace of every claim to the possession of a righteousness of their own, (and thereby reduced to the smallest of all conceivable dimensions), illustrate the remark with which he follows up this simile, that *the things which are impossible with men, are possible with God*. Luke 18:27. "True," say my Calvinistic friends; "and if you would but stop here, we could have no fault of any consequence to find with you." But how can I stop here, when it is impossible for you yourselves, *if honest and* [231] *reflective men*, to do so? You, as Calvinists, admit, that *in opening the eyes of the understanding* of some of the human race, and in imparting thereby spiritual life to those who formerly *were dead in trespasses and sins*, God manifests *the exceeding greatness of His power*. Eph. 1:18-20; 2:1, &c. In doing this, however, is God shewing *the utmost extent of His power*? or is He merely affording us a hint of His ability *to perform still greater things than these*? Is He, in bringing His people now to the knowledge of the truth, *exhausting His power to enlighten the minds of His intelligent creatures*? or, is He, in this astonishing manifestation of His power *here*, merely giving us a specimen, accommodated to our present limited understandings, of a still more astonishing manifestation of the same attribute, which is to take place *hereafter*? Now to this plain, explicit, straightforward question, I must demand an equally plain, explicit, categorical answer. No shuffling, or evasion, can be permitted. If, with whatever "pomp and circumstance" of words you attempt to disguise your meaning, the import of your answer shall be, that God in bringing a few human beings to the knowledge of His character, and thereby to the possession of everlasting life *here*, is accomplishing all that ever will be done in behalf of man, — then it is impossible for you, with all your sophistry and special pleading, to get rid of the conclusion, that *in saving a few now*, God is exhibiting *the utmost extent of His power in regard to the human mind*! That in saving His people, *He is exhausting His ability to save!!* [232] Nay, that in confining salvation to them, His object is actually to shew, not WHAT HE CAN, but WHAT HE CANNOT DO!!! Is this consistent with scripture? Is it consistent, even, with common sense? The exhibition of a power SUPERIOR *to that of man*, made the basis of an inference, that the power thus exhibited MUST BE LIMITED *like that of man*! The existence of an attribute which *as divine must be* INEXHAUSTIBLE, presumed to be consistent with the alleged fact, that *it has nevertheless been* EXHAUSTED! Is it possible for any mind endowed with ordinary powers of reflection thus to reason? I should suppose not. At all events, the mind duly enlightened and sobered by the word of God, perceives in *the power* by

which spiritual life now is imparted *to some*, a specimen of *a power* capable of imparting spiritual life ultimately *to all*. It derives from the fact, that a few individuals are enlightened and saved upon earth, a striking and impressive lesson, not merely of *what man cannot do*, but also of *what God can do*; and instead of arguig from *what God has accomplished*, to *His want of ability to accomplish more*; — which, I am sorry to say, is the practice of Calvinists, as well as of all men proceeding in their reasonings upon *mere natural principles*; — it argues much more scripturally, as well as rationally, from God's *present exhibition of a power capable of saving some*, to *His actual possession of a power capable of saving all*.

<sup>114</sup> Let the person who would thoroughly understand what I am now going to remark, first, peruse carefully Mat. 19:23-26; with the parallel passages, Mark 10:23-27; and Luke 18:24-27.

<sup>115</sup> Matthew 13:3-9; 18-23.

2dly. It is objected, "that, as according to the word of God, only those who believe *do not perish, but have* [233] *everlasting life*, therefore, all who do not believe *must perish*; and that this conclusion is inconsistent with my theory." In proof of the objection, and the conclusion deduced from it, John 3:14-16, *And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, &c.*, is quoted. It happens most unfortunately for the objector, that this passage in John, taking in along with it the 17th verse, affords one of the strongest, and most conclusive arguments, in favour of my system. True it is, that all who do not believe, not having eternal life, but possessing merely natural principles, do certainly perish. But in the very passage in which this declaration is contained, such a view is given us of the purpose for which God saves from perishing those who believe, as both explains to us what is meant by the others perishing, as well as completely subverts the popular theory. How striking the exhibition of human folly and disingenuity, afforded by both Calvinists and Arminians, in their respective commentaries upon this text. "God's love to the world denotes, not His love to the whole, but only to a part of the human race," say Calvinists. "The text asserts, that God loves the world, or all mankind; and yet we grant that His love does not issue in His saving all mankind," say Arminians. Had both these classes of religionists, instead of attempting to rear unscriptural systems of their own, attended to the train of reasoning prosecuted by our Lord throughout the passage, it may be, that they would have stumbled upon something, of which, by their language, they both shew themselves to have been most [234] grievously ignorant. Christ does not lay himself open to a charge of self-contradiction, by asserting *one moment*, that *God loves the world*; and *the next*, that by the event He shews himself *to have loved only a part of it*: but in the passage which we are now considering, he states three distinct propositions, in the regular order of *tracing effects up to their causes*. The first of these propositions is, a declaration of the striking parallelism, between *the natural cure* of such of the wounded Israelites as looked to *the brazen serpent, lifted up by Moses in the wilderness*, — and *the spiritual cure*, or saving from perishing, of such of the sinful children of men, as look to, or believe in, *the Messiah, lifted up, or presented to them, in the divine testimony. 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 3:14,15. This leads to the second proposition, which is explanatory of, and assigns the reason for, the privilege of *not perishing, but having eternal life*, which our Lord had asserted, that such of the human race as believed in him should enjoy. *For, (γὰρ), 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 16th. The γὰρ, *for*, with which this verse begins, shewing, that our Lord is reasoning not *inferentially* but *causally*; and the mention which he makes in this, as well as in the former proposition, of God's *saving from perishing*, and bestowing *everlasting life upon, those who believe*, shewing, that it is of this fact [235] that *the cause, or reason*, is to be assigned; the path to be pursued by us, cannot be mistaken. Our Lord wanted to guard Nicodemus, and through the language addressed to him to guard all who might peruse this passage, against imagining, that *God's sending His Son into the world*, was the result of any afterthought *on His part*, or of any merit *on the part of man*; and to shew him and them, on the

contrary, that it was the result of a plan eternally devised by God Himself, of which *His love*, that is, *His own nature*, was the sole *motive* or *cause*. Besides, Christ wanted to shew him and them, — and this is what is particularly to our present purpose, — *the cause*, or *reason*, why, in manifesting this love, or in carrying this plan into effect, God began *by saving those who believe*. It is in regard to this point, that Calvinists and Arminians betray their complete inattention to, and dreadful ignorance of, the language of inspiration. Neither the one, nor the other, appear to have the remotest idea of the nature of our Lord's reasoning. God's love to *the world*, or *whole human race*, according to the Arminians, terminates in *His saving only a part of them*; or His love to *all* is, by some means or other, *frustrated*; the great majority of the objects of it *reaping no advantage whatever from it*. Christ's reasoning, then, according to them, is, behold the greatness of *God's love to all mankind*, by His disposition, or ability, or both, to *save ONLY A PART OF THEM!* — No, say Calvinists, Christ means to assert, that God's love to *His people*, (for by *the world* we understand *His people*), is so great, that *He saves* [236] *them from perishing, by bestowing upon them eternal life*. Christ's reasoning, then, according to Calvinists, is, behold the greatness of the love which God bears to His people, *by the greatness of the love which HE BEARS TO HIS PEOPLE!* — Arminians make Christ's reasoning to be, behold *the strength* of God's love, by means of that *which in reality proves its weakness!* — Calvinists, on the other hand, represent Christ as proving *his proposition*, by *the proposition itself*; that is, in other words, *as not reasoning at all!* — In opposition to the absurdities committed by both these classes of theologians, a mere glance at the passage enables us to see, that for God's love to *some*, manifested in His saving *them* from perishing, Christ is here assigning as *a reason*, the love which He bears to *the world* or to *all*. In other words, Christ's intention, in the 16th verse, is to shew, that the fact of God saving *by faith* certain persons from perishing, is a proof or indication, not merely of His love to *them*, but likewise of His love to *the whole human race*. *God so loved the world*, or all mankind, *that*, as the means of evincing this and of carrying His love to them into effect, *He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life*. In other words, He is now saving *those who believe*, as the proof or indication, as well as the means, of His ultimately saving *all*. Or, perhaps, it may be still better expressed by saying, the *reason* for His now saving *a part of mankind* is, His love to *all*, and His intention therefore ultimately to *save all*. From this, the transition is easy [237] to the third proposition, in which our Lord assigns the reason for God's *loving*, and therefore *saving the world*, or whole human race. *For, γὰρ, God sent not His Son into the world, to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved*. That is, the reason for Christ's *not condemning*, but *saving the world*, or *all mankind*, is, that it was only by so doing he could fulfil the object of his mission into the world. In verse 16th, we are informed, that the reason of Christ's now *saving from perishing those who believe*, is God's love to *all*, and his consequent intention ultimately to *save all*; and in verse 17th, that the reason of God's *loving*, and therefore *saving all*, is, *that thereby alone He accomplishes His own everlasting designs and purposes*. 1. He saves *some* now, that He may save *all* ultimately; — 2. He saves *all* ultimately, that He may carry into effect *the everlasting counsel of His own will*. — To these reasonings succeed, in the 18th and following verses, some beautiful illustrations of his meaning, given by our Lord himself, and derived by him from the fact of those who believe, by their present deliverance from condemnation, realizing in their own case already the object of his mission; and of those who are condemned, not being brought into this state properly speaking by him, but being condemned already: any condemnation that may be connected with their unbelief, being the grand proof or confirmation of their being already in a condemned state; a state which consequently his appearance does not create, but in which he finds them. — But omitting these last verses, as conducting us into a [238] wide field of discussion, foreign in a great measure to our present purpose; and confining ourselves to verses 14-17 inclusive; let me ask any, who may object to the view which I have given of our Lord's meaning in these verses, how, — understanding Jesus in them to be reasoning *causally*, (as is proved by the use of the word γὰρ, *for*, in the 16th, and 17th verses), and understanding the facts for which he is assigning reasons to be, *God's saving from perishing those who believe*, and

*God's love to the world*, — they can, without landing themselves in absurdities of one kind or another, put upon the passage an interpretation different from that which I have assigned to it? I have shewn that Christ states, *first*, verses 14th and 15th, the parallelism between the *physical* cure effected in the case of some of the Israelites by their looking to the brazen serpent, and the *spiritual* cure which should be effected in the case of such of the human race as should believe in his name; — *secondly*, verse 16th, *the reason for* this spiritual cure or salvation of *believers*, as being, God's love to *the world*, or *whole human race*; — and, *thirdly*, verse 17th, *the reason for* God's love to *the world*, or *mankind*, evinced in *His sending His Son to save them*, as being, *that thereby alone He could fulfil His own everlasting designs and purposes*. Understand this view of the verses in question to be correct, and every thing is plain; — try any other method of explaining them, and every thing is thrown into confusion. Christ, as it were, here declares: "whatever may be the present results of my mission — however small may be [239] the number of those who while upon earth shall believe in my name — and however large may be the proportion of the human race, by whom my claims as the Messiah, and the glad tidings which I proclaim, shall be rejected — let it never be forgotten, that a similar rejection of a benefit of the most important kind, by a large proportion of those to whom it ought to have been most acceptable, is recorded in the Jewish annals. And, let me now inform you, that as the cure of such of those who were bitten by the fiery serpents as looked to the serpent of brass, was the means of preserving the Jewish nation; so the cure or salvation of such of those who have been bitten by the old serpent as shall believe, is to be the means of God's evincing His love to, and ultimately saving, the whole family of man: and that it is only by my thus ultimately saving the whole family of man, that I can fulfil the purpose for which my Father sent me into the world." This passage, then, so far from militating against, contains an express assertion of, the doctrine for which I am contending. Those who believe, as possessing *spiritual* or *supernatural* principles, are saved; — those who believe not, as possessing merely *natural* principles, perish. But the latter perish, not that they may be annihilated, or that hereafter they may be tormented for ever. No; although they perish, or by dying lose all that they naturally have, God, by now manifesting His character to those who believe, is providing Himself with the means of evincing His love, by the manifestation of His character, ultimately even to them. In a word, the [240] principle involved in this *causal* reasoning of our Lord's is, that God is now *saving us who believe*, because *He loves all*; and that until His Son shall have evinced the extent of his love by *saving all*, the purpose for which he was sent into the world, shall not have received its accomplishment.

3dly. The well-known passage, *If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature*, or creation, *old things are passed away, behold all things are become new*, 2 Cor. 5:17, is generally understood by religionists to have an exclusive signification; or to be intended to point out the restriction of God's love to a particular class of the human race, not only *here*, but *hereafter*. Viewing the scriptures as a whole, and comparing one part of them with another, I have been forced to come to an exactly opposite conclusion, with regard to the meaning of this verse. It is scarcely possible even for a man acquainted with no more than *the phraseology* of the Bible, to overlook the fact, that the terms in which, in the text quoted, the change which *every Christian undergoes* are described, are the very terms employed in Rev. 21:4,5, a passage already quoted and argued from, to describe the change which *all things ultimately shall undergo*. If concerning *the Christian* it is declared that even now *he is a new creature*, or, as elsewhere, that even now *he is created anew in Christ Jesus*; it is declared concerning *all things*, that they, likewise, are destined finally to be *made*, or *created anew*: — and if of *the Christian* it is said, that in his case *old things are passed away*, and *all things are become new*; so, in like [241] manner, speaking of *the ultimate destiny of all*, the inspired apostle asserts, that when all things shall have been made new, then *the former things shall have passed away*. Compare 2 Cor. 5:17, with Rev. 21:4,5. Now what is the fair conclusion, from the identity of the terms employed to describe the change which is undergone *by Christians* here, and the change which shall be undergone *by all things* hereafter? Is it that the change

undergone by Christians is exclusive; or, in other words, confined and restricted to them? No, certainly; common sense itself being judge. So far from this, from *the sameness* of the language employed to denote the change which passes upon *a few human beings* here, and *all things* hereafter, we find ourselves irresistibly impelled to the conclusion, that there must be *a sameness* in the change itself: and that, as the same language is applied to *a part*, which is afterwards applied to *the whole*, the change which takes place *in a part*, must be *an earnest* of the change which is to take place *in the whole*. In order to ascertain, then, the nature of the change which shall ultimately be undergone *by all*, nothing more is requisite, than simply to ascertain the nature of the change now undergone *by the family of God*. This latter change, we know, consists of two main parts. First. A manifestation of the character of God, as seen in the face of Christ, to the conscience of the individual; and the creation in his mind thereby of a new, divine, and spiritual principle. Formerly, he was ignorant of God's character, and, therefore, like the rest of his fellow men, who are simi-[242]larly situated, he was from time to time distressed with doubts and anxious forebodings respecting his own future destiny; — now, however, he knows that *God is love*, and, therefore, reposes upon his declarations and promises with implicit confidence. Secondly. The knowledge of God's character thus imparted to the believer, or the implantation in his conscience of the divine principle of love, is productive in him of a variety of important effects and consequences; and, among the rest, it exercises a controlling and subduing influence, over his natural feelings, passions, and propensities. Faith is, by its very nature,<sup>116</sup> *a victorious principle*, constraining and enabling him in whom it dwells, *to overcome self and the world*; Heb. 11 throughout; 1 John 5:4; Rev. 2:26, &c.; and hence it is laid down by the apostle as the leading characteristic of genuine Christianity, that all who are possessed of it *have crucified the flesh with its affections and lusts*. Gal. 5:24. — Having thus, by an examination of the sacred volume, and the verification of its statements in our own experience, ascertained, that the change which takes place in every Christian upon earth, consists of these two things; first, a manifestation to him of the divine character; and, secondly, a controlling, subduing, or overcoming influence, necessarily connected therewith; we are prepared for understanding the nature of the change which shall ultimately take place in all. If the language denoting the change which *now takes place in Christians*, is employed, as we have seen it is, to denote the change which *ultimately shall take* [243] *place in all*; and if, from the identity of the terms employed in both cases, we are entitled to argue to an identity of the things thereby signified; then, as the same Divine Being who *here* creates believers anew, by *a manifestation to them of His character*, and *the subduing influence wherewith that manifestation is connected*, has declared His intention of *finally* creating all things likewise anew, — it follows, analogically, that He will accomplish this purpose of His, by the very same means of *self-manifestation*, and *consequent subjugation*. And is not this the very way in which, from the general tenor of scripture, as well as from many remarkable passages contained in it, we learn that it is the divine purpose actually to proceed? Have we not seen, that the revelation or manifestation to intelligent creatures of the Sons of God, as the special objects of the divine favour, and as possessed of supreme felicity along with their head, is the event for which the whole of these intelligent creatures are eagerly, although instinctively longing? and that in these instinctive longings of theirs for the manifestation of the Sons of God, and thereby for the manifestation of the character of God himself, they shall not be disappointed? Rom. 8:19; with Psalms 104:21, and 27; and 145:15,16. And have we not seen likewise, that the effect of this future and final manifestation of the sons of God, (and through it of the character of God Himself), to rational and intelligent beings, will be their *deliverance from the bondage of corruption*, and their introduction into that *liberty* which consists *in glory*, or *in the knowledge and* [244] *understanding of God's character*; a liberty, however, which implies *the complete subjugation of the mind to God*? Rom. 8:20,21; compared with 1 Cor. 15:23-28; and Heb. 2:7,8. Now of this *complete manifestation of the divine character*; and of this *complete subduing of all intelligent beings to God*, which necessarily accompanies and flows from it; what can be conceived to be *a livelier emblem*, as well as *a more valuable and expressive earnest*, than that *partial manifestation of the divine character*, and that *partial subduing of opposition*

to him, necessarily accompanying and flowing from it, which is *the present privilege of every believer*? Does not *the new creation* of the believer upon earth, — by *the partial manifestation to him of the divine character*, and *the partial subjugation in him thereby of self and the world*, — exactly correspond with, and form the earnest of, that *new creation* in the full extent of the term, which shall consist in *the complete manifestation of God's character to all*, and, thereby, *the complete subjugation to God of all*? And, viewed in this light, is not the language which is applicable to *the one*, seen to be applicable likewise to *the other*? Greatly, alas! do men err, and dreadfully do they misapprehend the import of the statements and reasonings contained in the sacred volume, when they can allow themselves to represent *the partial change* which takes place in the minds of believers *here*, — which, from its very nature, is intended to be *a type*, as well as *an earnest*, of *the complete change* which is to take place in all *hereafter*, — as being, on the con-[245]trary, **THE UTMOST EXTENT of the change which the Supreme Being is capable of effecting!**

<sup>116</sup> As *divine*, or as the first fruits of *the divine nature*. 2 Peter 1:4.

4thly. To the system for which I am contending, the partizans of the popular theology are ready to object such passages as these: *Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God*. John 3:3. *He that believeth not the Son, shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him*. 36. *Follow — holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord*. Heb. 12:14. Now while I am not prepared to deny, that there may be systems of Universalism, to which the propositions laid down, in these and similar texts, may fairly enough be objected, they have no force whatever when brought forward in opposition to mine. Nay, they actually furnish me with an exceedingly cogent and convincing argument in its favour. Those who have perused with care and attention the theory developed in the preceding pages, must have observed, that I represent the whole human race as, not merely by nature, *children of wrath*, or *obnoxious to condemnation*, in consequence of sin, Rom. 3:9-19; 5:12; but, as continuing *children of wrath*, or *obnoxious to condemnation*, in the event of their not believing the gospel: and that I confine *the present enjoyment of eternal life*, and *the future privilege of reigning with Christ in his kingdom*, to those by whom *through faith the divine character is understood*. John 3:36; 5:24; 17:3; Rev. 3:21; 20:4,6. And now, let me ask, is there any one respect in which the language of John 3:3; 3:36; and Heb. 12:14; can be shewn to be inconsistent with [246] these sentiments? Let us try. In the first place, it is declared, that *the wrath of God abideth on him who believeth not*. But if so, he must have been subject to wrath or condemnation previously. Wrath which *abideth* or *remaineth*, is a very different phrase from *wrath which is for the first time incurred*. If the language of the passage before us had been, that in consequence of a person's *unbelief*, he for the first time incurs *wrath* or *condemnation*, — then it might with some plausibility have been argued, that as in consequence of unbelief a man is brought into circumstances *totally different* from those in which he *naturally* is, he may be exposed to a punishment hereafter *totally different* from that which he would *otherwise have undergone*. But as the wrath of God is said *to abide* on the man who believes not, what, if words have any meaning at all, is to be understood by the expression, but that *as an unbeliever*, such an one merely *continues* in the same state in which he *naturally* was? I am far from intending to deny, that the extent of a man's depravity, and the justice of the sentence of wrath or condemnation under which he labours, are more strikingly and fearfully demonstrated by his opposition to the Messiah; nay, I am ready to admit, that, as our blessed Lord has shewn in the 18th and following verses of this very chapter, there is *a condemnation* in the mind of him who believes not the gospel, over and above *the condemnation* which stands connected with the mere consciousness of having violated law; namely, *the condemnation* incurred by the mind, in consequence of its [247] consciously clinging for justification to *that which has condemned it*:<sup>117</sup> but as *this additional condemnation* is [248] the feeling of a person *condemned already*, it is not, and cannot be, *the bringing of the mind into a state which properly speaking is new*; but is merely *the continuance and confirmation of the mind in the state, which from its very constitution, is natural to it*. The language of the 36th verse of the 3d chapter of John, that *the wrath of God abideth on him who*



believes not, so far, then, from being inconsistent with, is strikingly confirmatory of, the view given by me, that *the man who believes not, continuing to possess merely natural or soulical principles, continues, therefore, under condemnation*. In the second place, it is declared, that the person who believeth not the Son, and upon whom the wrath of God abideth, *shall not see life*. In the other texts quoted by me at the beginning of this paragraph, corresponding statements are made. Except a man be born again *he cannot*, according to the Messiah, *see the kingdom of God*; and without holiness, according to the apostle, *no man shall see the Lord*. That *to be born again*, and *to believe on the Son of God*, are synonymous modes of expression, appears clearly from the whole strain of the chapter in which they both occur. That *holiness*, in Heb. 12:14, signifies *separation*, must be obvious to every man acquainted with the meaning of the original word;<sup>118</sup> and that *the sanctification or separation*, there spoken of, is effected by and consists in *the truth*, or *the belief of the truth*, is evident from John 17:17.<sup>119</sup> As it is thus manifest that *being born again*, — *believing* [249] *on the Son of God*, — and *sanctification*, or *separation*, as consisting in the belief of the truth, — are all synonymous modes of expression, so it will, I presume, be conceded to me, that *to see the kingdom of God*, — *to see life*, — and *to see the Lord*, — are, for the purposes of my present argument, synonymous modes of expression likewise. But what is there in these different declarations inconsistent with my system? Do I maintain, that *any unbeliever shall see the kingdom of God*? On the contrary, is it not the fundamental principle laid down by me, that *without faith* there is no *spirituality of mind*; and that *without spirituality of mind* there neither is, nor can be, *any enjoyment of God*? The fact is, that the grand object of this essay is to shew, that to believers of the truth *alone*, is conceded the privilege of *seeing God*. Upon them *alone*, I contend, is bestowed a principle, which is, in them, *the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen*; — which, realising in them *the glory afterwards to be revealed*, raises them above sin, suffering, and death; — and which, conferring on them the first fruits of life and immortality, introduces them, in due time, into the heavenly kingdom. *The King in his beauty, and the land that is afar off*, they now behold *by faith*; and they shall ere long have these much desired objects revealed, in all their glorious reality, *to their enraptured sight*. In a word, believers do not require *to be created anew* hereafter, but possess *in themselves* even now *the very same principle, which is disclosed and developed throughout eternity*. They live *now, henceforth, and for ever*. [250] In their case *God is seen*, and *the divine nature is possessed*, by intelligent beings *clothed with flesh*. Not so, however, the unbelieving part of mankind. They never *see life*; — they never *see the Lord*. Them nothing awaits, but *exclusion from the heavenly kingdom*. Rev. 21:8. As possessed of nothing but natural principles, *death to them is destruction*. Mat. 10:28. While believers have in them *the first fruits of everlasting life*, John 17:3; Rom. 8:10,11,23; the unbelieving world, to use the simple but emphatic language of scripture, *have not life*. 1 John 5:12. Am I, in these statements, contradicting the sacred volume? It is true, I anticipate the arrival of a period, when even those who now possess a constitution merely *natural and mortal*, shall undergo *a supernatural change*, and be *clothed with immortality*. Acts 24:15, &c. But how totally different the persons who shall then be raised, from those whom we now behold! Possessed of *human nature* only here, they shall be possessed of *the divine nature* only hereafter. Rev. 21:5. While Christians have in their minds *by faith*, the *very same nature* which is to exist and be developed throughout eternity; and while in their case, therefore, to persons *in the flesh* it is given *to see God*; those who know not the truth, have nothing in common between *the nature which they possess now*, and *the nature which they shall possess hereafter*. As what they now are, *they are destroyed*. They shall, to be sure, ultimately *be created anew*, Rev. 21:5, and that by being raised at the consummation of all things in *the nature of the second Adam*, 1 Cor. 15:[251]45,49; but while possessing *their present nature*, they *neither shall nor can see the Lord*.<sup>120</sup> Now who will venture to affirm, that there is no difference between the case of those *who, while in the flesh, see and enjoy God*; and the case of those *who, while in the flesh, are entirely cut off from all vision and fruition of Him*. Between the case of those *who have in them a principle which, assimilating their present to their future existence, renders the future a continuation and development of the present*; and the case of those *who have in them now*

*nothing similar to what they shall have hereafter, and who consequently hereafter acquire an existence the nature of which is essentially different from that which they possess here?* And am I, — who, by maintaining, that such human beings as in this life continue ignorant of God's character shall ultimately be raised to another state of existence by having that character revealed to them, am able to solve the scriptural problem of *mere mortality* clothed upon with *immortality*, — to be branded as a denier of the word of God, by those whose mole-like vision enabling them to view only one [252] side of the question, and that too very imperfectly, are obliged to abandon the attempt to reconcile the scriptures of truth with themselves, as utterly vain and hopeless?<sup>121</sup>

<sup>117</sup> When we speak of *the condemnation* connected with *unbelief*, never let it be forgotten, on the one hand, that, as *faith is the gift of God*, the condemnation in question cannot, without impugning the divine justice, be supposed to proceed on the ground of *unbelievers not possessing that which God has seen meet to withhold from them*; and yet, on the other, that, there must be something in *unbelief* by which, *even on the ground of the principles which they naturally have*, persons chargeable with it *are justly condemned*. *Loving darkness, rather than light, is the ground of their condemnation*, as well as *the condemnation itself*. Law broken is *darkness*, because it points out no way of escape from the consequences of transgression; — Christ is *light*, because through him, as the fulfiller of law, the way of salvation is made manifest. Men, however, who, — in addition to *violating law*, (which all naturally do), and thereby *incurring condemnation*, — cling to *the law which they have violated*, and which *as violated* is now *darkness*, in hopes of *deriving justification from it*, — in addition to the *primary* condemnation which they have incurred by *the violation of law*, incur a *secondary* condemnation by being *self-convicted of seeking for justification by that which condemns them*. As the more extensive the demands of the divine law are seen to be, the more do the transgressions of men, and their inability to obey that law, become manifest; so, likewise, the more that Christ as *the light* shews, by his instructions and example, that *the law* reaches to, and requires, the perfect obedience of the heart, Mat. 22:37, Rom. 7:14, 13:10, 1 Tim. 1:5; the more is *this secondary sense of condemnation*, in him who *continues to seek for justification by the law*, strengthened and confirmed. This *seeking for justification by the law*, and *not the violation of law*, is the sin against the Holy Ghost. Mat. 12:31,32; 1 John 5:16; &c. And it is so, because it *contradicts*, or, in the expressive language of scripture, *gives the lie to* the Holy Ghost, 1 John 5:10, with Mat. 12:31,32, proclaiming *the desperate condition of mankind as transgressors*; and proving this in a way which even the natural conscience can understand, *by the impossibility of any one's being justified by that which condemns him*. This sin is *unpardonable*, because, as *pardon*, or *the sense of pardon*, which is the same thing, Rom. 5:1, Gal. 5:22, stands necessarily connected with *believing*, so does *the want of pardon*, or *the want of the sense of pardon*, which is the same thing likewise, 1 John 4:18, Rev. 21:8, stand necessarily connected with *unbelief*. While all other sins, therefore, may be, and in the case of the believer actually are *forgiven*, Mat. 12:31; 1 John 5:16-18; the unbeliever by *clinging to the law for justification*, and thereby *never seeing the righteousness of Christ to be his*, cherishes in his mind a principle with which it is absolutely impossible for *the sense of forgiveness*, that is, for *forgiveness itself*, ever to be associated.

<sup>118</sup> ἁγιασμός.

<sup>119</sup> See the Greek.

<sup>120</sup> Not only do the unregenerate portion of the world, verify the language of the apostle by the fact, that they never see *the Lord while in the flesh*, or as *human beings*; but they also verify it by this other fact, that *they never see the Lord at all*. *The Lord* is the scriptural character of the Supreme Being manifested as *Ruler*, or *reigning Mediator*; see Psalm 110:1, and Acts 2:36. Now as the unregenerate part of mankind are not raised while Jesus *reigns as Mediator*, or is manifested as *Lord and Christ*, 1 Cor. 15:23-28, Rev. 20:5; and are only raised when *the mediatorial kingdom*, or *Lordship* of Christ comes to an end, or when God is manifested as *the all in all*, 1 Cor. 15:24, &c.; of course they never *see the Lord*, or see the Supreme Being in his character of *Lord*, or *reigning Mediator*. See note at page 187 of this volume.

<sup>121</sup> If the language which I have employed in the text shall have been unsuccessful in conveying my meaning to the reader, perhaps, by attending to the following short explanation, he may be able to comprehend it. Believers of the gospel alone having in them *the earnest of the divine nature*, and, as alone possessing *this*, alone possessing *a principle which is common to intelligent beings in time and eternity*, how plain is it that the vision of God is, and must be, confined to them. For, the believer being *spiritual* here as well as hereafter,

is *the same person* here and hereafter, in a sense *totally different from that in which the unbeliever can be so*. There is *an identity* between the intelligent being who is *spiritual here*, and *spiritual hereafter*, which cannot exist in the case of him who is *natural here*, and rendered *spiritual merely hereafter*. The moment this is understood, is it not obvious, that supposing *identity of person* to consist in *identity of nature*, believers alone *do and can see God*?

If any person shall be disposed to cavil at the view given in the text, and explained in the previous part of this note, I would remind him of a part of my system which may, perhaps, more readily fall within the sphere of his apprehensions. I admit that, in no sense whatever, do unbelievers *see*, or *enjoy*, *the kingdom of God*. From 1 Cor. 15:23-28, it appears that *this kingdom* is to last only *until all things shall have been put under his feet* by the Messiah; and that the subjugation of *all things*, including unbelievers of course, is *the last act of his regal authority*. For, in the subduing of them, *his kingdom* expires; verses 21, and 28. But if so, then, into his kingdom, unbelievers never enter. They are brought to know God, not as persons *reigning*, but as persons *reigned over*. It is their fate to be *subjects*. To be *kings* is the privilege of *believers only*. Rev. 1:6, &c.

5thly. Any system of religion, which involves in it as a fundamental principle, the ultimate happiness of the whole human race, is necessarily, according to the ordinary classes of theological reasoners, at variance with those passages of scripture which treat of "the second death." It being assumed by such persons, that *the second death* can only signify *everlasting torments*, — as the wicked are represented as undergoing *the second death*, the conclusion is inevitable, that the wicked are subjected to *everlasting torments*. Every thing, of course, depends on the sense which my opponents attach to the words *second death* being correct and scriptural: for, if I can shew, that scripture itself has given us a definition of the phrase which is inconsistent with *their* theory, and in strict accordance with *mine*, instead of augmenting the security of their stronghold by the use of this argument, they will have been thoughtlessly furnishing me with an additional means of sapping and undermining it. Now, with a view to avoid all superfluous discussion in regard to this subject, I at once concede, that according to Rev. 21:8, every unbeliever shall undergo *the second death*; and that, according to Rev. 2:11, and 20:6, it is the special privilege of believers to be exempt from *the second death*: they remaining *unhurt by*, and *overcoming it*, instead of being, as the wicked are, *subjected to its sway*, and *overcome by it*. Having thus come to an understanding with my opponents, respecting *the persons* who are, and who are not, the subjects of *the second death*, this point, of course, I regard as settled. The only question to be discussed, then, is, what is the *second death*? *Everlasting torments*, say the supporters of the various popular systems. As I always prefer receiving the definition of *scriptural* phraseology from *the scriptures themselves*, when definition is to be had in that quarter; and as a definition of the words *second death* has been given by the only sacred writer by whom they are employed; I intend to avail myself of it. Popular religionists can have no reasonable objection, to my preferring *the word of God*, to *the word of man*. The author of the book of Revelation, after informing us, in chap. 20:14, that *death and hell were cast into the lake of fire*, adds these remarkable words, THIS IS THE SECOND DEATH. Now, supposing *the lake of fire* to signify *hell*, even the mere English reader must perceive, that it is absurd to represent *hell* itself as *cast into hell*. *Hell* cast into *hell*, is certainly a *strange*, and not very likely to be a *scriptural idea*. And yet, blundering in their notions of religion as ordinary professors of it frequently do, they are so far right, that *the lake of fire* here is synonymous with *hell*; the apparent absurdity springing from the meaning of the Greek word translated *hell*, in this passage, having been misconceived. As to the signification of ᾠδης, *hades*, the word in question, learned men have contrived to puzzle their own minds, and as much as in them lies the minds of their readers likewise, by the various and discordant theories which they have proposed respecting it; a tolerable acquaintance with which may be obtained by consulting Parkhurst's *Greek Lexicon*, or Campbell's *Preliminary Dissertations*. Without entering into all the niceties and refinements of the heathen mythology, it may be enough to observe, that as ᾠδης, in scripture, is generally connected with the word *death*, 1 Cor. 15:55, &c.; and as *death*, in so far at least as respects the body, is followed by *burial*; ᾠδης, with whatever accessory ideas it may sometimes be accompanied, may be under-

[255]stood to signify, and may be rendered by the word *grave*.<sup>122</sup> This sense is very properly assigned to it by our translators in 1 Cor. 15:55, one of the places in the New Testament where it occurs; and it is likewise the meaning assigned to it in the margin of Rev. 20:13,14, the latter the text in question. This passage, then, corrected, will read thus: *death and the grave were cast into the lake of fire; this is the second death*. It would be a mere waste of time for me to set about proving, what lies upon the surface of the text itself, that the words, *this is the second death*, apply, not to *any particular phrase* contained in, but to *the whole of the preced-[256]ing part of the sentence*. Is it not said, that *the lake of fire* is the second death; but, that *death and the grave's being cast into the lake of fire* is so. The whole of the preceding part of the verse is, therefore, a definition of *the second death*. This being ascertained, what is *the lake of fire*? and what is implied in *death and the grave being cast into it*? for, whatever is implied in this, constitutes the second death. *The lake of fire*, I have already admitted, has the same signification as the word *hell*; or, rather, as the Greek word γέεννα, *Gehenna*, which in the New Testament is so translated. This admission I have been led to make from observing, that *fire* is always either expressed, or understood, wherever the term *Gehenna* occurs; and that the qualities which are here ascribed to *the lake of fire*, are elsewhere ascribed to *Gehenna*. This brings me at once to the second and all-important question, what is implied in *death and the grave being cast into the lake of fire*? In other words, what is the grand effect produced by *the lake of fire*, upon *death and the grave*, when they are subjected to its action? Assuming the identity of *the lake of fire* and *Gehenna*, I answer, by remarking, that the Greek word γέεννα, *Gehenna*, that is, *the land, or valley of Hinnom*, which was situated close to Jerusalem, has been commonly supposed to denote *a place of torments*, from the circumstance of children having been there *passed through the fire to Moloch*, and for other reasons. Jerem. 19:4,5; 23:35, &c. Now, in opposition to this, I contend, that *Gehenna* signifies *a place of destruction*, or figura-[257]tively *destruction itself*: a view which I have been obliged to take, from considering Jerem. 19:4,5, in connection with 6,7; where it is declared, that the place in question should be called *the valley of slaughter*. The correctness of this view becomes still more probable, if it be true, as many critics and commentators have asserted, that in the valley of Hinnom a fire was kept continually burning, for the purpose of consuming the filth, offals, &c., of the city of Jerusalem. But, setting aside altogether the identity of *the lake of fire*, and *Gehenna*, — that *the lake of fire* should be a figurative mode of expression for *a place or means of destruction*, rather than for *a place or means of torments*, — and that too, when the things subjected to its action are spoken of as being, not merely *exposed to it*, but *cast into it*, — is what I think must suggest itself to every reflecting mind. This, then, being proved or admitted, to say that *death and the grave were cast into the lake of fire*, must be equivalent to saying, that *death and the grave were consumed, destroyed, or brought to an end*. An interpretation, the correctness of which is put beyond the reach of doubt, when we consider, that to suppose *the casting of death and the grave into the lake of fire*, to signify *the exposing of death and the grave to everlasting torments*, would be to charge the inspired writer with having given utterance to a sentiment, closely verging on the very climax of absurdity. By this *scriptural* and therefore *legitimate*, method of induction, we arrive at the conclusion, that not *everlasting torments*, but *the consuming, destroying, or bringing to [258] an end, of death and the grave*, is what constitutes *the second death*. According to our various popular theories, *the second death* is, in some way or another, *the perpetuation of death, and of a state of things which now is connected with it*; whereas, according to the passage which we have been considering, *the second death* is *the end or destruction of death, and of all that is connected therewith*. Man supposes *the second death* to be *the giving of everlasting existence to death*; God declares *the second death*, on the contrary, to be *the death of death itself*. O how plain to the scripturally-enlightened mind, is the whole subject. *The first death* is that which takes hold on *man*, and on *all that is merely natural*, Genesis 3:19; Psalm 102:25,26; — *the second death* is that which takes hold on *death itself*. As by *the entrance of sin, life or existence*, if I may so express myself, was imparted to *death*, Rom. 5:12; so by *the destruction of sin*, the *life or existence of death* is *destroyed, or brought to an end*; 1 Cor. 15:26. Jesus is he who, as possessing *life in himself*, John 5:26, *swallows up*

and destroys death, or becomes THE DEATH OF DEATH. 1 Cor. 15:54,57. How beautifully, when this is understood, is *the entrance of the first death, or the acquisition of an existence by death*, with which scripture opens, Gen. 3:19, — seen to be contrasted with *the second death, or the termination of the existence of death*, with which scripture closes. Rev. 20, 21, and 22. And how clearly thus is He, — whose essential attribute it is that He is possessed of *everlasting life*, and who, by appealing as *the promised seed of the woman*, has [259] *bruised the head of the serpent, or destroyed death*, which is *the head, power, or life of sin*, Gen. 3:15, with 1 Cor. 15:55,57, — seen, by *the death* which he causes *death itself* to undergo, to be THE SECOND DEATH.<sup>123</sup> See Heb. 12:29, compared with Rev. 20:14.

<sup>122</sup> If I were to hazard a conjecture respecting the proper scriptural signification of ἄδης, I would say, that it stands in the same relation to *soul, or natural life and mind*, in which διαφθορά, or φθορά, *corruption*, stands to *natural body*. As φθορά is that which takes hold of, and destroys, or is the destruction of, the *natural body*; so is ἄδης that which takes hold of, and destroys, or is the destruction of, *mere natural life and mind*. Acts 2:27,31, in the Greek, will illustrate my meaning. The Lord Jesus appeared with *a life and mind*, as well as with *a body*, assimilated to ours. I say, *assimilated*, Rom. 8:3; for *the issue of his undertaking*, as well as *the peculiarity of his birth*, shewed, that although viewed in one light, there was *sameness*, yet viewed in another light, there were *differences*. His *mind*, unlike ours, resisted and overcame *evil*; his *body*, unlike ours, resisted and overcame *corruption*. He sacrificed *himself*, in so far as *he had principles in common with us*. But the *differences* subsisting between *him and us*, occasioned a different result *to him*, from that which befalls those who are possessed of *mere natural principles*. He could sacrifice *his life and his body*, as having possessed *a life and a body like to ours*. But upon *his mind*, as *entirely spiritual*, John 3:34, and therefore *unlike ours*, ἄδης, which destroys *soul, or natural life, and natural mind as connected with natural life*, could take no hold. Luke 23:43. Although *upon the life* which he had *in common with us*, ἄδης did take hold; it could no more take hold of, or affect, *his divine and spiritual mind*, than φθορά, *corruption*, could take hold of, or affect, *his body*. The result necessarily was *his resurrection by a power inherent in himself*. John 10:18.

<sup>123</sup> Having thus ascertained upon *the best*, because *the highest of all authority*, that *the second death* signifies *the destruction of death, or the death of death itself*, how obvious the meaning of all those passages in which the phrase occurs, whether in connection with *believers or unbelievers*. Believers cannot *be hurt of the second death*, Rev. 2:11, nor *has it power over them*, Rev. 20:6, for the plainest of all reasons, that *death is already destroyed in them*. John 6:50,51; 1 John 5:11. The principle of *faith* which dwells in them being, in so far as it is possessed, *the divine nature*, 2 Peter 1:4, and *the earnest of everlasting life*, John 3:36, 5:24, 11:25,26, 1 John 5:12, &c. &c., sets death at defiance. As *the divine nature*, it is impossible for it *to sustain any injury from death*; — as *the present possession of everlasting life*, instead of *death having power over it*, it *has power over, and subdues death*. It is the very essence of *faith*, to be *an overcoming principle*. Heb. 11 throughout; 1 John 5:4. Not so, however, with unbelievers. Possessing only *natural principles*, they possess that only *over which death has power, or which may be overcome and destroyed*. Nay, understanding *the second death* to signify *the swallowing up or destruction of death, and of all that is connected with it*, — when we are informed, that *the fearful, and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolators, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone, which is the second death*, Rev. 21:8, — have we not suggested to us the idea, that *this very destruction of the wicked as such, (for destruction, as has already been shewn, is the meaning of being cast into the lake of fire)*, is equivalent to a declaration of the mode in which, ultimately, *they become partakers of everlasting life*? In other words, although when *the first death* takes hold of the wicked, *they lose all that they have*, yet are we not taught by the passage just quoted, that this very circumstance merely prepares them for *the second death*, likewise, taking hold of them; or, for its *creating them anew, and bestowing upon them everlasting life*, by its *destroying, consuming, and swallowing up in them all the principles which they naturally have*? My meaning will perhaps become more obvious, by contrasting a little farther the case of *the believer*, with that of *the unbeliever*. The believer, as already *risen with Christ*, Rom. 6:11, Eph. 2:5,6, Coloss. 3:1, and *renewed in the spirit of his mind*, Eph. 4:23, having in him by faith the principle of *everlasting life*, in reality *never dies*; John 11:25,26; 2 Corinth. 5:8. It is true that, as possessed of *natural principles*, he undergoes *the first death*; for the veracity of God requires, that the sentence denounced against Adam and his natural posterity, shall be executed upon all of them. But as he is possessed of *supernatural* as well as *natural principles*, over the former neither *the first nor the second death* has any

power. Not *the first death*, for this *supernatural principle* has power over it, and destroys it; Corinth. 15:55, &c.: — not *the second death*, for this *supernatural principle* is itself *the second death*; John 3:36, &c. Every believer has in him *the first fruits of the divine nature*, or *that in which*, as consuming or destroying all that is merely earthly, *the second death consists*; 1 Corinth. 15:47, with Heb. 12:29, Rev. 20:14, &c.: and if so, how can he himself be hereafter a subject of *the second death*? Can the divine nature be supposed to *prey upon*, *consume*, or *destroy itself*? Without answering formally a question, the answer to which is so obvious, I go on to observe, that it is because the unbeliever has in him, while *here*, nothing but *natural principles*, that he is capable of undergoing, *hereafter*, *the second death*. When *the first death* takes hold of him, having in him *no supernatural principles*, he necessarily loses all that he has: and were it not that there is *a second death*, which can overtake, consume, and destroy *the first death*, and *himself as the fitting subject of it*, by creating him anew, his case would be utterly hopeless. — Over the principle of *everlasting life* in the believer *the second death* has no power; it being impossible for *death* to have power over that which is itself *the destruction of death*. But as the unbeliever has not in him *the principle of everlasting life*; — as he is *dead even while he lives*, 1 John 5:12, and as he *continues dead till the consummation of all things*, 1 Corin. 15:23,24, Rev. 20:5; — he is evidently the very person on whom hereafter *the second death*, or *the destruction of death*, can take effect. He is evidently *the fitting, the only fitting subject*, for its operation. Can any one now be at a loss to understand what is meant by *the fearful, and unbelieving, &c., having their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone, which is the second death*? Rev. 21:8. The various classes of mankind here enumerated, who prove by their exhibiting only *terror, unbelief*, and the other *works of the flesh*, that *the spirit of Christ, or the divine nature* dwells not in them, must submit not only to be excluded from *the kingdom of God*, — a privilege, the enjoyment of which is reserved for *believers alone*, Rev. 20:4,6, 21:7, &c., — but to have all that they *naturally possess and delight in*, nay, to have *themselves also, soul and body*, cast into *the lake of fire, and destroyed*, Mat. 10:28. While believers neither require to be, nor can be destroyed *at death*, but enter into glory *as they are*, in consequence of their possessing *the divine nature*; unbelievers, as having *nothing supernatural* in them, are *destroyed*; and live ultimately, therefore, not with *any nature or principle possessed by them now*, but in consequence of their *being, hereafter, entirely created anew*. While believers even already *bear the image of the heavenly*, it is by unbelievers being *cast into the lake of fire* that they come out ultimately *bearing it*.

[260] I am satisfied that I have now done all that, strictly speaking, can be required of me to prove my system. As to those whose attachment to certain theories of religion is so great as to determine them to adhere to [261] these at all hazards, or whose interests are involved in the maintenance of particular creeds, — to them I do not address myself. On their minds I despair of making any impression. To them must be conceded the privilege of carping and cavilling at statements however clear, and proofs however conclusive. But there is a class of my readers whose case I cannot lose sight of; a class for whose sake, principally, the composition of this essay has been undertaken. I mean the candid, and the upright. The men who, understanding the truth to a certain degree, are desirous to bow to divine authority whenever satisfactorily made out to them; but who, from the strength of their prejudices, or their inability to follow out a train of reasoning, find themselves puzzled and diffculted in regard to my conclusions. Is there no way in which I can still farther simplify the matter to them? Can I, by any mode of stating my positions and arguments different from that which I have adopted, become the instrument of removing their doubts? The followers of the Lamb may rest assured, that if I but knew how, in reference to this matter, I could be of service to them, there are no pains which I would spare, no efforts which I would omit, in order to [262] testify the affection which, for the truth's sake, I bear towards them. My only fear is, that of exhausting the patience of my readers. Let me try, however, if I cannot, by a few additional arguments, contrive to place the subject in such a light as may tend to confirm impressions in favour of it where already made, and to remove doubts respecting it where any exist. The arguments which I shall employ for this purpose may be denominated miscellaneous; being answers to anticipated objections, — the results of analogy, — and ideas which have been suggested to me by a perusal of the divine word. Instead of dwelling upon what is to be advanced, I shall do little more than throw out hints, — leaving it to the intelligent part of my readers, from the scriptures and from what has been already stated, to fill up the outline.

1. "Your system," it may be alleged, "is inconsistent with the idea of the wicked undergoing *eternal death*." Before this charge can become relevant, it will be necessary to shew, that *eternal death* is a doctrine of the scriptures. But in what part of the sacred volume, pray, is mention made of *eternal death*? If that blessed book be searched from beginning to end, can it by any possibility be discovered there?<sup>124</sup> And if not there, am I obliged to receive either the phrase, or the doctrine insinuated by means of it, on the bare [263] authority of man? The fact is, that the uniform omission of the phrase, and the express contrast instituted in more than one text, not between *eternal death* and *eternal life*, but between *death* and *eternal life*, speaks volumes to the reflecting mind. See Rom. 5:21; 6:23, &c. Taken in connection with the whole tenor of scripture, it is a hint, and a very intelligible one too, that *death*, as a principle which may be *brought to an end* or *destroyed*, neither is nor can be *eternal*; whereas *life*,<sup>125</sup> as *the very nature of God himself*,<sup>126</sup> must necessarily be so. Supposing me, however, to admit, for the sake of argument, that *eternal death* is implied in some of the expressions which occur in the sacred volume, would it in that case signify *eternal torments*? Would it not, on the contrary, be equivalent, either, to *the eternal continuance of death*? or, to what is elsewhere denominated *the second death*? But, in neither of these cases, can it be identified with *the eternal endurance of sufferings in a future state*. For, if synonymous with *the eternal continuance of death*, how can a person in a *state of non-existence* be *the subject of torments*? Or, if with *the second death*, which we have shewn to signify *the destruction of death*, how can a person in whom *death* and *deathlike principles* shall have been *destroyed*, and who shall have been *created anew* by being raised to the possession of *an everlasting and therefore perfect existence*, be obnoxious to that which [264] can be predicated only of a person who is in a state of *transient and therefore imperfect existence*? To settle all disputes, I may mention, that although the expression is not a scriptural one, I am a believer in *eternal death*: but in an *eternal death* which, paradoxical as the proposition may appear, is synonymous with *eternal life*. For, what so well deserves the appellation of *eternal death*, as a principle by which *death itself is everlastingly swallowed up and destroyed*? And is not *eternal life*, as THE ETERNAL DEATH OF DEATH ITSELF, this very principle?

<sup>124</sup> Poor Dr. M'Knight, in his note on Rom. 6:23, says, with great simplicity: "It is observable that, although in scripture the expression *eternal life* is often to be met with, *we no where find eternal joined with death*."

<sup>125</sup> Nothing is deserving of the name of *life*, but what is *eternal*. Compare 1 John 5:12, with 11.

<sup>126</sup> See Exodus 3:14, John 8:58,59, 14:6; 1 Thessal. 1:9, 1 Tim. 6:16.

2. "But it was *the seed of Abraham*, and *not mankind in general*, that Christ took hold of, or took hold of." Heb. 2:16. True, it was *the seed of Abraham*, as distinguished from *the nature of angels*, or rather *angels themselves*,<sup>127</sup> that Christ took hold of; but how do you arrive at your conclusion, that this is inconsistent with the ultimate salvation of the whole human race? "Why, the apostle argues, that believers are Abraham's seed; and as it was the seed of Abraham that Christ took hold of, therefore, believers, as that seed, alone have any interest in his meditorial undertakings." And such reasoning as this, although a mere sophism, will, I have no doubt, pass current with nine hundred and ninety-nine thousand, nine hundred and ninety-nine, out of every million of the unreflecting dupes, to whom it is generally addressed! Need I tell the well-informed and scripturally-enlightened reader, that, although in the fourth chapter of his epistle to the [265] Romans, and in the third chapter of that to the Galatians, the apostle Paul reasons on the principle of the identity of Christ's and Abraham's seed, his mode of reasoning is exactly the reverse of our religious wise-acres? According to them, *it is because we are Abraham's seed, that we are likewise Christ's seed*; but, according to the apostle, *it is because we are Christ's seed, that we are likewise Abraham's seed*. If ye be Christ's, THEN are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise. Gal. 3:29. "And is this the whole amount of the objection which you can bring against our mode of reasoning?" interpose my opponents. "Why, even on your own shewing, Christ's seed, and Abraham's seed, are equivalent expressions; and if so, why quarrel with us, merely because we have happened to put *the one expression* before *the other*?" Nay, my worthy friends, I beg

leave to demur to your principle, that to draw a conclusion from our *being Abraham's seed*, to our *being Christ's seed*, is the same mode of reasoning, as to conclude from *our being Christ's seed*, to our *being Abraham's seed*; for they differ from each other *toto cælo*: and upon this demurrer, I join issue with you. Arguing from the fact of *their being Abraham's seed*, to *their being likewise the Messiah's seed*, was the principle upon which the Jews proceeded. *We be Abraham's seed, and were never in bondage to any man; how sayest thou, ye shall be made free?* John 8:33. In other words, "as Abraham's seed, are we not already the Messiah's seed? and what higher privilege, then, than what we already [266] possess, can you hold out, or promise to us?" But were the Jews right, in having recourse to this kind of reasoning? Did it receive the sanction of him, with whom they thus ventured to bandy arguments? If you have any doubts respecting the nature or extent of the mistake which they committed, read attentively the rebuke which Christ administered to them, on the occasion alluded to, John 8:34, downwards. The import of that rebuke is, "instead of its being proved by your being Abraham's seed, that you are my seed, it is, on the contrary, by your being my seed, that you become and prove yourselves to be in reality Abraham's seed:" verses 39, 40, 42, &c. Again; even after the gospel had been preached to them by the apostles, the Jews continued to argue from *their being Abraham's seed*, to *their being Christ's seed*. But did the apostles, any more than their divine master, admit the correctness of this mode of reasoning, or countenance their countrymen in employing it? Quite the reverse. The import of the speech of the apostle Peter, recorded Acts 15:8-11, and of the argument prosecuted by the apostle Paul, in the fourth of the Romans, and the third of the Galatians, is, that so far from the circumstance of the Jews *being Abraham's seed*, constituting them likewise *Christ's seed*, — it was *as Christ's seed*, that both Jews and Gentiles *became Abraham's seed*. Rom. 4:9-13; 16-18; Gal. 3:9; 26-29. See also Rom. 2:28,29. It being thus evident, that in the view of our Lord and his apostles, there was a very marked difference between arguing from *persons being* [267] *Abraham's seed*, to *their being Christ's seed*; and arguing from *persons being Christ's seed*, to *their being Abraham's seed*; the former being condemned, and the latter approved of, by infallible authority; are we not hereby furnished with a test of the nature and value of similar reasoning, when employed by our religionists at the present day? Let us try. "We who believe," say they, "being Abraham's seed here, therefore, we alone, as thereby likewise Christ's seed, shall enjoy eternal life hereafter." Now, is this reasoning Jewish, or Apostolical? It is reasoning from *the possession of certain exclusive privileges here*, to *the possession of similar exclusive privileges hereafter*. But this is the very way in which the Jews reasoned. From *enjoying exclusive privileges under the Old Testament dispensation*, they argued to *their enjoyment of similar exclusive privileges under the New*. And are Christians, in their discussions with one another, to adopt and indulge in a strain of reasoning, which drew down upon the Jews of old the severe rebukes of the Lord of Glory? No, certainly. On the contrary, taught by the language of Christ and his apostles, that every one who *becomes Christ's seed, becomes thereby, likewise, Abraham's seed*, we thus argue, that in consequence of the whole human race ultimately *bearing the image of the heavenly*, or *becoming Christ's seed*, they thereby ultimately, likewise, *become Abraham's seed*. That is, instead of arguing Jewishly, from *persons becoming Abraham's seed*, to *their becoming Christ's seed*, we argue, as the apostle himself does, from *persons becoming Christ's* [268] *seed*, to *their becoming likewise Abraham's seed*. Gal. 3:29. A mode of reasoning not only strictly apostolic, but exactly agreeing with those passages of scripture which, intimating that *in Abraham's seed, that is Christ, all the nations of the earth should be blessed*, point out *the whole human race as blessed in Christ the seed of Abraham*, and as *thereby rendered Abraham's seed*. Gen. 12:3; 18:18; 22:18; Rom. 4:9-17.<sup>128</sup>

<sup>127</sup> See the Greek, and the margin, at the passage.

<sup>128</sup> Upon any other principle, than that contended for by me in the text, the apostle Paul's reasoning in Rom. 4:9-17, as well as in Gal. 3:6-29, is perfectly worthless. From the circumstance of Abraham's *having stood justified before God*, not as possessed of *peculiar earthly privileges*, but as a human being *to whom had been*



*imparted the knowledge of the divine character*, Rom. 4:10,11, a conclusion follows, not to the justification and salvation of any one as possessed of *peculiar earthly privileges*, but to the justification and salvation of every one *to whom may be imparted the knowledge of the divine character*, verses 16, and 17. And on the very same principle, on which the grace of God appears conspicuous in New Testament times, in God's saving men, like Abraham of old, although not interested in the external covenant entered into with *the Father of the faithful*, and his natural posterity; will not the same grace of God appear still more conspicuous in a future state of existence, in God's ultimately saving men, although not interested in those peculiar blessings which, in the kingdom of Christ, are the portion of the spiritual Israel. Gen. 12:3, &c., with Rom. 11. In a word, what is the fair conclusion from Abraham's seed, in New Testament times, not having been confined, as in the Old, to *his natural posterity*, but having included *men of every kindred and tongue, and people, and nation*, Gal. 3:29, if not this, that the seed of Christ, the antitype of Abraham, shall not, at the period of the consummation of all things, be confined, as in his kingdom, to *his spiritual posterity*, but shall include *the whole family of man*. Rom. 5:18; 11:32; 1 Cor. 15:22. And as Christ is Abraham's seed, does it not clearly follow, that in the event of *the whole family of man* ultimately becoming *Christ's seed*, they thereby ultimately become *Abraham's seed* likewise?

3. "It is expressly asserted by the apostle, that *our God is a consuming fire*, Heb. 12:29; but, according to you, instead of consuming He saves. How, pray, do [269] you reconcile your representations of the divine character, with the view of it furnished to us in this passage?" An objection like this, although extremely common, comes with the worst possible grace from the supporters of the popular theory. For, however plausible at first sight it may appear to be, when urged against my sentiments, can those who have recourse to it fail to be aware, that it tells with tenfold force against themselves? Suppose me to retort upon them their own question, and to ask, how they contrive to reconcile their ideas of God with this passage? "O, this we can do with the utmost ease. God hates sin with such an intensity of hatred, that His feelings towards it are compared to the action of a mighty fire, which flames out, and shall continue to flame out, against it for evermore!" True, God hates sin with a perfect hatred; and the comparison of Him to a consuming fire, is a lively and expressive emblem of the feelings which He cherishes towards it: but, admitting all this, how can *that which He consumes*, possess *everlasting existence*? *Sin* and *sinner*s being, as our adversaries allow, the fuel of the flame spoken of in the passage in question, how can *that which is destroyed, exist for ever*? According to the popular theorists, God is represented to be *a consuming fire*, in reference to His treatment of sin; — a thing which no Christian will or can deny: — and yet, *presto! begone!* the same God who, by their own admission one moment, *as a consuming fire, destroys sin*, is, by some species of juggling or self-deception which it is difficult to account for, the [270] next moment represented as a being who *actually preserves sin throughout eternity!* The words, *our God is a consuming fire*, are thus, according to them, interpreted to mean, that sin, which here is a property of beings whose existence is transient, and which itself, consequently, has here but a transient existence, shall nevertheless have everlasting existence conferred upon it hereafter, by being rendered a property of beings who are to live for ever! God hating sin *so as to consume it*; and yet, strange to tell, *imparting to that which He hates and consumes, everlasting existence*? Did any one ever meet with an idea so preposterous? And yet, this is the sum of the popular theory; and the consequence to which those who make use of the text in question as an argument against me, unfortunately reduce themselves. God who, as *a consuming fire*, destroys *both sin and sinners*, nevertheless assigns to *sin and sinners, as such*, everlasting existence! — I am ready to concede, that in declaring God to be *a consuming fire*, the apostle had an eye to the appearance which God made to Moses at Mount Horeb, in *the bush which burned with fire, but was not consumed*. Exod. 3:1-10. But this concession, even they themselves being judges, is unfavourable to them. For, which of the two following representations of this emblem, falls to be regarded as the correct one? Is it that the bush denoted sin; and that God's dwelling in the bush, and burning without consuming it, indicated *God's taking up His abode in sin, and delighting to exercise His wrathful propensities upon it, without consuming it, for evermore*? Or, [271] is it that the bush signified *the whole family of man as one with Christ*; and that the circumstance of God's dwelling in the bush,

burning but not consuming it, indicated *God's taking up His abode in man, or making man His tabernacle, — burning, consuming, and destroying in man, his earthly or sinful nature, as what could be, and deserved to be, burned, consumed, and destroyed, — and yet, not consuming man himself?* If any difficulty shall be felt respecting the answer, let the language of God to Moses, Exod. 3:6, compared with Mat. 22:32, Mark 12:26,27, and Luke 20:37,38, and the whole history of the Jewish people, decide the matter. The Jewish nation, as having passed through the severest ordeals in past ages, and as continuing to the present day a distinct people, in spite of all the trials and sufferings which they have endured, is, in one point of view, the interpretation of the burning bush: but who sees not in the fact of *the whole human race dying, and yet living for ever*, 1 Cor. 15:22, the only interpretation of the emblem which completely satisfies and exhausts it? For a direct and positive proof that man, and not sin, is God's *tabernacle* or *place of abode*; and that, *as a consuming fire*, God *consumes or destroys all the natural properties of man*, without, however, *consuming or destroying man himself*, see Rev. 21:3-5.<sup>129</sup>

<sup>129</sup> See the same doctrine indirectly brought out in 1 Cor. 3:13-15.

4. "But scripture declares, that *God hath mercy upon whom He will have mercy, and that whom He will He hardeneth*. Rom. 9:18. Now, how is it pos-[272]sible to reconcile your sentiments with this view of the divine sovereignty? Unless God possess the power of *consigning some to everlasting misery*, as well as of *advancing others to everlasting happiness*, how can the passage quoted be fulfilled? and how can the full extent of the divine power be known?" That sovereignty is one of the attributes of the Supreme Being, and that whatever tends to impinge on it, or interfere with its exercise, must at once be rejected, I have no hesitation in admitting. And I grant, farther, that in the case of Pharaoh referred to in the passage quoted, and in that of the Jewish people which Pharaoh's fate was intended to illustrate, we have most striking instances of God's making use of intelligent creatures, in opposition to their own designs and inclinations, as the means of shewing forth His power, and promoting His purposes. Rom. 9:17, *to the end of the chapter*. But here the question arises: does the manifestation of the divine sovereignty require *the eternal existence of sin and sinners as such?* Or, is not the attribute of sovereignty strikingly displayed in rendering *the temporary existence and triumph of evil*, subservient to *the everlasting existence and triumph of holiness and happiness?* The followers of Calvin maintain the former; the writer of these pages the latter. Little are the former aware of the consequences in which, by their doctrine, they necessarily involve themselves. If correct, sin is *an end*, and not *a means to an end*; — the principle of *evil* must, as is asserted by the Manicheans, *be co-eternal with the principle of goodness*; — intelligent beings may [273] be possessed of *perfect existence*, and yet may be *imperfect in every other respect*; — and, above all, *the value of the Messiah's conquest* is detracted from; — Jesus, according to their principles, either having been unable to effect the destruction of evil; or, in opposition to scripture, having been manifested not *to destroy*, but *to confirm the Devil's works*. See 1 John 3:8. The sovereignty ascribed to God by Calvinists is thus, when examined into, found merely to be *brute force*, under the direction and control of *arbitrary will*: the attribute of power being regarded by them, apart from all consideration of the necessity of its being consistent, in its exercise, with the other attributes of *wisdom, justice, mercy*, and so on. In opposition to the ideas of divine sovereignty thus entertained by Calvinists, I contend, that the attribute in question is exhibited *in the complete conquest, and final destruction of evil*; — in rendering *the temporary existence and triumphs of sin*, subservient to *the everlasting existence and triumphs of grace*. Rom. 5:21. The existence of evil now, can be disputed by none. Well, then, why does it exist? It *entered and abounded*, not that it might exist forever, but that *by means of its temporary existence*, an opportunity might be afforded for *the entering and superabounding of grace*; — the *superabounding* of this latter principle, consisting in the very fact of its *completely destroying, and bringing to an end*, the former one. And is not sovereignty displayed in this? Nay, what is still better, is not the sovereignty thus displayed consistent with *wisdom*, as subservient to the accomplish-[274]ment of a most glorious plan,

— with *justice*, as meting out to intelligent beings exactly what they deserve, — and with *goodness*, as issuing in the complete happiness of the whole creation? Is it no recommendation of this view, that the sovereignty which it presents is chargeable, neither with caprice, nor cruelty? God, according to it, does what He will with His own; — He has His *vessels of wrath*, and His *vessels of mercy*; — He appoints *some to honour*, and *some to dishonour*; — *He hath mercy upon whom He will have mercy, and whom He will, He hardeneth*. All this, however, being subservient to an end which is to be attained in a future state, takes place not *hereafter*, but *here*; — God's selection of instruments, and the purposes to which He applies them, are only necessary during the continuance of this present system of things; — and, therefore, the various situations in which human beings are placed, and the various ways in which they are employed here, although affording a most decided display of the divine sovereignty, so far from being preparatory to the existence of *a similar*, are actually the means by which provision is made for the existence of *a totally dissimilar*, state of things hereafter. But is something more completely realizing our ideas of sovereignty, as implying the exercise of *unlimited power*, and *irresponsible will*, still sought after? Rom. 9:19-22. Behold this, then, in the facts of the communication of *the knowledge of the truth*, and thereby of *the principle of everlasting life*, to *some of the human race here*; and of *the knowledge of the truth*, and thereby *the enjoyment of* [275] *everlasting life*, being imparted to *the whole human race hereafter*. For, out of a number of intelligent beings, all naturally standing upon the same footing of guilt and depravity, what but sovereignty<sup>130</sup> dictated *the selection of those who should here be made partakers of the divine nature*? and as, previous to the commencement of time, it depended entirely upon God Himself, what orders of beings He should summon into existence, and what rank He should assign to each in the scale of creation, is there no sovereignty<sup>130</sup> displayed, in *His assigning to the whole family of man, a rank superior to that of His other creatures, both here and hereafter*? It seems to have been a conviction of the sovereignty displayed, in *God's dealings with man as a whole, through his union with the Messiah*, which drew from the inspired Psalmist that remarkable exclamation: *what is man, that thou art mindful of him? and the son of man, that thou visitest him?* Psalm 8:4.

<sup>130</sup> A sovereignty, however, be it observed, consistent with, and implying the exercise of, wisdom, justice, goodness, and so forth.

5. I have hinted already, that the Jewish people, besides being, in one point of view, *typical of believers*, are, in another, *typical of the whole human race*;<sup>131</sup> and [276] I have pointed out a few curious analogies, confirmatory and illustrative of this. In addition to those which have been set before my readers already, I may suggest the following. Abraham was the head of the Jewish people; and to him, as the suitable reward or acknowledgement of his faith, certain promises were made; which were to be fulfilled, during the subsistence of this present world, in the case of his natural posterity. Among these promises, it was declared to himself by implication, and to one of his descendants, expressly, that although *God should make an end of all the nations among whom He was to scatter the Jews, yet would He not make a full end of them*. Jer. 30:11. They were to be preserved as a distinct people, — subjected to the severest marks of the divine displeasure, and yet hedged around by the divine faithfulness, — until the period for their conversion, and subjugation to the Messiah, should arrive. This privilege they were to enjoy through their earthly connection with Abraham, and the other believing patriarchs. A fact to which the apostle evidently alludes, when he says, that the Jews although *enemies for the gentiles' sakes*, were nevertheless *beloved for the Fathers' sakes*. Rom. 11:28. Now, understanding Abraham to have been *the type of Christ*, and the Jews *the type of mankind as a whole*, have we not a beautiful analogy here suggested to us? Abraham occupied the twofold character of *a believer*, and *the head of an earthly posterity*. Rom. 4:9-17. As *the former*, none of his posterity shared with him in spiritual blessings, but such of them as shared with him in [277] the possession of the principle of faith. As *the latter*, however, many blessings of a most important kind flowed through him to his natural posterity; and, among others, the blessing of never being *as a nation* annihilated, and of

ultimately being *as a nation* brought to the acknowledgement of Jesus of Nazareth as the Messiah. Now, can the reflecting mind fail to receive from this a hint, as to what Christ is, and does, to the whole family of man? Jesus is both the *author and finisher of faith*, Heb. 12:2, that is, *the head of believers*, Psalm 116:10; 2 Cor. 4:13,14; — and he is likewise possessed of a nature which he shares *in common with every human being*. 1 Tim. 3:16; Heb. 2:14. In his *former* capacity, none but *the family of faith* are *his posterity*. Viewed as *the faithful one*, he has no connection with any, except *the faithful*, out of *every kindred, and tribe, and people, and nation*. But Jesus was a *partaker of flesh and blood likewise*. As such, he is to *the whole family of man*, the antitype of what Abraham was to *the Jews of old*; — and as through Abraham, blessings of an inferior kind flowed to *all the Jews*, so through Jesus, blessings of a superior kind<sup>132</sup> flow to *all the human race*. The grand blessing which the Jews *as a nation* enjoy, through their connection with their believing progenitor, we have seen to be, that although severely punished, they have never yet been destroyed; nay, that they shall be preserved, until a simultaneous acknowledgement of Jesus as the Messiah, shall burst forth from all of them. Need I [278] here suggest the analogy? As one with Jesus spiritually, *believers alone* can now share with him *in spiritual blessings*. But as one with him, through their possession of the same nature in which he was manifested, how clear that to *the whole human race*, as the antitype of *the Jews*, there belongs the privilege of *not being annihilated*, even although visited with *death as sin's wages*; and of being brought ultimately to *that knowledge of the Messiah*, which to them then, as to their believing brethren now, is *life everlasting*?<sup>133</sup>

<sup>131</sup> Besides being the type of *believers* or *the true church*, and of *the whole human race*, such is the manifold wisdom of God, that the Jews serve also for *a type of the true and false church of God*, considered as one whole. Mat. 13:24-30. As among the Israelites of old, there were found a few *who in reality believed*, while the rest merely at the utmost *made a profession of believing*; — so from the beginning of the Christian dispensation until now, there have been springing up together two bodies of men, the one, *believers of the truth*, whose consciences are purged from guilt, Rom. 5:1, 8:1; and the other, persons who make a profession, the insincerity of which is proved by *their labouring under doubts and fears, as to God's intentions with regard to them*. Mat. 13:24-30; 37-43; Rev. 21:8.

<sup>132</sup> *Superior* to those which flowed through Abraham *to the Jews as a nation*.

<sup>133</sup> Perhaps the following condensation of the last paragraph will render my argument more intelligible: — Abraham as the type, and Christ as the antitype, have each *a natural*, and *a spiritual posterity*. To *the natural posterity* of each belong *blessings*; but *blessings* of a kind *inferior* to those, which belong to *the spiritual posterity* of each. And as through *the special blessings* bestowed on Abraham's *spiritual posterity* at the commencement of the New Testament dispensation, *blessings of a more general kind* are to redound to *his natural posterity* at the close of that dispensation; so through the *special blessings* bestowed on Christ's *spiritual posterity* in his heavenly kingdom, *blessings of a more general kind* are to redound to *his natural posterity* at the consummation of all things. Rom. 11:30-32. I would just add, to what has been stated, that as Abraham's *natural posterity* is *the nation of the Jews*, so Christ's *natural posterity* is *the whole human race*.

6. The fact that the scriptures, although they assert a resurrection both of *the just* and of *the unjust*, Acts 24:15, make much more frequent mention of the resurrection of *the former* than of *the latter*, receives a most satisfactory explanation upon the principles which I am advocating. Why is it, that in such passages as Luke 14:14, 20:27,28, 1 Thess. 4:13-18, and a variety of others, in which *the resurrection* is spoken of, it is to *the resurrection of believers only*, that our attention is directed? Supposing the correctness of the views [279] proposed in these pages to be admitted, we answer, 1st, because, upon *the resurrection of believers*, *the resurrection of an unbelieving world* is dependent. Such is the beautiful connection subsisting between one part of the divine economy and another, that it is impossible for us to have a clear conception of what it proposes as *causes*, without at the same time conceiving of the *effects* to which they are subservient; nor, of what it sets before us as *effects*, except in the light of the *causes* by which they are produced. Still, however, as, in point of order, *causes* precede their *effects*, it is but natural that to *the former* the mind should be directed, previous, and under

certain circumstances even in preference to, *the latter*. Now, as, through *the resurrection of the Lord Jesus*, there takes place *the resurrection of his people*; 1 Cor. 15:23; Eph. 2:6; so through *the resurrection of his people*, there takes place *the resurrection of the rest of mankind*. John 3:16,17; Rom. 8:19-21; 1 Cor. 15:22-28; Rev. 20:4,5. *The resurrection of the people of God*, being thus the very thing upon which hinges, and from which proceeds, *the resurrection of the rest of the family of man*, — can we wonder at a matter of such importance, being presented to the mind, as that which *chiefly*, or, at all events, *in the first place*, deserves its consideration? But, 2dly, another reason for the more frequent mention of *the resurrection of believers*, than *that of unbelievers*, appears in the fact, that, *strictly speaking*, the future existence of those who are now ignorant of God's [280] character, is not so much *a resurrection*, as *a new creation*. To understand this, be it observed, that the life of believers *hereafter*, is the continuation and development of a principle possessed by them *here*; whereas, the life *hereafter* of those who are unbelieving *here*, is the acquisition by them of a principle to which *while here* they are total strangers. A believer of the truth, having the divine nature, which in him while here is clothed with *a natural*, afterwards clothed with *a spiritual body*; — the *spiritual*, being his *natural body*, changed and glorified; — is, with the strictest propriety, said to have *his* body raised again; or to be a partaker of *a resurrection*. Luke 20:35,36; Rom. 8:11. But, although an unbeliever likewise is raised again, in the sense of *a mind and a body* which here are *natural*, being hereafter rendered *spiritual*; yet how, in the sense of *sameness of nature* constituting *personality*, can we speak of *him* as being *raised again*? In the case of the believer, *the sameness* of his nature *in so far as respects his mind* both here and hereafter, warrants us to speak of him *with reference to his body* as undergoing *a resurrection*; but as, in the case of the unbeliever, *a changed and glorified body* is occupied hereafter, not by *the same*, but by *a changed and glorified mind*, is it not obvious, that a person in this predicament is hereafter the subject, not so properly of *a resurrection*, as of *a new creation*? And if so, have we not in this fact, likewise, a reason, and a very strong one too, why in some passages of scripture, — John 6:[281]37-41, Rom. 8:11, and Philip. 3:20,21, *for instance*, — the privilege of *being raised again*, is spoken of only in reference to the people of God?

7. One grand recommendation of the system advocated in these pages is, that according to it *divine manifestation hereafter is progressive*; whereas, according to every other, *it is represented as coming to an end with this present world*. That the object of God in all that is taking place is *self-manifestation*, or that *for His own glory He hath foreordained whatsoever cometh to pass*, is not merely the oft-repeated dictate of scripture, Rom. 11:36, &c., but is admitted in almost every Protestant creed and confession. See Westminster Assembly's *Confession* and *Catechisms*. From this it obviously follows, that whatever system of religion is found to be most consistent with *increasing divine manifestation*, is most consistent with *God's object*, as that is brought out in the scriptures of truth. But can it be alleged, with regard to ordinary systems, that they are thus consistent? Certainly not. And this, because they all proceed upon the principle of *a future state of existence being neither more nor less than a repetition of the present*. It was not peculiar to the celebrated author of *the analogy between natural and revealed religion*,<sup>134</sup> to suppose, that as sin and punishment exist *here*, sin and punishment may likewise exist *hereafter*. But what enlightened mind sees not at a glance, that this is to destroy *the possibility of progressive manifestation*? The whole state of matters here, nay, the very [282] fact of the existence of this present world in subserviency and as preliminary to a future state of existence, is proof positive, that in order to *divine manifestation*, *means are requisite*; and, that it is only by *an increase of the means*, that *any increase of the manifestation itself* can take place. But as, according to all the popular systems, sin and suffering which exist *here*, shall also exist *hereafter*; — and as a future state of existence shall thus be merely a repetition of the present; — do not *the sameness of the materials*, necessarily imply *a sameness in the result*? God, according to such systems, providing *hereafter* merely *the same means of manifestation* which He provides *here*, how, pray, can *the manifestation* of Himself *hereafter*, which is *the effect of those means*, be *different from* or *superior to* what it is *here*? Can

*similar causes* produce any thing else than *similar effects*? Where there is *no increase* or *advancement in the means*, can there be *any increase* or *advancement in the end*, to which these means are avowedly subservient? It is at this particular point, that the value of the system for which I am contending, begins to make its appearance. It not merely admits the abstract principle that *an increase of divine manifestation hereafter*, implies *an increase of the means of that manifestation*; but it points out, likewise, wherein *the increase*, both of *the manifestation*, and of *the means*, consists. It shews, that as *here*, so *hereafter*, intelligent beings are not merely *the persons* to whom *the manifestation of the divine character is made*, but are themselves likewise *the grand medium* through which *that* [283] *manifestation is made*. Intelligent beings, according to it, are at once both *the subjects*, and *the means*, of *divine manifestation*. This, however, being the case, how obvious that *increase hereafter of divine manifestation*, necessarily implies *increase hereafter in the number of those to whom that manifestation is made*. In other words, as *upon earth* divine manifestation is *increased and enlarged*, in proportion to *the increase of the number of those* to whom that manifestation is imparted; every addition to *the subjects* of divine manifestation, being necessarily an addition also to *the means* of divine manifestation; — so, *hereafter* likewise, divine manifestation must be *increased and enlarged*, in proportion to *the increase of the number of those* to whom it is imparted; *then*, no less than *now*, intelligent beings themselves being *the grand means*, as well as *subjects*, of divine manifestation. Who, that considers this, can fail to perceive, that that system of religion alone can be correct, which leaves room for *an increase of divine manifestation*, by leaving room for *an increase of the means of it* hereafter; — and which represents *the completeness of divine manifestation*, as being coincident with *the manifestation of God to all intelligent beings* as the end, *by all intelligent beings* as the means? This ordinary systems of religion do not: for, representing *all the intelligent beings* to whom God intends to make Himself known, as enjoying that privilege in this present world, they necessarily cut off the possibility of *any increase* of divine manifestation hereafter. On the other hand, it has been the object of these pages to [284] shew, that in the very fact of *the increase of the number of intelligent beings* to whom God manifests Himself hereafter, He finds *the means of increasing* the manifestation of Himself hereafter. Now is there a single discerning individual who knows, that *divine manifestation*, and *the means of divine manifestation*, advance *pari passu* upon earth, capable of supposing, that there can be *any increase of divine manifestation* hereafter, except through *an increase of the means of it*? If the *partial* conquest of sin and death, be the means of *partial* divine manifestation here, — can any thing short of the *complete* conquest of these, be the means of *complete* divine manifestation hereafter? Proceeding on the principles implied in the answers which must be returned to these questions, the system developed in these pages contends, that as the death and resurrection of the Messiah, are the means of conveying to his people that knowledge of the divine character which they possess here; so the death and resurrection of the Messiah and his people, are the means of conveying to the rest of the human race that knowledge of the divine character which they shall possess hereafter. Nay, it contends farther, that the respective fates of the righteous and the wicked, shall be a means of mutual manifestation; that is, as, by means of the resurrection of the righteous, there shall ultimately be manifested to those who are now wicked the highest conceivable view of *the divine justice*; — so by means of the ultimate resurrection of those who are now wicked, there shall be [285] imparted to the righteous the highest conceivable idea of *the divine mercy*.

<sup>134</sup> Butler.

8. "Say what you will, you represent the fates of the righteous and the wicked to be the same; — a circumstance which is enough to induce us to reject your system." There must certainly be something, either prodigiously obtuse in the intellects of those with whom I have to deal, or very confused in the statements which I have made, to occasion such a remark as this. So far from wishing to represent the fates of the righteous and the wicked as being *the same*, my object all along has been to shew that they are *essentially different*. In the first place, I have stated, that two persons are set before us in the

scriptures, — each of them having a posterity resembling himself, — and each of them, with his posterity, undergoing a fate, corresponding to the nature of which he and they are possessed. The former of these persons is, with his posterity, *earthly, wicked, and distinguished merely by natural principles*; — the latter of them is, with his posterity, *heavenly, righteous, and distinguished by supernatural principles*. The former of them is, with his posterity, *swept away, and brought to an end*; it being a maxim of God's word, that *the wicked shall be no more*, Psalm 104:35: — the latter of them is, with his posterity, *elevated to the possession and enjoyment of life everlasting*; it being equally a maxim of God's word, that the righteous shall *ascend into God's holy hill, and abide there for ever*. Psalms 15, 24. Is this to confound the fate of the righteous, with that of the wicked? Still farther, in [286] the second place, I have frequently laid it down as an axiom, that the connection which Christ has with his believing people, is something totally different from that which he has with the rest of mankind. Between Him and believers there exists, not merely *a sameness of nature in so far as flesh and blood are concerned*, but also *a sameness of mind*; they having *the first fruits* of that *spirit* which he possessed without measure: — between him and the rest of the human race, there exists merely *a sameness in so far as human nature is concerned*. Now, who sees not, in *this present difference* between believers and unbelievers, the foundation laid of *a difference in their respective fates*? Who sees not, that they who are of *one spirit* with the Lord of Glory, must have a different fate from those who are merely of *one body* with him? This very difference it has been my object to point out in the latter part of the volume. They who by faith are of *one spirit* with the Lord, 2 Cor. 4:13, enter into his joy *even here*, and continue to possess it *now, henceforth, and for ever*; — on the contrary, those whose privilege extends no farther than to the possession of *a body* similar to his, are liable to have, nay, shall have, *their present nature totally destroyed*. Mat. 10:28; Rev. 21:8. Is this to maintain that *a similar fate* awaits *the righteous and the wicked*?

9. It is no slight argument in favour of the system propounded in these pages, that in no other way, except by means of it, can the language of the sacred volume be reconciled with itself. How, I ask, can any [287] man, availing himself merely of the lights with which popular divines furnish him, contrive to render self-consistent, those passages of scripture which treat of the everlasting punishment or destruction of the wicked, with those passages which treat of their everlasting salvation? Were he to consider merely the texts which represent the wicked, as being *driven away like the chaff* — as being *no more* — as being *cast into the lake of fire* — as being *destroyed soul and body in Hell* — as being *punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power* — and so on, — what other conclusion could he arrive at, but that the wicked were hereafter to be annihilated; or that with this present world their existence was entirely to come to an end? And yet, how could he reconcile such a view with those numerous other texts, which represent the wicked as rising again, and existing hereafter for evermore? — Again, were he to consider only those texts which speak of God as *loving the world* — of Christ as *dying the just for the unjust* — of his *tasting death for every man* — of his *blood cleansing from all sin* — of his *being a propitiation for the sins of the whole world* — of *eternal life being the gift of God to man* — and so on, — would he not be justified in concluding, with many classes of Universalists, that every member of the human family was to attain to the possession of eternal life, exactly in the same way, and on the same footing? And yet, how could this view be reconciled with those passages of scripture, which represent eternal life as withheld from the wicked? — I say, how is a [288] plain man, with no other light than what is afforded by our *blind leaders of the blind*, and the erroneous systems which they propound, to be able to reconcile such apparently self-contradictory statements, as I have just been extracting from the sacred record? And yet, reconcilable they must be, if the scriptures are the word of God. This being the case, is there no likelihood of that system being true, which offers an easy, complete, and scriptural solution, of all these otherwise perplexing difficulties? Which, instead of having recourse to quirk, quibble, and subterfuge, in order to get rid of, or explain away, either passages which treat of the everlasting punishment of the

wicked on the one hand, or such as treat of their everlasting salvation on the other, receives the views presented in both as correct, because standing recorded in the word of God; nay, not only so, but is able to shew, that however *paradoxical* the two sets of statements at first sight may appear to be, they are not in reality *self-contradictory*? Such is the system for which I contend; — for, it both shews that the wicked shall be *everlastingly punished*, by their having the only nature which they here possess *everlastingly destroyed*; — and yet renders this *everlasting punishment* of theirs, perfectly consistent with their being *everlastingly saved*, by shewing, that they shall be created anew in the holy and heavenly nature of Christ Jesus, at the consummation of all things. The *everlasting punishment* of the wicked, in the full extent of signification which belongs to the term *everlasting*, is thus, and thus only, shewn to be perfectly consistent with [289] *the complete destruction, of sin, suffering, and death, the works of the Devil*. But what system of divinity, except the one which I am now proposing and illustrating, can effect the reconciliation of these two otherwise discordant ideas?

10. According to the theory advocated in this work, those who here continue wicked, although *ultimately saved*, have *neither part nor lot in the kingdom of Christ*. This view has already, in a variety of ways, been adverted to and pressed on the attention of my readers; but it is so important, as to justify me in bestowing upon it a particular notice. It is frequently adduced as a charge against systems of Universalism, that the wicked who, if scripture be true, are *excluded from Christ's kingdom*, shall nevertheless, according to them, be *admitted into that kingdom*, upon a footing of equality with the righteous. At this point, I concede to my opponents, that if the system which I hold be obnoxious to the charge just stated, it is thoroughly vitiated, and deserves instant rejection. But how, in reality, stands the matter? Why, that according to the sentiments which I have been inculcating in these pages, *the fearful, and the unbelieving*, no less than *the grossly profligate*, as all indicating, by the fruits which they bring forth, their total destitution of the divine nature, *have no part whatever in Christ's kingdom*. Rev. 21:8. The fact is, that among those who may bring against my theory the charge alluded to, probably not one in a thousand knows what Christ's kingdom is; and who they are that are destined to partake of it with him. For the [290] information of such persons, I would observe, that as the kingly office among men, implies the possession of power and authority, and the existence of subjects over whom it is exercised; so when we speak of Christ as a king we mean, that he is possessed of power, and that he exercises authority over those who are subjected to his sway. Now Christ thus reigning, do any of the human race, or do all of them, share with him in his kingdom, or kingly office? By paying due attention to the answer which we return to this question, the scriptural nature of the theory broached in these pages will become apparent. Were we to say, that none of the human race are admitted into his kingdom and reign with him, we should contradict scripture, which represents it to be the privilege of believers, to be kings, as well as priests, unto God. Rev. 1:6. Were we to say, that the whole human race enter into his kingdom, we should equally contradict scripture, which confines the privilege of reigning with him to his believing people. Rev. 20:4,6. Observing these facts, then, we maintain, that although Jesus originally reigns over believers as well as others, yet by bringing the former to the knowledge of the truth, and thereby converting them into friends, he gives them to partake with him in his kingdom or reigning power; the subjects common to him and them thenceforward, being the unbelieving part of the family of man. So long, then, as there are unbelievers, — men ignorant of the truth, and opposed to it, — so long shall Christ and his people have subjects; or so long shall his reign and theirs continue. But the [291] kingdom of Christ and his people is not to last for ever. There is, as we are informed, a period approaching, when he shall deliver up the kingdom to God, even the Father. 1 Cor. 15:24. The reign of Christ, with his people, is to last only for a thousand years. Rev. 20:4,6. But how does this joint kingdom of Christ and his church, over an unbelieving world, come to an end? Why, just in the same way in which Christ's kingdom comes to an end in the case of believers themselves, viz., in consequence of unbelievers being *subdued unto himself*, — in consequence of their being *changed from enemies into friends*. Christ and his people are *to reign, until all power, and authority, and rule, shall*



*be put down; or, until all his enemies shall be put under his feet*; 1 Cor. 15:24,25; that is, in plain English, until he shall have achieved that complete conquest over every thing opposed to God, which consists in reconciling all things unto Him. Col. 1:20. But who sees not at a glance, that this prevents unbelievers from entering into Christ's kingdom? — that it renders their reigning with him absolutely impossible? It is true, that the converting of unbelievers into friends, at the consummation of all things, is an act of Christ's kingdom or kingly office: but how can those who are then rendered his friends, attain to the possession of reigning power with him, when it is considered, that in the conversion of them his kingdom expires? 1 Cor. 24-28. If his change of them is an act of his kingdom, it is the last act of it; and how, therefore, can they reign *with him*, when *he himself has ceased to reign*? Besides, [292] how can any one reign, when there are no subjects to be reigned over? Christ now reigns, because in his enemies he finds so many subjects, Psalm 110:2; — and his people reign with him, because, after their conversion, the great majority of the human race still continue the enemies, and consequently the subjects, of them, as well as of their head. But when the unbelieving part of the family of man shall, from *enemies and subjects*, be converted into *friends*, — to bring about which glorious issue the kingdom of Christ and his people is set up, — shall not that kingdom of necessity come to an end?<sup>135</sup> And coming to an end with the conversion of unbelievers, the only subjects whom it ever had, how can unbelievers enter into it, or become possessed of kingly power? How can they enter into, and enjoy that, which no longer exists? Thus is it apparent, that while every believer enters into, and becomes a partaker of, Christ's heavenly kingdom; from that kingdom, — from all participation in kingly power with the Son of God, — every unbeliever is for ever, and necessarily, excluded. Instead of *reigning with Christ*, unbelievers are *reigned over by him and his believing people*. So far from sharing with Christ in his kingly office, as believers do, unbelievers are the very persons, in the case of whom, his and their kingly office is exercised. Without doubt unbelievers are ultimately converted into Christ's friends; this conversion of theirs [293] being the grand object, as well as the most important act of his kingdom; but as, the moment that their conversion takes place, Christ has no longer any subjects to reign over, it follows, both that his kingdom no longer exists, and that reigning with him is on the part of those who are then converted utterly impossible. Is this to represent unbelievers as entering into Christ's kingdom *on a footing of equality with believers*? Nay, is this to represent unbelievers as entering into Christ's kingdom *at all*?

<sup>135</sup> Let me not be misunderstood. The kingdom of God, in his character of *Lord* and *Christ*, comes to an end; as *the all in all* he reigns for ever. This explains many otherwise ambiguous declarations contained in the sacred volume. See notes at pages 187, and 251.

11. The system for which I contend, affords a full and satisfactory explanation of passages of scripture which, treating of the benefits of Christ's redemption, sometimes represent these as redounding to *many*, sometimes to *all*. The following are specimens of passages of this description: *The son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister; and to give his life a ransom FOR MANY*. Matthew 20:28.<sup>136</sup> *Christ Jesus — gave himself a ransom FOR ALL, to be testified in due time*. 1 Timothy 2:6.<sup>137</sup> Few circumstances connected with the phraseology of the New Testament, have contributed more to puzzle critics and commentators, than the ambiguity of the manner in which, by the inspired writers, the terms *many* and *all* have been employed. According as Arminian or Calvinistic spectacles have been worn, *many* has been supposed to signify *all*, and *all* has been supposed to signify *many*. Those who under the influence of curiosity, or some [294] more laudable motive, may wish to see how far even the strongest minds have been perplexed, in their attempts to comprehend and account for the apparently interchangeable use of these two words, may consult any celebrated Arminian or Calvinistic commentator, in regard to such a passage as Rom. 5:12-21. And yet, upon the principles developed and insisted on in this work, the scriptural usage in question occasions no difficulty whatever. Our blessed Lord and his apostles kept continually in their own view, and were desirous to keep continually in the view of those by whom their discourses and letters might be perused, two

different and yet inseparably connected ideas. *The one*, that the benefits resulting from the mission of the Son of God into the world *in a certain sense* were to be *peculiar*; — *the other*, that these benefits *in a certain sense* were to be *general*. In *one sense*, Christ was to give his life as a ransom only for *those who should believe in his name*; — *in another sense*, the advantage of being ransomed was to extend to *the whole human race*. The moment that this is understood, instead of any ambiguity attaching to the use of the phrases *many* and *all*, where the extent and application of the benefits of Christ's redemption is the subject matter treated of, the employment of *one of these phrases at one time*, and of *the other at another time*, is seen to be peculiarly beautiful and instructive. Is it the intention of our Heavenly Father to suggest to us, that those only who believe *have everlasting life*; — that they only, *while descendants of the first Adam, become also descendants of the second*; — [295] and that they only, instead of succumbing under the power of death, are, even while in their fleshly nature, ransomed from, and enabled to triumph over it? How admirably is this accomplished by the language, *the son of man gave his life a ransom for many*, Mat. 20:28; the word *many*, employed to denote the number of the subjects of his ransoming grace, being one which, although it does not directly signify *all*, is nevertheless not exclusive of *all*. Again, when that apostle, who appears to have possessed the largest measure of the spirit of his divine master, found it necessary, 1 Tim. 2:6, in prosecuting an argument which he had begun in the previous part of the epistle, to assert as a fact, that *Christ Jesus gave himself a ransom for* or on account of *ALL*, how properly, when we consider that the universality of the ransom was not to be immediately realized, does he add, that it was *to be testified*, or a *testimony*, not at the time when he wrote, nor for many ages afterwards, but *in due time*; or, *when the period destined and suitable for it should arrive*. O that theologians of all sects and parties, taught by the very manner in which the sacred writings are composed, could be induced to suspect, that as there is a sense, in which the enjoyment of heavenly blessings by *all*, is not inconsistent with their being confined to *many*; so there is likewise a sense, in which the peculiar enjoyment of them by *many*, is not necessarily exclusive of their ultimate communication to *all*.<sup>138</sup>

<sup>136</sup> Λυτρον ἅντι ΠΟΛΛΩΝ.

<sup>137</sup> Ἀντilyτρον ὑπερ ΠΑΝΤΩΝ.

<sup>138</sup> Not in the absurd Arminian sense, of a communication to *all*, from which *the great majority derive no benefit*.

[296] 12. "Your system, disguise it as you will, makes Christ to stand in the same relation to wicked or unbelieving men, in which he stands to his believing people. This, of itself, is sufficient to authorize us in rejecting it." How often must I repeat, and shew, that this representation of my system is the result, either of gross stupidity, or of gross perversion. Although I have admitted — although it is the object of these pages to prove — that Christ *the living God is the Saviour of all men*; how often have I observed, and endeavoured to draw attention to the fact, that he is the Saviour *especially of those that believe*. 1 Tim. 4:10. If I have maintained that there is a sense in which he is *the Saviour of all*, I have just as decidedly maintained that there is a sense in which he is only *the Saviour of some*.<sup>139</sup> This very difference springs from *the difference* between the relation in which he stands *to all*, and that in which he stands *to some*. *To all*, as has been already again and again stated, he stands in the relation of having had a human body and human nature like theirs; Mat. 1:18,25; 1 Tim. 3:16; Heb. 2:14; 1 John 4:2,3; — *to some* he stands in the relation of having had a mind, or spirit, or divine nature, like theirs; 1 Cor. 2:16, 6:17. [297] Unbelievers, as partakers of flesh and blood, all have *the body of Christ*; — believers, as partakers of the divine nature, 2 Peter 1:4, alone have *the mind of Christ*. Now, *this very difference* between the relation of unbelievers and believers to Christ, I have attempted already to shew, is the source of *a difference* between the respective fates of the one and the other. Unbelievers, as having bodies or human natures like to Christ's, share the fate of Christ's body or human nature; — believers, as having minds or divine natures like to Christ's, share the fate of Christ's mind or divine nature. Christ's body, or human nature, was *sacrificed*; Heb. 10:5,10; — his mind, or divine nature, *that day*, or

immediately, *entered into Paradise*. Luke 23:43. This, at once, to the enlightened mind, affords an explanation of the whole matter. Unbelievers, as having no other connection with Christ than a sameness of body or human nature, are at death sacrificed: — believers, as having that intimate connection with Christ, which is implied in their possessing the first fruits of his mind or spirit, although like their head, as to their human nature, they die; yet like their head also, as to their divine nature, they immediately enter into Paradise, and live for ever. At this point appears the incorrectness of the popular system, and the scriptural accuracy of that for which I contend. "Unbelievers," say the popular theologians and their followers, "are in a future state to be tormented for ever." But as this was not the fate of Christ's personal body or human nature, so, reasoning analogically, neither can it be [298] the fate of bodies, or human natures, similar to his. Christ sacrificed his personal body, or human nature. But how? By tormenting it for ever? By annihilating it? No: in neither way. He sacrificed it by destroying it as a human body, or by bringing *human nature in himself to an end*; — and this, that he might afterwards new create and fashion his formerly human, natural, and earthly body, by raising it changed into a divine, spiritual, and heavenly body. So it is with the unbelieving world. As Christ's personal body, or human nature, was by him sacrificed or destroyed; so are their bodies, or human natures, the only thing which they have in common with him, sacrificed or destroyed likewise. But as the sacrifice of his own *body* by the Messiah, was subservient to his afterwards raising it new created and fashioned into a *glorious body*; so, is the sacrifice of the *bodies* of the unbelieving, subservient to his afterwards raising them new created, and fashioned into *glorious bodies* likewise. Again; his *body* lay for a time in the grave, while his *mind* or *spirit* immediately entered into Paradise. Such is *the difference* between the respective fates of the unbelieving and the believing. It is the fate of the former, as having no other connection with Christ, than what consists in the sameness of their bodies or human natures, to lie in their graves till the consummation of all things; — Hosea 6:2; compared with Isaiah 25:8, Hosea 13:14, 1 Cor. 15:55, &c.; — it is the fate of the latter, as having in them the divine nature, when they die, immediately to enter into glory. Is this to represent the connection subsisting between [299] Christ and his people, to be the same as that which subsists between him and the world in general? or, to represent the fate of the one, as being the same with the fate of the other?

<sup>139</sup> Here let me, in the most decided manner, disclaim the old Arminian or semi-Arminian doctrines, of a distinction between redemption *of the whole*, and redemption *of a part*; between *salvation by purchase*, and *salvation by power*; and between *the sufficiency*, and *efficiency of the atonement*: and also the modern absurd modification of these by Messrs. Irving, Campbell, &c.; by which God is represented as *having saved all mankind*, and yet as ultimately *damning the greater part of them*. I cannot sanction any system, which either directly, or indirectly, would represent *the creature* as frustrating the purposes, and rendering nugatory the love, of *the Creator*.

Lastly. I would propose what follows, as at once an illustration of, and an argument for, the theory advanced in these pages. The kingdom of heaven has, by our blessed Lord himself, been compared to leaven; which being inserted into dough, slowly and progressively, but certainly, imparts its properties to the whole lump. Mat. 13:33. Now, according to the system which I hold, the children of men as a whole constitute the lump, into which the leaven of the divine nature has been inserted, and upon which that nature shall continue to operate, until its own properties shall be ultimately imparted to the whole. To express myself somewhat differently. There are three distinct states in which intelligent beings have appeared upon earth. First, with a human body, and a human mind. Secondly, with a human body, and a mind partly human and partly divine. And, thirdly, with a human body, and a mind perfectly divine. It was requisite, that intelligent beings should possess human bodies, in all these different states, for the following among other reasons. First, that but for this there would have been nothing in common among the three different classes; secondly, that, situated as we now are, and possessed of our present faculties, apart from the fact of his possessing a human body, we could have formed no conception what-[300]ever of an intelligent being;<sup>140</sup> and, thirdly, that as the purpose of God was to manifest His

character, through the medium of shewing what the divine nature is capable of effecting, it was requisite, that in every one of the states mentioned, there should be something upon which that nature might operate. Now, according to the system proposed and advocated in these pages, the divine nature dwelling in the Lord Jesus, first, assimilated the nature of his own personal body, to that of his mind; secondly, it is assimilating gradually the nature of the minds and bodies of his people, to his own; and, in the third and last place, carrying on the same process, it shall ultimately assimilate to his own nature, the minds and bodies of all. That is, the leaven of the divine nature, dwelling originally in the Lord Jesus, gradually but certainly leavens, by assimilating to itself, the whole lump of humanity. Now, is there in all this, any thing inconsistent with the unerring declarations of the sacred volume? Nay, is not this an abridged statement of all the doctrines which it contains? Of this I feel confi-[301]dent, that none but a mere naturalist, or a modern Socinian, can, consistently with himself, deny the truth of my allegations. Taking the matter out of the abstract form in which I have presented it, is not the following the scriptural method of setting it before us? God was manifested in the flesh; or Jesus of Nazareth, although clothed with the human form, and to all outward appearance a mere man, nevertheless had a mind essentially divine; God being his Father, and the Spirit without measure his portion. John 3:34; 1 Cor. 15:45; 1 Tim. 3:16. He came into the world, that he might *destroy*, not *confirm*, *the works of the Devil*; — that he might save by raising to a level with himself, not condemn, the children of men. With a view to this, and as the earnest as well as means of accomplishing his gracious purpose, he not merely raised his own personal body from the grave, investing it with the attributes of immortality, but he has in every succeeding age been communicating to some of the human race a portion of his spirit; thereby rendering them as to their minds partakers of the divine nature, and thereby implanting in them a principle which ensures to them the resurrection of their bodies, and the complete assimilation of these to his own. Rom. 8:10,11; Philip. 3:20,21. But the subduing and assimilating energy of the Lord Jesus does not stop here; for these effects of it, mighty and stupendous although they be, are merely of the nature of means to an end. The subduing of all things to himself, by their complete assimilation to his own nature, is the end at which he is [302] aiming; and to which the various changes already alluded to are merely, as so many steps in the process, necessarily subservient. By rendering divine his own personal body, and thereby the minds and bodies of his saints, Jesus merely paves the way for ultimately rendering divine the rest of the children of men. In doing so, he fulfils all these scriptures which, in the first place, represent him as raising both *the quick and the dead*; and, in the second place, as for evermore *dwelling by his spirit in his body*. When he shall have raised not merely *the quick*, but also *the dead*; — not merely *his believing people*, but also *an unbelieving world*; — then shall be completely verified his own declaration, that *all the dead shall hear the voice of the son of God, and hearing it shall live*. John 5:25,28.<sup>141</sup> And when, by [303] his believing people, who not merely are possessed of, but likewise constitute, *his mind or spirit*, he shall come to dwell for evermore in those who as now unbelieving are fitly represented by *his body*, then shall God himself, (and Jesus is God), as pervading the whole lump of humanity, and conforming it thoroughly to his own nature according to its various capabilities, realize that sublimest of all the views of God presented in scripture, THE ALL IN ALL. 1 Corin. 15:28, Rev. 21:3-5.

<sup>140</sup> I say, *we could have no conception whatever of an intelligent being*; for, although it is a most important and glorious truth, that we shall, hereafter, exist in a form superior to that of man, I defy any person, with his present faculties, *to conceive of an intelligent being wearing a form superior to the human*. If he shall doubt this, let him try. And if he shall fail, as most assuredly he will, let him learn to admire the wisdom of that God, who knowing the impossibility of our rising, while in our present state, *to the conception of Himself as He is*, has been pleased *to clothe Himself with flesh*, thereby descending to and meeting our apprehensions. At all events, after making the attempt and failing, the supposed objector will be more likely to understand the Messiah's language to Philip, *he that hath seen me, hath seen the Father*, John 14:9; and the emphatic declaration of the beloved apostle, *it doth not yet appear what we shall be*. 1 John 3:2.

<sup>141</sup> There is a sense in which the doctrine contained in the scriptures is addressed to the whole family of man.

That sense is, that it shall be heard and understood by the whole human race, either *here* or *hereafter*. *Unto you, men, I call, and my voice is to the sons of men*, Prov. 8:4, may be taken as a specimen of the nature of the addresses with which the sacred volume abounds. But does not this, viewed in connection with such declarations as, *all that are in the graves shall hear the voice of the son of God*, John 5:28, suggest to us, both that the word of God, as addressed *to all*, shall sooner or later be heard *by all*? and that heard *by all*, it shall produce the same effect *upon all*, by imparting *to all* the principle of life? Isaiah 55:3. The voice of the son of God, as THE WORD, was heard and obeyed in *the old creation*. *He spake and it was done; he commanded, and it stood fast*. Psalm 33:9, John 1:3, 1 John 1:1. In other words, when he issued his command, the natural creation started into existence. And is the same word less powerful *now*, than it was *formerly*? Has it ceased to be *the omnific word*? No. Jesus, the word of God, is heard and obeyed as decidedly in *the new*, as he was in *the old creation*. Whether he is pleased to speak to the conscience *dead in trespasses and sins* here, or to cause his voice to pierce the gloomy recesses of the tomb hereafter, in either case, the communication of a living principle is the result. John 5:25,28. The whole human race constrained to listen to his voice, become either *here* or *hereafter* new creatures. 2 Corin. 5:17; Rev. 21:3-5. Heard thus ultimately *by all*, how clear do those passages of scripture appear to be, which represent God's words as addressed *to all*. See 1 Tim. 2:4.

Before closing this chapter, and leaving the whole matter with the consciences of my readers, it is incumbent on me to take some notice of an objection, by which all systems of Universalism are liable to be assailed. Standing as the objection to which I allude does, at the very threshold of enquiry; and, on the supposition of its being valid, raising an insurmountable barrier in the way of every attempt to proceed; if I have hitherto paid no particular attention to it, my reason for this has been, not my having overlooked the importance, or my feeling any desire to avoid the discussion of it, but my conviction, that although first in order, antagonists are by no means likely to have recourse to it, until every other means of attacking my positions shall turn out to be unavailing. That objection is, that *the resurrection and new creation* in the image of Christ, of those who die unbelieving, at the consummation of all things, is [304] *an absolute impossibility*. "God," it will be urged, "can do any thing, but hereafter create anew, and confer a spiritual existence upon those, who while on earth continued destitute of the knowledge of the truth." And, in support of this assertion, such adages as the following will, it is probable, be quoted and insisted on: *as the tree falleth, so must it also lie; — as death leaves us, so must judgment find us; &c.* Now, when a worm of the dust, professing to receive the scriptures as divine, takes upon him to aver that any thing is impossible with God, he should be prepared to substantiate his averment by distinct and unequivocal proofs derived from these very scriptures; otherwise, it must be regarded as a mere dogma of his own, and treated accordingly. If the man who denies, that God can destroy sin, suffering, and death, the works of the Devil, 1 John 3:8, and maintains, that God having once given existence to these must continue that existence to them for ever, can adduce such scriptural proofs of these positions, as the inspired writers have furnished us with, in reference to some other things which they allege that God cannot do; — if, for instance, he can shew in proof of his positions, passages of scripture as explicit as, *it is impossible for God to lie. He cannot deny Himself, &c.*; then, I admit that the matter is settled in his favour: and in common with all who feel their consciences bound by the declarations of *the Most High*, I bow to the solemnly and authoritatively pronounced decision. But if no scriptural authorities can be adduced by my opponents; and if besides I can shew, that their notion [305] is contradicted as well by the scriptures to which they appeal, as by views and admissions of their own; then the inference is plain, — that strong, unquestionably, as the objection would be if it could be proved, yet as unsupported, nay, contradicted by scripture, it must be merely the offspring of human fancy; and the fact of its being resorted to, must be a proof of the inherent weakness of the cause which stands in need of its support.

In order to bring out, and render fully manifest, the utter futility of the objection to Universalism which assumes *the impossibility of the thing*, it will be necessary to consider the various forms into which this objection may be thrown. These are three in number:

1. The objection may be, *that the transformation of the bodies of those who die wicked, into the*

*likeness of Christ's glorious body, at the consummation of all things, is impossible.*

If presented in this form, the objection is easily disposed of. Let the passage or passages of scripture be pointed out, in which God has declared, that the transformation in question is impossible, and the business is settled. But if this cannot be done, — and no man acquainted with the sacred volume will venture to say that it can be so, — then the only other way, in which a denial of the possibility of the ultimate resurrection of the bodies of the unbelieving dead in Christ's image can be substantiated, is from the nature of the thing itself. The objectors must shew, that there is some thing in the constitution of the body of *an unbeliever*, [306] so very different from that of *a believer*, as to render impossible in the case of *the former*, a transformation which confessedly takes place in the case of *the latter*. But can they do so? No, most assuredly. So far from any difference between the bodies of believers and unbelievers existing here, those of the former are in all respects like those of the latter; — like them being vile and sinful bodies; and like them, while on earth, neither undergoing, nor being capable of undergoing, any change whatever. If *the Spirit of the believer* is *life because of righteousness*, his *body* still continues *dead because of sin*. Rom. 8:10. And yet this body of his, in spite of all its earthly, natural, and dying properties, is proved by scripture to be capable of being changed *into the likeness of Christ's glorious body*. Phil. 3:21. But if so, what is to prevent the same change from taking place in the body of an unbeliever? The properties and qualities of the bodies of all are during life the same; and they are subjected to the same decomposing process after death. The bodies of believers and unbelievers alike *see corruption*. But if, notwithstanding the earthly nature of the believer's body, and the fact of its *returning to the dust from which it was taken*, God has pledged Himself to manifest the greatness of His power in raising it hereafter a heavenly body, — is any man, in the absence of all divine authority to that effect, entitled to say, that it is impossible for God to raise and transform in a similar manner the body of an unbeliever? Is any thing too hard for God? (It will be observed, that I am putting [307] out of view such divine declarations as, *Behold, I make all things new*, &c., in which the change for which I contend is expressly asserted; and am content for the present to reason analogically.) Will it be alleged, that the qualities of two human bodies being exactly the same, divine power although able to effect a particular change in the one, cannot effect a similar change in the other? The subject matter to be operated on in the case of every human body being exactly the same, can a greater power be required for changing it in one case, than is required for changing it in another? And, even if, for the sake of argument, I were to admit, what in fact I do not, that a greater power was required for raising and changing the bodies of unbelievers, than was required for raising and changing those of believers, could my opponents shew, that God did not possess that greater power? The fact is, that even were the scriptures perfectly silent in reference to the matter, it is the very acmé of absurdity, for any man to admit the power of Christ to transform the vile and natural bodies of one class of human beings into the likeness of his own glorious body, and with the same breath to deny his power to effect a similar transformation on the bodies of another class of human beings; these bodies being in all respects the same with those, on which the transforming influence is confessedly exerted! The man who denies Christ's power ultimately to change the bodies of unbelievers into the likeness of his own, not merely hazards a contradiction which he is unable to support by divine testimony, but actually [308] ventures to restrict the power of God in a case where, arguing from analogy, we have every reason to conclude that it shall be put forth. But,

2, Perhaps the objection is, that *although it may be possible for Christ hereafter to fashion the body of an unbeliever into the likeness of his own, it is nevertheless impossible for him to exert a similar transforming influence in the case of the unbeliever's mind.*

The person who states the objection in this form, places himself in the following curious predicament. If belonging to the body of Calvinists, or to certain classes of Arminians, it is with him of course a fundamental principle, that the power of God is so great as to enable Him to impart to some

human beings, like the rest of the descendants of Adam *dead in trespasses and sins*, such a knowledge of Himself, as is to them the present possession of life everlasting; John 3:36; 5:24; 1 John 5:12, &c. &c.: — and yet, by proposing the objection to my system in its present form, he is actually involving himself in self-contradiction; for he is maintaining, that the same divine power which he allows to be *capable of effecting a certain change in the mind*, is nevertheless *incapable of effecting that change in the mind*! That what divine power *can do*, it *cannot do*! Can he flatter himself with the vain hope of finding in the scriptures a sanction for his absurdities? Certainly not. To the nature of the case, however, the objector may now, as on the former occasion, betake himself. The nature of the case? Why the substance of his objection is this, that what God has shewn Him-[309]self *to be able to accomplish* under *less* favourable, it is *impossible for God to accomplish* under *more* favourable circumstances! God, according to him, is able to render the mind *spiritual*, or to impart it to *the divine nature*, even while it is clothed with *an earthly and natural body*, and while to all appearance, consequently, it is unfitted for the reception of *the heavenly principle*; — and yet, strange to tell! according to him, likewise, God is unable to effect a similar change, when the body has been raised *heavenly and spiritual*, and when to all appearance, consequently, it has been fitted for the reception of *a spiritual mind*! God can, in the case of believers, change the mind even when *clothed with flesh*; and yet, in the case of one who dies an unbeliever, God shall not be able to change the mind, even although the body shall have been raised *a spiritual body*! Does not the objection to Universalism which asserts *the impossibility* of its being true, when proposed in this form, *effectually confute itself*? A body raised *heavenly and spiritual*, to be tenanted by an *earthly and natural* mind! Faugh!

3. Baffled in two of his attempts, the objector will perhaps shift his ground, and maintain, *that although at the consummation of all things, the bodies and minds of those who die unbelievers shall be raised spiritual*, — *the possession of a spiritual nature being indispensable to their existing for ever, it is nevertheless impossible for God to impart the same spiritual nature to them, which He bestows on those who believe.*

[310] Now, not to insist on the fact, that *spirit* is *the divine nature*, John 3:5,6; 4:24;<sup>142</sup> and that therefore to admit, that those who die unbelieving shall ultimately possess *a spiritual existence* is, whether intentionally or not, to admit that they shall ultimately possess *the divine nature*; that is, *the same nature which believers have*; I prefer bringing my answer to the objection at once to a point in the following way. How many natures does the inspired volume represent those who are now the descendants of Adam as being invested with? Two, or more? In all my scriptural reading and researches, I have never been able to meet with more than two. These are, first, *the image of the earthly*; and, secondly, *the image of the heavenly*. 1 Cor. 15:49. Mankind are either *as now* possessed of *earthly and natural principles*, and thereby like *the first Adam*; — or, they shall be *as hereafter* possessed of *heavenly and spiritual principles*, and thereby like *the second Adam, the Son of God*. Verse 48. Of these *heavenly and spiritual principles*, believers are represented as already possessing *the earnest or first fruits*. Now, before the objection, proposed in its present form, can succeed in shaking and subverting my theory, it must be shewn, that in addition to the nature of *the first Adam*, and the nature of *the second*, scripture recognises the possibility of human beings possessing *a third nature*, a *tertium quid*, which is neither *the nature of Adam*, nor *that of Christ*: — similar to the former, in so far as it is *sinful and punished*; and yet similar likewise to the latter, in so [311] far as it is *spiritual and lives for ever*. But in what part of the inspired volume, is such a strange anomalous compound as this, set before us and insisted on? Not in the 15th chapter of 1st Corinthians, that portion of scripture in which the whole subject is most explicitly and philosophically treated of; for, there, not the semblance of a hint is dropped, as to human beings existing in any other nature, than either that of *the first*, or that of *the second Adam*. Not in those passages of scripture which speak of the Devil; for, whoever he may be, he, along with his works, *is*, or at all events *is destined to be, destroyed*. Heb. 2:14; 1 John 3:8. And a being who is not himself to exist hereafter, can scarcely afford a model, according to which the nature of

beings who are to exist hereafter shall be fashioned. In short, let us search the scriptures as we will, *the earthly, sinful, soulical nature of the first Adam here, and the heavenly, righteous, spiritual nature of the second Adam hereafter*, are the only two natures in which, by their inspired authors, human beings are represented as existing. What, then, is the result of an objector admitting, that even those who are now *unbelieving*, shall hereafter appear *possessed of spiritual minds and bodies*? Why, that he blows his own objection to atoms. Instead of his being now in a capacity to prove, that it is impossible for my system to be true; it is actually impossible for that system, consistently with his admission, to be false! Admitting, as he does, the spiritual nature of all human beings hereafter; and being unable to shew from scripture, that any other spiritual nature than that [312] of the Son of God is recognized as belonging to human beings in a future state; he becomes himself unwittingly, by the present mode of stating his objection, an advocate for that very cause, which it is his avowed object to subvert and destroy.

<sup>142</sup> *God is Spirit*. See the Greek.

## [313] CHAPTER VIII.

### CONCLUSION.

The decrees of God are His eternal purpose, according to the counsel of His will, whereby, FOR HIS OWN GLORY, HE HATH FORE-ORDAINED WHATSOEVER COMES TO PASS.

WESTMINSTER ASSEMBLY's Shorter Catechism.

The argument for my theory is now complete. All that remains for me is, to state the conclusion to which the whole inevitably leads. Not but that this conclusion must have been anticipated by many of my readers; at all events, by a large majority of the scripturally-enlightened part of them. It has been already so often suggested to them, sometimes *less*, sometimes *more directly*, while arguing the subject, that there is scarcely any possibility of its having failed to attract their notice. And yet, this by no means precludes the [314] necessity of my setting it again formally before them. I am bound to bear in mind, that, notwithstanding all the pains which have been taken by me to simplify the subject, every Christian is not capable of bringing together, and comprehending, the details of a long and necessarily complicated piece of reasoning. Nay, I should consider, that even men of more enlarged capacity, as well as more extensive spiritual information, to whom my theory is new, may derive advantage, from having the whole matter placed before them in a brief and condensed but varied form. Besides, in a formal statement of the conclusion, may I not hope to be enabled to throw additional light upon my theory; and, thereby, to facilitate its reception by the religious world? Be this as it may, it is one of the chief merits of my system, and will, I presume, to reflective persons appear to be one of the chief evidences of its truth, that it admits of being cast into a great variety of shapes, and presented under a great variety of aspects. It does not depend on any one particular mode of expressing it. Many a religious theory which at bottom is perfectly hollow may, like the present Bishop of Peterborough's elaborate attempt to account for the phenomena observable in the language and structure of the three first gospels,<sup>143</sup> assume at first sight a remarkably plausible appearance: but scrutinize it; apply to it the test of [315] stubborn facts; nay, merely throw it into a somewhat different form; and it immediately, like

Fancy's fairy frost work, melts away.

This, however, is not the case with the system advocated by the author in these pages. It will bear to be examined, and turned over, and, to avail myself of Bacon's inimitable phraseology, *anatomized* even, as much as you please. Its truth is not dependent on its being stated in any one particular form of words.



Were it not for the risk I should run of exhausting my readers' patience, (too largely drawn upon already), I could, from notes now lying before me, present it, in a way perfectly consistent with itself, under at least seven or eight different aspects. It is true, that let any false, heathenish, or unscriptural element, be introduced into it; such as, *the confounding of soul or natural mind, with spirit or supernatural mind; or the confounding of Christ's kingdom which is peculiar to believers, with the ultimate enjoyment of God by the whole human race, a state of things in the accomplishment of which Christ's kingdom comes to an end*; and immediately, as happens when an improper figure or character is introduced into the working of an arithmetical or algebraical problem, or a proposition is stated incorrectly as to mood and figure in the premises of a syllogism, the false assumption will be found necessarily to taint and vitiate the conclusion. But let the views presented to us in the scriptures, be taken by us exclusively as our guides; — let us be careful that for every step in our argument we can plead the sanction of divine authority; — and let us [316] avoid all *real* clashing and inconsistency in the language which we employ; — and, in whatever words our system may be expressed, the result will be uniformly the same. As the legitimate conclusion, God will always come out *hating sin*, and yet, thereby, *the sinner's friend*; *just*, and yet, thereby, *the justifier of the ungodly*. Rom. 3:20-31; 4:4,5; 5:6-11,21; 6:23; 8:20,21; 11:32.

<sup>143</sup> See *Dissertation on the origin and composition of the three first Canonical Gospels*, by Herbert Marsh, B.D., now Bishop of Peterborough. This work is of the nature of a supplement to his Lordship's translation of J. D. Michaelis' *Introduction to the New Testament*. The Dissertation itself, and two defences of it published by his Lordship, are curious specimens of misdirected ingenuity.

The amount of my religious theory may be brought out in these two ways. First. In a series of propositions. Secondly. Through the medium of a few observations expressed somewhat more in detail.

First. My theory may be set before my readers in a series of propositions. This will give me an opportunity of shewing, how far I am from being confined to any one particular way of expressing myself in regard to it. The two modes of stating it which immediately follow, are selected from a number of others which, with a view to spare the reader's patience, I omit.

I. It may be couched in the following propositions:

1. That the whole human race, without a single exception, are naturally *wicked*. Rom. 3:10.
2. That the whole human race *as wicked* deserve to be *punished*, or are *fit subjects of justice*. Rom. 3:19; 5:12.
3. That the whole human race *as wicked* do not deserve any favours at God's hands hereafter, or are *fit subjects of mercy*. Rom. 5:18; Titus 3:5.
- [317] 4. That in order to the whole human race who die as the subjects of *divine justice*, afterwards living for ever as the subjects of *divine mercy*, it was necessary that there should be a *Mediator*, or a person who should be a *connecting link* or *medium* between them, as first *the subjects of divine justice*, and afterwards *the subjects of divine mercy*. 1 Tim. 2:5; Coloss. 1:20,22.
5. That *God manifest in the flesh*, is this *Mediator*; and that he is so, in consequence of his having, by his assumption of human nature, rendered himself personally the subject, both of *divine justice*, and of *divine mercy*. John 10:18; Philip. 2:6-11; Heb. 9:11-15,26.
6. That the Mediator not merely exhibited *the nature of man* as the subject of *divine justice* and *divine mercy* in himself, but being *God*, and *as such* one with mankind, who all *live, and move, and have their being in him*, his satisfaction of *divine justice* necessarily becomes theirs, and in His enjoyment of the *divine mercy* they necessarily participate. Rom. 9:5; 1 Tim. 3:16; Acts 17:28; Rom. 10:4; 1 Cor. 1:30,31; 15:20-22; 2 Cor. 5:21.

7. That *the divine mercy* being manifested through the conferring of *everlasting life*; and *everlasting life* consisting in *the knowledge or manifestation of the divine character*; *everlasting life* is even now communicated to all those to whom *the knowledge of God's character through the Messiah is communicated*. Acts 13:34,38,39; Jude 21; John 17:3; 1 John 5:11; John 3:36.

[318] 8. That although such persons as have thus *the knowledge of God's character* imparted to them, die as *possessed of Adam's nature*, and consequently as *subjects of justice*, they, nevertheless, live for ever as *possessed of the first fruits of the divine nature*, or as already *the subjects of mercy*. Rom. 5:12; John 11:25,26.

9. That the communication of *eternal life* by the belief of the truth to such persons, is not the full extent or exhausting of *the divine mercy*, but merely a proof or specimen of it; and that the persons who are thus the subjects of it now, are merely the first fruits of a richer harvest afterwards to be gathered in. Eph. 1:9,10; 2:7; Coloss. 1:20,22; James 1:18.

10. That by the imparting of *everlasting life* to believers even now by the manifestation of the truth to their consciences, and by the fact consequently of their living *now, henceforth, and for ever*, they become, along with their Head, the means of ultimately conveying *the knowledge of God's character*, and thereby of communicating *eternal life*, to the rest of their fellow men. John 3:16,17; Rom. 8:19-21; 1 Tim. 2:4; 2 Cor. 5:17, with Rev. 21:4,5.

11. That when *eternal life* shall have been communicated to all by whom *death* has been incurred and undergone, the exhibition of *divine mercy*, as well as of *divine justice*, shall be complete. Rom. 5:18; 6:23; 1 Cor. 15:28.

And, lastly, that by this ultimate communication of *eternal life*, or a *righteous nature*, to all who are now possessed of a *wicked nature*, the *wicked nature* pre-[319]viously possessed by them is *swallowed up, destroyed, and obliterated*; — that *the wicked as such* are *everlastingly punished*, by being *everlastingly destroyed*; — and that they are *everlastingly destroyed*, by having *their present wicked nature* changed into, and swallowed up by, *the righteous nature of the Son of God*. Heb. 2:14; 1 John 3:8; Psalm 1:4; 37:38; 104:35; 2 Thess. 1:9; 1 Cor. 15:22,49,54; Coloss. 1:20; Rev. 21:5.

II. Another way of stating my theory, in a series of propositions, is as follows:

1. This present world is the seat of intelligent beings in an inferior and imperfect state of existence.

2. The *new heavens and the new earth* by which *the heavens and earth which now are* shall be succeeded, are destined to be the seat of intelligent beings in a superior and perfect state of existence.

3. The intelligent beings who shall enjoy hereafter a superior and perfect state of existence, are the same intelligent beings who are now living in an inferior and imperfect state, not as they now are, but changed and glorified.

4. The transformation of an inferior and imperfect, into a superior and perfect state of intelligent existence, is effected, first, by means of a Being possessing *essentially* superior intelligence, appearing clothed with the nature of beings possessing inferior intelligence; and, secondly, by means of this superior intelligent Being imparting, to a few of the inferior intelligent beings [320] among whom for a time he sojourned, the understanding of *who and what he is*: this understanding being in them, even while in *their present inferior state*, the first fruits and earnest of a *superior intelligent nature*. 1 Timothy 3:16; John 3:14,15,36; 5:24; and 17:3.

5. In further prosecution of His plan of raising intelligent beings from an inferior to a superior state of existence, the superior Being, after having accomplished all that was necessary for Him to do while clothed with the inferior nature, and, in particular, after having sacrificed, destroyed, and brought to an end, the inferior nature which He himself personally had assumed, ascended, with *the inferior*

transformed into *the superior nature* in himself personally, to the enjoyment of that everlasting and perfect existence which essentially belonged to him; and, in due time, after having sacrificed, destroyed, and brought to an end their inferior natures, likewise, he will raise to the enjoyment of an everlasting and perfect existence with Himself those to whom, during the subsistence of their inferior state, he communicates the first fruits of his own superior nature; and this, by completely transforming *their inferior nature*, into the likeness of *his own superior nature*. Rom. 8:11; 1 Cor. 15:20; Phil. 3:20,21.

6. By the transforming influence thus put forth, partially here, and completely hereafter, in the case of those to whom the first fruits of *the superior intelligent nature* are here communicated, a medium is provided by which the same transforming influence may ultimately be put [321] forth in the case of all, and by which, consequently, the whole of those who are *here* possessed of *the inferior intelligent nature* of the first Adam, may *hereafter* appear possessed of *the superior intelligent nature* of the second Adam, the Son of God. 1 Corinth. 15:22; Eph. 4:9,10.

7. In the accomplishment of this object, *the complete happiness of all intelligent beings* appears inseparably connected with *the complete manifestation of the divine character*. Without such a state of things as exists here, there would be no opportunity for exhibiting *the divine justice*; — without such a state of things as shall be hereafter, there would be no opportunity for exhibiting *the divine mercy*. Without both *the present* and *the future state of things*, therefore, the divine character could not have been perfectly manifested. But *the perfect manifestation* of this character, necessarily implies *the manifestation of all the divine attributes in perfection*. It is not by the Son of God succeeding in reclaiming only *a part of the human family*, and leaving *the rest of them* a prey to sin, suffering, and death, *the works of the Devil*, throughout eternity, that *perfect wisdom, perfect power, and perfect love* could be exhibited. No; if *sin reigns unto death*, thereby achieving a complete conquest over *the natural creation*; — it is only by *Grace reigning through righteousness unto eternal life* over all who have been the victims of sin and death's reign, and thereby rendering their complete conquest over *the natural creation*, subservient to a complete conquest over themselves by *a new and supernatural creation* of all [322] persons and things, that the temporary triumph of these foes of man appears to be consistent with *the perfection of the divine attributes*. With *the perfect manifestation of the divine character*, then, the end to which every thing is tending, there is necessarily connected *the perfect destruction of evil, and its consequences*; or in other words, *the perfect happiness of all*, by the transformation of *their present inferior* into *a superior intelligent nature*. 1 Corinth. 15:28.

Secondly. I now proceed to lay before my readers an abstract of the system advocated by me in a somewhat more detailed form.

The principle from which I set out is, that the object of the Supreme Being, in all that he has done, is doing, and will do, is, *his own Glory, or the manifestation of His own character*. Rom. 11:36; Gal. 1:5; 2 Tim. 4:18; Heb. 13:21; 1 Peter 5:11; Eph. 1:6,17,18; 3:21; Phil. 1:11; 4:19; Matt. 5:16; 1 Cor. 10:31. I at once accept as a fair and scriptural statement of the fundamental principles of my system, the following language contained in the Westminster Assembly's *Shorter Catechism*: — "God, for his own glory," or, for the purpose of making Himself known, "hath foreordained whatsoever comes to pass." *Answer to the 7th Question*.

His own glory, or the manifestation of Himself, being thus assumed to be the end which God proposes to Himself in all his procedure both here and hereafter, the two following things are evidently implied in this. First, [323] the existence of *means of divine manifestation*; and, secondly, the existence of *intelligent beings to whom this manifestation is made*.

1. There must exist *means of the divine glory, or manifestation*.

A great number of things are implied in this proposition, both as regards the Creator, and the

creature. — As regards the Creator, — the arrangement of the means of self-manifestation, the communicating or the withholding of them, and the times for rendering them effectual, must all depend on himself. As regards the creature, — when we speak of the necessity of means of divine manifestation, the following ideas will at once suggest themselves to any man, however slender may be his powers of reflection. 1st. There is no possibility of communicating to the creature, the knowledge of the Creator, except through *media* or means. 2dly. The mind of the creature being naturally fitted for the understanding, not of the divine character, but of the concerns of this present world, if the knowledge of the divine character is to be imparted to it, the means of divine manifestation must be such as that they shall be capable of entering into a mind so constituted; and, for this purpose, the views of God which are first presented to it must be such as have the closest possible connection with, and bear the strongest possible affinity to, those views of things which naturally it is capable of taking. 3dly. The means of divine manifestation although, when carried home to the mind, effectual in imparting to it the knowledge of the divine character; must, from the very nature of the case, at [324] first impart to it that knowledge in a comparatively speaking low, faint, and infantine manner. 4thly. Although, from this circumstance, the degree of divine manifestation originally imparted to the creature, must be such as to be afterwards susceptible of enlargement and increase; yet, it is obvious, that *the degree of divine manifestation itself* can only be enlarged and increased, in proportion as *the means of divine manifestation* are enlarged and increased. 5thly. If it is only in proportion as *the means of divine manifestation* are enlarged and increased, that *the divine manifestation itself* can be enlarged and increased, then how absurdly do those persons talk who, while they represent *enlargement of the divine manifestation itself as unlimited*, are nevertheless disposed to *restrict and limit the means of that manifestation*. 6thly. The creature being necessarily finite, and the Creator being necessarily infinite, it must be impossible to limit *the manifestation of Himself* which by the Creator may be imparted to the creature; and, consequently, there must be an indefinite capability of increase on the part of *the means of divine manifestation*.

## 2. There must exist *beings capable of receiving a manifestation of the divine character*.

On this topic the following observations fall to be made. 1st. Of all the creatures with which we are acquainted, man is the only one *capable of receiving a divine manifestation*. It will not be pretended that either *inanimate nature*, or *the inferior animals*, are *capable of receiving it*. 2dly. I use the language, *capable of receiving a divine manifestation*, of set purpose; be-[325]cause I cannot forget the fact, that although man can apprehend the divine character, yet his apprehension of what God is, is not the result of efforts put forth by himself, but of God's choosing to make His character known to him; — man having no power to confer the knowledge of God upon himself, either in its first beginnings, or in any of its subsequent stages. *Capacity of apprehending God's character, only if, and when, God is pleased to make his character known*, is what exactly describes the state of man's mind. 3dly. God's object being *his own glory*, or *to make himself known*; and mankind, as possessed of intelligence, *being the only creatures here to which he can be made known*; it must be obvious, that it is only in proportion as *He is made known to mankind*, that his object is accomplished. 4thly. Very few of the human race, comparatively speaking, have ever yet known God; and his object, consequently, has been accomplished hitherto in the case of very few. 5thly. As long as this present world shall last, even although in some future age divine manifestation may be imparted to the children of men in a degree far surpassing that of which, from existing circumstances, we can form any conception; yet there always will be, as there always has been, a large proportion of the human race from whom, owing to a variety of causes, divine manifestation will be withheld. 6thly. The object of God being self-manifestation, and the human race being so constituted as to be *capable of receiving this manifestation*, unless the manifestation of Himself shall be coextensive with the whole range of humanity, — unless it be conceded to all [326] either now or ultimately, — God must have that for His object which, nevertheless, with reverence be it spoken, He does not see meet to carry into effect; or, in other words,

in the event of the *capacity* of all to receive a manifestation of Himself, and yet of the manifestation of Himself being confined to those to whom He is made known here, He must have created millions of creatures *capable* of being rendered subservient to that which is assumed to be His object, whom, nevertheless, He must have created in vain.

The fact of *the manifestation of Himself* being *the grand object* at which God is aiming — *the final cause* of all his operations — thus necessarily implying, the existence both of *means of divine manifestation*, and of *beings to whom the manifestation is made*, I am led to state a most important part of my theory, viz., that *intelligent beings*, or *the persons to whom the manifestation of the divine character is made*, themselves constitute *the principal means through which that manifestation is made*. The beings *to whom* God manifests Himself, are likewise the chief medium *through which* he manifests Himself; or, there is a striking identity between *the subjects*, and *the chief means* of divine manifestation. As the understanding of this topic demands a little more attention than has hitherto been requisite, and as the understanding of it is actually the conviction of the truth of my theory, I make no apology for dwelling upon it at considerable length.

To comprehend what I mean, it must be borne in mind, that *every thing* by which we are surrounded, and [327] *every event* that happens, becomes, when employed by God for that purpose, *a means of divine manifestation*. Some things and some events, however, are fitted to manifest the character of God in a higher degree than others. The manifestation of God by *the vegetable*, is superior to that which is furnished by *the mineral kingdom*; — and again, that which is furnished by *animals*, is superior to that which is furnished by *vegetables*. Still farther, man occupying the highest place in nature, the manifestation of God which is furnished by man, and by man's concerns, is necessarily superior to that which is furnished from any other quarter. Man, therefore, as he is the only being *to whom* a manifestation of the divine character is given; so is he himself, likewise, the chief natural medium *through which* that manifestation is given.

Here another part of my system requires to be taken into account. Although, in this present world, God is manifested *to man* principally *through man*, it is not to *every man* that a manifestation of the divine character is thus vouchsafed. Indeed, but few, comparatively speaking, of the human race, while on earth, either *have enjoyed* or *shall enjoy it*. For God to be manifested *to any human being through the inferior creation*, and *through man himself*, implies, that God himself has specially interposed to render these things *means of the manifestation of Himself*; and this, by causing the individual, in the light of His own word, to perceive them exhibiting His character as LOVE; a view of God which can only enter the mind in connection with perceiving [328] Him to cherish Love towards ourselves personally. 1 John 4:8,9,10,19; 5:10,11. Farther; the apprehending of the divine character by those human beings to whom while here it is conceded, is far from being perfect; because, — not now to advert to the fact, that *the means* through which it is communicated upon earth are not *means* fitted to communicate it in the highest degree, — it is to be recollected, that human beings to whom the divine character is manifested, do not apprehend *the present means* of divine manifestation, in the highest degree in which even *they* are capable of being apprehended.

To the unlimited and unqualified application of my last remark *one exception* must be admitted. There was one bearing the human form, by whom *the inferior creation*, and *man himself*, were fully apprehended as *means of divine manifestation*. By Him, therefore, the divine character was understood *in the highest degree*, in which through *such means* it was capable of being so; in other words, by Him *all* the views of God which any thing *natural* could impart were thoroughly exhausted. Need I observe, that I am speaking of the Messiah. The Lord Jesus, while on earth, had the divine character manifested to him in the highest degree in which, through the medium of the creatures, persons, and events of this present world, it was capable of being so; or, as is beautifully expressed by the Baptist, *God gave not the spirit by measure unto him*; John 3:34: this manifestation of the divine character in his case, as in

that of his people, standing connected with and implying the [329] knowledge of God as LOVE; and the knowledge of Him *as such*, in *the light of the Love borne by his Heavenly Father towards himself personally*. Matt. 11:25-27; 27:46; John 11:41,42; 17, throughout.

Let me, as more particularly tending to establish the truth of my system, dwell on the important fact alluded to in the two immediately preceding paragraphs, that, while Christians and their Head have the divine character manifested to them upon earth, through the medium of *the inferior creatures* and of *man himself*, it is not through the medium of these things *of themselves* that the manifestation in question takes place, but through the medium of these things *seen in connection with, and in the light of, the love borne by God towards themselves personally*. The understanding of this is essential to our perceiving how it is, that men are at once *the subjects*, and *the chief means*, of divine manifestation. Christ while on earth enjoyed as *a means of divine manifestation*, the love borne by God *to Himself and his people*; and Christians while on earth enjoy as *a means of divine manifestation*, the love borne by God *to Christ and through him to themselves personally*. Now what I want to invite particular attention to is the fact, that the love which Christ knew God to bear towards himself, and the love which Christians know God to bear towards themselves, *was not and is not to him and them*, properly speaking, *a means of divine manifestation* over and above *the inferior creation and man himself*; but actually constitutes THE LIGHT in which *the inferior creation and man* became to our Head, and become to [330] us, *means of divine manifestation*. Indeed, if more intelligible to my readers, I may say at once without any circumlocution, that *the apprehension of God's love to ourselves personally* is, emphaticé, *the only means to us of divine manifestation*. The moment I am enabled to perceive, *that I myself personally am an object of God's love through Christ Jesus*, then, but not till then, am I furnished with *the means of understanding that God is Love*. 1 John 4:8-10. How correct, in this way, is discovered to be the principle, that *the beings to whom a manifestation of the divine character is given*, are themselves, likewise, *the grand medium through which that manifestation is given*. This does not interfere with the principle, that *the inferior creation and man himself* are, to me and my fellow believers, *means of divine manifestation*; but it shews, that *of themselves* these things *can manifest to us nothing of God*; and that as it was only in the light of the law or word of God, that the Messiah saw them manifesting to him the character of his Heavenly Father; Psalm 119:27,99,130; indeed, throughout; so it is only in the light of the same law or word understood by us, (and understood by us it cannot be, except as manifesting God's love towards ourselves), that we likewise see them manifesting to us the divine character.

Hitherto we have been speaking of *divine manifestation*, and of *the means of divine manifestation*, merely as regards this present world. I now go on to observe, that there exist both *a higher manifestation of the divine character*, and *higher means of that manifestation*, [331] than any which the transactions of this present world afford.

The first of these is, the personal resurrection of the Messiah himself, and his personal ascension to God's right hand. Through the medium of these privileges conferred on him, there was vouchsafed to the Messiah himself, an enlarged manifestation of justice and mercy, in the most perfect harmony. While justice had been exhibited in demanding from him a life which, as connected with human nature, was forfeited; — mercy was exhibited in conferring upon condemned human nature, as possessed by himself personally, the gift of everlasting life. Again, there was to him a manifestation of justice, in connecting his perfect righteousness here, with perfect life hereafter; — and of mercy, in conceding to one wearing the human form, the privilege of acting with perfect purity here, and of thereby becoming to an immense multitude of intelligent beings the source of eternal life hereafter. And as God, by raising the Lord Jesus from the dead and seating him at his own right hand, gave to the Saviour himself a manifestation of justice and mercy in perfect harmony, and in a degree superior to that in which during his abode upon earth this manifestation could be imparted to him; so to us, when enabled to

understand these facts, there is imparted a more enlarged view of the divine character, than, previous to the death and resurrection of the Messiah, even believers of the truth were capable of attaining to.

But, there is a still farther enlargement of *divine* [332] *manifestation* hereafter, implying of course a still farther enlargement of *the means of divine manifestation*. This second stage of divine manifestation is, the resurrection from the dead, and introduction into Christ's kingdom, of those to whom, while on earth, the principle of faith or the first fruits of the Spirit are imparted. In the resurrection and glorification of believers there is, to their blessed Head and to themselves, an increased manifestation of the divine justice and mercy.<sup>144</sup> Justice, when viewed as the ransomed ones of the Messiah; — mercy, when viewed as the descendants of the first Adam. And as the resurrection of believers, by implying an enlargement of *the means of divine manifestation*, implies also an enlargement of *divine manifestation itself* hereafter; so has the anticipation of this event a tendency to enlarge our views of the divine character, even while sojourners in this present world.

<sup>144</sup> Not of the justice and mercy of God *alone*, but also of his truth, goodness, &c. But I confine myself to the two attributes selected by me, both as those upon which the scriptures themselves principally insist, and to avoid prolixity.

Although none of *the orthodox*, as they are called, have ever yet treated of the subject exactly as I have done, I do not anticipate from the better informed part of them any particular opposition to my system, so far as I have yet advanced. They cannot with any regard to consistency deny, that *increase of divine manifestation*, implies *increase of the means of divine manifestation*; and, therefore, that if we comprehend the divine character *hereafter*, in a degree superior to that in which we are capable of comprehending it *here*, [333] it must be in consequence of our having that character presented to us *hereafter*, through a medium superior to that through which it is presented to us *here*. They cannot deny, that when we who believe shall come *to see Jesus as he is*, we shall, in the light of this future and heavenly manifestation of the Messiah, have God more gloriously manifested to us, than He is capable of being manifested to us now; — nor can they deny, that as the Messiah himself is represented as having been capable of receiving an increase of divine manifestation, Luke 2:40,52, Mark 13:32, so there shall be to him, in the resurrection of his people and their elevation to the joint occupancy with him of his throne, an increased manifestation of the divine attributes. But now comes the rub. With the resurrection of believers does divine manifestation terminate? Sorry am I to be obliged to say, that if the various *orthodox* systems of religion are to be credited, it does. It is the obvious import of all such systems that, with the resurrection of the just, *divine manifestation*, or, which is the same thing, *the means of divine manifestation*, comes to an end. The unjust or unbelieving portion of mankind, these systems unquestionably acknowledge, are to be raised: but, then, this resurrection of theirs is not for the purpose of affording any increased manifestation of the divine attributes; or if, as is sometimes allowed, for the increased manifestation of *some* of them, such as *justice, truth, &c.*, at all events, it is not for the increased manifestation of *mercy, goodness, love, &c.* Now, to the enlightened and reflective mind, does not the very an-[334]nouncement of a system like this carry along with it its own refutation? For, can the means of divine manifestation come to an end? and can God manifest his attributes otherwise than in connection, and in a state of the most perfect harmony, with one another? Are the means of manifesting the divine attributes so very limited, that they must come to an end with the resurrection of the just? and is it to be supposed impossible for God so to manage matters, as that the resurrection of the unjust shall become the means of displaying his attributes in a still greater degree, and in a still higher perfection, than they were ever displayed before? Or, if it be admitted that in the resurrection of the unjust a still higher display of the divine attributes is possible, I beg to enquire farther: having already seen that in the resurrection of Christ as the first fruits, and in the resurrection of those that are Christ's at his coming, 1 Cor. 15:23, the apparently irreconcilable attributes of justice and mercy are displayed in glorious harmony; — not justice alone, nor mercy alone, but both together; — not justice jarring with mercy, nor mercy with justice, but both perfect concords; — is it to be supposed,

that in the last stage of the divine procedure, at *the end* or resurrection of the unjust, 1 Cor. 15:24, only one class of attributes, viz., these connected with justice, can be displayed? and this, from the impossibility of reconciling with one another at this last stage, the attributes of justice and mercy which God had been able to reconcile at every preceding stage? That what God had been able to harmonise in the case of his Son, and in [335] the case of his Son's people, he is obliged to abandon as everlastingly and irretrievably discordant in the case of the rest of the human race? Let the *soi disant* orthodox answer these questions satisfactorily, according to their respective systems, if they can. And if they find that they cannot, let them suspect, that in confining the highest manifestation of the divine attributes in perfect harmony to the resurrection of the just, they may be guilty of an unwarranted because an unscriptural limitation of the display of these attributes.

The man who has duly examined, deliberated on, and understood the contents of the last paragraph, will be prepared to advance with me to what I have now to propose as the third and last stage of my system. Such a man perceiving that, in the resurrection of the unjust at the consummation of all things, there is *the means of an additional divine manifestation*, will perceive the impossibility of separating this from *the fact of an additional divine manifestation*. As a *farther manifestation*, it is obvious, necessarily requires a *farther means of manifestation*; so a *farther means of manifestation*, it is equally obvious,<sup>145</sup> necessarily implies a *farther manifestation itself*. And as all the divine attributes go together; — as there is no possibility of separating them, or of exhibiting them at variance with one another; — he will expect to find, in the resurrection of those who are now unjust, an exhibition not of one, but of all the divine attributes, in the utmost harmony and perfection. Having seen both justice and mercy exhibited in the fact of the resurrection of Christ, and in that of the resurrection of his people, he will expect to find both justice and mercy exhibited in the fact of the resurrection of the rest of the human race. Not one of these attributes merely, but both of them; — not justice merely in taking away the life that now is, but mercy likewise in freely bestowing everlasting life. Nor, when the matter comes to be scripturally examined, will he find his anticipations disappointed. The grand cause of the enlargement of our views of the divine character through the medium of the resurrection of the unjust is, that we shall be enabled to perceive the attributes of justice and mercy displayed in that event in a way, and to an extent, different from and superior to that, in which they were ever capable of being displayed to us previously and otherwise. In the case of the resurrection of the Lord Jesus, and in that of his people, we perceive justice and mercy exhibited in perfect harmony; but the justice in their case is, if I may use the phrase, mixed with mercy, and the mercy is mixed with justice. The justice is mixed with mercy, for, although they die in so far as they are possessed of a fleshly nature, they never die in so far as they are possessed of a spiritual nature; — the mercy is mixed with justice, for, although eternal life is to every one wearing the human form the result of mercy, nevertheless there is something of justice visible, in connecting the divine nature here, with the divine nature hereafter. But in the resurrection of those who live and die ignorant of God, justice and mercy are set before us in their pure and unmixed state. Justice is, [337] in their case, exhibited unmixed, in their forfeiture of the life that now is; and, as they have no other life while upon earth, in their continuance till the consummation of all things under the bondage of corruption; — mercy is, in their case, exhibited unmixed, in there being ultimately conferred upon them, although unable to plead the shadow of a right to it, the privilege of everlasting life. As transgressors *only*, they are *the fittest* subjects of *justice*; — but as transgressors *only*, they are also *the fittest* subjects of *mercy*. Having in them no heavenly and divine principle like believers, *justice alone* is manifested in their fate here; — and, for the very same reason, *mercy alone* is manifested in their fate hereafter. Who, then, perceives not, that, through the medium of the resurrection of the unjust, there shall be afforded an enlargement of divine manifestation; and this, in consequence of an enlargement, thereby, of our views of the divine justice and mercy? and what Christian finds not his views of the divine character enlarged, even here, by the anticipation of this glorious event?



<sup>145</sup> Upon the principle of God doing nothing in vain.

Thus, then, does it appear, that *an increase of divine manifestation*, is necessarily connected with *an increase of the means of divine manifestation*; — and that *the highest degree of divine manifestation of which we are capable of conceiving*, is necessarily connected with *the highest degree of the means of divine manifestation of which we are capable of conceiving*. And farther, thus have we completely confirmed to us the principle laid down by me, that intelligent beings are not merely *the persons to whom a divine manifestation is given*, but are themselves, like-[338]wise, *the grand medium through which that manifestation is given*. To the Lord Jesus, at the period of his resurrection from the dead, there was afforded a manifestation of the divine character superior to that which he had enjoyed while on earth; — and the grand means through which he had this superior manifestation afforded to him was the very fact of his own resurrection from the dead. To the Lord Jesus and his people, at the period of the resurrection of the latter, shall be afforded a higher manifestation of the divine character; — and, again, the grand means of this higher manifestation will be the fact of the resurrection of the latter. And, in like manner, to the Lord Jesus, his people, and the rest of the human race, there shall be afforded, at the period of the resurrection of the last named persons, the highest manifestation of the divine character of which we are capable of conceiving; — the grand means of this highest conceivable manifestation being, the fact of the resurrection of the rest of the human race. To make the matter still more evident, let me observe, that at the period of the resurrection of Christ's people, he, as the Righteous One, is the means of divine manifestation to them; just as they, as the objects of mercy, are the means of divine manifestation to him. And that, at the period of the resurrection of the rest of the family of man, Christ and his people, as the righteous, are the means of divine manifestation to the rest of the human race; just as the rest of the human race, as ultimately the objects of mercy, are the means of divine manifestation to Christ and his people. Isaiah 53:10-12. Thus are intelligent beings [339] shewn to be both *the subjects*, and *the means*, of divine manifestation; — and thus are we brought to the point, that *complete divine manifestation* stands inseparably connected with, and necessarily springs from, COMPLETE HUMAN SALVATION.

Let me conclude this view of my theory with the following abstract of it. Time holds to eternity the relation of *a means to an end*. All the objects, events, and personages of time, and all the partial manifestations of the divine character which are thereby afforded in time, are merely subservient to that grand and complete manifestation of the divine character which is reserved for eternity. God is now manifested *to some*, that he may be ultimately manifested *to all*; — and He is ultimately manifested *to all*, that *His glory*, or *the manifestation of His character*, may be *complete*. But for the existence of beings inferior to man, how could man's superiority to them have been manifested? but for the existence of man, and the exhibition of the inferior qualities and tendencies of human nature, how could the superiority of Christ's character and nature have been manifested? and but for the exhibition of God's love to Christ and his people, how could there have existed the means of manifesting God's character ultimately to all? In one word, unless there had existed in the first place *inferior divine manifestation*, how could there have existed *the means of superior divine manifestation*? But the manifestation of the divine character to any intelligent being, is the communication to that being of *the divine nature*, or *eternal life*; 2 Peter [340] 1:4; John 17:3; 1 John 5:20; and, therefore, as the manifestation of the divine character now and during the intermediate state to a part of the human family, implies the present and continued possession of *a divine and immortal principle* by them; so the manifestation of the divine character ultimately to all, must imply the communication of *the divine nature*, or *everlasting life*, ultimately to all. Farther; *the divine nature* as possessed by the creature consisting in *divine manifestation*, it is obvious, that *the degree in which the divine nature is possessed*, must be *the degree in which the divine character is manifested*. But the divine character shall not be manifested *in the fullest conceivable extent*, until the period of *the consummation of all things*; for, it is not until *then*, that *all* being raised from the dead, and being new created, shall at once be the *subjects*,

and afford *the means*, of *complete divine manifestation*. From this, then, we gather, that the highest view of God's justice, mercy, wisdom, truth, power, and so on, which in our present state we can conceive it possible for Him hereafter to communicate to intelligent beings, is His *manifesting these attributes*, that is, His *manifesting Himself*, TO ALL, BY MEANS OF ALL.

After the copious exposé of my sentiments given in the preceding part of this work, my only remaining business is to point out the drift of the whole.

Those who have paid any attention to the nature and progress of my reasoning, must have observed, that one [341] great end aimed at by me has been, to shew with what ease two statements both resting upon divine authority as their basis, and yet at first sight inconsistent with each other, are nevertheless capable of being reconciled. These two statements are, first, *that the wicked shall be everlastingly punished*; and, secondly, *that sin, suffering, and death, the works of the Devil, shall be destroyed*. Calvinists, and the great bulk of Arminians, fixing their attention exclusively upon *the former*, have found themselves unable to maintain it, except at the expense of maintaining likewise *the everlasting existence of sin and suffering*. The ordinary classes of Universalists, fixing their attention exclusively upon *the latter*, have found themselves unable to reconcile their sentiments with scripture, except by denying, that *the punishment of the wicked shall be, in the proper sense of the term, everlasting*. Those who have adopted what is called *the annihilation scheme*, or the idea *that only believers of the truth shall live hereafter*, while they endeavour, by thus cutting the Gordian knot, to extricate themselves from the difficulty, are chargable with the equally grievous error of maintaining, *that death, one of the works of the Devil, shall not, in the case of those who are now unbelievers, be destroyed*. In the present essay, I have encountered and solved the difficulty; and this, upon principles totally different from those adopted by the various classes of religionists just alluded to. I have admitted, *that the wicked shall be punished everlastingly*; using the term *everlastingly* in its unlimited sense as to duration: and yet I have shewn, *that their everlasting punishment [342] is perfectly consistent with, nay, necessarily implies, the everlasting destruction of sin, suffering, and death*. I have shewn that *all the wicked*, that is, *all who live and die possessed of Adam's nature only*, Rom. 3:9-18, *shall be everlastingly punished, by having the only nature of which they are here possessed everlastingly destroyed*; Mat. 10:28; 2 Thess. 1:9; Rev. 21:8; — and that *sin, suffering, and death, the works of the Devil, can only be everlastingly destroyed, in consequence of those who live and die wicked, being ultimately raised and new created in the nature of the second Adam*. When all who now bear the image of the earthy, shall be raised to bear the image of the heavenly, as *sin, suffering, and death*, the attributes of *the former*, shall thus be swallowed up in *righteousness, happiness, and everlasting life*, the attributes of *the latter*; — and as the future existence of *sin, suffering, and death*, shall thus be rendered an absolute impossibility; — shall not *the works of the Devil* be thus effectually and for ever *destroyed*? I have shewn that the view thus presented, is borne out by the general analogy, and the express statements, of the sacred volume. *As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive*. 1 Cor. 15:22. *The creature, or intelligent creation, was made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of Him who hath subjected the same, in hope, because the creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption, into the glorious liberty of the children of God*. Rom. 8:20,21. *Behold the tabernacle of God is with men, (not some men, but men in general), and He will dwell [343] with them, and they shall be His people, (these words point to a state of things different from that in which a particular nation, or particular individuals, constitute His people), and God Himself shall be with them, and be their God. And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain: for THE FORMER THINGS ARE PASSED AWAY. And He that sat upon the throne, said, Behold, I make ALL THINGS new*. Rev. 21:3,4,5. Now, is there any other method but that which I have proposed, by which *everlasting punishment*, Mat. 25:46, can be reconciled scripturally with *the destruction of the Devil and his works*? Heb. 2:14; 1 John 3:8. If any man can point out to me another and a better way of reconciling these two apparently self-contradictory

objects of the Supreme Being, than is obtained by understanding, that *the everlasting punishment of the wicked is their everlasting destruction*; and that *their everlasting destruction is effected by their wicked nature being ultimately swallowed up in a nature which is perfectly righteous*; his system shall be hailed by me with rapture, and embraced by me with avidity.

But important as it is thus to be able to exhibit *justice* and *mercy* completely and everlastingly reconciled, the enabling me to do so is by no means the most important part of my system. Although, as to my religious sentiments, I am what is commonly called a *Universalist*, and have no objection to encounter all the obloquy and [344] reproach which in this country at least commonly attach to the name, it cannot have escaped observation that my *Universalism* is of a very peculiar kind. Not only do I maintain, upon the authority of God's word, that *there is a sense in which eternal life is the privilege only of those who believe*; — that *hereafter there shall be a judgment of approbation and condemnation*; — and that *the wicked shall be everlastingly punished*; — but I deny, that *to believe the gospel, is to believe that Christ died for all and that God loves all*. To many this will appear to be the greatest of all the paradoxes which these pages contain. It becomes necessary for me, therefore, to vindicate my assertion by explaining its meaning.

If I receive any statement *as a matter of faith*, that is, *as divinely revealed to me*, it is productive of *absolute certainty* in my mind. *If we receive the witness of men, the witness of God is greater*. 1 John 5:9. The testimony of man is, in many cases, productive of a conviction so strong as to be *scarcely distinguishable from absolute certainty*; but if so, the testimony of God which is necessarily superior to that of man must, when believed in, be productive of a conviction stronger than that which man's testimony can produce, namely, *absolute certainty itself*. In the case of Abraham, the divine testimony believed in was attended with *full, or perfect persuasion*; Rom. 4:21; and such likewise, when believed in, will be the effect produced by the same testimony in the mind of every other member of the family of man. I have no hesitation, then, in laying it down as [345] an axiom, for the proof of which I refer to the scriptures themselves, that whatever statement of a religious kind is productive not of *absolute certainty*, but only of a *probable persuasion of its truth* in our minds, may be received by us *as the word of man*, but does not enter our minds *as the word of God*. 1 Thess. 2:13.

Now, neither the way in which Calvinists on the one hand, nor that in which Arminians and Universalists on the other, if speaking according to their respective systems, propose what they call *the gospel*, is agreeable to God's way of proposing it; or can produce *absolute certainty* of its divine origin in the mind. The Calvinist proclaims that *God loves His people*, and calls this preaching the gospel; the Arminian proclaims that *God loves all*, and calls this preaching it: both egregiously blundering, and both defeating their own professed object. For, supposing me to be ignorant of Christianity, and to be listening either to the one or to the other, is it not evident, that were I to believe what either of them denominates *the gospel*, I should not directly believe *God's love to myself personally*? That, in either case, *God's love to myself* would be a *conclusion from*, and not directly *the belief of*, what they respectively proclaim *as gospel*? That I must, in the one case, draw a conclusion as to my own personal interest in God's love, from His love to *some*; and in the other, from His love to *all*? But if, as has been already shewn, it is only in the light of *seeing God to cherish an unchangeable and everlasting love towards myself personally*, that I can receive any thing upon [346] *His authority*; — how can I receive either the Calvinistic, or the Arminian gospel as *divine*, when both leave *more or less uncertain*, and as *a point to be determined otherwise*, the very fact in the light of which alone *I can receive any testimony as divine*?

That *God loves His people*, and yet that *He loves the whole human race*, however difficult at first it may appear to be to reconcile the one proposition with the other, are facts, both of which may be established by an immense mass of scriptural evidence; and they are facts, the truth and relative bearings of both of which may be apprehended by a person who is already a believer. But the

proclamation of either of them *does not constitute the gospel or glad tidings*; in other words, *does not constitute that in which the believer for the first time hears God addressing him*.

The gospel is not a proclamation that *God loves a part of the human race*; or, that *God loves all the human race*; but that *God loves the persons addressed by it*. And in the strictest consistency with the nature of the proclamation itself, the belief of the gospel is, *the belief of the persons addressed that God loves them*. If I hear the gospel, *I hear a declaration that God loves me*; — if I believe the gospel, *I believe that God loves me*. The gospel is, then, *a proclamation of God's love to those who hear it*; — and the belief of the gospel is, *the belief of God's love to themselves personally on the part of those who believe it*.

If the statements just made are understood and acquiesced in, it must be apparent, that as it is not from [347] knowing *God's love to a part of the human race*, so neither is it from knowing *His love to all*, that we attain to the knowledge and conviction of *His love to ourselves personally*. But, on the contrary, apprehending the character of God *as love*, in connection with, and in the light of *the love which He bears to ourselves personally*, we become possessed of the principle which enables us to perceive His character *as love* exhibited, first, *in the love borne by Him towards His people*, and, secondly, *in the love borne by Him towards all*.

Here let me address a few words to my Universalist friends, respecting the particular points as to which I differ from them; and let me briefly, and in all kindness, hint to them the grounds on which I do so. In proclaiming the gospel, I am not entitled to say to my auditors, either in substance, or in so many words: "God is love, a proposition the truth of which is evinced by the fact of Jesus having died *for all*;" and, therefore, as a matter of inference from this universality of His love, believe that He died *for you*:" on the contrary, my language should be to the following effect: "God is love, a proposition the truth of which is evinced by the fact of Jesus having died *for you*." No doubt, the fact of Jesus having died *for all*, a fact known to me, not properly speaking as a believer of the gospel, but as one whose views of divine truth are somewhat enlarged, enables me to proclaim unhesitatingly to any and to every human being whom I address, *Jesus loved you, and gave himself for you*: but the person to whom I as the instrument address this [348] language, must believe<sup>146</sup> that *Jesus loved him, and gave himself for him personally*, Gal. 2:20, before he is capable of believing<sup>147</sup> *the love borne by Jesus towards a single other individual of the human race*; much less, *the love borne by Jesus towards the whole of their number*. Perhaps the simplest way of stating the matter is this. All false modes of proclaiming the gospel involve the necessity of *some condition*, (no matter what the condition may be), *being performed by the persons addressed, before they can apprehend God's love to themselves*; in other words, all such modes of proclaiming it are virtually declarations, not of *what God IS to the persons addressed*, but of *what He MAY BE to them*: whereas the true mode of proclaiming it will be found to involve the necessity of performing *no condition whatever*, seeing that it is a declaration of *what God IS to the persons addressed*. In the former case, there is *a something interposed between the proclamation, and the sinner's own personal interest in it*; in the latter case, *the proclamation is brought home directly to the sinner's own conscience*. To make my meaning somewhat plainer. If I say to any fellow sinner *God is Love*, and endeavour to prove my position by insisting on the fact that *God loves all*, as before such a statement can be brought home to the conscience of the individual, he must be able to draw an inference from it respecting himself personally, — his ability to draw this inference, being *the condition* of his perceiving his interest in God's love, — it is evident that my mode of stating the [349] subject is *a conditional one*: whereas, if I say, *God is love*, a position which is proved by the fact that *He loves you, and has sent His Son to die for you*, the individual addressed requires to draw no inference from the language used by me, for I bring the proclamation home *directly* to his conscience; at least as far as one fellow-creature can bring this all-important topic home to the conscience of another. "It is not true," thus I may be supposed to address him, "that *God MAY BE love*; no, be it

known to you, that God IS *love*; and that if you have any doubts respecting His love to yourself personally, it must be because you are making your own natural opposition to and hatred of Him, the measure of the feelings which you are supposing Him to cherish towards you. God does not *hate* you, Rom. 5:8,10, for His unchangeable character is *love*; but the fact is, that *you naturally hate God*; Rom. 8:7; and that in the ignorance of your mind naturally, you pay Him the compliment of ascribing to Him *your own hateful character*. Psalm 50:21. Be it known to you, however, that in the views of God naturally cherished by you, you are mistaken; — He is not such a Being as you yourself are; — *He is love*; — *He cannot, therefore, hate you*; — the unchangeableness of His character stands in the way of His entertaining towards you any other sentiments than those of love; — it requires Him to love you at the present moment; — you have been, you are, you ever must be, the object of His love."<sup>148</sup>

<sup>146</sup> Upon the authority of *God*, not on that of *man*.

<sup>147</sup> Upon the authority of *God*.

<sup>148</sup> When in the text I suppose *myself* to address the individual, I suppose myself *merely the instrument of bringing God's own word to bear upon that individual's conscience*. — Farther, that until we apprehend God's love to ourselves personally, we are not in reality regarding God as *an unchangeable Being*, is obvious from this, that even those who do not see God *to love themselves at the present moment*, are nevertheless cherishing a hope, more or less strong, that God *may love them at some future period*; that is, in plain English, *are necessarily regarding God as a changeable Being*. — Still farther, God loves all the family of man, not *as human beings*, but *as one with His Son*: but His love to them is exhibited differently as respects *believers and unbelievers*; He new creates *the former* in the spirit of their minds here, and He new creates *the latter* at the consummation of all things. As loving them all, John 3:16,17, the natural existence of all here is subservient to the spiritual existence of all hereafter; their being all the subjects of His justice, is subservient to their being all the subjects of His mercy; and because *they are all* the objects of His love, we are warranted in proclaiming His love *to all of them*. But this very love borne by God *towards all*, requires the manifestation of His love *to some* of them upon earth, as the means of its accomplishment. John 3:16.

[350] The following short paragraph expresses what, in the one which I have just finished, I have at somewhat greater length been endeavouring to inculcate.

The gospel testimony is, *God, through Christ Jesus, hath given TO YOU eternal life*. The belief of this testimony is, *God, through Christ Jesus, hath given TO US eternal life*. 1 John 5:11. *The witnessing of our spirit*, thus completely agrees with *the witnessing of the Divine Spirit*; Rom. 8:16; or, there is the same exact correspondency between the one and the other, that there is between *the impression produced on the wax*, and *the seal by which the impression is produced*.<sup>149</sup> And as *the belief* in question is the result, not of *human*, but of *divine testimony*, it is not *a high probability*, but *absolute certainty*.

<sup>149</sup> *He that believeth on the Son of God, hath the witness*, or testimony, IN HIMSELF. 1 John 5:10.

[351] But it is not in this way merely, that we are enabled to perceive *the knowledge of God's love to ourselves personally*, and not *the knowledge of God's love to all the human race*, to be the first step in true and vital religion; for the same thing admits of several other modes of proof. Desirous as I am to bring this essay to a close, I must restrict myself in the selection and illustration of these. The three following will be enough to satisfy the spiritually-enlightened mind, of the strong and substantial grounds on which I rest my cause.

In the first place, what the mind of a natural unenlightened man requires is, *to have peace spoken to himself personally*. *How shall I be just with God? What shall I do to be saved? How shall I escape the wrath and curse of God due to me for sin?* are the questions which, when such a person is awakened, naturally and necessarily suggest themselves to his conscience. His anxiety is to know what is to become of *himself*, not what is to become of *others*. What, to a person in a state like this, are declarations that *others are to be saved*; — that *others are destined to be happy*? Such declarations are

oil poured on the flame by which he is being consumed; — are wormwood added to the gall of his already embittered spirit. What he stands in need of is something fitted to satisfy the cravings — to still the disquietude — of *his own conscience*. Until he shall be satisfied respecting *his own state and prospects*, the natural selfishness of the human mind will not permit him to derive pleasure from declarations respecting *the [352] future happiness of others*. Now as, according to the system for which I am contending, the very first view presented by the gospel to any man's mind, is that of *his own personal interest in the Saviour*; and the very first effect produced by the gospel believed in, is *personal peace of conscience*; Rom. 5:1; does not the exact adaptation of the provision made by the gospel, to the wants of the conscience, evinced by its thus exactly meeting and satisfying its cravings, plead strongly in favour of my theory?

In the second place, it is contrary to every principle of common sense and sound philosophy to maintain, that *the mind begins by generalizing on any subject*. The first ideas of the child necessarily respect individual or particular objects; habits of generalizing their ideas, although acquired in early life more or less by all, necessarily implying the previous existence on their part of the knowledge and observation of particulars. Again, to whatever occupation or pursuit the mind of any human being may be directed, he must be contented, first of all, to observe particulars; and to acquire the habit of generalizing by means of his advancing knowledge. Now it would be surprising indeed if religion, which has for its object the character of *the infinite Being*, should be found to contradict this otherwise uniform law of the human mind. But the fact is, that it does not contradict it. In religion, as in every thing else, man must *particularize*, before he can be able accurately and legitimately to *generalize*. He must submit to take his place on the lowest form, and to learn the a, b, c, [353] of Christianity, before he can acquire the views, or be qualified to join in the exercises, of the more advanced scholars. If, without having duly *particularized*, he shall attempt, as Bacon has most happily expressed it, "to fly off to *generals*," he will merely afford, in his own case, another proof of the melancholy consequences which have followed from the indulgence of this tendency of the human mind in every age. To apply these remarks to the subject of which I am treating. While I admit, that a believer of the gospel may, *in the progress* of his Christian career, be enabled to perceive the love of God in a certain sense ultimately embracing all; I deny, that he perceives or can perceive this *at the outset of it*. No. He has the character of God as love manifested to him, first of all, by the discovery to him of *his own personal interest in that love*; — then, by the discovery to him of *the interest in it possessed by all those who have like precious faith with himself*; and, lastly, if his mind shall be so far enlarged, by the discovery to him of *a sense in which the whole human race have an interest in the divine love*.

God loves from whole to parts; but human soul,  
Must rise from individual to the whole.<sup>150</sup>

Now, are my Universalist friends, on sound and philosophical, not to say *scriptural* principles, able to gainsay this?

<sup>150</sup> Pope's *Essay on Man*.

In the third and last place, in proof of the point which I am trying to establish, I would direct the attention of my readers to the manner in which the scriptures themselves speak of *the gospel*, and of *the [354] belief of the gospel*. The following is a specimen of the preaching of *the gospel* or *glad tidings* by one apostle: *Be it known UNTO YOU, therefore, men and brethren, that through this man is preached UNTO YOU the forgiveness of sins*. Acts 13:38. And the following passage often already quoted by me is, according to another apostle, a specimen of the gospel record or testimony, as it enters the consciences of those to whom it has been addressed, and by whom it has been believed in. *This is the record, that God hath given TO US eternal life; and this life is in His Son*. 1 John 5:11. Can any thing be conceived more conclusive than such passages as these, both as to *the personal nature of the gospel*, and as to *the personal nature of the belief of the gospel*?<sup>151</sup> But this is not all. Exactly

corresponding to the quotations just made, is the language employed by believers throughout the sacred writings, when expressing themselves relative to the bearings of the truth upon their own personal state and circumstances. *Jesus, OUR Lord, says Paul, was delivered for OUR offences, and was raised again for OUR justification; therefore, being justified by faith, WE have peace with God, through OUR Lord Jesus Christ.* Rom. 4:25; 5:1. *God hath made him to be sin FOR US, who knew no sin; that WE might be made the righteousness of God in him.* 2 Cor. 5:21. *The Son of God, who loved ME, and gave him-[355]self for ME.* Gal. 2:20. *WE know that WE are of God, and the whole world lieth in wickedness. And WE know that the Son of God is come, and hath given US an understanding, that WE may know him that is true; and WE are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God, and eternal life.* 1 John 5:19,20. Let no man say, (with a view to avoid the conclusion which evidently follows from language like this), that this mode of speaking was peculiar to the apostles; and that it would be presumptuous in ordinary believers of the gospel to express themselves after a similar fashion: for one of these apostles, giving utterance no doubt to the sentiments of all of them, having addressed an epistle *to them that have obtained like precious faith WITH US*, has thereby proved, beyond the possibility of cavil, that *the faith of the apostles, and that of the members of the church*, are exactly and necessarily the same. It being thus manifest, that, in the scriptures themselves, *the gospel is always personally addressed, and is always believed in with a personal reference*, how strong the reason which we have for maintaining, that, although one who has believed the gospel is possessed of the principle by which, if followed out, he may come to understand the bearings of divine love upon the situation and circumstances of his fellow believers, and of the world in general; yet it is only in the light of divine love seen as cherished towards himself personally, he can acquire the ability to do so.

<sup>151</sup> The original proclamation of the gospel to the shepherds in the plains of Bethlehem is strikingly personal. *Fear not, for, behold, I bring YOU good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people. For unto YOU is born this day, in the city of David, a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord. And this shall be a sign unto YOU, &c.* Luke 2:10-12.

In these various ways, then, do I establish my position, that it is not by my being informed of God's love [356] *to the whole human race*, no more than it is by my being informed of his love *to a part of them*, that I attain to the certain knowledge of his love *to me*; — but, on the contrary, that it is by my *having the eyes of my understanding opened*, through the medium of the divine testimony itself, to perceive, *with absolute and unqualified certainty*, the love borne by God *towards me*, I become qualified to perceive the love borne by him, first, *towards fellow believers*, and, secondly, *towards the world in general*.

The manner in which the mind once divinely enlightened is carried forward in its apprehensions of truth, is exceedingly simple and obvious. Perceiving that my own personal security for the enjoyment of everlasting life, is founded on the circumstance of the blessing being *unconditionally* bestowed; — of its being *God's gift*, and not *the reward of my own merit*; — I begin to perceive, when my mind is a little more enlarged, that the very same ground of *unconditionality* on which it is secured to me, is that on which it is secured to my fellow believers. And my mind still continuing to enlarge, and being enabled to apprehend distinctly the complete sameness of the footing upon which the whole family of Adam naturally stand before God, at last perceives, that that very circumstance of eternal life being *the gift of God*, which constitutes the ground of its security *to us*, constitutes, likewise, the ground of its security *to all*. How precious to such a mind the declaration of God by the prophet Hosea, when, after having shewn the utter hopelessness of re-[357]lief to man from his own righteousness, or any efforts of the creature, the Supreme Being exclaims, with all the sweetness, and pathos, and energy, of parental affection: *I will heal their backsliding, I will love them freely; for mine anger is turned away from him:* Hosea 14:4: — and how exhilarating the kindred declaration uttered by the same prophet: *I will ransom them from the power of the grave: I will redeem them from death:*<sup>152</sup> *O death, I will be thy plague; O grave, I will be thy destruction; repentance shall be hid from mine eyes.* 13:14.

<sup>152</sup> By the way, a pretty intelligible hint as to what the nature of the redemption effected by the Son of God is. Not redemption, in the sense of being saved from undergoing the consequences of sin; — but redemption, in the sense of undergoing these consequences, and yet being raised to the enjoyment of everlasting life.

As the mind advances in divine illumination, difficulties connected with the scriptures which were once found to be exceedingly puzzling and annoying, nay, in some cases, to be absolutely insurmountable, begin to disappear, and new beauties begin to disclose themselves. Understanding that God *loves all*, I have a clearer and more distinct idea of *His love to me*, and of the grounds and reasons of that love, than when I conceived His love to be confined *to myself*, and *to my fellow believers*. And yet, but for *the character of God as love* having entered into my mind through the portal of perceiving *His love borne towards myself personally*; — but for the absolute certainty which I have of *love being His nature*, apprehended in connection with the absolute certainty which I have of *His love to me*; — [358] I never could have known what God is; and, therefore, never could have received the scriptures as His testimony. Indeed, ignorant of what God is, I never could have attained to more than a *probable persuasion* of the truth of the scriptures; and must have continued destitute of that principle, by which, through various gradations of discovery, I at last acquire the absolute certainty of *His love to all*.

My grand reason for insisting so much upon this point of the necessity of *our knowing God's love to ourselves personally*, before we are prepared upon scriptural grounds, and as a matter of divine revelation, *to apprehend God's love to all*, is, that I have observed Universalist doctrines, *as commonly held*, to have a dreadful tendency to scepticism. Not that I mean to deny a similar tendency in Calvinism and Arminianism; but that I consider this tendency in Universalism, *as commonly held*, to be more marked than in almost any other form of *professing* Christianity. How many of those who call themselves Universalists are open and avowed sceptics, and even glory in the character?<sup>153</sup> How many of those, too, who have made a profession of Universalism for a time, are found after a while to abandon it, and embrace the ordinary popular doctrines? Why is all this? I fear, the answer must be, that Universalism is, with many of those who profess to have embraced it, not a *divine truth*, but merely a *probable* [359] *persuasion*. They have been attempting to balance what they conceive to be the evidence in its favour, with the evidence against it; — they have been treating the subject as if it were a matter of mere opinion, and as a matter of mere opinion, their sentiments respecting it are held. When they affirm, that *all mankind shall be saved*, their meaning at the utmost is, that *they would like this to be the result*; and they are, consequently, the historians not so much *of their convictions*, as *of their wishes*. But is this the way in which *divine truth* enters into and takes possession of the mind? Is this the nature of the impression produced by a *divine testimony* when understood? Certainly not. Many professing Universalists are sceptics, or sceptically inclined, because divine truth *as such* has never yet effected an entrance into their minds. They have attempted, in the first place, to grasp the idea that *God loves all*, not understanding the testimony of God to be that *He loves them*; and not understanding, either, that until this last named truth shall have obtained a firm and infallible footing in their minds, they are totally incapacitated for receiving any other truth *upon divine authority*. They would fain start up at once into the vigour and manhood of Christianity, not understanding that it is *as little children they must enter into the kingdom of God*. Say I these things *in sorrow*, or *in anger*? *In sorrow*, most assuredly: for, when I hear men treating what I know to be true *upon divine authority*, as if it rested merely *on the authority of man*; and, like all who thus act, depriving themselves of the peace, comfort, and tranquillity, which divine truth received as such necessarily imparts, as well as rendering themselves liable to be *tossed to and fro by every wind of doctrine*, can I help cherishing a strong desire to see them brought to a better mind; — ceasing to make common cause with the infidel and the sceptic; — and receiving *as the word of God*, and not *as the word of man*, — that is, receiving *as absolutely certain*, — whatever God may have been pleased in the scriptures clearly and explicitly to reveal?<sup>154</sup>

<sup>153</sup> What has occurred among the Universalists of New York and New England, within the last two or three



years, affords a melancholy practical proof of the truth of this statement.

<sup>154</sup> The observations contained in this paragraph apply *particularly*, although not *exclusively*, to the American Universalists. Our trans-atlantic friends seem to be sadly over-run by the sceptical spirit. But I fear that almost all existing classes of Universalists have embraced systems more or less obnoxious to the charge of fostering scepticism; even the very best systems proceeding on the principle that *believers of the gospel may labour under doubts respecting their own future destiny*; a principle which, whether avowed by Arminians, Calvinists, or Universalists, is necessarily at once *the result*, and *the parent* of scepticism. It grieves me to observe this principle insisted on by two of the best modern writers of the Universalist school: Elhanan Winchester, in his fifth dialogue on *Universal Restoration*, and Rely in his otherwise admirable treatise on *the Union between Christ and his Church*.

From the charge of scepticism brought by me against Universalists in general, let me except particularly such *Scotch Universalists* as I am personally acquainted with. So far as I have had opportunities of judging, *they appear to know the truth*; the grand reason of which probably is, that they did not jump into *Universalism* at once.

It is fair to state in the most express terms, that the objection just insisted on by me applies not to *systems of Universalism* alone. On very nearly the same grounds on which I reject *them*, do I reject the absurd, mixed, and self-inconsistent theory of divine truth recently propagated by Messrs. Irving, Campbell, Erskine, &c. These gentlemen proceed upon the false [361] principles of representing *the belief of the gospel*, to be merely an inference from the assumption that *God has saved all*; — of representing *the salvation of all* as, *mirabile dictu*, preliminary and subservient only to *the salvation of a part*; — of representing *the creature as*, by his unbelief, defeating the love and purposes of *the Creator*; — in one word, they contrive to mix up some of the worst features of the Arminian, with some of the worst features of the Calvinistic theory; — to combine *that frustration of the divine purpose* which is characteristic of the former, with *that limitation of the divine love* which is characteristic of the latter. How different this from the scriptural doctrine of Barclay. And yet, strange to tell, because the phrase *assurance of faith*, previously employed by Barclay to designate his theory, has been employed by the members of the Irving School, to designate theirs likewise, — grave, able, and celebrated divines have been found, either stupid, or disingenuous enough, to confound the one with the other.<sup>155</sup> No. Bereans reject *the modern scheme of assurance*, with as much decision as the bitterest of its enemies ignorant of the truth can do; and, in the rejection of it by the Bereans, the writer of these pages and those who coincide with him in his sentiments, for reasons already stated fully acquiesce.

<sup>155</sup> See Appendix R.

Those who have been able to follow me through the whole of this essay, and those especially who have comprehended the few last paragraphs, will now understand why it is, that I am so much attached to the [362] leading sentiment of Mr. Barclay. "No man," according to that excellent and devoted follower of Christ, "is or can be a child of God, but he who, in the light of the divine testimony believed in by him, apprehends *with absolute and infallible certainty* the love borne by God towards himself personally." This, I am satisfied, from a long, minute, and experimental examination of the sacred volume, is *the fundamental principle of Christianity*. It is true, that Mr. Barclay's mind was never, spiritually speaking, sufficiently enlarged and enlightened to take in *the love of God to all*; — that he was never able to shake off certain errors and prejudices under which, in common with other members of the Christian church, he laboured: — but, however much I may deplore this circumstance, I rejoice in the good service which by his personal ministrations he rendered to a few fellow believers in his day; and which by his writings he will continue to render to all who can appreciate genuine, scriptural, unsophisticated Christianity, till the end of time. While grieved at the unscriptural notions of numbers who profess Universalism; — while obliged to observe that, in but too many cases, it is *as a human opinion*, and not *as a divine truth*, they are holding *God's love to all*; — it is quite refreshing to turn from *a sceptical profession like theirs*, to *a profession becoming the children of God*. I can always

hail a Berean as a Christian brother. The genuine Berean, enlightened by God Himself through the medium of His own blessed word, is always *absolutely certain* that "God hath given to him eternal life, [363] this life being in His Son;" and in this conviction of his, stigmatized by natural characters like one already alluded to as "bold, unshrinking assurance," <sup>156</sup> I rejoice to be able to sympathize. I recognize in it the profession of *the same precious faith* which enabled the inspired apostles of the Lord to give utterance to their sentiments in such language as this: *we know that we are of God*: 1 John 5:19: — nay, I recognize in it the spirit of one who was the apostles' superior, and who, addressing the unbelieving Jews, thus in language already quoted by me, contrasted their sentiments with his own: *ye have not known Him; but I know Him; and if I should say, I know Him not, I shall be a liar like unto you; but I know Him, and keep His saying*. John 8:55. My Berean friend cannot advance with me to see *the love of God*, in a certain sense, *ultimately embracing all*; and conceives, that *the everlasting punishment of the wicked* which I admit, renders *the new creation of the wicked a matter of impossibility*. Well, it is not my province to remove this inability of his to perceive the consistency of the one doctrine with the other. The same God who has enabled us to sympathize *so far*, in *the certain and infallible knowledge of everlasting life to ourselves personally*, can alone, if it be His blessed will, carry forward my Berean friend in his religious views; and, in the hands of our common Heavenly Father, I leave him. If to him it shall be given to see, that *the wicked are the whole family of Adam as such*; Rom. 3:10; and that *none of the [364] family of Adam, as such, are destined to live hereafter*, 1 Cor. 15:49,50; we shall not be very far from coming to an agreement in our views, both as to *who the wicked are*, and as to *what shall be their everlasting punishment*. 2 Thess. 1:9; 1 John 3:8; Psalm 37:36,38; 104:35. This is my incessant prayer, that the doctrine of Mr. Barclay, respecting *the assurance of faith*, may spread yet more and more; knowing as I do, that by it alone, as a lever of tremendous power, can the mass of corrupt principles and practices, under which the so-called Church of Christ has been so long and is even now labouring, be effectually and for ever overthrown.

<sup>156</sup> *The Gairloch Heresy tried*, &c. By R. Burns, D.D., ed. 3d, p. 54.

How numerous the errors which have flowed from that radical error of religionists, which respects *the proper standard of the enormity of evil*. "Nothing shews so forcibly the evil of sin, as the eternal torments to which the ungodly world shall hereafter be subjected." What! has it come to this, that a standard for estimating the hatefulness of sin of mere human invention, is to set aside and supersede the standard which God Himself has proposed? I had always thought, instructed by the sacred volume, that in the cross of Christ, — that in the sufferings undergone by the Son of God, — there was presented to me, a far more striking and impressive view of the enormity of sin, and of the divine hatred borne towards it, than by any other means I could attain to. And yet, I am to be told upon the bare authority of man, in this, as well as in many other respects, [365] *making the word of God void by his traditions*, that in *the sufferings of mere creatures* I may behold the evil of sin *more impressively displayed*, than, taught by God, I behold it in *the sufferings of the Creator Himself manifest in the flesh*! This cannot be. When man thus ventures to contradict the divine record, he must be withstood. In the fact, that even the Son of God himself, although personally free from sin, could not carry *human nature* with him into heaven; — that he required to sacrifice *the nature which he had assumed in common with us*, and to change it in himself into *a glorious and heavenly nature*, before he could rise personally to the enjoyment of eternal life; — I have afforded to me a more striking and impressive proof of God's hatred of evil, and of whatever is connected with it, than *all the sufferings of all the creatures which God has made, however long protracted and however intense, could by any possibility have supplied me with*. And how sweet the consideration, that, while in the light of human nature destroyed by the Son of God in himself personally, I behold it destroyed by him in all; — I also, in the light of that nature changed by him in himself personally into a divine and heavenly nature, behold a similar change effected by him upon human nature in the case of all. Let me put it to the consciences of my readers, if *the destruction of human nature*, as in those who are possessed of it *a sinful nature*, Rom. 8:3; — if the

sweeping away thereby of sin, and all the effects and consequences of sin, 1 John 3:8, and this through the sacrifice of the [366] Son of God; Heb. 2:14; — does not afford a much more striking as well as scriptural display of the evil and enormity of sin, than is afforded by God, according to the ordinary orthodox notions, causing sin to dwell in His sight for ever, by *investing sin and sinners as such with everlasting existence?*

The whole matter is reduced to this. God's object having been *His own glory, or the manifestation of Himself*, Rom. 11:36, — without a state of things *like the present*, combined with and in subserviency to a state of things *like that which is to succeed*, this object could not have been accomplished. Sin required to exist in order to there being a manifestation of *divine justice*; — sin required to exist also in order to there being a manifestation of *divine mercy*. And without two states, one in which sinners might exist and be punished, — and another in which the highest degree of blessedness might be conferred on those very same beings who, by transgression, had proved themselves to be utterly undeserving of the privilege, — how could either *justice* or *mercy* have been displayed *in perfection?* Without the existence of sin, how could either threatenings or promises have been given forth; and, without the existence of two states, one in which the threatenings, and another in which the promises, might be literally and completely fulfilled, how could the divine attribute of *truth* have been *perfectly* manifested? In what other way can we conceive of *power* being more remarkably displayed, than in the complete change of *this natural* [367] *creation*, and of *all that it contains*, into a *new and supernatural creation*; and yet, apart from the entrance and existence of sin, what reason or necessity could there have been for such a change? Lastly, *wisdom* becomes apparent in proportion to the excellence of the end aimed at, and the adaptation of the means employed to the attainment of that end; but the end, in the case supposed, being the complete manifestation of the divine character, and this in connection with the complete and everlasting happiness of intelligent beings, — the most excellent end that by any possibility can be conceived, — how, except through the medium of *sin* and *death* being swallowed up in *righteousness* and *everlasting life*, in other words, how, except through the medium of *such a state of things as exists now*, being succeeded and superseded by *such a state of things as shall exist hereafter*, could this end of complete divine manifestation have been accomplished? The orthodox, as they call themselves, and I, then, are agreed in this, that two states of things, one in which sin exists and is punished, — and another in which righteousness exists and is rewarded, — are indispensably necessary, in order to the complete development or manifestation of the divine character. But there happens to be this *little* difference between the views of the orthodox in reference to the matter, and those presented in the scriptures, that whereas, according to the former, *the two states of sin and righteousness* EXIST TOGETHER *for evermore*; — the great bulk of professing Christians thus boldly avowing themselves to be supporters of the old Mani-[368]chean doctrine; — according to the latter, *the present state* or *state of sin* is subservient to, superseded by, and swallowed up in, *the future state* or *state of righteousness*. *Sin reigns unto death*; — but it is that *grace may reign through righteousness, unto eternal life, by Jesus Christ our Lord*. Rom. 5:21.

The literary world has of late years been agitated by discussion of what has been called *the greatest happiness principle*. By some of our most eminent political writers, it has been alleged to be the perfection of human governments and institutions, to promote *the greatest possible happiness, of the greatest possible number, for the greatest possible length of time*. This being the case, may I not invite, and that too with considerable hopes of success, the attention of the advocates of this system, to the grand principle stated, illustrated, and defended, throughout the present work? For, what is it that I contend for, or rather, what is it that I shew to be the sum and substance of the revelations of the sacred volume, but that it is the object of *the divine government and procedure* to promote what they themselves regard as the only proper and adequate end of all *human governments and institutions?* Have I not been endeavouring to shew, that it is the object of God, by the manifestation of Himself, to *promote the greatest possible happiness, of the greatest possible number, for the greatest possible*

*length of duration?* It is true, that the politicians of whom I am speaking wish and expect to see promoted *in time*, what God has declared it to be His intention to promote *in eternity*. But still, the [369] principle involved in their sentiments and mine being to a certain degree the same, may I not, without impropriety, count upon their lending my statements a patient hearing; and endeavouring, from the arguments with which I support *my* position, to extract something by means of which they may be able to illustrate and strengthen *theirs*?

To conclude. According to the system advocated in this essay, — a system which, when understood, affords the key to the plan upon which the essay itself is constructed, — all that religion is *natural*, or in other words *false*, which regards our own everlasting destiny, or the everlasting destiny of others, as, in any respect whatever, *contingent and conditional*. The persons professing such a religion may call themselves Socinians, or Arminians, or Calvinists, or Universalists; — they may speculate as much and as long as they please concerning God's love to *a part*, or His love to *the whole of the human race*; — but while the sentiments which they entertain leave any degree of *uncertainty*, — any degree of *contingency* or *conditionality*, — in their minds, respecting *the love of God to themselves personally*, and thereby respecting *their own personal and everlasting destiny*; the convictions of such persons amounting at the utmost to *high probability*, and not to *absolute certainty*, are at once discerned by every truly enlightened person to proceed from *human testimony and reasonings merely*, and not from *the testimony of God*. All those views which *proceed from God Himself*, enter the mind as *absolutely and infallibly* [370] *true*; — and to apprehend any view as *absolutely and infallibly true*, is to apprehend it in the light of *our own personal interest in it*. The very first glimpse of true and spiritual religion makes its way into our minds, not as a matter of doubtful disputation, but by giving us to perceive that eternal life has been *freely*, and *certainly*, and *indefeasibly bestowed upon ourselves*. 1 John 5:10,11. In the spiritual enlightening of *our* minds, God is manifested *to us* in His real character as *love*; — and this His character is seen *by us*, in the light of the fact of His having sent His Son into the world that *we* might live through him. 1 John 4:8-10. At this point, however, it is possible that *the absolute certainty* even of a mind enlightened from above may stop. As there are but few of the professors of ordinary and popular notions of religion, who have carried their investigations, *upon natural principles*, to the extent of a Clarke, a Butler, or a Warburton; — nay, as the great majority of such persons are contented with the first and most superficial views of the subject which occur to them; — so I am sorry to think, that there are but few even of the *genuine* disciples of the Lamb, who have, by pushing their investigations into *the contents of the sacred volume itself*, acquired profound *spiritual* views of divine truth. Although every Christian, by knowing *with absolute certainty* the love which God bears *towards himself personally and individually*; — and this in spite of his being naturally *the enemy of God*; Rom. 5:10; 8:7; — is possessed of a principle, which, if followed out to its legitimate effects and con-[371]sequences, would lead him to perceive, that the love of God necessarily reaches to and embraces *all who stand in the same natural condition of enmity to Him*; yet, to very few, indeed, is it given to advance thus far. The greater part of those who are enlightened from above to apprehend *God's love to themselves personally*, seem to be totally unable to advance a single step beyond *this knowledge of their own personal interest in the Messiah*:

Manent immoti locis, neque ab ordine cedunt.

Of those who after being personally enlightened make some advances in divine knowledge, the progress in general is dreadfully slow, and attended with many interruptions. The force of early prejudices, — dread of adopting heretical notions, — want of leisure or inclination, — the sad inability of teachers of religion to afford satisfactory information with regard to this all-important subject, — neglect of searching the scriptures and *comparing spiritual things with spiritual*, — and, above all, the impossibility of reconciling passages already understood *in the popular sense*, with the scriptural doctrine of *the final destruction of sin and its consequences*, — constitute formidable, I might almost say *insuperable* barriers, in the way of the genuine followers of Christ Jesus making progress in their

spiritual researches. Few, few indeed, even of those who have been *taught from above*, attain to clear, and ample, and scriptural views, of the nature and extent of man's salvation. But, blessed be God, that some, notwithstanding all the obstacles and impediments which they have [372] to encounter, and especially those which are thrown in their way by *false* or *weak brethren*, are by grace carried forward in the career of divine discovery; — that not *by probable* or *sceptical reasonings*, but *by the continued and Almighty teaching of the Holy Spirit*, they are enabled to see, in the light of God's own word, more and more of the extent of His love, and of the certainty of its ultimately overcoming every species and degree of opposition; — until, at last, they can join with me in comprehending and admitting what, not merely to *the natural*, but even to *the partially enlightened spiritual mind*, must ever appear to be two irreconcilable propositions: *the everlasting punishment of the wicked, or Adam's posterity as such, by their everlasting destruction*, on the one hand; and *the everlasting life of those who are now wicked, by the communication to a part of them of the image of the second Adam the Lord from Heaven now, and the new creation of the rest of them ultimately*, on the other.

How delightful thus to know, that the scriptures do not pay the Supreme Being an unmeaning compliment, when they represent Him to be

#### THE JUST GOD AND THE SAVIOUR.

[no 373]

#### [374] APPENDIX.

##### A

Volume I. Page 6.

THE learned, candid, and reflecting reader, although supplied with abundance of authorities, by Schleusner in regard to this word, will derive but little satisfaction from a perusal of his remarks. As to *the noun* he seems to have contented himself solely with the observations of Hesychius, and other preceding lexicographers. Looking at what he says respecting the derivation and literal meaning of *the verb*, and its application in the scriptures, while I am far from being inclined to dispute its being sometimes used in the sense of *full persuasion*, I am more than ever confirmed in my suspicions, that in other cases besides 2 Tim. 4:5, such, for instance, as Luke 1:1, it has the sense of *fulfilment* or *accomplishment*. And if so *the verb*, why not also *the noun*? I should like much to see "Verpoortenius' Dissertation," referred to by Schleusner.

[375] B

Volume I, Page 50.

Review contained in the *Christian Herald* for July, 1826.

1. *The Assurance of Faith vindicated, in a Letter to a Friend, by the late John Barclay, A. M., Minister of the Berean Assembly, Edinburgh.* Third Edition. Glasgow, 1825.
2. *Memorial by the Rev. David Thom, regarding the Theological Points of his Case.* Second Edition.

THE inquiry respecting the assurance of faith relates to the evidence of personal Christianity. To denominate a conviction that I am individually in a state of salvation the *assurance of faith*, is a misapplication of scripture language; at least upon any hypothesis but that of Bereanism. The phrase occurs only in Heb. 10:22, where, it must be evident on the slightest examination, it means faith in the objects of the gospel testimony, the efficacy of the blood of the great High-priest in taking away sin, and opening a way of access to God. And if a difference be discerned between this truth, and the proposition that I am reconciled by the blood of Christ, we had better apply the scripture phrase to what it properly represents, a confident faith in the provision which God has appointed for man's salvation.

— However, we shall not enter on a dispute about the application of a term.

Mr. Barclay's doctrine on this subject is briefly stated in the following passage.

"If the witness concerning sin, death, and condemnation by the law, be held for a true witness, why doubt concerning the same witness being true, concerning righteousness and justification? and that I who believe the record, am as certainly justified through that [376] righteousness imputed unto me, as I am certain of the record's being true? For it is assuredly contained in the scripture, that all who believe this record are justified. I believe the record; therefore I believe I am justified. The latter is as certainly true as the former. If the latter is not true, and held true by me; why, pray, should the former? I know no reason; for why do not both stand or fall together?" p. 36.

"All who believe this record are justified. I believe the record; therefore *I believe* I am justified." Now who does not perceive that there is more in the conclusion than in the premises of this syllogism? It ought simply to have stood, All who believe are justified — I believe — *therefore I am justified*. It is evidently possible, so far as the reasoning goes, that a man may be justified in consequence of the two first propositions being true, while yet he *does not believe* that he is justified. To warrant the inference, it would require to stand thus: All who believe are justified; *I believe that I believe*; therefore *I believe I am justified*.<sup>157</sup> Mr. Barclay's mystifications cannot make the case stand otherwise; and it fell to him, therefore, to shew that my *believing the reality of my belief* was the same thing as my belief itself, or at least was inseparable from it. It is surprising [377] how, in so very plain a matter, any one could so far confuse himself as to suppose that the reality of his own belief in the truth of the gospel was a part of the truth of the gospel itself, so that to doubt the one thing was also to doubt the other. — Mr. Thom, who agrees with Mr. Barclay as to the conclusion, sees more plainly the steps by which it is to be arrived at.<sup>158</sup> "As God no where in his word declares, that such and such an individual shall be saved, — and as faith in a *divine testimony*, can have respect merely to what is *testified*, — of course, assurance of personal salvation, or trust in God, on the ground of our own particular interest in the blessings promised, cannot have place in the direct act of faith, or in that process of mind by which we *credit the divine testimony*." p. 8. — He therefore looks upon assurance of personal interest as *flowing from* justification, but as not being *of the essence* of faith: and he refers this assurance, this secondary belief, to the testimony of *consciousness*. "When the saving truth is believed, the mind must be conscious that it is so believed. To deny this, would be to maintain, that it is possible for the mind to be unconscious of its own operations." The certainty of the evidence of consciousness is, then, the thing to be examined, and in this lies the sum and substance of the question as to the Berean doctrine of assurance. On this subject we shall endeavour, with as much brevity and simplicity as possible, to present a few remarks.

<sup>157</sup> Nothing can be conceived more impudent, perhaps I should soften my language and say more indicative of ignorance, than the representation of Mr. Barclay's reasoning given in the preceding part of this paragraph. It is not *the major proposition* of Mr. Barclay's *syllogism*, that "All who believe this — that is, the divine record — are justified." Had it been so, unquestionably the conclusion would have been, "*therefore I am justified*." What, however, can be thought of the Reviewer's fairness, or sense, or both, when, looking at the passage quoted, we observe, that he has either suppressed, or overlooked, the words with which the *major proposition* begins. "It is assuredly contained in the scriptures, that all who believe this record are justified." That is, as the scriptures stood infallibly true to Mr. Barclay's conscience, or were believed in by him, the proposition in question should have been thus expressed: "I believe that all who believe this record are justified." The whole syllogism, properly enunciated, will stand thus: "I believe that all who believe the divine record are justified; but I believe the divine record; therefore I believe that I am justified." Where, now, is the flaw in the reasoning? Really one's spleen is moved within one at the trickery to which *natural* characters, and some of them too with no ordinary pretensions to religion, can have recourse. But the circumstance upon which I am now animadverting is of a piece with the rest of the critique. — D.T.

<sup>158</sup> I disclaim the compliment paid me at Mr. Barclay's expense. At the time when I wrote my Memorial, (in

1825,) I had but very imperfect views of the subject. I was aware of *the infallibility of consciousness*, but I did not see *the belief of personal salvation* involved necessarily in *the belief of the gospel testimony* as I now do. D.T.

It is, in the first place, very plain, that if the testimony of consciousness were infallible, there could be no such thing as self-deception; for consciousness is connected alike with all our mental acts and feelings. To explain how it happens that a power which takes cogni-[377\*]zance of what passes through our minds, should deceive us by its testimony, would lead us too far into the philosophy of the human mind; but we may just remark by the way, that if the operations of mind were better understood by theologians, we should have far fewer of those unprofitable metaphysical vagaries which have so often perplexed the beautiful simplicity of Christian truth. But one thing is plain, that if consciousness were a source of certain information as to the state of our minds, there could be no such thing as self-deception. And is not self-deception just as inherent and universally prevalent in every human mind as that depravity in which it originates? Are we not continually deceiving ourselves as to our characters, our propensities, our purposes, our passions, our faults, and every thing within us? With regard to belief itself we often deceive ourselves. One man tells us, he believes there is no such thing as apparitions, and yet trembles in the church-yard or the lonely chamber. Another tells us he trusts in the credit and honour of a certain neighbour, but when put to the test, he dares not commit his property to that neighbour's keeping. The same with regard to Christianity. There are multitudes who mistake for firm belief what is little better than a negation of disbelief. They have a certain measure of knowledge respecting Christian truth and its evidences. These subjects pass before their thoughts from time to time, and have the appearance of reality, as clouds at a distance look like the solid land. The mind yields an indolent acquiescence; and this with many is believed to be faith.<sup>159</sup>

\* [In the 1833 publication, two consecutive pages are numbered '377'. G.F.M.]

<sup>159</sup> For an exposure of the fallacies and sophisms broached in this paragraph, I refer to the remarks upon it contained in the second chapter of my work. D.T.

There are, no doubt, some things in which consciousness cannot deceive us. When I suffer pain, or see or hear or touch an object, my consciousness produces absolute certainty. In the same way, when I rejoice, or [378] clearly conceive some truth, I am distinctly conscious of these states of mind, and believe my consciousness. The force of the evidence of consciousness, is, in truth, just in proportion to the vividness of the impression of which we are conscious. He who believes strongly, has a strong conviction that he does believe. We shall here probably be referred to another part of the Berean doctrine respecting the faith of the gospel. This is represented as the "consequence of having heard and recognised the voice of God speaking directly to us in the Scriptures." It is said that "God must have some direct way of making himself known to us, or, in other words, that an evidence must accompany and prove the truth of his word, totally distinct from all that evidence of intuition, reasoning, and sense, by which we yield our assent to truth proposed to us on human authority." "And now that I believe," says Mr. Barclay, "why should I doubt? — How is it possible for me to doubt, that he who now manifests himself the Creator of my spirit, is as able to persuade me, and actually does persuade me, of his speaking to me in the Scriptures, and by them, makes me as conscious of his truth declared in them, as I am of light, hearing, pleasure, pain, life, or existence, when I am awake, and so affected? If any man dispute my consciousness of these, I despise his arguments, and think myself entitled to answer him with silence." p. 34. — Now in so far as the spiritual manifestation of the gospel presents it more vividly and powerfully to the mind than is the case while the blindness of nature remains, in so far, we believe, does consciousness rise in the certainty of its testimony to our believing unto salvation. But in so far as the statements we have quoted imply the notion of any evidence distinct from the truth itself, an evidence given *along with* the truth from the Spirit of God, an evidence producing an absolute certainty and thereby excluding all degrees in the strength of conviction, an evidence rais-[379]ing assurance of our own belief to a *ne plus ultra*, a point which we can neither exceed nor fall from, — in

so far we believe them to be utterly unfounded in Scripture or any other evidence. We conceive that the evidence given in spiritual illumination, is the glory of the truth itself. It tells us of God, of his character, of his purposes; of man, of his state, his danger, his remedy; of Christ, his atonement, his grace, his power to save. Why, the whole of this has an evidence in itself; it is truth, and has the character of truth; it is consistent with itself; it meets the wants of man; it is full of the wisdom and the glory of God. Now the Spirit just brings the sinner to see the truth as it is; and when he sees it, he believes it.<sup>160</sup> But there are degrees of illumination, as the word of God declares over and over again; there are therefore degrees of evidence; and degrees of evidence imply degrees of faith; and degrees of faith suppose degrees of personal assurance. We come then to this conclusion, that in so far as the "voice of God himself speaking in his word and by it," means some evidence distinct from that of the truth itself, manifested only to the real believer, and making him know infallibly that he has it; in so far we have merely John Barclay dogmatizing, and asserting what has no support from the word of God.<sup>161</sup>

<sup>160</sup> This sentence is correctly expressed. *O si sic omnia*. D.T.

<sup>161</sup> The natural and sophistical character of the reviewer, is most strikingly brought out in this paragraph. His statements contained in the three first sentences are, if he were aware of it, completely subversive of his own theory; the very same principle on which he admits consciousness to be *infallible* in the cases supposed, being that on which it must be *infallible* in every case that can occur. — As to what he says about the vividness, or non-vividness of the impressions produced on the mind, this has nothing to do with the subject: the fact being, that whether *the impression* be *strong*, or *weak*, we can never be *conscious of it*, except as *what it is*. — The denial of there being any thing peculiar in *the nature* of the evidence of divine truth, when carried home to the conscience by the Holy Ghost, and the confining of all peculiarity in it to *the vividness and power* of the impression, is one of the most barefaced specimens of *begging of the question* that I have ever met with. No doubt "the evidence given in spiritual illumination is the glory of the truth itself;" nor does Mr. Barclay contend for any other. But this very "glory of divine truth" is a something in its very *nature* so peculiar to itself, — so very different from, and so very superior to, the power, and influence, and evidence, than accompany truth of every other kind, — that sooner might we suppose natural light to fall upon the natural eye without being observed by it, than suppose spiritual light to be apprehended by any mind, and yet that mind to be unconscious of what has taken place. No; "the voice of God himself speaking in his word, and by it, does not mean some evidence *distinct from* the truth itself, manifested only to the real believer, and making him know infallibly that he has it:" on the contrary, the voice of God thus speaking is *the truth itself*, which is manifested only, aye and manifested infallibly, to the believer in that truth. And as consciousness even in regard to things natural is, by the reviewer's admission in this very paragraph, infallible; much more must he, into whose mind views so peculiarly glorious as are those of divine truth have been introduced, be conscious of the privilege which has been conferred on him. In a word, the double dealing of the reviewer, as well as the completely natural state of his mind, are in this passage rendered strikingly manifest. — D.T.

But it may be said, Be it so; it matters not of what nature the evidence be; we believe the gospel, and are thoroughly conscious of believing it, and our consciousness thus certifies us of our state.

This leads us to a *second* point in illustrating this subject; we would ask those who last spoke, *what* is it they believe?<sup>162</sup> how do they know it is truly *the gospel*?<sup>163</sup> There are more sources of deception here than many are aware of. We do not speak of various sorts of faith, for we look upon that to be a single principle; but there are many ways in which men may conceive themselves to be believing the gospel while they are believing something else.<sup>164</sup> It may be said that this is foreign to the subject, and takes us away from examining our own belief to the examination of the truth itself.<sup>165</sup> This objection will be best removed by proceeding with our observations.

<sup>162</sup> The gospel, to be sure. — D.T.

<sup>163</sup> By its being truly the gospel that we believe. — D.T.

<sup>164</sup> That is, from our liability to be deceived by believing what is false, the reviewer would infer *our liability to be deceived by the consciousness of believing what is true!* See this paralogism exposed, volume 1st, pages 50-55. — D.T.



<sup>165</sup> And so it does. — D.T.

In the first place, there is a knowledge of the gospel which is very different from that with which faith unto salvation is connected. It is indispensable that the natural man discern what the gospel is, in a certain sense, otherwise he could not be charged with hating [381] it.<sup>166</sup> On the other hand, the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, neither can he *know* them, because they are spiritually discerned. It is no satisfactory answer to this, to say that the spiritual man *believes* in the things of the Spirit of God while the natural man believes them not. The difference plainly consists in the *knowledge* possessed, if the apostle mean what he says.<sup>167</sup> We may illustrate this from natural things. There is a way of understanding, and speaking correctly, and believing, with regard to ordinary things, which is different from a full and influential knowledge of them. One man hears a report about an engagement between two armies abroad, and of ten thousand being left dead on the field: he hears and believes this, and after all is but little affected by it. Another who happens to have been a witness of some such scene of carnage before, hears the same report, and is infinitely more affected by it than the former. The reason is, that while both receive the same outline of the thing, and speak about it in the same terms, the one has a much ampler conception than the other of the horrors and miseries of the event. Again, we may be told of a generous action done by an individual in relieving the misery of a fellow-creature, and we may believe the story, and be able to tell it over again, and yet be comparatively little affected with it. But had we been present at the scene, and witnessed the wretchedness relieved, and seen the glow of sympathy which lighted up the countenance of the philanthropist, and heard the words of kindness which fell from his lips; had we beheld the real circumstances of the case, our feelings of satisfaction and esteem would have been far more vivid. And yet we might tell the story to others again in much the same terms as before. [382] The same holds in spiritual things.<sup>168</sup> A man may be able to affix a correct and consistent meaning to all the terms of religion,<sup>169</sup> and yet have his mind occupied with the faintest and coldest conception of the great realities. Take, for example, the words, eternity, hell, heaven, sin; how easy is it to know so much of these as to speak of them correctly, while yet we have before our minds no adequate or affecting representations of the things themselves.<sup>170</sup> Human language has but a limited power in suggesting the objects and thoughts which correspond to it, especially where the mind is opposed to the reception of these; and thus it is, that while the natural man discerns so much of divine truth, as to speak about it, and exercise his reason upon it, it requires the special agency of the Spirit of God to unfold that truth in its length and breadth, and depth and height, in its attractive beauty and commanding claims.<sup>171</sup> We might proceed to many illustrations of this topic, had we time for it. Dr. Campbell, in his *Philosophy of Rhetoric*, quotes two passages from earlier writers, which many years ago suggested the remarks submitted above. — "I believe every one, who examines the situation of his mind in reasoning, will agree with me, that we do not annex distinct and complete ideas to every term we make use of, and that in talking of *government, church, negotiation, conquest*, we seldom spread out in our minds all the simple ideas of which these complex ones are composed. 'Tis however observable, that notwithstanding this imperfection, we may avoid talking nonsense on these subjects, and may perceive any repugnance among [383] the ideas as well as if we had a full comprehension of them." Mr. Erskine, in his admirable *Essay on Faith*, has thrown light on part of this subject, by the views he has given respecting the *moral meaning* of gospel truth. But the principle applies more widely to every part of revealed truth, whether relating to the moral character of God or not. Before shewing its connection with the assurance of personal salvation, we must attend to a few further observations.<sup>172</sup>

<sup>166</sup> No doubt: recollecting, however, that *this species of knowledge* is, in reality, *ignorance of the nature of the gospel*. — D.T.

<sup>167</sup> True. But *spiritual knowledge*, is synonymous with *belief*: this *spiritual*, differing from *natural knowledge*, in its very *essence*; and not in *degree* merely, as is suggested by the sceptical mind of the critic. — D.T.

<sup>168</sup> This is denied. The difference between *natural conceptions of divine things*, and the *spiritual knowledge of*

*them, is essential, and not in degree merely.* — D.T.

<sup>169</sup> This is incorrect; and in proof of my assertion, I vouch the reviewer's inability, throughout this critique, to speak consistently on the subject of religion.

<sup>170</sup> It is not so very easy for the *natural* man to speak correctly of these subjects, as the reviewer seems to think. See 1 Cor. 2:15; Heb. 4:12. — D.T.

<sup>171</sup> Disgusting! "It requires the special agency of the Spirit of God to unfold" the truth to the mind *at all*. The difference between *natural* and *spiritual knowledge*, is not merely a difference *in degree*. — D.T.

<sup>172</sup> In this whole paragraph the reviewer, besides attempting to put the change upon us by shifting the question from *the consciousness of belief* to *the subject matter believed in*, would represent the belief of divine truth, as differing from a natural knowledge of the subject, merely *in degree*! The belief of the gospel cannot with him, therefore, be *the first fruits of the divine nature*, 2 Peter 1:4, nor the production of *the Spirit*, John 3:6, for this would imply a difference *in nature*. — D.T.

Not only may there be such a deficiency<sup>173</sup> of spiritual illumination as we have just noticed; there may be some accompanying error which prevents an individual from feeling the application of divine truth to himself, which negatives the influence of the whole upon his mind.<sup>174</sup> How many who hear the gospel and find their consciences testify to its claims, act like Felix when he said to Paul, 'Go thy way for this time, when I have a more convenient season I will send for thee.' Their impression is, that although they must at some time flee from the wrath to come, there is no immediate danger. Suppose a man told of a distant danger, should we conclude that he did not believe the intimation if he did not immediately set about providing against it? We have been told that there can be no kind of faith in the gospel salvation if the sinner is not in earnest in immediately receiving and obeying it. This does not truly represent the state of the case. How many impressions and convictions take place in the minds of young and old, which are stifled by the idea that there is no imme-[384]diate danger. The language not merely of the lips but of the mind is, 'The gospel I believe to be true, I regard Christ as the only Saviour from the wrath to come, but it is time enough to seek the remedy when I am really in danger.' We are far from saying, that the real spiritual illumination of the mind could be neutralized by such a sentiment as this; for a sinner who truly had that view of God which slays the enmity of the heart and the love of sin, would turn to his service whether there was immediate danger from disobedience or not. What we mean to say is, that this conviction is a powerful auxiliary to the natural darkness of the human mind, and to those slight impressions of the whole concerns of religion to which we adverted above. And also, that this conviction neutralizes those strong convictions of certain parts of the truth of God which do often occur, and which may appear to one that looks at the testimony of his consciousness merely, a decisive proof that he has believed unto salvation.<sup>175</sup>

<sup>173</sup> "Deficiency?" Destitution "of spiritual illumination" is what expresses the state of a *natural* man's mind. — D.T.

<sup>174</sup> True; the master error being, as in the case of the reviewer, his not seeing eternal life, as freely bestowed, bestowed on himself even now. — D.T.

<sup>175</sup> So, persons who have "strong convictions" that they must do something in order to escape from the wrath of God, and obtain eternal life, have "a certain degree of spiritual illumination!" The scriptures have taught me, that such persons have no spiritual illumination at all. I find their characters described, Rom. 10:3, and elsewhere. — D.T.

Again, there may be other errors connected with a partial perception and feeling of gospel truths, which may infallibly subvert the operation of all that is known and felt. A ruling error of every natural man is, that sin is his happiness. Now how possible is it, nay how often is it exemplified in fact, that this impression should be laid asleep for a time by some affecting views<sup>176</sup> of gospel truth and the love of God, and yet, not having been expelled by the transcendent and powerful illumination of that Spirit<sup>177</sup> who never operates in vain, should finally regain its ascendancy,<sup>178</sup> and again subject the soul [385] to that dominion from which it appeared to have quite escaped?<sup>179</sup>

<sup>176</sup> Natural views. See Mat. 13:20,21. — D.T.

<sup>177</sup> "Transcendent and powerful illumination of the Spirit?" How true, in a scriptural sense; but how untrue, in the sense of the difference between *natural knowledge of the gospel*, and *faith in it*, being *merely* a difference *in degree*. — D.T.

<sup>178</sup> *Regain* its ascendancy? See 1 John 2:19. — D.T.

<sup>179</sup> "*Appeared* to have quite escaped. Well; these last words are consistent with scripture, particularly with the parable of the sower: but how can they be reconciled with the idea of sin's "*regaining* its ascendancy?" — D.T.

To apply these observations to the testimony of consciousness to the reality of personal faith. Supposing that consciousness told us truly that we believed in the objects of our professed faith, there is a most important question to be settled, Is what I believe really that gospel which is the power of God unto salvation?<sup>180</sup> A correct accordancy with the statements of inspiration, even should we take this for granted, which every one does respecting his sentiments, does not prove to me decisively, that I am not a mere speculator who can understand and reason about terms, and believe the meaning which he affixes to them, while yet the truth has come to him in word only, not in demonstration of the Spirit and in power. Nor can strong impressions from what I understand, prove infallibly that I am not deluding myself with the operations of my natural powers and passions, while there is some lurking error left by depravity in my heart that neutralizes the whole gospel, and will shew itself by finally expelling it. Now these are errors which will not be cured by directing to the consciousness of faith or an examination of doctrines; the deficiency of such religion can only be detected by referring to its practical influence on the heart and the life.<sup>181</sup>

<sup>180</sup> If we believe any testimony, no matter whether true or false, *consciousness* informs us, and informs us truly, that we believe it. Consciousness has nothing to do with the truth or falsehood of *the subject matter believed in*. The question stated in the text, is one which falls to be answered by means very different from an appeal to that principle. But misrepresentation happens to suit the critic's purpose. — D.T.

<sup>181</sup> The whole of this paragraph is a specimen of the sophism, that from our liability to be deceived by believing what is false, *we have reason to suspect that we may be labouring under self-deception, even when conscious of believing what is true!!!* — Besides, if consciousness may deceive us as to *faith itself*, how shall we be warranted against its deceiving us, likewise, as to *the fruits and effects of faith*? — D.T.

[386] The doctrine of Berean assurance can only be supported on the supposition of a peculiar illumination accompanying the belief of the truth, testifying infallibly that the illumination comes from God. This notion has no countenance from Scripture.<sup>182</sup> Either the supposed testimony is something altogether distinct from the truth stated, a direct witness to the soul that this is a revelation from God,<sup>183</sup> and then we reject it totally as unfounded in the word of God: or it is simply the glory, and beauty, and evidence of the truth itself discovered to the mind.<sup>184</sup> In the latter case it is not different *in kind* from knowledge otherwise imparted, and brings no testimony to its divine origin but the degree and energy in which it comes, and the effects which it produces. These are great, and worthy of the almighty Agent who operates in conversion; but still, they are not specifically different from the influence of truth otherwise known: there are, therefore, resemblances of divine illumination which cannot by any intuition be distinguished from it, either by the subject of their influence or by others.<sup>185</sup> A correct [387] acquaintance with the terms of the gospel scheme,<sup>186</sup> presents a resemblance which is often mistaken for the reality. Vivid impressions of different parts of truth present another resemblance which may be mistaken for the reality. Were we to tell those who are distinguished by such religion, to appeal to consciousness, which could not deceive them, they would tell us they were conscious of their knowledge and their faith, and they would speak truly; but they would not have the better evidence on that account.<sup>187</sup> The knowledge and faith of true believers, for the same reason, warrants no infallible assurance in respect to personal state.<sup>188</sup> The more conspicuous these characteristics are, the better evidence they afford. Accordingly there are degrees of assurance spoken of in Scripture. "Wherefore

the rather, brethren, give all diligence to make your calling and election sure:" this implies that although they had reason to look on themselves as elected, they might yet make that surer to their own conviction. We read elsewhere of "giving diligence unto the full assurance of hope unto the end." Our limits forbid us to add many other illustrations which occur.

<sup>182</sup> The way in which Scripture gives the lie to the critic is so very remarkable, as to deserve being quoted at length: *God who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God, in the face of Jesus Christ.* 2 Cor. 4:6. — D.T.

<sup>183</sup> "The supposed testimony" is "*a direct witness* to the" conscience "that this is a revelation from God;" but so far from this direct witness being "something altogether distinct from the truth" revealed, it is in reality that very truth itself. — D.T.

<sup>184</sup> The phraseology of the latter part of this sentence is correct: but it is evident from the context, and especially from what follows, that the critic attaches an unscriptural meaning to the terms employed by him. — D.T.

<sup>185</sup> The whole substance of the reviewer's errors lies couched in the two last sentences. Not being himself a subject of the enlightening influence of the Spirit, he is not aware of the knowledge of God differing *in kind* from all "knowledge otherwise imparted." Besides, not being himself a subject of "divine illumination," and, consequently, finding himself unable to distinguish between it and its counterfeits, he allows himself foolishly to conclude, that all, even those who are possessed of this illumination, must labour under the same inability that he does! In other words, from the inability of *ignorance of divine truth* to make the distinction in question, he would fain draw a conclusion as to the inability of *knowledge of divine truth* to do so! In how many ways is this sophism, this absurdity, presented to us. See 1 Cor. 2:14-16; Heb. 4:12. — D.T.

<sup>186</sup> These words betray sad ignorance of divine truth on the part of the reviewer. "Terms of the gospel scheme" is language which no believer in that truth will employ. Life everlasting is bestowed, not on *our compliance with terms*, but *freely*. So far from any *resemblance* to "divine illumination" appearing in the case of him who thinks or speaks of "terms," the cherishing of such an idea, and the holding of such language, afford to the man who is truly enlightened proof positive of total darkness on the part of those in whom they are found. — D.T.

<sup>187</sup> True; for the business of consciousness is merely to report to us our belief *as it is*, not *as it should be*. — D.T.

<sup>188</sup> In this sentence, and in those which follow till the end of the paragraph, we have the critic regularly attempting, from the fact of *persons ignorant of the gospel* frequently deceiving themselves by fancying that they believe it, to draw a conclusion, as *to the liability of persons actually acquainted with the gospel, to be deceived by what they are believing!* And, consequently, as to the impossibility of such persons attaining to "infallible assurance in respect to personal state!" In other words, we have the reviewer here gravely and formally writing himself *a fool*. — D.T.

How then stands the subject of evidence? The state of salvation is connected with all that the word of God [388] represents as constituting the Christian character.<sup>189</sup> The man whom God has accepted is one who believes the gospel, whose heart is changed by it, and whose actions are regulated by its laws.<sup>189</sup> Now all these are equally the objects of our knowledge, we may say of our consciousness; they are all equally connected, although in different ways, with salvation;<sup>189</sup> why then single out any one of them as the only evidence?<sup>190</sup> When a man believes the record concerning Christ, he is justified through faith; the consciousness of his faith, then, becomes a measure of evidence<sup>191</sup> that he has passed from death unto life, and he straightway rejoices in hope of the glory of God. Faith *works by love*; love, therefore, is a farther evidence, and why should we overlook it? Love leads to the keeping of the commandments, and why should we overlook that either? Faith, and love, and obedience, when taken each by itself, may have counterfeits; but when united, they prove a universal dominion of truth. They prove this just in the degree in which they are found; and the more conspicuous faith and love and obedience are, the more of the assurance of personal salvation we are warranted to entertain.<sup>192</sup> We are not to look upon assurance as any fixed point in the scale of confidence; but a principle [389] which

commences with the first act of faith towards the propitiation for sin, and which grows with the advance of faith and holiness.<sup>193</sup> It is evident, that if we suppose it to be an assurance which cannot deceive us, while we connect with it the doctrine of perseverance in grace, we annihilate the possibility of doubt as to our final salvation, and make void the exhortations of Scripture addressed to our fears and hopes.<sup>194</sup> We find that such was not the confidence of the apostle Paul. He could say at once, "I know in whom I have believed, and I am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed unto him against that day;" and "I keep under my body and bring it into subjection, lest that by any means when I have preached to others, I myself should be a cast-away."<sup>195</sup> If he was infallibly assured of final salvation, the supposition of his proving a cast away operating as a motive to self-denial, evidently could not have been entertained at all.<sup>196</sup>

<sup>189</sup> True; very true. — D.T.

<sup>190</sup> Because "love," and "obedience" are, at the utmost, merely *effects* flowing from faith as the *cause*; and because it is not until *the principle of faith*, consisting in *the absolute and infallible certainty of God's love through Christ to ourselves personally*, exists in the mind, that either *the love*, or *the obedience*, can spring into existence likewise. To look to *the love*, or *the obedience*, then, for proofs of our being believers, would, by the doubt as to our personal Christianity which our so doing would imply, be to manifest *our want of the principle of faith*. — D.T.

<sup>191</sup> His faith is the *sole* evidence of this. Heb. 11:1. — D.T.

<sup>192</sup> This is one of the flattest contradictions given to the word of God, that for a good while I have met with. Instead of its being the doctrine of God's accredited messengers, that "the more conspicuous faith, and love, and obedience are, the more of the assurance of personal salvation we *are warranted to entertain*; it is their uniform and unanimous declaration, that upon the righteousness of God manifest in the flesh, and upon it only, the hopes of believers rest from first to last; and that, by means of this righteousness entering into their consciences, dread as to futurity is at once and for ever banished therefrom. 1 Cor. 1:30,31; Gal. 2:20; Rom. 5:1. — D.T.

<sup>193</sup> "Act of faith!" The expression is not scriptural, as it is used by the reviewer. The mind in believing is *perfectly passive*. John 6:44,45; 2 Cor. 4:6. The principle of *faith* advances, as we advance in *spiritual illumination*. But the very lowest degree of it is *absolute certainty*; and, by being so, stands distinguished from all conviction produced by *human testimony* and other *natural means*. — D.T.

<sup>194</sup> It is true, that the faith of the gospel "annihilates the possibility of doubt as to our final salvation;" and this, by that divine principle being *assurance of our present salvation*. 1 John 5:11. It is also true, that *this assurance* makes void "exhortations" (not scriptural exhortations, be it observed), "addressed to" men's "fears" of future damnation. But it is not true, that those scriptural exhortations and warnings which are addressed to believers, as God's children, with a reference to the conduct which they should pursue in passing through this present world, and the risks which they run of incurring their heavenly Father's displeasure, are thereby made void. — D.T.

<sup>195</sup> A curious specimen of religious scepticism. An attempt is here made, with the greatest coolness and effrontery, to represent two passages of scripture as being at variance with one another! What could an avowed infidel do more? — D.T.

<sup>196</sup> Perfectly correct, supposing the apostle, when he used the word *cast-away*, ἀδοκιμος, to have spoken with a reference to what might be his fate *in a future state of existence*: but quite irrelevant, on the supposition of his having expressed himself, as we know him to have done, with a reference to what might happen to him *while passing through this present state of existence*. A glance at the previous part of the chapter in which the word occurs, 1 Cor. 9, suffices to shew us, that Paul's enjoyment of the apostolical office, and his being continued in the possession of the other singular divine privileges bestowed on him, depended, or *was conditional* on, his acting up to the dictates of his peculiarly enlightened conscience. — Perhaps the word ἀδοκιμος, here as in other passages, signifies merely, *without proof or evidence*. In this case the translation of the end of the verse will run thus: *Lest that by any means, when I have preached to others, I myself should be without proof, or evidence*; that is, *should be without proof or evidence* of bearing the apostolical commission which I have. See the beginning of the chapter. — D.T.

[390] These remarks for the present must suffice. We may in some future number prosecute the subject, and shew more fully the light which Scripture throws upon it, and its decided opposition to what we reckon an unscriptural and pernicious sentiment.<sup>197</sup>

<sup>197</sup> The drift of the whole review, then, is, to shew that there can be no such thing enjoyed by any Christian as *the absolute certainty of life everlasting belonging to himself personally*. That is, the critic's object, in his own puny way, is to shew, that God's word *must be untrue*; Rom. 5:1; 8:16; 1 John 5:11; and to represent the religion of Christ Jesus as *a religion of scepticism*.

Such are the religious guides by whom the serious and sober-minded Scotch Independents allow themselves to be led by the nose. — D.T.

## C

Volume I, Page 325.

It may be, that, in the body of the work, I have supposed my readers to be better acquainted with the nature and different kinds of evidence, as well as better qualified to perceive the application of my remarks to the subject of which I am treating, than they actually are. In order to make up for any defect of this sort, let me here submit a few additional remarks to their consideration. — *Evidence* signifies that, whatever it may be, by means of which truth or falsehood is perceived; and *the strongest evidence* is that by means of which truth or falsehood is *most clearly perceived*. From this it must be obvious, that *evidence* is of the nature of *light*; and that *the strongest evidence* is that which sets truth or falsehood in *the strongest light*. One grand means of affording evidence is *testimony*. But *testimony*, as [391] *evidence*, differs in strength according to a great variety of circumstances. Such is the constitution of human nature, that, before testimony can produce any conviction, it must satisfy certain requirements of the mind; and the testimony which satisfies the most of these requirements, is productive of the strongest conviction. But the evidence of testimony which commonly we can obtain, and on which commonly we deem it proper to act, does not come up to the highest perfection of such evidence which the mind is capable of conceiving and requiring. There is always some circumstance wanting, which, were such evidence to possess, it would produce a conviction still stronger than that which results from it. It is, however, conceivable, that there should exist a testimony, coinciding with, and thereby satisfying, all the requirements of the mind in regard to evidence; such a testimony, supposing it to exist, affording the strongest of all evidence, and consequently producing the strongest of all conviction. Now this is what we allege is predicable of *the testimony of God*. It meets and satisfies every requirement in regard to evidence, which can be conceived to be felt by the human mind. It is, therefore, *the perfection of evidence*.

*Human testimony* cannot *directly* and *positively* afford evidence of the truth of *divine testimony*; it being impossible for *the inferior* to prove *the superior*: — but *indirectly* and *negatively* it may do so; for it is a requisite of *any other testimony* proposed to us to be believed in, that it shall not contradict *properly authenticated human testimony*. Human desires and feelings, in the same *negative* way, may afford evidence to *divine testimony*; it being requisite, that any testimony demanding our credence shall not be inconsistent with the existence of such desires and feelings. And so with other matters. But *divine testimony* does, to him who believes in and understands it, satisfy every natural requirement of the mind. It tallies with the information conveyed [392] by authentic human testimony; — it tallies with and satisfies the natural desires, feelings, and cravings of man; and especially it tallies with and satisfies his natural craving after righteousness, in order to the enjoyment of peace and tranquillity; — and so on.

*Divine testimony*, however, does not stop here. Were it to do so, it would merely be *human testimony* presented to us *in its most condensed form*. As *mere human testimony*, it would be impossible to get over the infidel argument of Hume, Rousseau, &c., to which I have particularly directed attention in the

body of the work. *Divine testimony*, therefore, while it is the bringing into a single focus of all the scattered rays of *natural* light or evidence, and while it thereby leaves even the natural mind without excuse, is also the medium through which a light or evidence *superior to that of nature* beams into the *spiritual* mind. The grand reason of this may be stated to be, that what *perfectly* satisfies nature, — that what *perfectly* satisfies, nay, exhausts all the requirements of the *natural* mind, — *must of necessity be nature's superior*. As the light which, when he was on the road to Damascus, struck Paul's natural eye, and which we know to have been *the Shechinah* or visible emblem of the divine presence, is described by him to have been *a light above the brightness of the sun*, Acts 26:13; so the light of divine truth shining into the mind of the Christian, not merely satisfies all that *naturally* his mind requires the evidence of testimony to possess, but *goes far beyond it*. It is *a supernatural light*, actually eclipsing all the effects of *the natural light of testimony*. If *divine testimony* merely satisfied what the mind *naturally* requires, it would come under the category of *natural knowledge*, and might be apprehended by *the natural understanding*. But, as besides satisfying the *natural* requirements of the mind in regard to evidence, the *divine testimony* affords to Christians *a supernatural evidence of its truth*, then, besides a [393] *natural knowledge* of its meaning, there is in the mind of every Christian the principle of *faith*, or *a real and spiritual understanding of it*.

From all this, then, it is plain, that while men are attempting to prove *divine testimony* by that which is *human*, as they are proceeding on the principle of *divine testimony* being inferior to and capable of receiving light from *that which is human*, they are necessarily manifesting themselves to possess nothing more than *a natural understanding of spiritual things*. But the moment that *faith* is produced in the mind, or that *the divine testimony* enters the mind with *its own peculiar evidence* and *as what it is*, that moment does the mind begin to perceive *human testimony* proved by *that which is divine*, or *the inferior* proved by *the superior*. Instead now of the mind attempting to throw light on *the testimony of God*, by means of *the testimony of man*, respecting the events of remote ages, — *the testimony of God* is now found by the mind to enable it to sift, correct, and throw light on *the testimony of man*; nay, to enable it to go farther back than *the latter* can carry it, and to thread its way through mazes where the light of *the latter* utterly fails. Instead now of *the testimony of God* being seen to be merely *not inconsistent with* human desires and feelings, it is found actually to explain and throw light on the nature and final causes of the existence of all of them. In a word, the difference between *a mere natural understanding*, and *faith* or *a spiritual understanding* of divine truth, is, that while possessed of *the former*, all our anxiety is to find *human testimony* agreeing with, and, as we suppose, corroborating *divine testimony*; whereas, when raised to the possession of *the latter*, we are satisfied of the truth of *the divine testimony* in its own light or evidence, and begin to make use of it for the purpose of corroborating or correcting *human testimony*. A mere *natural knowledge* or *understanding* of the subject, may be to us like [394] *the light of the sun*; but *faith*, or *the spiritual understanding* of it, is to us like *a light surpassing that of the natural sun*. All who are spiritually acquainted with what I am now speaking of, will at once comprehend my meaning when I say, that from *a mere natural knowledge* or *understanding of Christianity* men may fall, as in every age they have fallen; but from *faith* or *a spiritual understanding* of it, none ever yet apostatized. The one is *a corruptible*, the other *an incorruptible seed*. 1 Peter 1:23.

By way of still farther illustrating what has been stated in the preceding part of these observations, I add: It was necessary that *a perfect testimony* should be that of a being of *perfect wisdom, truth, power, justice, and love*; nothing short of this coming up to the requirements even of *the natural mind*: but *the testimony of God* goes beyond these requirements; for it is *the testimony of a being* whose perfect *wisdom, truth, power, justice, and love*, only exist in connection with, and as necessarily subservient to, *the everlasting happiness of ourselves personally*. It is this latter view, shining into the mind, which constitutes that glorious divine light or evidence, by which all other evidence is at once and for ever eclipsed and superseded. 2 Cor. 4:6; Heb. 11:1. See also 2 Cor. 3:10.

It is well known that Messrs. Taylor and Carlile, of London, visited several parts of England, in the discharge of what they were pleased to denominate their *infidel mission*, during the summer and autumn of 1829. [395] The following paper, given in to them by the author during their stay in Liverpool, and inserted by them in their periodical called *the Lion*, will present to the reader, in a condensed form, what is stated and insisted on, in the body of the work, respecting the impossibility of *proving the word of God, by the word of man*. The author, as will be obvious on a perusal of the paper, does not mean to deny, that *infidel statements* may be *disproved by the word or testimony of man*; but he certainly does deny, that *divine truth* can be *proved by that word or testimony*. While human testimony may *negative* the former, it is totally incompetent to *establish* the latter. A glance at the paper will suffice to shew, that the concessions towards the end of it are merely *argumentandi causa*. Let the author here take the opportunity of stating the obligations under which, in common with the other members of the church of God, he conceives himself to lie to those, who, although unable by what are commonly called *the external evidences of Christianity* to prove *directly* the divine origin of scripture, have nevertheless done good service *indirectly* to the cause, in consequence of their having, by means of these *external evidences*, driven the infidel tribe from the various positions which, from time to time, these indefatigable opponents of revelation have thought meet to take up.

#### PROTOCOL OF THE REV. DAVID THOM'S INTENDED ARGUMENT.

*Liverpool, 19th August, 1829.*

Mr. Thom begs leave to submit to Messrs. Taylor and Carlile the following brief statement of the subject-matter in dispute between him and them: —

The evidences of the divine origin and authority of the books called the Holy Scriptures are commonly divided into two parts, viz., such as are external, or his-[396]torical, and such as are internal, or arise from the scriptures themselves.

The former Mr. Thom has always considered sufficient to *negative*, or at least to *neutralise*, the arguments of Deists. But this is the utmost that he can say with respect to them. Such evidences, *if fairly exhibited*, being of the nature of *human testimony and human reasonings*, however successfully they may refute objections, leave the mind, in regard to *a divine testimony*, exactly where they find it. The question still remains untouched — Is the book called the Bible the production of man, or does it derive its origin from a higher source? And this is a question to which, *on the supposition of the latter part of the alternative being true*, neither human testimony nor human reasonings can supply an answer.

The latter, or the internal evidences, Mr. Thom considers *the only ground* upon which any man can be satisfied that the scriptures are *a divine testimony*.

The medium by which Mr. Thom has been led to entertain this view is, his conviction of the necessary inferiority of all other evidence to the testimony of God. Our conclusions, if legitimate, being deduced from what is more clear, and not from what is more obscure — from what is possessed of greater, and not from what is possessed of lesser authority, it follows, that if the scriptures can be proved to be divine by evidence which is external and independent of themselves, such evidence must be clearer and possessed of more authority than they are. What reflecting individual, however, does not perceive, that to attempt to prove the scriptures, which by the terms of the supposition are divine, by evidence which by terms of the same supposition is necessarily inferior, is to be guilty of the grossest of all absurdities.



It appears to Mr. Thom, therefore, to be undeniable, that unless the scriptures can be proved to be divine by internal evidence, or in other words, unless their divine [397] origin can be proved from themselves, there is no way in which they can be proved at all.

Passing over the other internal evidences of the divine origin of the scriptures which are commonly enumerated and insisted on, such as *the unity of design, consistency, majesty, simplicity*, and so on, which are apparent throughout the whole, Mr. Thom has no hesitation in specifying *the novelty and importance*<sup>198</sup> of the information which they communicate as what have chiefly contributed to satisfy him that they proceed from God. Had not the scriptures supplied him with views and principles of the most important kind, to which he must otherwise and necessarily have remained a stranger, he confesses that he should have wanted one of the most powerful, and to him convincing, arguments in their favour. The fact of the scriptures being *a revelation*, constitutes to him the grand proof of their *divinity*.

<sup>198</sup> I was obliged thus to express myself, in order to meet the apprehensions of those whom I addressed. But although true, that the *novelty and importance* of the views imparted to me by the scriptures, meaning thereby the difference between them and the views suggested by mere human writings, have always powerfully struck me, it is God's character as love, manifested to me in the light of *the love borne by Him towards myself personally*, that outshining the light of every other species of evidence, has carried home irresistible and infallible conviction of the truth of his own most blessed testimony to my mind. — D.T.

It has been admitted by Mr. Carlile, that in the event of a divine revelation existing, and of the mind being satisfied that it does so, it must convince by means of its internal evidences, — the very way in which Mr. Thom alleges that the scriptures have convinced him. It is true that Mr. Carlile's admission is entirely hypothetical, but Mr. Thom cannot help deeming it of great importance.

Mr. Thom, on the other hand, admits that the scriptures are a divine revelation only to him by whom they are seen to be so, or, in other words, by whom the internal evidences of their truth and origin are seen and appreciated.

[398] As the testimony of God, when apprehended, cannot from its very nature produce a conviction short of *absolute and infallible certainty*, and must in this way stand distinguished from the testimony of man,<sup>199</sup> Mr. Thom has no hesitation in avowing that he is *absolutely and infallibly certain* of the truth and divine origin of the scriptures.

<sup>199</sup> 1 John 5:9.

But although Mr. Thom has an absolute and infallible certainty of this fact produced in his mind by the understanding of the scriptures themselves, he nevertheless perceives and freely admits, that it would be necessary for him to relinquish Christianity, and embrace Infidelity, if Messrs. Taylor and Carlile could succeed in establishing the following position, viz.

That the knowledge of God might have been acquired by man, independently of the scriptures altogether, by the mere exercise of his natural faculties.

The reason of this is, that to establish the fact of *the ability of the human mind by its own natural powers to discover the existence and perfections of God*, would be to overturn *the necessity of revelation*. And to demonstrate revelation to be *superfluous*, is without more ado *to set it aside*.

Mr. Thom is satisfied that *the very idea of a divine revelation* owes its origin to the fact of the existence of *such a revelation*. The man who undertakes to disprove this will not be long in discovering that he has rather a difficult task to perform, as he must not merely refute those arguments of the learned which, in his (Mr. Thom's) opinion, have conclusively shewn tradition to be the source of all the knowledge of God which ever obtained among heathen nations, but likewise establish positively the ability of man to become acquainted with God, without any direct revelation from Him, by proofs

somewhat better than those adduced by Thomas Paine and Archdeacon Paley.

[399] Mr. Thom further admits that his faith in the scriptures as the word of God would be entirely subverted, if Messrs. Taylor and Carlile could establish any of the following positions, viz.

- 1st. That the existence of a Being superior to man *is impossible*; or
- 2dly. That supposing such a Being to exist, *it is impossible for him to reveal himself to his creatures*; or
- 3dly. That supposing him to have revealed himself, *it is impossible for him to have done so through such a medium as the scriptures*.

The proof of the first of these positions would establish Atheism; the proof of the second would supersede the necessity of examining the scriptures altogether; and the proof of the third would set the scriptures aside, as *having been weighed in the balance and found wanting*. The proof of any of them would be sufficient to overturn Mr. Thom's belief; but before establishing the last, it would be necessary to shew that the scriptures had been *understood* before being *rejected*. Indeed, Mr. Thom is content to peril the matter on this single point, that the scriptures were never yet *rejected*, nay, that they were never *doubted of*, by any man by whom they were *understood*.

Mr. Thom has only to add, that he who undertakes to prove any of the above positions, assumes ground higher than that which a being situated and constituted like man is entitled to do, as he virtually declares himself to be acquainted with all the possible conditions and relations of things; and yet, unless *the impossibility* in one or other of the above cases be substantiated, the Infidel, for aught he knows, may after all be in the wrong. Let him prove that a God, or a divine revelation, or such a revelation as the scriptures, is *impossi*-[400]*ble*, and the whole fabric of Christianity is at once subverted; but if he cannot succeed in doing so, the character of a Sceptic or Doubter is the highest to which he can pretend.

D. THOM.

*To the Rev. Robert Taylor, A.B. &c.,  
and Richard Carlile, Esq.*

## E

Volume I, page 379.

The 1st and 2d verses of the 11th chapter of the epistle to the Hebrews, rightly understood, and compared with some other passages of the sacred volume, afford a singular and striking proof of the correctness of Mr. Barclay's theory. The principle of that theory is, that faith is the only means of our understanding the divine testimony; and, consequently, that it is to us the only evidence of what we believe being the divine testimony. In the 1st verse of the chapter just referred to, *faith* is defined to be, *the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen*. That is, faith is *in us* the basis upon which future blessings rest, and the essence or substance of which they consist; — besides being to us the evidence of our enjoyment of these blessings. The object of the apostle in the 2d verse is to acquaint us with the reason of this. The circumstance of this verse being connected with the immediately preceding one by the word γὰρ, *for*, at once shews us that it is *causal*. *For, by it the Elders obtained a good report*. From the translation of this passage, as well as from the general strain of the comments which have been made on it, it would appear, that in it the apostle has been understood to be speaking of *the good* [401] *report* which in the Old Testament scriptures, *the elders*, or Old Testament saints, have obtained from the Holy Ghost; or, in other words, of the approbation which in the Old Testament scriptures the Holy Ghost has been pleased to bestow upon them. See Poole's *synopsis*; Schleusner, on the word μαρτυρεω, *towards the end*; Beza's *Latin translation*; M'Knight's *English translation* and

*paraphrase*; M'Lean's *translation, paraphrase, and notes*; Scott of Aston Sandford's *Commentary*; &c. &c. But although it is true, that the faith of the Elders has been placed upon record as the object of divine approbation; it is not true, that it is of the approbation bestowed on the faith of the Elders the apostle is here speaking. His object clearly is, to assign a reason for the definition given in the first verse. He is anticipating and answering the question, why is *faith the substance of things hoped for*, &c. But in what respect is the fact of the Holy Ghost *having given a good report concerning the elders* an answer to this question? The truth is, the ordinary interpretation of this passage is one proof out of many which might be adduced, of the absolute necessity of our personally believing and thereby understanding the gospel, before we are properly qualified to translate, much less to comment on, the sacred volume. The passage in question has no reference whatever to a testimony either good or bad borne *respecting the elders*; but it refers most obviously to a testimony borne *to them*. The ἐν ταύτῃ of the 2d verse, and the δια της πίστεως of the 39th; — the ἐμαρτυρήθησαν of the former verse, and the μαρτυρηθέντες of the latter; — mutually explain one another. (To which may be added the μεμαρτύρηται of the 5th.) From both passages taken together, and read in the light of their respective contexts, it appears, that *the reason of faith* being what in the 1st verse it is defined to be is, that *by or through it the Elders*, or persons spoken of throughout the chapter, *were witnessed to*; [402] that is, had the divine testimony earned home to their consciences, or became the subjects of that testimony. In other words, *faith is the substance*, &c., because, the divine testimony, with which naturally the mind of man has nothing to do, or which naturally has no existence in his mind, is *by faith*, or by being believed in, carried home to his mind, — comes thereby to have an existence in his mind, — or, in plain English, *becomes a testimony to him*. By faith, he who formerly had nothing ado with, had no interest in the divine testimony, comes to have that testimony abiding in him, or to be the subject of that testimony. Both the verb in the 2d, and the participle in the 39th, it will at a glance be perceived, are in the passive voice. All this being understood, it becomes apparent, that the translation of the first two verses is: *Now faith is the substance of things hoped for; the evidence of things not seen; for by it the Elders were witnessed to*; or, *by it they had the divine testimony rendered a testimony to them*. And the whole is summed up in the 39th verse by observing, that although the Elders, or Old Testament Saints, *had the divine testimony carried home to their consciences, or became the subjects of that testimony, by faith*, they nevertheless were not privileged, during their abode upon earth, *to enjoy the reality* of those blessings which *by faith* they anticipated. How obvious, that these passages in the 11th of the Hebrews, fall to be explained on the same principle with Rom. 8:16, *the spirit itself beareth witness WITH OUR SPIRIT, that we are the children of God*; and with 1 John 5:10, *He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness or testimony IN HIMSELF*. It is but right to mention, that for the first hint respecting the true meaning of Hebrews 11:2, I was indebted to a highly esteemed Christian lady.

[403] F

Volume I, page 396.

## EXTRACTS FROM BARCLAY'S, WITHOUT FAITH, WITHOUT GOD.

He that cometh to God must believe that he is —

### INTRODUCTION.

Hold fast! Christian, hold fast! your all is at stake. Let no man rob you of your God. Your God is your all. Without your God, though you were a king this day, you were poor. Bereaved of your God, you were bereaved indeed. If they take away your God from you, what have you more?

Hear, for it is Jehovah that calls; "Hear, O Israel, I am the Lord thy God. I am one. There is none besides me. My glory will I not give to another, nor my praise to graven images. Thou shalt have no other gods before me. Little children, keep yourselves in the love of God. Keep yourselves from idols. Amen."

For why should they spoil you with their vain philosophy, and beguile you with enticing words, to the entangling of your hearts withal among the briers and thorns of their vain babblings and oppositions of science, falsely so called; which some professing, have erred concerning the faith, and drowned themselves, with their deluded followers, in perdition.

But that your hearts, beloved of God, may be established in the present truth, and secured against the sleight of men, and cunning craftiness of them who lie in wait to deceive you, with regard to that grand indispensable and prime article, *the Being of God*, which is [404] undoubtedly the foundation of all religion pure and undefiled, consider and bear about with you, the meaning of the Holy Ghost in these words, *He that cometh to God must believe that he is* —

*The Words explained.*

Now, when a person is spoken of as coming to God, no man can be so foolish and so absurd as to think of bodily motion from one place to another: for God, you know, is equally and essentially present in all places and times; neither can you go any whither from his presence, nor approach nearer to him, throw your bodies into what kind soever of motions or postures you please.

So, when we hear such expressions as these, Looking to God; coming to him; drawing near to him; flying to him for refuge; cleaving to him; running to him as to a high tower; hiding one's self under his wings; taking hold of him; leaning, depending, and resting upon him; and other like forms of speech, we all know they are not literally to be understood of bodily motions or actions; but only as figurative resemblances and signs, which the Holy Ghost hath chosen, to express his own invisible workings in the spirits of those men whom he maketh willing in the day of his power, working in them both to will and to do, of his own good pleasure.

Thus we may condescend upon an instance or two; "Looking to the Lord, fleeing from the wrath to come, and laying hold upon eternal life," we find explained by "believing on the Lord Jesus Christ, that we may be saved."

And as to the meaning of that particular expression, "coming to God," the Lord hath spoken full to the point, John 6:35, where, comparing himself to bread and water, affording eternal life to the eater and drinker thereof, he says, "He that *cometh to me* shall never hunger, and he that *believeth on me* shall never thirst." [405] Now, surely we come to him as the bread of life, in the same manner that we come to him as the water of life. And here you may perceive with your own eyes, that we come to him and receive everlasting life, when we believe him, or believe on him; for to *believe him*, and to *believe on him*, do signify precisely the same thing; as is evident from John 3:36. "He that *believeth on the Son*, hath everlasting life; and he that *believeth not the Son*, shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him." Hence it is evident, that *coming to God* signifies to *believe God*; and in the text, it signifies also to approach God in worship under the influence of this faith: so that the meaning of the sentence will appear to be as if it had been written, "He that really worshippeth God must," of necessity, "believe that he is."

The word *believing*, among men, plainly signifies, "Our holding of a thing for truth which is told us by another person, merely on account of that person's credibility or authority." If the authority or testimony on which we believe be only human, as when a man declares a matter to his neighbour, the belief arising from thence is merely a *human* belief, credit, persuasion, assurance, faith, or inward evidence, communicated to the mind by means of the outward testimony; for all these are only different names for the same thing, which is the belief of a truth or a falsehood, according to the truth or falsehood of the testimony supporting it.

When we believe on the testimony or authority of God, this is *divine* faith, assurance, or certainty, in which there can be no falsehood; but only all pure truth, because God himself is the Testifier, with

whom it is impossible to lie or deceive.

Now, it having pleased the Father of spirits, who knows the frame of every heart which he hath created, to speak to us of the heavenly and spiritual things in the forms of human language, which he himself hath [406] given us for the mutual communication of our thoughts, and which we naturally understand: when he useth any of our well-known terms, such as *believing* and *hoping*, for instance, thereby to discover to our apprehensions his own hitherto and otherwise unknown and eternal truths, it is manifest he would have us to take up his meaning in these words, according to their plain natural use and common acceptance, in the ordinary course of life and conversation among mankind. Otherwise, we behoved to say, (which God forbid!) that the Spirit of truth deceiveth and mocketh the world, when he crieth aloud by the mouth of all his inspired ambassadors, and saith to every creature under heaven, "Be it known to you, O men — that through Jesus Christ is proclaimed to you the forgiveness of sins: and by him all that believe are justified — and saved — Except ye believe — ye shall die in your sins."

It is true, indeed, that though divine faith, considered in itself, resembles in all respects that which is human; yet it differs in these following peculiar and essential circumstances: for divine faith is not only distinguished from human, as said before, because it rests upon the testimony and authority of God alone, but also because God, the author of the testimony, is equally and solely, in his own special manner, the author of its manifestation as a truth in the conscience of the believer; and also, because it amounts to absolute certainty of assurance, without any mixture of doubt in the nature of it, being universally, wherever it is, without any exception, distinguished from a mere probability, or matter of doubtful disputation, by having God himself manifested in the conscience for its evidence. In proof whereof it is written, "Flesh and blood hath not revealed this to thee, but my Father which is in heaven — We believe and are sure that thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God — I know and am persuaded by the Lord Jesus — If we receive the [407] witness of men, the witness of God is greater — Ye have an anointing from the Holy One, and ye know all things — I have not written to you because you know not the truth; but because ye know it, and that no lie is of the truth — He that believeth hath the witness in himself — Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God."

Here, then, we may rest upon it, that divine faith does not come by human researches and reasonings; unless it should be said, that these and the word of God are the same thing; which were a direct contradiction to the Holy Ghost, as shall afterwards more fully appear.

Wherefore, let every man look to the ground of his faith, and see if it be the very record of God, imprinted by the finger of God upon his heart, and if his heart continue to bear a pure impression of the words of truth. For the truth of God, believed in the heart, bears the same relation and proportion to the truth declared in the word of God, as the figure and graving upon the wax to the same figure and graving upon the impressing seal.

Thus, O believers, God even your Father fulfils his covenant, manifests himself, and writes his laws of love in your hearts, and seals you by his Spirit to the day of redemption. So God hath spoken, and so have ye believed; that your faith might not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the demonstration of the Holy Ghost, and the power of God. Even as an apostle hath said, (and all believers have like precious and equally honourable faith with the apostles), "I know whom I have believed. And he that believeth God hath set to his seal that God is true." Thus, unless he hath set his seal to a blank, to a nothing — and believeth not that which in very deed he believeth, and knoweth not what he actually knoweth, we must be allowed to say, That every believer of God hath in himself, and not in another, which were impossible, undoubted certainty, and that by means of the divine testimony, of that which he believeth, the reality [408] whereof, while he believes it, he can no more hesitate about, than he can hesitate about the reality of his own existence. "For he that cometh to God must believe," or be assured on the testimony of God himself, "that he," this God whom he hath believed, "is" even what he hath declared himself in his word to be. — Pages 3-8.

### *Of the golden Calf and Molech.*

It is manifest it was the Creator, Preserver, and Governor of all, even Jehovah, who brought up Israel out of Egypt — So far agreed — Yet when they had made their image, proclaimed a feast to the Lord, offered sacrifice to the idol, and rejoiced in the work of their own hands — did the Lord, who said to Moses, "The people have corrupted themselves; they have turned aside quickly out of the way which I commanded them; they have made them a molten calf, and have worshipped IT, and sacrificed THEREUNTO, and said, THESE BE THY GODS, O ISRAEL, which have brought thee up out of the land of Egypt" — did the Lord, by all these words, mean to say, that they were only worshipping himself, and that he acknowledged the service as done to himself, though they mistook in a name, and called it the *golden calf*? Will the greatest calf of a water-dipt or sprinkled atheist say so? If this was to know, acknowledge, and worship God, what is idolatry? What were they punished for? For worshipping the true God! What then is required and forbidden in the first, second, and third commandments?

Moreover, who gave them sons and daughters? Was it not God? You allow it — Well, when they made them pass for an offering by fire, through the fire, unto Molech or Malcham, their king, as the name signifies, from whom they said they had received them — how comes Jehovah to upbraid them, by telling them, "That [409] they offered his children, his sons and his daughters to devils; which he commanded them not. — They served the idols of the nations, which were a snare unto them. — Yea, they sacrificed their sons and their daughters unto devils — unto the idols of Canaan — And the land was polluted with blood. Thus were they defiled with their own works, and went a-whoring with their own inventions. Therefore was the wrath of the Lord kindled." — Wherefore kindled? Will this account of the matter persuade us that it was for worshipping and serving the true God, whom they knew and acknowledged under the name of Molech, and other sounds of abomination? None but a devil will say so in this instance.

Yet, how are men so blinded, that they shall scarce have time to turn a page of the book of God, before you shall find them at the same absurdity again, labouring tooth and nail to convince you, "That all men, of all nations, who are worshippers of something, whatever it be, are worshippers of God — *the same One living and true God*" — (unless they say this, they say nothing to the purpose; for who ever denied that blinded nations worship idols, shame for glory?) "under various names and characters, suitable to the various genius, language, and fashion of their own country, people, and age of the world wherein they live."

If you will indeed be so kind as believe some of the heathen philosophers themselves upon occasions, or those who recommend and hold them forth for true worshippers, at the expense of flatly contradicting Jehovah, they were all acknowledgers and worshippers of the One true God, notwithstanding all that monstrous multiplicity and endless diversity of their strange gods. — Pages 46-48.

### *Reason steals from Revelation.*

You will allege perhaps, that though the heathens failed in attaining to the knowledge of the true God by [410] reason, or the light of nature without the word, yet we now-a-days may succeed better in our researches — It is answered, Not so; unless you allege, that the human nature is now more capable, and better disposed, than it was of old. You will not insist upon this ground, which you know you cannot maintain: for what is natural to man, is equally so in all ages and circumstances. And to determine what human nature of itself, without external aid, *can* know of such high things, we have no more to do for common use and benefit of man, but inquire what human nature *hath known*.

But it may be you allege, that our reason, or the light of nature, may borrow some discovery of God from revelation, so as to talk, at least pretty well and plausibly, of his names, titles, attributes,

properties, qualities, or perfections.

*Ans.* No doubt; every thing that reason now-a-days, or any former time, pretends to have found out concerning God, is stolen or usurped from revelation: so that, when the reasoning pride of man struts and swells, and boasts of its innate and in-born, or of its acquired knowledge of God, it only lies, and exposes itself to the derision of the wise, being stuck round, like the foolish bird in the fable, with borrowed feathers. But then — if you insist on this, you must give up the cause of the natural knowledge of God, and consequently natural religion into the bargain — for let your great *Diana, Reason*, restore her borrowed clothing, and her nakedness is discovered.

Moreover, all idolaters or worshippers of false, that is, no gods, since the beginning of the world, have always had the same opportunities in more or less, as well as Nebuchadnezzar, Cyrus, Darius, Belshazzar, and others mentioned in Scripture, of adorning and trimming out their *mock divinityships* and temples, with the usurped glories, and peculiar things belonging, and dedicated only, to the Lord God of Israel: for God, at divers times, [411] and in sundry manners, spake to the fathers, in all ages and nations, by his prophets — And so men were permitted all along, as unbelievers and hypocrites to this hour, for the trial of the saints, in the holy counsels of eternal Sovereignty, to inroach upon several of the revealed attributes, properties, and works of God, by seizing, or rather manufacturing and counterfeiting, and then attributing them every one to his own favourite idol, saying in his heart, "This is my God, and let all the world worship it." — Pages 54-56.

*How the Philosophers furnish out a character for God.*

But let the philosophers alone for a character too: they will presently let you see here also, how little need they have of revelation for discovering the character, more than the bare existence, of God.

How successful they are, you may see, when they begin to spin out of their own bowels, and, spider-like, fall a-weaving, by means of their reasoning faculties, a superficial, flimsy, and, I will venture to say, *poisoned* web (take it upon the whole) of attributes, for the clothing of this same existence, which they have found out, and call *God*, with what appear in their eyes suitable perfections.

They go the same way to work as above. They first begin with some virtues or good things, which they fancy they see in the world, or in its frame and administration: these virtues or good things they run up to as high perfection as they can, sifting from them the apparent vices or ill things as well as they may, and then make a compliment of them all to the god they have found; whom they endeavour to adorn with some kind of a character.

"Thus," say they, to give a little farther scantling of their measures, "we observe some goodness, wisdom, justice, truth, stability, &c., in the world; and therefore we infer, there must be some original fountain of [412] these virtues, which in *itself* is good, just, wise, true, stable," &c. As for the sins, vices, or ill things, they say, "Those are either some way good in themselves, or, upon the whole, with regard to the universal system; or, that God could not have made a better of them, nor rewarded virtue without them; nor, in a word, maintained this universe in proper poise and government without vice, and the punishment thereof." For the illustration of all which points, one has no more to do but peruse their systems of natural religion — suppose Tindal, the professed deist, his system of *Christianity as old as the Creation*, and the most part of the sermons, at Boyle's lectures, for the defence of natural religion.

And thus also, altogether without the word, they fancy themselves well able and qualified to provide God of a character. Well, to join issue with them here too, let us also try the same way of arguing, carefully setting aside revelation all the while, as they also do; for revelation would quite spoil this kind of reasoning: but to proceed —

Do we not observe, moderately speaking, rather fully more of the evil, folly, injustice, falsehood,

changeableness, &c., than of their opposite virtues, in the world?

If then (for their account of the vices will scarce satisfy every body, and we shall suppose so for the present, as if it had not been given at all) we are to argue from the existence of the finite streams (as they speak) which we see, to the existence of an infinite, original, unseen fountain, from whence those streams or vices must flow, (seeing, by supposition, we know nothing of the fountain but by the streams), it is easy to perceive our God now will turn out to be of a quite different kind of character from wisdom, goodness, justice, truth, &c., and at least we must admit the old Persian or Manichean scheme, which maintained (I suppose by the same way of reasoning which our philosophers have adopted) the necessary existence of *two* gods, the one good, and the other evil. The consequence, on this plan, is most [413] natural, and unavoidable; for if light, to our apprehension, infer a principle of light, what will darkness infer? If life, and the preservation of life to the sixtieth or seventieth year, infer a principle or fountain of life for so long, what will death in the end of all infer? Surely, if preservation infer a preserving power, destruction must, for the same reason, infer a destroying power. If virtue must have its principle in God, where must vice have its principle? and vice is, at least in appearance, (from which only the case will allow us to argue), equal to virtue. — If constancy or unchangeableness, apparent in things, suppose a principle constant and unchangeable, what must changeableness and inconstancy suppose? If the qualities of wisdom, holiness, justice, goodness, and truth, in some measure apparent among the creatures, are to pass for a demonstration of an infinite, eternal, and unchangeable, wisdom, holiness, justice, goodness, and truth, self existing in a Creator called God — what will a much greater and more glaring appearance of the contrary and directly opposite qualities of folly, profaneness, injustice, maliciousness, falsehood, pass for a demonstration of? — Pages 65-67. Edin. 1776.

#### OBSERVATION.

I would strongly recommend all who are disposed to prosecute their researches into *the nature and ground of divine faith*, to procure, and read over carefully, Professor Halyburton of St. Andrews', *Treatise on natural and revealed religion*, and *Essay concerning the reason of faith*, especially the latter, a new edition of which, I am glad to observe, has recently issued from the press. Notwithstanding all the defects of style with which they are chargeable, no one can rise from the perusal of the works just mentioned without being satisfied, that they are the productions of a vigorous, profound, and truly learned mind. Besides, if we have read much on the [414] *evidences of Christianity*, we cannot fail to discover, that from Halyburton's treatises succeeding writers have pillaged without acknowledgment and without mercy. Barclay's view of the subject, as given in the work from which the preceding extracts have been taken, I certainly prefer, as being less scholastic, and more scriptural, than that of his learned and able predecessor; but after several perusals of Halyburton's *Essay concerning the reason of faith*, candour obliges me to say, that the study of the works of both individuals is requisite for any man who would attain to a thorough acquaintance with the subject.

#### G

Volume I, page 462.

I cannot help pointing the attention of my readers more particularly than in the text to the temptation of the Messiah, as a subject from which instruction may be gained to which our popular divines are utter strangers. That the Son of God was tried as the first Adam was — that lures which ensnared and overcame mere human nature, were presented without success to one possessed of the divine nature — and that an essential distinction between *the first man as of the earth, earthy*, and *the second man as the Lord from Heaven*, was thereby manifested and established, — are circumstances which the most superficial reader of Gen. 3 and Mat. 4, may at once observe. But by how few is the grand principle involved in both narratives comprehended! And of the few who do comprehend it, how much smaller



the number by whom its applicability to the case of Christians in every age is perceived! — The first Adam [415] fell *by unbelief*; — the second Adam stood *by faith*. — To the former, suspicion of God's veracity was suggested, and he sunk under the temptation. *Ye shall not surely die*. — In regard to the latter, the same thing was tried, but with a totally different result. The voice from Heaven had declared to Jesus at his Baptism, that *he was God's beloved Son, in whom the Father was well pleased*. In proof of his Messiahship, then, he had *an express divine testimony*. He had no more; and, as believing it, he required no more. Against his conviction of the truth of this testimony, all the artillery of Hell was brought to bear. But it would not have suited the purpose of the Tempter to assail it directly. A gross and glaring attack, he saw clearly, would have put the Saviour on his guard. The mode of proceeding, then, was to suppose the heavenly declaration true, and yet to suggest to the Messiah *that he should prove it to be so*. *If thou be the Son of God, command that these stones be made bread*. That is, "if thou be the Son of God, thou canst have no difficulty in establishing the fact to thine own satisfaction, by performing what is in thy case a much needed miracle." Jesus at once detected and rent in pieces the snare laid for him. The temptation proceeded on the principle, of his requiring satisfaction as to his Messiahship — of the heavenly declaration not being of itself sufficient to establish his confidence in the fact, — of his mind being susceptible of *a conviction different from and additional to that derived from an express divine testimony*. All this Jesus saw through, and put away from him. His business he knew was, to live and walk *by faith alone*; and thereby to take his place *at the head of the whole family of the faithful*. 2 Cor. 4:13,14; Heb. 11, *throughout*, with Heb. 12:1,2. But could he, in consequence of the Tempter's suggestion, have been induced to work a miracle in order to prove to his own satisfaction his character as the Messiah, he would, in [416] the first place, have manifested distrust in the divine testimony, as not of itself sufficient for his satisfaction, — thereby bringing himself down to the level of the first Adam; and, in the second place, supposing him to have performed the miracle for the purpose suggested, instead of thenceforward walking *by faith*, he must have walked *by sense and sight*. He, therefore, at once and unhesitatingly repelled the temptation; preferring to the means of proving his Messiahship which the Devil had suggested, to take his stand *upon the divine testimony alone*. *It is written, man shall not live by bread alone*, &c. See Eph. 6:16,17. But what enlightened Christian may not perceive in the language and conduct of the Messiah, the condemnation of popular religion? In answer to the question proposed to me, *what is the reason of the hope that is in you?* I have no hesitation in stating, "God's testimony that he hath given to me eternal life through his Son." "Is *this* all your ground of hope?" says the astonished and ignorant supporter of what is commonly called *evangelical Christianity*. "May you not be deceiving yourself? Can you trust to the divine testimony alone, independently of all regard to your own frames of mind, actions, and experiences? Can you trust to the work of the Spirit *without you*, until you have previously ascertained that you have experienced, likewise, the work of the Spirit *within you*? Would it not be much better, and savour less of presumption, if your hope were derived in some measure from, or at all events were shewn to be genuine by, the discovery in yourself of feelings and dispositions conformable to those of the Saints of God?" Now what is all this, but an attempt to lay for me, and for all who with me are possessed of the apostolic faith, the same snare which Satan attempted to lay for the Son of God? And whenever such language is used to us, have not I and my fellow believers an opportunity of shewing, that we are well aware of the [417] nature of the temptation presented, as well as of the character exhibited by him from whom the temptation proceeds? "Avaunt, Satan!" will be our reply: "we need nothing besides the divine testimony, to prove to us our connection with the Son of God; and that we ourselves are the sons of God in virtue of that connection. Rom. 8:14-17. The information given us by the sacred record, that as we are one with the first Adam *by nature*, so we shall be one hereafter with the second Adam *by grace*, — that as we die in consequence of our connection with the former, so we shall have life everlasting imparted to us in consequence of our connection with the latter, — that *as we have borne the image of the earthy, so we shall also bear the image of the heavenly*, — is to us proof positive of the fact. And the very certainty of this which we have *through faith in the divine testimony*, is of itself to us

*the substance of the things which we hope for, the evidence to us of the things which we do not see; — is of itself to us the earnest and first fruits of that life everlasting, of which we anticipate hereafter the full enjoyment. Having, therefore, God's own testimony, the highest, and surest, and strongest of all evidence, to rest on in proof of our sonship, we cannot stultify ourselves, and call God a Liar, by speaking or acting as if we conceived, that His testimony required to be, or could be, bolstered up and corroborated by any other testimony, call it our own experiences, or what you will. As, then, the Messiah when tempted to repose confidence, as to his Sonship, on an act to be performed by himself, and thereby to withdraw his confidence from the word of the Infallible Jehovah, repelled the temptation by standing firm upon that word alone; so we possessed of the spirit of the Messiah, when tempted by you, popular religionists, to repose confidence as to our sonship on something to be performed or possessed by ourselves, and thereby to withdraw our confidence from the word of God, which unconditionally and certainly declares our spiritual relationship to God through Christ, repel your temptation in the same way; preferring to all the specious *fleshly-wise* methods of proving our Christianity which you suggest, to stand firm on the bare and unsupported testimony of God alone." Is it nothing to have learned a lesson like this from the temptation of the Messiah?*

## H

Volume I, page 468.

The manner in which the absolute and infallible certainty of everlasting life, is itself the present possession of everlasting life, may be thus briefly and syllogistically placed before the mind of the Christian reader:

1st. The absolute and infallible certainty of eternal life, necessarily constrains those in whom it dwells to love God; 2 Corin. 5:14,15; 1 John 4:19; that is, it is in them necessarily productive of and connected with that principle of love, in which the divine nature consists; 1 John 4:8-16; 2 Peter 1:4;

But the divine nature is eternal; 1 Tim. 6:16;

Therefore, the principle of the absolute and infallible certainty of eternal life, as that in which the present possession of the divine nature consists, is that in which the present possession of eternal life consists:

Or,

2dly. That which is itself an unchangeable principle, is by its nature fitted to be the first fruits of eternal life, or the unchangeable nature of the Supreme Being;

[419] But the absolute and infallible certainty of God's love to ourselves personally, by resting upon the absolute and infallible testimony of Him who cannot lie, is an unchangeable principle.

Therefore, the absolute and infallible certainty of life everlasting, is by its nature fitted to be the first fruits of eternal life, or the unchangeable nature of the Supreme Being.

## I

Volume II, page 97.

Je ne sai par quel malheur il est arrivé, que plusieurs Theologiens Protestans out imité les Catholiques Romains, et qu' après les avoir accusés de tyrannie et d'orgueil, ils sont tombés dans les mêmes fautes. Il semble, si l'on en juge par leur conduite, que la plus grande source de leurs disputes revient à ceci; c'est que la Cour de Rome fait mal à propos, ce que les Protestans seuls ont droit de faire. Lors que l'Eglise Romaine a établi des dogmes qu' elle a voulu que tous ses Theologiens

reçussent, ç' a été un attentat horrible sur la liberté des Chrétiens: mais lors que les Protestans en ont usé de mêmes, ce n' á été qu' une pieuse precaution pour empêcher que l'erreur ne s'introduisit dans leurs Eglises. L'Eglise Romaine a eu tort de prononcer des arrêts sur des sujets de peu d'importance: mais les Protestans ont raison, lors qu' ils en usent de même. Cette Eglise s'attribue une autorité qui n' appartient qu' à Jesus Christ, en voulant qu' on explique l'Ecriture par les decrets de ses Conciles; mais les Protestans ont droit de contraindre ceux qui vivent sous leurs juridictions, de l'interpreter par leurs Catechismes, et Confessions de Foi.

Il est vrai que ceux des Protestans, qui entendent les principes de leur Religion, blâment extrêmement cette [420] conduite: mais cela n'empêche pas que la plupart ne l'approuvent, et qu' on ne la suive presque par tout. C'est qui a fait nâître l'impertinente distinction, de *norma fidei primaria, et secundaria*; et qui a fait dire que l'Ecriture est la principale Règle de notre foi, et que les Confessions et Catechismes sont une autre règle inferieure; termes ridicules en eux-mêmes, et inventés pour tromper ceux qui se payent de mots. Car il est vrai, au contraire, que la plupart des Theologiens donnent plus d'autorité à ces ecrits humains, qu' à l'Ecriture; puisqu' ils excommunient ceux qui reçoivent l'Ecriture, seulement parce qu' ils refusent de recevoir leurs Confessions. C'est ce qui a donné lieu au Pere Simon de presser contre les Protestans ces paroles de Flaccius Illyricus: *omnia quae ex scriptura dicuntur, debent esse consona Catechisticae summae*, c'est à dire, qu' il faut interpreter l'Ecriture par rapport au Catechisme, en sorte qu' on ne doit entendre aucun passage, que selon les principes de ces pitoyables Abregés de la Religion, que l' on met entre les mains du Peuple. On sait que ç' a été aussi le sentiment du Synode de Dordrecht, qui, au lieu de revoir la Confession de Foi, et le Catechisme d'Heidelberg, les canonisa, et rendit odieux les Remontrances en Hollande, parce qu' ils demandoient qu' on corrigeât ces ecrits, qui sont non seulement humains, mais ou l'on voit encore des marques sensibles de la foiblesse humaine.

Mais on dira, peut-être, que cet aveu pourroit scandaliser les foibles, et qu' il ne faut pas leur donner occasion de douter si la Societé ou ils vivent est la veritable Eglise. Je répons à cela, qu' il est encore moins permis d'approuver une conduite si mauvaise, qu' est celle des Theologiens qui egalent à l'Ecriture des miserables Formulaires, composés la plupart avec très peu de jugement; et que c'est proprement scandaliser les foibles, c'est à dire, les faire tomber dans le peché, que de leur persuader, qu' une conduite si mauvaise est conforme à [421] l'Evangile; puisque l'on sait, que le peuple entêté de son Catechisme regarde avec horreur ceux qui ne l'approuvent pas, et sert d'instrument aux Theologiens, pour persecuter cruellement ceux qui ne veulent pas recevoir leurs decisions.

Mais quoique cette conduite soit peu conforme à l'esprit de l'Evangile, qui est un esprit de charité, et de sanctification; qui inspire plutôt l'obéissance aux préceptes de Jesus Christ, que l'amour des disputes en des choses purement speculatives; l'Eglise Romaine n' a rien à reprocher là-dessus aux Protestans, si ce n'est, qu' après avoir bien crié contre elle, ils imitent sa conduite; et donnent à leurs Confessions de Foi, et à leurs Catechismes, la même autorité, qu' elle donne aux Canons de ses Conciles.

*Sentimens de quelques Theologiens de Hollande, sur l'histoire critique du Vieux Testament composée par le P. Richard Simon, de l'oratoire. (Par Le Clerc.) 20ième lettre, pages 448-450. Amsterdam, 1685.*

## K

Volume II, page 116.

The following passage, extracted from one of Dr. Wardlaw's well known and elegant sermons *on the Socinian Controversy*, will afford my readers a specimen of that false view of the nature and object of the atonement, against which I find it necessary to caution them.

"The *righteousness* of God is *declared*, or made manifest, by the infliction of the penalty of

transgression on the person of Jesus Christ, as the voluntary surety and substitute of the guilty. — THIS, IT IS FREELY ADMITTED, IS NOT ACCORDING TO THE PRECISE LETTER OF THE DIVINE LAW: for that, like every other, requires, of [422] course, the personal punishment of the offender: 'The soul that sinneth it shall die.' But the *spirit* of the law is as fully preserved; the ends of justice as effectually answered; the dignity and authority of the Divine Lawgiver as completely secured, by the sufferings of a sufficient and voluntary substitute, as by the sufferings of the guilty transgressors themselves. Nay if, as in the case before us, this willing surety is, in nature and dignity, transcendently superior to the sinner in whose room he appears, these ends may be answered, with even more impressive effect, in the one way, than the other."<sup>200</sup>

<sup>200</sup> Sermon 7, pages 210, 211; Glasgow, 1814.

Agreeing, as I do, with Dr. Wardlaw, in many, perhaps most of the statements contained in this and the other sermons, I must say, it is painful for me to read language like this. Could the doctor be aware, when he penned the words from the beginning of the second sentence of the paragraph quoted, that he was making a bold attack upon the veracity of God? "This, it is freely admitted, is *not according to the precise letter of the Divine Law*." What! Does Dr. Wardlaw expect me to believe, that God in any case does what is not *in the strictest sense according to the letter of His law*? That in any case He dispenses with the threatenings which He has denounced against sin and sinners? If Dr. Wardlaw does, he is much mistaken. The blunder of the doctor, which is not peculiar to himself, is traceable to the facts of his not understanding, in the first place, that Christ died, not *instead of*, but *along with the guilty*; and, secondly, that the object of Christ's death was *not to prevent the guilty from undergoing the penalty due to transgression*, — for if so, he would have interfered with the divine threatening, — *but to render their undergoing that penalty, consistent with their attainment of everlasting life*. Christ died to shew that God, even *while just*, could also be *the Saviour*; that even while *true to His* [423] *threatenings*, He could also be *true to his promises*: — not to shew Him to be *the Saviour, without being just*; — nor *the fulfiller of His promises*, without being also *the fulfiller of His threatenings*. Hence it is, that God saves no man, no, not even His people, from the penalties due to transgression. As sinners, or in so far as they are possessed of human nature, they die. So far from Dr. Wardlaw being right, the sentence is executed in their case *to the very letter*; Gen. 3:19; Rom. 6:23. It is true, as possessed of Christ's nature *believers never die*; John 11:25,26; but as possessed of Adam's nature *they die like others*: and in that case, how dare any man, professing to respect the sacred volume, say, that Christ died *in their stead*? Christ, as *God manifest in the flesh*, by dying exhausted death; which no mere man can do: and in this his *swallowing up of death*, and *resurrection from the dead*, we, as one with him, have a glorious and everlasting interest. See 1 Corin. 15, *throughout*.

What renders the Dr.'s blunder so lamentable is, that it affords a sad occasion for the triumph of the party whom he was professedly opposing. Would to God, that while writing the paragraph which I deem so obnoxious to censure, he had but understood the import and bearing of his own admirable remarks contained in *the paragraph which immediately follows*. "The righteous God has given to his creatures a righteous law, accompanied with the threatening of a righteous penalty. IF THE LAW AND THE PENALTY WERE BOTH ORIGINALLY RIGHTEOUS, THEY MUST REMAIN IMMUTABLY SO. — If the law, when given, required no more than what is right, how can it, without bringing a reflection on the perfect wisdom, and unchanging rectitude of the Divine Being, ever require less? If the penalty, by the threatening of which obedience was originally enforced, contained in it no more than what is strictly just, HOW CAN THIS PENALTY, without giving rise to the [424] same kind of reflection, BE REMITTED, OR EVEN MITIGATED?"<sup>201</sup> Is any thing more required, than merely the application of these admirable principles, to overturn the unscriptural doctrine of substitution advocated by the Dr. and others?

<sup>201</sup> *Ibid*: page 211.

Much as I dislike the ordinary way of stating the doctrine of *the atonement*, I cheerfully admit, that there is a sense, and that a very important one too, in which Jesus suffered and died *in our stead*. If it be asserted, in any of the almost infinitely diversified forms in which the proposition is wont to be couched, that, in suffering and dying, Jesus underwent *what, but for this interposition, we must have undergone ourselves*, and that, in this sense, his sufferings and death were *vicarious*, the assertion is at once and pointedly denied, as a bare faced attack on the justice and veracity of God. If, however, it be asserted merely, that, in suffering and dying, Jesus voluntarily subjected himself *to what it was indispensable he should undergo, in order to our being rescued from the thralldom of death, and becoming partakers of everlasting life*, in this sense, it is manifest from the scriptures, that he suffered and died *in our stead*. 1 Cor. 15:3,20-22; 2 Cor. 5:21; 1 Peter 3:18; &c. And yet, as *for our advantage* is obviously the meaning of the phrase *in our stead* when employed in this case, it strikes me, that *on our account*, or *in our behalf*, would, in reference to this all-important subject, be a much more correct mode of expressing ourselves. But as I have no desire to quarrel about mere words, [425] provided they be used in a scriptural sense, my opponents are perfectly welcome, if so disposed, to retain their favourite phraseology. I am well aware, that Socinians have adopted and propagated errors of the most pernicious kind, respecting the nature and object of Christ's death. But because in their statements of the doctrine of the atonement they have run to one unscriptural extreme, shall we, as the only means of meeting and counteracting their mistakes, allow ourselves to run to another extreme as unscriptural and as much to be deplored as theirs? With the word of God in our hands, and the understanding of it in our hearts, it is impossible for us not to see that the sufferings and death of Christ were indispensable to our attainment of everlasting life: and that by none but Christ, could these sufferings and that death have been undergone. They were indispensable to our attainment of everlasting life, because, except by the appearance of a pure and holy being in our nature, *justice*, although otherwise satisfied *passively* by *punishment*, could not have been satisfied *actively* by *obedience*; and, unless satisfied *in this latter way*, could not have been *exhausted*: and the appearance of such a pure and holy being in our nature, in consequence of *the very holiness and purity of his character*, necessarily implied his undergoing pangs and sufferings to which we as impure and unholy are not exposed, and of which, therefore, we can form no adequate conception. And by none but Christ could atoning sufferings and death have been undergone, because, it was only *God manifest in the flesh*, which Christ was, who could have exhibited holiness and purity in our nature; who could have *voluntarily* assumed the human form, *voluntarily* subjected himself to earthly trials, and *voluntarily* parted with his earthly life; and, above all, who, as possessed of a life over which death had no power, could have *exhausted* or *swallowed up* death in himself. Now, do those who [426] contend for Christ having suffered and died *in our stead*, merely mean, that the sufferings and death which he underwent could have been undergone *by himself alone*, and that they were undergone by him *for our sakes*?<sup>202</sup> If so, they and I are at one. In this case there is, there can be, no dispute between us. His peculiar and intense sufferings, as a pure and holy being, — his exhaustion of death, as essentially the deathless one, — and his being the communicator, not the recipient, of everlasting life, — being points in regard to which Christ necessarily differs from all who ever have worn, or ever shall wear, the human form, are not merely conceded by me to my opponents, but are even gloried in by me. But let us not be told, in future, of God rescuing us from sufferings hereafter which, *as having threatened*, but for Christ's sake *He must have inflicted upon us!* In other words, of God, for Christ's sake, submitting to have *His justice tainted* and *His veracity impeached!* No. Thinking and speaking according to *the lively oracles* themselves let us ever maintain, that Jesus came into the world, not to save us from a single pang which the justice and truth of God, expressed in the original threatening, required we should undergo; but that, allowing the original threatening in its full extent to take effect upon every one of us, he might, by his own death and by thereby swallowing

up death in himself, render our endurance of the penalty denounced in the original threatening consistent with our enjoyment of everlasting life. He died not *in our stead* but *along with us* here, that he might live not *in our stead* but *along with us* for evermore hereafter.

<sup>202</sup> Taking in also the idea of his having been *one with us*.

Is it still insisted on, that he died *in our stead*? Well, be it so. He certainly as *God manifested in the flesh* has accomplished *for us*, what we could not have accomplished *for ourselves*. 2 Cor. 5:21.

[427] M

Volume II, page 138.

"The word עֹלָם, *olem*, (or עוֹלָם, *owlem*), which the Septuagint translate (wherever it respects time) by the Greek word αἰών, (and which translation seems to have been the occasion of the frequent use of that word αἰών afterwards among the Greek Christians), it is well known, is usually in our Old, as is also the word αἰών in our New Testament, rendered by the English words *eternal*, *everlasting*, and *without end*; but how justly is the question in debate. This word עֹלָם, *olem*, among the *Hebrews* signified as a verb, *to hide, to conceal, to reserve in darkness and secresy*; as a noun, *uncertain, indefinite, undetermined, undeclared*; and consequently applied to a person it means, *an uncertain, an indeterminate person*; and applied to time, (its only use which at present concerns us), *an indefinite, undeclared, though very long time*. The word αἰών among the *Greeks* signified, in its genuine meaning, *an age, or so long as very old men live, a term of about a hundred years*; yet sometimes the *Greeks* applied it to a much longer term than an 100 years, and sometimes to a shorter term; so that the word αἰών, *aion*, corresponds tolerably with the word עֹלָם in its *use*, though not in its *natural import*; for though αἰών signifies not as עֹלָם, *hidden, covered, concealed, indefinite, unascertained*, yet, as applied to time, it denotes what is very like this, *a long, though undetermined portion or period of time*."

The above passage, supported and illustrated by a number of scriptural quotations and critical notes which for the sake of brevity I have omitted, occurs in a very learned, valuable, and instructive work, published in 1761 anonymously, but supposed to be from the pen of Stonehouse the friend of Wesley, Hervey, &c., en-[428]titled, *Universal restitution a scripture doctrine. This proved in several letters wrote on the nature and extent of Christ's kingdom; wherein the scripture passages falsely alleged in proof of the eternity of Hell torments are truly translated and explained*. The work, I believe, is out of print.

In *The dialogues* of Elhanan Winchester, and other Universalist works, observations on the force and import of the Hebrew and Greek words translated *everlasting*, similar to those just quoted, will be found. The conclusion to which statements of this kind obviously lead is, that the greater part, if not the whole, of the passages in the sacred volume which treat of *the punishment of the wicked*, and *the happiness of the righteous*, have respect to *that punishment*, and *this happiness*, only in so far as *suffered and enjoyed*, during *periods, ages, or æras*; leaving what is to happen when *duration, as measured by ages, shall be no more*, or *at the consummation of all things*, to be settled according to not *inconsistent but still higher principles*. They clearly suppose our Lord, in the 25th chapter of Matthew, 46th verse, and similar passages, and his apostles in various parts of their writings, to have intended merely to direct attention to what shall take place *while ages roll on*, as what is to a certain degree within the capacity of man to conceive of; leaving out of view what is to take place *when ages shall be no more*, as a subject lying too far beyond the grasp of the human mind.

Now although I have taken a different way of answering the objections, derived from the use of the word *everlasting*, which may be brought against the system of Universalism, I have no intention to deny the force and conclusiveness of statements such as those which I have quoted at the head of this article. *Valeant quantum*. They deserve and will obtain the notice of every reflecting mind. It is

remarkable enough, that the anonymous writer's conclusion coincides with that to which, [429] by a series of totally different premises, I have found myself obliged to come; viz., that *during Christ's kingdom, or so long as duration can be measured by a succession of ages*, believers alone live and enjoy happiness; and that it is not *until time and ages shall be no more, or till the consummation of all things*, that the unbelieving part of mankind shall be *delivered from the bondage of corruption*, by being *created anew*.

## N

### Volume II, page 167.

As the author prefers no claim to originality in his denial of *the immortality of the soul*,<sup>203</sup> so neither does he assert that he has been the first to discover the distinction between *soul* and *spirit*. The following long and interesting quotation from the anonymous work already alluded to, *Universal restitution a scripture doctrine*, will shew that the distinction in question had caught the attention of others before him. If there be any novelty in his views concerning the matter, it chiefly respects the consequences which he has attempted to prove necessarily flow from it.

<sup>203</sup> See the works of Dr. Law, Bishop of Carlisle, especially his "Considerations on the theory of religion," and his Discourse on "The nature and end of death under the Christian covenant."

"The human soul in its own nature mortal or corruptible.

1. "We read (Rom. 8:29), God has predestinated us to be of one form with the image, (or personal representation), of his Son, i.e. to become like Christ glorious in our outward persons, by being inwardly begotten of him, and so full of his life and immortality. [430] For this life is to be effected in us by a regeneration; the soul of man being, as his body, a mere mortal in herself, until she derives her spirit or quickening principle by regeneration from Christ the second Adam, 1 Cor. 15:47; John 1:13; Eph. 2:1.

"By this derivation (which St. Peter calls, 2 Peter 1:4, a being made a partaker of the divine nature), she becomes what her second Father is, a living spirit, as says our Lord, John 3:6, That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is Spirit. John 6:63. It is the Spirit that quickeneth. So says St. Peter, 1 Peter 1:3,4. He (Christ), hath begotten us again (Rom. 9:26, the children of the living God, and by so being) to an inheritance in corruptible.

"St. Paul tells us that (1 Tim. 6:16), God only hath immortality; and does not this sufficiently prove that his creatures have it not? and that immortality can no otherwise be had by them than from him? and it is produced in us (1 Peter 1:23,  $\epsilon\kappa$ ) out of an incorruptible seed, ( $\delta\iota\alpha$ ) by the logos of the living God which abideth *æonianly*; as we also abide in him, the sons of his own similitude.

"The mortality of the soul was therefore a doctrine universally received by the primitive Christian writers, namely, Justin Martyr, Tatian, Irenæus, Athenagoras, Theophilus Antiochenus, Tertullian, Cyprian, Arnobius, Lactantius, as well as by the Jews of the apostolic age; till about the end of the fourth century; when the opinion of a natural immortality of the soul first began to spread itself, with the notorious decay of Christian faith and light.

"Indeed, common sense may teach us, that whatsoever is passible, (as is the soul), must also be mortal in its own nature, since passion or suffering tends to dissolution, and so to death.

[431] "In this view of things, we learn how to understand the word  $\piνευμα$ , spirit, as used with the word body, in James 2:26, namely, as the body without the spirit (i.e. the soul) is dead; so, &c. — For the spirit which Christ imparts to us is that to the soul, which the soul is represented to be to the body.

"The soul is naturally (i.e. in her unregenerate state) void of spirit, and so in a corruptible habit. This we can learn from Acts 3:23, Mat. 10:28, James 5:20, compared with Jude 19, where the psychical or

soul-man is by a periphrasis called a soul (without, or) not having a spirit.

"The soul's present unquickened state of living is the result (not of any immortalizing spirit essentially united to her, much less of any power of life in her own self, but) of a נשמה חיים (or which is the same רוח חיים) breath of lives, called in Greek πνοή (see Acts 17:25) extrinsically communicated to man in common with all other animals, (see Genesis 2:7, 6:17, 7:15,22) and imparting to all creatures a successive vitality suitable to their respective natures.

"So then to be predestinated to become images of Christ, is to be predestinated to become his children, or to live in his life, of which we read, Rom. 8:10, Now if Christ be in you, the body indeed is dead, through the sin-offering, but the spirit (derived from Christ) is alive, through the righteous one; and if the spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead, will also quicken your mortal bodies, by his spirit that dwelleth in you."

*Universal restitution a scripture doctrine, &c. Note on Letter 21st.*

Although the author by studying the 15th of 1st Corinthians was satisfied of the correctness of the distinction between *soul* and *spirit*, previous to his perusal of the preceding extract, he suspects that the first idea [432] of the subject may have been suggested to him, by some strikingly original observations contained in the works of the Rev. Robert Riccaltoun, of Hobkirk, which he met with as far back as 1825.

## O

Volume II, page 175.

ECCLESIAST. cap. 9, ver. 5.

*Mortui, autem, nihil sciunt amplius.*

Inepte torsit hunc locum Hieronymus ad mercedem mortuorum in purgatorio. Nam Salomon sentire videtur mortuos sic dormire ut prorsus nihil sciant. Et plane credo non esse in scriptura locum fortius pro mortuis dormientibus et nihil intelligentibus rerum nostrarum, contra sanctorum invocationem, et purgatorii fictionem. Est vero Hebraismus, *non est eis merces*, quem nos sic reddimus Germanicé, *Es ist mit ihnen umsonst, die da tod sind*. Omnia eorum sunt nihil, non jam faciunt profutura, sicut alibi legitur, *Est merces operi tuo*. Et Paulus, *Labor vester non erit inanis*.

Ver. 6.

*Amor quoque et odium.*

Omnia intellige activé ut supra, id est, beneficia quæ faciebant amando, obediendo, &c., tradita sunt oblivioni. Quod vero Hieronymus cavillatur, "tametsi mortui nihil sciunt quæ aguntur in mundo, tamen alia sciant quæ fiunt in cœlo," *error est ac stultum*.

*Nec preterea partem habent in mundo.*

Id est, nihil nobiscum habent commercii. Describit mortuos quasi insensata cadavera, &c.

Annotat. Luther. in Ecclesiast. An. 1532.

Tom. 3, fol. 271, edit. Jen. 1603.

[433] Ver. 10.

*Quia in inferno nullum est opus, &c.*

Alius locus quod mortui nihil sentiant. Nulla, enim inquit, est ibi cogitatio, ars, cognitio, sapientia. Sensit ergo Salomon, *mortuos omnino dormire, et nihil prorsus sentire*. Jacent ibi mortui, non numerantes dies vel annos, sed excitati videbuntur sibi vix momentum dormivisse. Infernus autem



significat foveam, sepulchrum, proprie vero me iudice significat, ilium abditum recessum in quo dormiunt mortui extra hanc vitam unde anima abit in suum locum, (qualiscumque est, non enim corporaliter esse potest). Ut intelligas infernum dici, ubi continentur animæ, *et quasi quoddam sepulchram animæ*, extra hunc corporalem mundum, sicut terra est sepulchrum corporis. Quid autem illud sit, hoc est nobis incognitum. Sic Genesis 42:38. *Descendam lugens ad infernum*, item, *Deducetis canos meos cum dolore ad inferos*. Non enim veri sancti descendunt ad inferos ut ibi aliquid patiantur; sunt itaque mortui extra locum, quia quicquid extra vitam hanc est, extra locum est, sicut et post resurrectionem exempti erimus a locis et temporibus. Sic Christus quoque extra locum est, contra illos qui captivant Christum loco, cum tamen ubique sit; neque enim verbum Dei segregatur a carne, ubi Deus est, ibi et caro Christi est, sed Deus est ubique, ergo et Christus quoque ubique est. Id. fol. 272.

## P

Volume II, page 192.

The North American Divines, of the Universalist School, have of late years directed their attention very particularly to the fate of the unbelieving portion of the human race, after the termination of their connection [434] with this present world. While many of them, with Winchester, Chauncey, Douglas, &c., still retain the notion of *limited punishment*, that is, *torments*, being endured in a state of existence subsequent to the present, several of them, with Messrs. Ballou of Boston, and Balfour of Charlestown, (Massachusetts), at their head, have espoused the doctrine of *all punishment terminating with this present world*. To the politeness of the last-named gentleman, I am indebted for having had an opportunity of perusing the lively, ingenious, and talented productions, in which he has broached and supported his favourite opinion. His Inquiries "into the scriptural import of the words Sheol, Hades, Tartarus, and Gehenna, all translated Hell, in the common version," — "into the scriptural doctrine concerning the Devil and Satan, and into the extent of duration expressed by the terms olim, aion, and aionios, rendered everlasting, for ever," &c., and other works, will well reward the time devoted to the perusal of them. I think that Mr. Balfour and his friends have missed sadly in not perceiving the distinction between soul and spirit, — the present possession of the first fruits of everlasting life by God's people, — and the fact that believers continue to live even when their earthly existence comes to an end. It also strikes me, that they have not a distinct idea of who are the wicked, and of what that is wherein their everlasting punishment consists. Had Mr. Balfour understood these matters, he would have been far more successful in his controversy with Mr. Hudson, than he appears to me to have been.

## Q

Volume II, page 221.

The following, expressed syllogistically, is the argument prosecuted by the apostle, in the passage of the [435] eighth of the Romans, which I have been quoting and commenting on.

### THESIS.

We who believe are heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ; our joint inheritance consisting in sufferings here, and glory or manifestation hereafter. Verse 17th.

### FIRST ARGUMENT.

Reason for present sufferings not detracting from the value of the future glory considered as an inheritance.

That which is so trifling as to bear no conceivable ratio or proportion to the future glory or manifestation, cannot be regarded as in the slightest degree detracting from its value:

But present sufferings are so trifling, as to bear no conceivable ratio or proportion to the future glory:

Therefore, present sufferings cannot be regarded as, in the slightest degree, detracting from its value. Verse 18th.

#### SECOND ARGUMENT.

Reason for present sufferings bearing no conceivable ratio or proportion to the future glory.

That towards which the strongest instinctive longings and tendencies of the whole intelligent creation as undergoing present sufferings are directed, must be something fitted to be a full compensation for the endurance of these sufferings, which it can be only by annihilating them:

But the future glory, or manifestation of the Sons of God, is fitted to be a full compensation for the present sufferings undergone by intelligent beings, for it completely annihilates these sufferings:

[436] Therefore, the future glory, or manifestation of the Sons of God, is that towards which the strongest instinctive longings and tendencies of the whole intelligent creation, now in a state of suffering, are directed. Verse 19th.

#### THIRD ARGUMENT.

A series of reasons, why the fact of the endurance of sufferings by intelligent beings now, although these sufferings are the result of sin, is not inconsistent with future emancipation from them.

First reason for present sufferings being perfectly consistent with future emancipation.

He who has been *involuntarily* subjected to a state of sin and suffering, cannot be treated as if he had placed himself *voluntarily* in such a state; and as sufferings hereafter would be the suitable punishment of intelligent beings who had placed themselves *voluntarily* in such a state, it is clear that intelligent beings who have been *involuntarily* subjected to sin and suffering here, cannot be subjected to sufferings hereafter:

But human beings have been placed in a state of sin and suffering *involuntarily*:

Therefore, human beings cannot be subjected to sufferings hereafter. Verses 20th and 21st.

Second reason for present sufferings being followed by future deliverance from them.

The sufferings of creatures, however intense, can never be carried beyond a certain length; relief of one kind or another, whether by death, or by obtaining the deliverance which a woman in the pains of childbirth does, being the necessary result:

[437] But human beings are creatures subjected at the present moment to sufferings of the intensest kind:

Therefore, from their present sufferings, human beings are destined, in one way or another, and at one period or another, to obtain deliverance. Verse 22d.

Third reason for the present sufferings of intelligent beings being followed by deliverance from them.

That which is an essential property of sufferings as undergone by any one class of

human beings, must be an essential property of sufferings as undergone by all of them:

But the sufferings, which, from our connection with the body, are still undergone by us who are the Sons of God and have the first fruits of the Spirit, necessarily point to future deliverance from them on our part; or, it is essential to the undergoing of sufferings by us now, that they shall be followed by emancipation from them in our case hereafter:

Therefore, the sufferings undergone by the rest of the human race, necessarily point to future deliverance from these sufferings on their part; or, it is essential to the undergoing of sufferings by them now, that they shall be followed by emancipation from them in their case hereafter.<sup>204</sup> Verse 23d.

<sup>204</sup> Perhaps the conclusion may be thus briefly expressed: Therefore, a state of suffering cannot be the final state of any intelligent being. Or, therefore, a state of suffering, instead of being the ultimate state of any intelligent being, must, in the case of every such being, be a state subservient and preliminary to an ultimate state.

#### FOURTH ARGUMENT.

Reason for the present sufferings of the Sons of God, pointing to deliverance from these sufferings on their part.

[438] That which is an object of *divine hope*, is something which, although not enjoyed now, is yet *certainly* to be enjoyed hereafter:

But emancipation from present sufferings is, to the Sons of God, an object of *divine hope*:

Therefore, emancipation from sufferings, although not enjoyed by the Sons of God now, is a privilege which *certainly* awaits them hereafter. Verse 24th.

And so on.

#### R

Volume II, page 361.

It is scarcely possible to conceive greater controversial ignorance, or unfairness, than is displayed by Dr. Hamilton of Strathblane, in his "Remarks on certain opinions recently propagated respecting universal redemption" already referred to. In that work, the Bereans are represented as holding, that "1. God, for Christ's sake, loves every human creature, and has redeemed all by the death of his Son. 2. As it is only for the sake of the atonement that any iniquity is forgiven, and the atonement was complete on the day that Jesus died, the sins of the whole world were all pardoned then, and every child of Adam succeeds by birth to an interest in Christ, and all the blessings of his salvation. 3. Saving faith is the knowledge or belief of the truth, that Christ is the propitiation for sin, that he died for the ungodly, that God loves us, has redeemed and pardoned us. 4. Justification is the knowledge or belief that we are redeemed and pardoned. 5. Since all men are born with an interest in Christ, and the sins of the whole world were forgiven when Jesus died, it is as absurd to pray for mercy, pardon, an interest in Christ, and similar [439] blessings, as to pray for our creation, the formation of the sun or moon, or the communication of gravity to matter." *Remarks, &c.*; pages 22 and 23. Now, not to take notice of the other false representations of the Berean doctrines which abound in Dr. Hamilton's works, but to confine myself to the quotation just made, I observe, that out of the five sentences of which it consists, three, viz., the first, second, and fifth, state what is positively untrue; one, viz., the third, defines saving faith in a way which I do not think the Bereans themselves would approve of; and one, viz., the fourth,

although expressing a sentiment of the Bereans, in the sense in which they themselves employ the words, does not so in the sense in which they are employed by Dr. H. More particularly. In the first place, the Bereans do not hold, that "God for Christ's sake, loves every human creature, and has redeemed all by the death of his Son;" — on the contrary, they hold, that "God loves only his people or the elect, and that He has redeemed them only by the death of His Son." In the second place, the Bereans do not hold, that "the sins of the whole world were all pardoned when Jesus died, and that every child of Adam succeeds *by birth* to an interest in Christ, and all the blessings of his salvation;" — on the contrary, they hold, that "by the atonement of Christ Jesus, all the sins of the people of God were taken away, and that every one belonging to the number of God's people, in due time enters *by faith* into the enjoyment of his interest in Christ, and all the blessings of salvation." In the third place, the Bereans do not hold, that "since *all men were born with an interest in Christ*, and *the sins of the whole world were forgiven when Jesus died*, it is as absurd to pray for mercy, pardon, an interest in Christ, and similar blessings, as to pray for our creation, the formation of the sun and moon, or the communication of gravity to matter;" — on the contrary, they hold, [440] that "since *every one who believes, knows his interest in Christ*, it is as absurd for *every one who believes* to pray for mercy," &c. In the fourth place, I do not think that the Bereans would define *saving faith* as being abstractly, "the knowledge or belief of the truth, that Christ is the propitiation for sin, that he died for the ungodly," &c.; but, on the contrary, they would define it as a principle which always *has reference to ourselves*, or, as the knowledge or belief that Christ is the propitiation *for our sins*, that is, *the sins of us who believe*, that he died *for us who believe* although by nature ungodly, and that *he loves us, has redeemed and pardoned us, who believe*." In the fifth place, "Justification," according to the Bereans, "is the knowledge or belief that *we*," not *as mere human beings*, which is evidently the sense in which Dr. Hamilton assumes them to hold the idea, but *as believers* "are redeemed and pardoned." In one word, the Bereans, instead of giving into and sanctioning the Arminian errors which Dr. Hamilton would represent them as having adopted, contend for *the five points*, in their Calvinistic sense, as fully and strenuously as the most decided supporters of the Decrees of the Synod of Dordt can do.

Poor Dr. Hamilton's mistake has arisen, from his confounding the sentiments of the Bereans, with those which have been espoused and propagated by Messrs. Irving and Campbell. But is blundering like this excusable in any man, especially in one pretending to be a learned divine, when we consider, that the views of the Bereans have been before the public, in the writings of Barclay, Brooksbanks, Nicol, &c., for more than half a century; and when it is well known, that the Bereans of the present day have in no material respect deviated from the sentiments of their founders? That they have neither adopted nor sanctioned the views of Messrs. Irving and Campbell? Surely wisdom and common honesty both dictate, that before any man attempt publicly to controvert the doctrines of others, he should at least *make himself acquainted with what they are*. To Dr. Hamilton I do not wish to impute any defect in the latter quality; and, therefore, I am reduced to the other alternative of concluding, that, in the particular case before us, he has not shewn himself to be overstocked with the former.

It will not do for the Dr. to attempt to defend himself by alleging that, although differently expressed, the sentiments of Mr. Barclay are *at bottom* the same with those of Mr. Campbell: for, to say nothing of this at present, the question here does not concern Dr. Hamilton's *conclusions*, but Dr. Hamilton's *professed statement of facts*.

May I hope that the Dr., as in duty bound, will take an early opportunity of publicly avowing his regret for having thus, through ignorance, or inadvertency, fallen into the misrepresentations of the Berean doctrine with which I have shewn him to be chargeable.

FINIS.

R. Riddick, Printer, Liverpool.