THE TRUE PHILOSOPHY OF LIFE

2nd Cr. LIVERED TO THE
NOV 20 1897
Library of Congress.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS.
BT78
Chap. Copyright No.
Shelf. K4
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

....THE....

True Philosophy of Life

AS IT RELATES TO

THE PRESENT AND THE FUTURE

VIEWED IN THE LIGHT OF

REASON AND REVELATION.

BY

L. C. KERR, MINISTER OF THE GOSPEL,

BELMONT OHIO,

1897.

"Come now, and let us reason together."

"Prove all things; hold fast that which is GOOD."

"In thy light shall we see light."

"Buy the truth and sell it not."

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
OFFICE OF
NOV 5 1897
Register of Copyrights.
TWO COPIES RECEIVED
60248 c2

PRICE, $1.25.

BT78
.K4

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1897,
By L. C. KERR,
In the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington.

THE LIBRARY
OF CONGRESS
WASHINGTON

PREFACE.

In presenting this volume to the reader we wish to say that it has been our object to rely mainly upon divine authority for the claims herein set forth, esteeming this of paramount importance to any or all others, believing this thought to be shared by every truth-loving individual. And while we have brought forward human authority, it was to show that there are others holding in common the same views, and not from any notion of infallibility attaching to such authority. In this attempt to adduce *human* testimony, *moderation* has been observed, as the reader will notice, thinking it better to give a few as samples out of the many, than to take up space in multiplying such testimonies thereby reducing in proportion the divine. In doing this we remark, if the claims made in this volume have not been sustained it certainly was not from any lack of Bible evidence. Our appeal to settle controverted questions has been to the tribunals of Reason and Revelation; we know of no better.

If it should be thought that this book breathes rather a spirit of controversy throughout, we must not forget how it is written, "*without* controversy great is the mystery of godliness" (1 Tim.,3:16);also that divine Truth, like the precious

metals of earth, is not procured without digging deep for; while error, like the gross substances of no real intrinsic worth, lies upon the surface, to be obtained at no cost. When we consider that we are living in an age of fables, when people in general will pay vastly more for *fictitious* literature than they will for the *veracious*, and a story or tale of a fabulous nature has a relish to it for many which sacred narrative does not possess; that error and fiction of the various natures can live and thrive without controversy, or so much even as to be questioned—while divine Truth, on the other hand, must force its way into minds by dint of Reason and Logic, if it would receive recognition at all: does there not exist a necessity to contend in righteous disputation upon the field of controversy for the sovereign claims of divine Truth? These facts evidence to us that we have reached the time in this world's history of which the Apostle Paul spoke in his Letter to Timothy, when he said: "The time will come WHEN THEY WILL NOT ENDURE SOUND DOCTRINE; BUT AFTER THEIR OWN LUSTS SHALL THEY HEAP TO THEMSELVES TEACHERS, HAVING ITCHING EARS; AND THEY SHALL TURN AWAY THEIR EARS FROM THE TRUTH, AND SHALL BE TURNED UNTO FABLES" (2 Tim. 4:3). We are requested by the Holy Spirit to "contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints," (Jude 3), and that is no less than what we have attempted to do in this book. It is ours, as Christians, to "prove all things, and hold fast to that which is good." (1 Thess. 5:21). The Apostle Paul

reasoned with the Jews *out of the Scriptures;* and when before Felix, he "*reasoned of righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come.*"

The reader is invited to a careful perusal of the following pages that he may know something of the reasons we assign for the hope that is within us. Keenly sensible of the imperfection of this work, it is now committed to the direction of the Lord on its mission of salvation, that it may be as "bread cast upon the waters," to be found "after many days."

L. C. K.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTION 9

CHAPTER II.

MAN'S CONDITION BY THE FALL 30

CHAPTER III.

REDEMPTION BY THE ATONEMENT . . . 51

CHAPTER IV.

THE CONDITIONS OF SALVATION; OR WHAT WE MUST DO TO BE SAVED 119

CHAPTER V.

THE KINGDOM OF GOD 171

CHAPTER VI.

THE KINGDOM OF GOD—WHAT IT IS. (Spiritual) 193

CHAPTER VII.

THE KINGDOM OF GOD—WHAT IT IS. (Literal) 210

CHAPTER VIII.

SANCTIFICATION—AS TAUGHT IN THE SCRIPTURES 236

CHAPTER IX.

THE DAY OF JUDGMENT—ITS OBJECT . . 298

CHAPTER X.

IMMORTALITY CONDITIONAL 348

CHAPTER XI.

SIGNS OF CHRIST'S APPEARING 410

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTION.

It may appear to the reader like a very indefinite term we have chosen for a title to a book, as the word "philosophy" is so comprehensive in its scope, being the "science of things divine and human, and the causes in which they are contained. When applied to God and the divine Government, it is called *theology;* when applied to material objects. it is called *physics;* when it treats of man it is called *anthropology and psychology*, with which are connected *logic* and *ethics;* when it treats of the necessary conceptions and relations by which *philosophy* is possible, it is called *metaphysics.*" We see then, according to the definition, as given by Webster, that the term is very comprehensive in its reach. It is also called, "the love of, inducing the search after, wisdom." The "*philosophy of life*," then, practically considered, would be "life" *viewed in the light of wisdom.* With this thought in view, I have selected the word *philosophy* and prefixed to it the other word "true," to distinguish it from the *false.* I do not mean to say that *philosophy* is in any wise false, but that the notions many people hold regarding life, and which they are pleased to denominate philosophy, are no less, to put it in

Pauline parlance, than "*philosophy falsely so called.*" There is so much of the spurious, like counterfeit coin, that goes under the name of "genuine" that it is in place to make the requisite designation; so that we thought it in keeping with the design of this work to title it "The True Philosophy of Life." Whether it shall be worthy of such an appellation of intrinsicality or not, we will leave the candid reader to decide.

With this thought of the subject before us, and in keeping with a proper appreciation of the same, let us endeavor to ascertain, as far as it is our privilege, what is the true *status* of life. What is life? is a question that we instinctively propound to ourselves, and one which is variously answered. The nature and complexion of the answer may depend largely upon the feelings, habitudes, and circumstances of those answering the question. Persons who have an easy time of it in this world, know nothing of the wants, privations, or physical ills, so general among men, would answer *according* to what life appears to them to be. Temporally speaking, life would be worth considerable to such. But to the other class—and the world is full of them—the answer would be very different. Not being blessed with physical comforts like the others, they would naturally take a much less exalted view of it; and so the estimations of life and the answers to that question would be as varied as the conditions and circumstances of those persons. But these would all be circumstantial answers, and hence

incorrect. The answers to our question would therefore be according to the standpoint from which life was viewed, and necessarily as diversified as the contingencies of human existence could admit. We see in this what and how varied are men's notions of life, and what a false philosophy of the same, if we may be allowed that term to express it, they have entertained. But, in order for us to get a correct answer to that question, we must view life from a disinterested, and therefore correct, standpoint. This will bring us to a right conclusion. When the Apostle James propounded the question, "What is your life?" he had the true answer in his mind; and I am well convinced that it was the real philosophical view of what this mortal life is. Hear the answer to the question, "What is your life?" "It is even a vapor, that appeareth for a little time, and then vanisheth away." (James 4: 14). This is very strong language; and yet no stronger than our brief stay here upon earth verifies. If this were the view entertained by people universally, we would behold a very different condition of things than now exists throughout the world. Men would be much more apt to live as they would wish to die.

When I ask the question, "What is the true philosophy of life?" I use the term in a teleological sense, or with reference to the *aim* and *object of life*. In the schools of the ancient philosophers the question was propounded: "What is the proper and final end of all human con-

duct?" and the answer given by each was characteristic of the doctrine of that school. Aristotle's answer was, "Happiness in a peculiar sense;" the Stoics replied, "A regard to the whole universe of being;" the Epicureans said, "Pleasure and the absence of pain." It will be seen that these several answers to this very important inquiry recognize an end within a means; or in other words place "the proper and final end of all human conduct" within the bounds of this mortal life. But is this the "final end of" life? if so, the so-called philosophy of the Epicureans was quite reasonable; for they held, that inasmuch as death ended all, and there was to be no hereafter, they ought to get all the good out of this mortal existence it was possible to obtain; hence their answer, "Pleasure and the absence of pain." Epicurus, for that reason, taught his followers temperance in all things, that they might get out of life its best possible expression. In doing this they would escape the many pains and other ills so incidental to the life of the inebriate, the libertine and the glutton. Mark, he did not observe these rules from principle, or because he considered there was anything *morally* wrong in life, but a *physical* wrong. He discarded, therefore, everything that tended to make people uncomfortable or unhappy—thereby keeping the vital economy untrammeled in its operations to the normal development of all the organic functions, indispensable with the enjoyment of the sensuous pleasures of life. And to this view of life agrees the Apostle Paul

on future existence by a resurrection from the dead, on the condition that death ends all. He says: "If after the manner of men I have fought with beasts at Ephesus, what advantageth it me *if the dead rise not? let us eat and drink; for to-morrow we die.*" He would not be less logical than the Epicureans. If there would be no resurrection from the dead, he too thought it best to enjoy the *present* as much as possible.

"The true philosophy of life," then, or the proper view and purpose of it, would lead us *to make the most and best use of it.* Whether it is a means to an end, or whether it is an end in itself, it is our province and privilege to know. I put the subject in this inquisitorial manner, as though I were not fully settled in which is true; and my reason for this is not from any disbelief in the sacred Scriptures that I entertain, but because there will be many, doubtless, of a sceptical tendency who will read this book. It is, however, no easy task to write for both believers and unbelievers. Yet at the same time if I can, in part at least, edify the one and convince the other, I shall consider I have not labored in vain.

Is there a life beyond the present one for mortal man, as *an outcome and end of this*—a life to which *this is a "stepping stone?"* or is *this all and an end to all—both a means and an end in itself?*

Atheists tell us we have nothing above, but everything in common with, the beast; that we sprang from the animal by evolution, and as it must return to the earth at the end of its exis-

tence, so must we to remain forever under the dominion of what is termed "death;" that there is no accountability on man's part, because *no one to be accountable to beyond himself*, and consequently, no retribution; that punishment for sin, and reward for obedience are mere figments of belief dwelling in the lofty regions of a few diseased imaginations. And this being so there is no use in us being concerned about matters of a *supposed* future, and expecting something that can never happen.

If this present life is all and death ends all, as these self-styled philosophers claim, it is certain that our condition, as human beings, is no better than that of the animal in point of destiny, for all die alike and return unto Mother Earth, to sleep an eternal sleep; while it is not as good by far in point of enjoyment *while we live*. For, while the animals know nothing about the troubles and anxieties to which man is born, and in which he lives and dies, they having, as a rule, the normal use of all their powers, have an infinitely greater amount of enjoyment during their ephemeral existence, in that sort of pleasure peculiar to their species. The animal, like man, is a sensuous creature possessing the five senses, which being normal give a pleasure to existence; while man, through sin and depravity, benumbs his sensibilities, vitiates all the vital functions of his being, thereby rendering himself miserable when he might otherwise be happy. Animals never kill themselves to get away from the miseries of this world, allowing that they

possess sufficient sagacity and power to do so,—and I have no doubt about it—life never becomes so intolerable as to cause that creature to put an end to his own existence. But how is it with man? In this respect man falls *far below* the brute. Self-destruction among the human family is a thing of such common occurrence that we take but little notice of it. Men are killing themselves and each other all over the world; suicide and homicide are epidemical. The brute kingdom knows nothing of the atrocities and cruelties in the midst of which man "lives, moves and has his being." Instead of man being at the head of creation, where God placed him, he is at the tail of it; and when he ought to be at the top, he is at the bottom. If *sin* has not done this revolutionizing, I would exceedingly well like to have some savant (?) of the no-life-beyond-the-present theory come to the front and inform us what has. How does he account for this wonderful turn-around of things? Or, was the animal, the brute, always in the lead? if so, why not look up to it as the primordial creature, or being, not from which man has *generated*, but from which man has *de*generated. Things in the moral world, like things in the realm of physics, descend by the force of gravity. If man is the offspring of the animal, as the pupils of this agnostic school claim, why is it that he *ascends and descends at the same time?* They never argue that the animal is superior to man in mental make-up, symmetry of mold, and beauty of form; but the opposite, that man is *superior* to the animal in

these respects. This is evolution ASCENDING. Man as a moral being, has deteriorated, and gone far below the animal, a fact which they would not attempt to dispute. This is evolution DESCENDING! Now, as like begets like, and the stream cannot rise higer than the fountain, how does it come that such superiority is produced by and flows from such inferior source? As the stream cannot exceed the fountain in height, but may descend infinitely lower, there would be much more plausibility in the claim that the animal had *descended from man*, than that man *ascended from the animal!*

To believe in such evolutional incongruities would require a greater stretch of credulity, than to believe the extravagant theory of Papias' exuberant fruits of the millennium. Ridiculous as it is, it shows to what extent some people will be led by a theory, ever so absurd. Papias, of the second century, is said to have believed that a single colossal grape-vine of the millennial age, fully developed, would bear 10,000 branches, every branch 10,000 shoots, every shoot 10,000 sprigs, every sprig 10,000 bunches, every bunch 10,000 berries, every berry 36 times 25 gallons of wine; and if a saint come to pluck a berry, they will all cry out: "Pluck me O, Saint, I am better, and praise the Lord through me." This seems like the climax of absurdities; but no more absurd than the theory that man is the *offspring* and *posterity* of the animal, and primordially the loathsome reptile. A greater absurdity and impossibility than this would be

hard to imagine. Yet we are called upon to accept of this, and swallow it down without questioning for truth. But this is one of the master arguments of that class of so-called philosophers, who claim there is no life beyond the present.

According to them, there is no such thing as sin in the world. While they admit—for they cannot deny it—that in a moral point of view man is far below the animal, they cannot tell us how it happened. Here they come to a missing link in their evolutional concatenation of causes. To admit sin would be to admit law; for "sin is the transgression of law"—and to admit law would be to admit a *law-maker*, or a *law-originator*, omniscient; and as *no law* can exist *without* a penalty, there must be a retribution, and consequently, a *hereafter*, when that law-maker "will render to every man according to his deeds." But, is there no *sin* in the world? Who is so demented as to believe *that*, in the face of a world of demonstration to the contrary? It certainly would be easier to believe the story of Papias's mammoth grapes than to believe that. We do not need any theology, or philosophy either, to prove that *sin exists* in our world; it is axiomatic. We cannot say of the brute that *it sins*, for it knows *nothing about the moral law*, and therefore, to it there is no transgression; "for by the law is the knowledge of sin," and "sin is not imputed when there is no law." Rom. 3:20; 5:13. A man could about as consistently deny his *own existence*, as to deny that there is *a law in the world governing man's life*, and making him *an*

accountable being. This cannot be rationally disputed. *Who* made that "law?" To say that *it made itself*, would be *worse* than foolish, to say nothing about being unscientific. Nothing in science and common sense can be produced *without a cause*, as every rational person knows. There cannot be, scientifically, an effect that was the *cause of itself*. *Every effect* is the *result of some acting force* or *power* OUTSIDE *of itself;* or, in other words, it is *not the agent* but *the thing done by the agent.* Law is the work of an agent, so to speak; the effect of a cause lying outside of and beyond itself; therefore it had a maker. And as it is super-human in its origin and intelligent in design, it must have been devised in the mind of an omniscient being, which is none else than "the GOD of the spirits of all flesh."

But again: We are told by these no-future-life philosophers, that not only what proves to be law, *made itself*, or came into existence by spontaneous process, but that *everything else did.* All the things we behold in the physical universe were *self produced.* They cannot see how there could have been an over-ruling, all-creative power in existence from eternity, who is operating in space, filling it with planets, or worlds, and giving order and law to the wonderful mechanism of the same; but they can *understand* how the materials composing those worlds, or matter, could exist from all eternity, actively operating upon itself in building up worlds, or spheres, and these throwing themselves into space at relative distances from each

other, and setting themselves in motion with such regularity of movement and precision in course, with infinite complications, so adjusted and arranged that each will travel its own *self*-assigned path, nor leave it to cross that of another, nor show the slightest tendency to err in its eternal march! Now if it take "a great stretch of faith to believe the Bible," as these men tell us, what would it take to believe this theory of "world-building," pray? They also talk about the "*absurdity* of creeds;" but this absurdity *out*-absurds *all the creeds of Christendom*, from the Niceno-Constantinopolitan of A. D. 325 to the Vaticanian of A. D. 1870! They *pretend* to believe that this dead, inert mass of matter, at some juncture in eternity, breathed life into itself, took on the power of force; and like Samson with the gates of Gaza rose up, and moved off in its infinite ponderosity on its cosmoplastic, or world-building, mission; in the expression of its wonderful activities, to fill eternity with labor and dot the immensity of space with worlds; and all this *through the power and wisdom of dead, inorganic, nonentitative matter!* And then, as if to cap the climax of absurdities, they tell us that *they don't believe in miracles!* All Bible miracles pale before these atheistic miracles. They find a great deal of fault with creeds, and marvel at their gross inconsistencies. But let us compare a statement as it occurs in two creeds,—a church creed and the atheistic creed, and see how they stand in regard to consistency. The Westminster Creed affirms that

GOD made all things. Anything very alarmingly inconsistent in this claim? Who else is capable of doing it? But here is the atheist Creed for it; it says "NO ONE *created* all things!" or "ALL THINGS *made themselves!*" which amounts to the same thing. Any inconsistency here? One would think from such statemehis as this by atheists that they would be the *last* men in the world to talk about the "inconsistencies of creeds;"

It may be said that we mistate them; but we plead "not guilty" to the charge. Let us see. An atheist is one that does not believe in the existence of God; for that is what the word signifies, (from "a," *without*, and "theos," *God*, "*without* God.") Here we start their theory, *without intelligence*, and, consequently, *without design;* therefore whatever is done is done *without any end* in view, there being no mind or entity to direct, devise, or plan. Now who is going to do it? There is nothing but matter, dead matter, anywhere. It will not help matters any to say that there are "laws of nature" in existence to accomplish the work. Where did *they* get these "laws of nature ?" Did they create themselves ? or did they come by "spontaneous generation?" To say that they created themselves would be no less absurd than the claim that the worlds made themselves! If "spontaneously generated from what germ did they generate? Were there other laws from which they took their existence? If so, where did those, their progenitors, spring from? But who ever heard or read

of "the spontaneity of law?" To say that they always existed independently, would be too puerile to demand intelligent notice. It does not require even a modicum of intelligence to understand that the word, "law," carries wrapped up within itself, and essential to its existence, the thought of *a "legislator,"* or *"law-maker,"* as shown above. If such could exist, as they claim, which would be an utter impossibility,—a law without a law-maker,—then certainly there could be *no design* in its workings; as there can be *no* design without *an intelligence to design*, or plan;—no design without a designer. Then we should have, not the present order and system we see but, a universe of "chance," where would reign chaos and confusion. In this condition of things, allowing that such could exist, for argument sake, could there be anything more inevitable than *universal "smash-up?"* What could prevent it? Seeing there is no design, no controlling or governing power at work,—nothing but *insensible* laws attending to affairs; to which we could attribute thought or intelligence with the same degree of propriety that we could to *a tree, a stone*, or any *other inanimate thing*. To suppose, or believe such a condition of things possible would be the sheerest nonsense, as any rational person can see at a glance. But this is the inevitable conclusion we must reach, if thoughtless law is the sole arbiter and sovereign of the universe, unaided by wisdom infinite. If our atheistical friends are tired of this horn of the dilemma, seeing inanimate, thoughtless laws

could not control matters intelligently, they are at liberty to take the other (horn), and attribute *thought* and *intelligence* to those laws; and then, as there can be no thought without a thinker; no intelligence or mind without personality or being, it follows that the working of those laws is the expressing of infinite wisdom in the person of Deity, God! There is no dodging this conclusion. All the atheistical sophistry they can invent will not save their cause.

But, a little further: We showed that those "laws of nature," operating *without intelligent direction*, if such thing could be, must work without design or plan, (as nothing short of an intellect can design); and therefore we should behold all the phenomena of nature expressed without order or design, which would be disorder and confusion. Now to reason backward from effect to cause, what are the characteristic manifestations of those "laws" governing the universe? Do we see *design* displayed in them? Answer, Do we see ANYTHING BUT DESIGN DISPLAYED? The most *perfect order* and *design* is manifested throughout. This fact no atheist will attempt to dispute. Therefore, there must be *a designing intelligence at work in the cause*, as design can be predicated of nothing but *intelligence*; hence God. The "laws of nature," then, are but the expressions of a designing Intelligence, or Creator, working everything after the counsel of His own will, giving the most exalted exhibitions of omniscience conceivable; and not an aimless, designless, inanimate, nonentitative, self-created

self-operating set of rules, or principles, peculiar to atheistical fancy, which could have no possible existence, except in the regions of a morbid imagination.

But we turn once more to the thought of things sublunary. We are told by this class of philosophers that all forms of life on our earth are the results of "Spontaneous Generation;" that dead, inert matter here, as in theother case, infused life into itself and put forth the manifestations thereof in peopling this world with all the varied forms of lifeand being, from themoneron to the mastodon, and on! But it has been proved that "Spontaneous Generation"—called by scientists, "abiogenesis"—is a nullity, and "biogenesis"—the doctrine that "life begets life"—an established fact. For the benefit of those that may be inclined to doubt this sensible position, if there should be any among the readers of this book, I give the following extract from "Natural Law in the Spiritual World," a very able, scientific work by Henry Drummond. He says:

"For two hundred years the scientific world has been rent with discussions upon the origin of life. Two great schools have defended exactly opposite views—one that matter can spontaneously generate life, the other that life can only come from pre-existing life. The doctrine of Spontaneous Generation, as the first is called, has been revived within recent years by Dr. Bastian, after a series of elaborate experiments on the beginnings of life. Stated in his own

words, his conclusion is this: 'Both observation and experiment testify to the fact that living matter is constantly being formed *de novo* (anew), in obedience to the same laws and tendencies which determine all the more simple chemical combinations.' Life, that is to say, is not the Gift of Life. It is capable of springing into being of itself. It can be spontaneously generated.

"This announcement called into the field a phalanx of observers, and the highest authorities in biological science engaged themselves afresh upon the problem. The experiments necessary to test the matter can be followed or repeated by any one possessing the slightest manipulative skill. Glass vessels are three-parts filled with infusions of hay or any organic matter. They are boiled to kill all germs of life, and hermetically sealed to exclude the outer air. The air inside, having been exposed to the boiling temperature for many hours, is supposed to be likewise dead: so that any life which may subsequently appear in the closed flasks must have sprung into being of itself. In Bastian's experiments after every expedient to secure sterility, life did appear inside in myriad quantity. Therefore, he argued, it was spontaneously generated.

"But the phalanx of observers found two errors in this calculation. Professor Tyndall repeated the same experiment, only with a precaution to ensure absolute sterility suggested by the most recent science—a discovery of his own. After every care, he conceived there might still be un-

destroyed germs in the air inside the flasks. If the air were absolutely germless and pure, would the myriad life appear? He manipulated his experimental vessels in an atmosphere which under the high test of optical purity—the most delicate known test—was absolutely germless. *Here not a vestige of life appeared.* He varied the experiment in every direction, but *matter in the germless air never yielded life.*

"The other error was detected by Mr. Dallinger. He found among the lower forms of life the most surprising and indestructible vitality. Many animals could survive much higher temperatures than Dr. Bastian had applied to annihilate them. Some germs almost refused to be annihilated—they were all but fire-proof.

"These experiments have practically closed the question. A decided and authoritative conclusion has now taken its place in science. *So far as science can settle anything, this question is settled. The attempt to get the living out of the dead has failed. Spontaneous generation has had to be given up. And it is now recognized on every hand that life can only come from the touch of life.* Huxley categorically announces that *the doctrine of Biogenesis, or life only from life, is 'victorious along the whole line at the present day.'* And even while confessing that he wishes the evidence were the other way, Tyndall is compelled to say, '*I affirm that no shred of trustworthy experimental testimony exists to prove that life in our day has ever appeared independently of antecedent life.*'"

We have in this experiment the touchstone by

which the atheistic fallacy of *spontaneous generation*, or the origin of life out of dead matter, is tested and exposed to the satisfaction of every candid, thinking mind. *Nothing from nothing, and nothing remains*, is a truism that will apply with all its force here. So far as the principle of life being inherent in lifeless matter is concerned, there is *nothing* in it; and the attempt to get it out surely is to get nothing, and there is nothing left. Nothing from nothing comes. All this boast about *life independent* of a life-giver, like all other systems of sophistry, falls to the ground. And then, the foolishness of such an idea is surprising indeed! To suppose *that creation, with all its vital phenomena, came into being by fortuity, and without a creative power*, seems too stultifying a notion to be entertained by any intelligent person for a moment! I can only account for such fatuity by the averment of the Psalmist in Psal. 53: 1, and it is this: "*The fool hath said in his heart*, THERE IS NO GOD!" The Psalmist knew that no wise man could gaze upon the face of the visible creation, beholding its wonderful manifestations, speaking in tones more audible than vocal utterance, of the power and glory of its Creator, and then contend that no such Being existed! So we read it in Psal. 19: 1–3: "The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament sheweth his handiwork. Day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night sheweth knowledge. There is no speech nor language, where their voice is not heard."

The thought, then, that there is an all creative

power behind this great creation, Who has made the worlds and this earth, and all that are therein, before Whom and in view of Whom all intelligence stand in awe, leads the disinterested individual to this inevitable conclusion, viz: *That He surely would give us some kind or species of revelation* as to *our destiny and His will concerning us.* This is more than an inference; it is a logical deduction from the true premise laid down, and becomes a philosophical expediency. Has He done so? We answer in the affirmative, He HAS, *most assuredly*; hence *the Source of the Christian Scriptures!*

"The true philosophy of life," then, would be to learn what that "Destiny" and "Will" is, which will bring us to a candid and unbiased investigation of the sacred pages of that Book of books—The BIBLE. That Book tells us of a Life beyond these mortal shores where pain and sorrow, sickness and death, man's inheritance here, "will be feared and felt no more;" and where we shall see and converse with that wonderful Being Who has created all things by the fiat of His Power; and of Whose work and wisdom we know so little. If there is anything else in this life that is more worthy of the engagedness of our time and energies than this, I confess I know not what it is. If this is not the *real* and *true* "philosophy of life," then I am ignorant of it. Nevertheless, there is a point of time at which all men take the same view of it that I do, and that time is *at their death.* To be ready *then* for the life to come is a matter of in-

finite consideration to them! It is to these momentous considerations that the following pages will be-devoted, in the elucidation of *some* of the things that we may know if we will. But before entering upon this, I wish to append a few timely thoughts bearing upon the line of this introduction from the able pen of the late Rev. W. E. Channing of the first half of the present century. They are as follows:

RELIGION THE ONLY BASIS OF SOCIETY.

"Few men suspect, perhaps no man comprehends the extent of the support given by religion to every virtue. No man, perhaps, is aware how much our moral and social sentiments are fed from this fountain; how powerless conscience would become without the belief of a God; how palsied would be human benevolence, were there not the sense of a higher benevolence, to quicken and sustain it; how suddenly the whole social fabric would quake, and with what a fearful crash it would sink into hopeless ruin, were the ideas of a supreme being, of accountableness, and of a future life, to be utterly erased from every mind.

"And let men thoroughly believe that they are the work and sport of chance; that no superior intelligence concerns itself with human affairs; that all their improvements perish for ever at death; that the weak have no guardian, and the injured no avenger; that there is no sacrifice to uprightness and the public good; that an oath is unheard in heaven; that secret crimes have

no witness but the perpetrator; that human existence has no purpose, and human virtue no unfailing friend; that this brief life is everything to us, and death is total, everlasting extinction; once let them thoroughly abandon religion; and who can conceive or describe the extent of the desolation which would follow!

"We hope, perhaps, that human laws and natural sympathy would hold society together. As reasonably might we believe, that, were the sun quenched in the heavens, our torches would illuminate, and our fires quicken and fertilize the creation. What is there in human nature to awaken respect and tenderness, if man is the unprotected insect of a day? And what is he more, if atheism be true?

"Erase all thought and fear of God from a community, and selfishness and sensuality would absorb the whole man. Appetite, knowing no restraint; and suffering, having no solace or hope, would trample in scorn on the restraints of human laws. Virtue, duty, principle, would be mocked, and spurned as unmeaning sounds. A sordid self-interest would supplant every other feeling, and man would become, in fact, what the theory of atheism declares him to be—a companion for brutes."

CHAPTER II.

MAN'S CONDITION BY THE FALL.

It requires neither theology nor metaphysics to teach us the fact that man is *mortal and dies.* However sceptical and unbelieving about everything else men may be, this truth they cannot disbelieve. Man does wither away like the herb of the field and die. His stay here upon this earth is short at most. He fain would linger upon these mortal shores and seek to make this "vile abode" his permanent home, but he cannot remain; he must leave it! Cardinal Wolsey is made by Shakespeare to quaintly describe the condition and desire of man in life, in these words: "This is the state of man: To-day he puts forth the tender leaves of hope, to-morrow blossoms, and bears his blushing honors thick upon him. The third day comes a frost (death), a killing frost; and, when he thinks, good easy man, full surely his greatness is ripening, nips his root, and then he falls, as I do." He dies and with him, all his fond dreams of pleasure and continued glory. Wolsey's "frost," invariably, cuts him off before he is ready to depart.

Death, that "King of Terrors," sways his mighty sceptre over this fair earth of ours, sweeping into its dust the teeming millions of inhabitants, and dotting it with graveyards. This

grim monster is cosmopolitan—moving under all suns and in all climes. He recognizes distinctions of neither station nor race. The rude hut and palatial mansion are alike, places of his unwelcome visitation. From the peasant to the prince, and from the savage and degraded Hottentot, to the enlightened and refined American, alike are his victims. The funeral obsequies associated with minglings of tears, griefs, and sympathies by pitied and pitying, compose a part of the social fabric of life; while the mournful procession, slowly marking the way to the last resting-place, tells in accents certain as solemn, that life is only borrowed and "the grave is the house appointed to all living."

If we turn from this mortal scene to ask for an explanation concerning the cause which brought about such calamitous condition of human affairs, "the wisdom of this world," which "is foolishness with God," can give us no solution to the mystery, whatever, or shed one ray of hope upon our benighted pathway in view of an eventual deliverance therefrom; but leaves us shut up to death and doom, to grope our way amid darkness and despair through this troublesome world to that "undiscovered country from whose bourne no traveler returns." But there is a source to which we may go for an answer to this grave enquiry. It tells us the *cause* of man's demise, and the time of its introduction into this world of ours. This "source" of instruction is the Word of Revelation. It comes from the Author of our being. It tells us *how* and

why this dark enemy, Death, came to invade our human rights and rob us of the life so graciously bestowed. It is given in these words: Wherefore, as BY ONE MAN SIN ENTERED INTO THE WORLD, AND DEATH BY SIN, AND SO DEATH PASSED UPON ALL MEN, FOR THAT ALL HAVE SINNED." This, then, solves the msytery, and sheds upon our dark world the light we so much desire. How suitable are the words of St. Matthew's Gospel here: "The people which sat in darkness saw great light; and to them which sat in the region and shadow of death light is sprung up." (Matt. 4; 16.) How true it is then that "if it were not for this gospel how dark this world would be."

This divine revelation informs us of the *cause* of death's advent into the word. "Sin entered into the world, and death by sin." There was a law given to man for his good in the moral government; its penalty, death. Man, by disobedience, broke that law; incurred the penalty, and death followed. And ever since that time man, as a race, has found himself a *dying* creature. To the question, then, asked by the sceptic and the atheist, "Why do men die?" The answer, and the *only* answer that can be given, is BECAUSE MEN BY NATURE ARE SINNERS! This being true, that *sin* is the cause of death, and man is a sinner, man can never be exempt from death until the cause is removed. As long as the cause remains intact, so long will the effect continue in course of operation. But, remove the cause and the effect will cease. If that cause, sin, *cannot* be removed,

then its legitimate effect, death, must continue to all eternity in its active work upon the race of mankind, if the propagation of human species should be allowed to go on. But, stop here, dear reader, and consider this melancholy effect again, and then you will be the better prepared to look at the theme that we are about to introduce. Think of it, I say, what an awful state of things it would be, if death were to continue to reign over the human family to all eternity! NO END to death-beds! NO END to funerals! NO END to the heartaches and anguish! NO END to the rain of tears! NO END to the wrongs suffered by the poor, the defenseless, the fatherless and the widow! In fine, NO END to the CURSE *of humanity!*

But, remember, it will not mend matters in the least, to speculate here, as the manner of some is, by inquiring for the "whys" and "wherefores." The *fact* of the introduction of sin and death into the world is declared. We know we are the victims of sin and death. The more common-sense question to ask would be, "*How shall we escape them?*" God has not told us just his reason for permitting the introduction of sin into the world, and that, in itself, is a sufficient reason that we should not ask the question; because, we may inquire to the end of time and we shall be no wiser than when we instituted the inquiry. It is one of the things that is not for us to know,—possibly, one of "the secret things," and "belongs unto the Lord our God."—Deut. 29:29. To persist in the

determination to *know* something that *cannot* be known, would not be an evidence of mental superiority, but of *mental weakness*. And more than that, for a man to speculate upon the brink of eternal ruin would evince a great lack of intelligence on his part. I am aware of the fact that some persons think it an evidence of their smartness, to raise objections to the gospel, and oppose it; but I cannot compare it to anything else than that of a man *trifling with his doom as he is approaching it*. For, suppose that what he was trying to establish were true, that there is no salvation from sin and death, where does his argument place him? *In eternal death and oblivion*. To *try to establish this, his own eternal ruin, and laugh in view of it, considering it a manifestation of sagacity, or smartness*, would be more compatible with the nature and mental status of the inmates of an Insane Asylum, than with those of a sage or a wit; for none other than a maniac or an idiot could be expected to laugh and sport over his own ruin! So I am candid when I say, that I never hear a person deriding the gospel of his salvation, but I become fully satisfied that I am listening to one who is *mentally deficient*. I have sounded such persons in the different ways just to satisfy myself about it, and I have found it to be true in every case, that *lame in this and lame in everything*. And why not? Would it be good logic to suppose that a man whose mental balance was off, on the prime object of his life and being in the world, should be sound on all things else?

Man was created and put here on this earth for a grand and glorious purpose; and not for what the beast is here, to serve its end for a few months or years at most, and then lie down and perish and be no more. The intellect which recognizes this great truth to the fu'lest extent, possible to man, is of the highest grade, and most complete development; while he who does not recognize the object of man's creation and endowments, must necessarily be of the lowest grade, and approaches nearer that of the animal which sees nothing above or beyond the gratification of its appetites and passions, and consequently, must be, in a large measure, intellectually deficient; while we make all due allowance for the blinding and demoralizing influence of sin upon the intellect of the natural man.

We, as rational creatures, then, must deal with things as they are, and not as we might fancy they *ought to be*. As we have remarked, it would not be wise *to think to change the unchangeable*, or *reject them* because they were not so changed. We are here; sin is here; and death is here. We are the victims. To fold up our arms, so to speak, and succumb to such fatality mutely and complacently, would be suicidal indeed. "A prudent man foreseeth the evil, and hideth himself; but the simple pass on, and are punished." Discretion would dictate to us the availability of the appropriated means of deliverance from sin and consequent death.

But man is not apt to apply for the remedy only to the extent to which he realizes the malady. It is the sick that "need a physician;" and until the victim of sin is brought too see something of the *curse* of it; where it has placed him; what he loses by it here; the forfeiture of eternal life with all its concomitant blessings in the kingdom of God; and the retribution it must, in the very nature of things, entail upon him, when the "secrets of all hearts are made manifest;" until he begins to weigh these things, I say, will he not set about to remedy the evil. Or, not until sin might become "exceeding sinful," and be seen in its true light, and "that sin might appear *sin*," will the victim seek release from its deadly coils. Pope has expressed this thought very beautifully in the following stanza:

> "SIN is a Monster of such horried mien,
> Which to be dreaded is but to be seen.
> But seen too oft, till familiar with her face,
> We first listen, pity, then embrace!"

It is man's familiarity with sin that renders it companionable, and takes away all that is ugly about it in appearance; and it seems to him a rather harmless thing. Solomon says of it thus: "There is a way which seemeth right unto a man, but the end thereof are the ways of death." And again: "All the ways of a man are clean in his own eyes." The congeniality of man's fallen nature to sin may account for so strange an infatuation. And to break this tie of affinity between man and his fatal companion, there must be a

change in man's nature; it can never be accomplished without. Sin is radical and demands *radical treatment.* The love for sin must be eradicated. The texture of man's very being is interwoven with sin, and it becomes, in a word, a part of his nature. It is natural to sin or he wouldn't do it.

This *nature* he inherited in the "fall" of Adam as the Apostle tells us in I Cor. 15 : 47, 48, when speaking of this matter. He says, "The first man (Adam) was of the earth, *earthy.* * * * *As is the earthy, such are they also that are earthy.*" This had reference to his posterity of all time. It follows as a matter of course, that Adam transmitted his *fallen nature* to his posterity just as certainly as he did his *species.* This must follow as a corollary. It is a biological law, that "like begets like," and not the reverse. It is on this principle that characteristic resemblances and traits of character continue to run on through many generations. The parent transmits in part or in whole his special idiosyncrasies, or peculiarities of physical or mental constitution and temperament. It could not, logically, be otherwise. "After their kind" was the principle on which God began to people the earth with all forms of animated existence. And "as the stream cannot rise higher than its fountain," the offspring cannot necessarily, be better than that off of which it sprung; or the source from which it is derived. The stream of water cannot be any purer than the fountain from which it

issues. Therefore, whatever nature Adam took on through the fall would be the very nature he would, by propagation, transmit to his progeny; and as that could be none other than a *fallen* nature it would involve *the fall of his posterity for all time*. And if it was "a *fallen* nature," it was *a sinful nature*," and hence, forces were set in motion which, if permitted to continue long enough, *must people the world with sinners!* And so we behold it.

But, coincidently, we find this doctrine of man's fall repeating itself. It is not only true in *theory*, but true in *practice*. Now what are the facts in the case? We find this, which no one can dispute: Every person in this world,—for this is of that class of rules which has no exception,—becomes a sinner when the circumstances for it have ripened. In other words, as soon as the child crosses "the line of accountability," as it is termed, and *knows* right from wrong, it becomes a transgressor, as we see it. Why this, unless the proclivities to sin were already implanted within the young nature, ready to break forth when the vital forces shall have become developed enough to express them? Man is like the field, in the parable of the "tares and wheat," given by the Savior, and recorded in Matthew's Gospel, 13th chapter; when the wheat was sprung up, and brought "forth fruit, then appeared the tares also;" so when the human life develops sufficiently, then the evil in his nature appears also. This is the carrying out of what the Bible says about the

natural man. "All have sinned, and come short of the glory of God,"—Rom. 3:23. Romans 1st ch. presents a dark picture of full fledged human nature when left to its own spontaneity, to the full development of its lapsed proclivities, and after all divine restrant was lifted off. Hear it:

"Because that, when they knew God, they glorified him not as God, neither were they thankful; but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened. Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools, and changed the glory of the uncorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and fourfooted beats, and creeping things. Wherefore God also gave them up to uncleanness through the lusts of their own hearts, to dishoner their own bodies between themselves: who changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshiped and served the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed for ever. Amen. For this cause God gave them up unto vile affections * * * And even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate mind, to do those things which are not convenient; being filled with all unrighteousness, fornication, wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness; full of envy, murder, debate, deceit, malignity; whisperers, backbiters, haters of God, despiteful, proud, boasters, inventors of evil things, disobedient to parents, without understanding, covenant breakers, without

natural affection, implacable, unmerciful; who knowing the judgment of God, that they which commit such things are worthy of death, not only do the same, but have pleasure in them that do them."

This description of the depravity of human nature, here given by the Apostle Paul, is only a fair sample of what man has exhibited during all time. His history attests the truth of this. Left to himself, it would seem the depth of his depravity is equaled only by that of the demon; for it would be hard to conceive of a condition worse than this drawn by the pen of inspiration. The world for six thousand years, or thereabout, has given evidence of the depth and measure of that fall in all the actualities of which a depraved humanity could be supposed capable. So that to attempt to prove this would be to prove something that had been proved and demonstrated ten thousand times over; as recognized by the Apostle where he says, "We have before *proved* both Jews and Gentiles, that *they are all under sin.*"

The fact of man's fall and the adduced cause of it, so palpable to our comprehension, constitute an axiom that forever annihilates the position of atheists and infidels, and silences their cant and ribaldry in derogation of the sacred Scriptures. For no other hypothesis has ever been, or can be, devised, upon which that "fall" can be predicated, with the least show of consistency, taxing, as it always has, all the ingenuity and sophistry of the schools of sceptics.

We ask our atheistical friends for one species of tangible, or rational demonstration, from their stand-point, of how man's fall and ruin came about and they are as silent as death in regard to it, because they have nothing to offer but their favorite theory of man's frog-ancestry with the rest of its kindred evolutionary nonsense. That man is a fallen creature they do not pretend to deny; but *where* along the differential genealogical line that fall *occurred*—whether between frogdom and apedom, or this side of the latter and before he reached the plane of humanity, or subsequent to it—they have never told us. It might be somewhat interesting to know where they could place the fall of man, with their terribly degrading system of evolution. He could not have fallen, *while in the reptilian kingdom*, as it would be impossible for a reptile to fall—having nothing to fall *from*; and what is true of the reptile is eqally true of the baboon or ape, so far as *morality* is concerned, and so he could not have fallen while in the ape kingdom—having *no standard* yet to fall from. And if he fell *after* he reached the human kingdom, it follows, as a logical sequence, that *he must have come into possession of something* since he left the ape-kingdom to fall *from!* there *must have been a moral standard raised.* And now it would be fully as interesting to have them give us some information regarding this "standard! *Who raised it?* Or did *it also* come by evolution? If so, from what did it evolve? (We are tracing causes and effects now). If the *physical*, in man's evolving from

the reptile, must and did produce *physical* results, then this *moral* standard, according to evolutional principles, must and did evolve of, or from some *moral* cause already in existence. It surely never came up with the frog into the ape, and thus found its way to man, or we should have seen it developed in those creatures. No, neither frogs nor apes know anything about "moral law;" therefore it did not come through them. Now as everything must come by evolution, according to atheists, *morality*, or *moral law*, came by the same process; and as it could not come from the *physical*, as we have shown, then it must have come from some other source; and as it was a separate and distinct thing from the physical, not being inhered in it, it came from a *moral* source, entirely *independent of the material*; and as *morality* is an attribute of *mind* and *not* a property of matter, it follows therefore that it had its origin in an intelligence; and as it could not have been the production of a finite intelligence,—for the less could not produce the greater—it must have had its source in an intelligence that is *infinite*, which was and is none other than the Being we call "God." This establishes the source of man's moral standard—proves it God. It follows, then, that man is not the offspring of the frog and the ape in either moral or physical existence; and that there is no lineal consanguintiy, or descendant blood relationship, whatever, existing between them; but that he is of another and higher type of organized life, endowed with reason and other

capabilities, distinguishing him from, and exalting him above, all other terrestrial, or mundane beings; thereby making him a *moral* creature as well as rational, and consequently, a *subject of moral government*, with a knowledge of obedience and disobedience, and their consequences. Here was not only *moral law*, but a *moral subject*, to whom it could apply, and with whose intelligence such law was perfectly compatible. But to talk about the progeny, or offspring, of frogs and apes having a "moral government," seems so silly that, to be candid about the matter, there must be a sad lack of common sense in the mind of the individual who advocates it, to say nothing about its being at war with scientific reasoning. And yet we have men who lay great claims to intellectual superiority teaching this kind of foolishness, wherever they can find people alike foolish enough to listen to them. If this is the best that Ingersoll has in stock for his fellow-creatures, he is certainly not *a benefactor*. One of two things is true with the man who advocates this absurdity, be his claims to wisdom what they may: HE EITHER DOES NOT BELIEVE IT, OR HE IS NOT BRIGHT!

With the fact, then, that the moral law, or standard, came from God and did not spring out of the ground as a production of matter, as any rational person ought to know, man's *fall* and the *consequence* of it are plain. There was such law given to Adam. I am aware of that stated in the fifth chapter of Romans, where it is said, "Until the law (given by Moses) sin was in the

world: but sin is not imputed where there is no law. Nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses. * * * Moreover the law (of Moses) entered, that the offence might abound." And also in John 1:17, "The law was given by Moses." From these statements some have inferred that there never was any law in existence till that one given on Mount Sinai through Moses to the Children of Israel. But this latter was called, *the* law, because it was the first written code of commandments that we have any account of, and that ever was given to man expressing all the duties and obligations resting upon him. While this is true in a more general sense, the other is true in a special sense. There was given to Adam a moral law peculiar to him, as the first and head of a race; the penalty of which was death, the same as that of the other law; though not to be inflicted by the same executive process. The law given by Moses took on more of a civil character, and like the law of the land its penalty was executed by the hands of man; but the law to Adam was not a civil law, but purely a moral law, the transgression of which, in the very nature of things, would bring about the penalty. As soon as Adam transgressed he became a dying creature, and the penalty was fully and finally inflicted when he was nine hundred and thirty years old. That "the wages of sin is death" was as naturally demonstrated in his case as in that of all his dying posterity. And so "death" continued, as Paul says, to reign right on without any interruption over all, though

they "had not sinned after the similitude of his transgression." And it mattered not whether those to whom the law of Moses was given, kept it or not, they suffered the penalty of Adam's law just the same, while the infliction of the penalty of Moses' law was only due the transgressor. For in Adam's transgression the penalty, death, fell on all his posterity for all time. "Through the offence of one many were dead;" and "by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation;" and so "death passed upon all men, in whom all have sinned." (Rom. v.). And again, the penalty of Moses' law was *temporal* death, as we would speak of the penalty of the law of the land being inflicted for a capital offence; while the penalty incurred by the transgression of Adam's law, or the law given to Adam, was *eternal* death. This law did not only call for the *execution* of the transgressor, but forbid him the right to ever live again; or in other words, it held him under its dominion to all eternity. So that it is very plain, that all his (Adam's) children must die and continue to die, without any hope of ever re-living, so far as the present state is concerned.

The reason for this seems philosophical enough. We stated before that Adam, through disobedience, fell and became possessed of a *fallen*, or *depraved* nature, and also of a *dying* nature; and that he imparted, or transmitted that same condition of existence to his offspring. This is axiomatic, from the fact that he could not impart to posterity *what he did not possess;* or he could not

give to them any better nature than *he* had. The fountain from which they must flow, so to speak, was one of sin and death. Now to expect righteousness to issue from such a fountain would be contrary to philosophy and common sense. And inasmuch as such an existence must eventuate in death and dissolution, it must just as certainly *continue there*. It surely cannot rise up and revive of itself. To suppose this would be about as absurd as the atheistical notion of the worlds, or planets, creating themselves, or frogs transmuting themselves into moral human beings! And it is just as certain again, that the law that put them (Adam's posterity) to death would not, nor conld not raise them to life. And now how are they to get out from under the power and penalty of that law? They *cannot* get out. And so the human family go continuously on peopling the regions of the dead without one ever returning therefrom, and will as long as the eternal ages shall roll, unless some power shall interpose and stop it. The penalty for sin is death; and as all have sinned *in* Adam, and by nature *after* Adam, that same "all" *must die*. "In Adam all die." Neither sin nor death is in the least degree reconstructive in its tendency. Their functions are those of demolition and destruction. One robs man of the power to work righteousness, and the other puts a period to his existence, respectively. And they are so related and associated that they cannot be separated; so that he who possesses sin, has, locked up within his vital

economy the very elements essential to his dissolution. To make men see this is the first element to be considered in the analysis of the redemptive scheme.

From these considerations we find the transgressor under a double penalty. (1) The penalty incurred by Adam's transgression which is eternal death, and from which there could be no release, placed him back into the original elements from which he was taken. That penalty was couched in this language to Adam and involved the race, "Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return." (Gen. 3:19). And as we have said, he was made a transgressor in this case not from choice, or "willingly, but by reason of him (Adam) who had subjected" him to it. (2) The penalty of "the law" given by Moses, which law "entered that the offence might abound," laid him under its infliction, and was the second. Nor need this be objected to on the ground that this last named "law" was given to the Jews, or Israelites, and was peculiar to them only. It is true that the *written* law, "written and engraven in stones," was given to and for that people and for all who should, during their dispensation, become Israelites; but it is also true that the principle of that law extended *beyond* them, and formed the basic element in Roman Jurisprudence and subsequently entered into the civil polity of all the enlightened nations of earth; while the "letter" of it passed away with the Jewish Economy. If any one denies this latter claim, and contends that the "letter" is still in force

and binding, let him produce the "tables of stone" on which it was written, or keep still. "The letter killeth but the spirit giveth life." The "letter" was done away with and succeeded by the ministration of the spirit, as the Apostle tells us in 2 Cor. 3d ch. And, so far as the "principle" of that law governing the affairs of the nations of earth is concerned it has carried its punitive significance with it in the expression of its penalty; and consequently that law is as peculiar to the civil polity of the nations of earth today as it was to that of Israel in their day, in the way of acquiting the innocent and punishing the guilty; that in as far as it extends over the earth today, so far does the penalty of it fall upon the head of the criminal; while back of and beyond that there still hangs over him the other penalty of eternal death.

But we have only touched upon this subject of the two laws and their respective penalties to illustrate the point in question. The law of Moses was called "the law of a carnal commandment," and spoke "death" to the trangressor, while it could not confer "life;" but it pointed to a law called "the law of life," of which in a certain sense it was a type. For while the law of Adam, as we term it, passed the penalty of death upon all mankind, and that unconditionally, this law of Moses made the penalty *conditional*,—confining it to the transgressor; and in this it pointed to a law yet to come which would condemn only the transgressor, and offer life to the obedient. This shadowed forth the mercy of that law which

the Apostle called, "the law of life in Christ Jesus," and which he says "made him free from the law of sin and death." This made the law of Moses typical of that greater law which was to follow; as its giver, Moses, was typical of the giver of the greater, Christ. So we read, "The law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ," and then "we are no longer under a schoolmaster." It will be the province of the next chapter to notice that which the law of Moses has pointed out and typified.

A SUMMARY OF THE CHAPTER.

The following are the points touched on in this chapter as they seem related to each other, given ordinally:

1. That man is a *dying* creature is attested by all the veritable data conceivable. His trend is toward "Mother Earth."

2. Sin is the only adducible cause of death's advent into our world; and sin is the Transgression of Law.

3. The Bible is the only source of information and light respecting the *time* of the introduction of sin into this world.

4. Man is a *sinner by nature.*

5. Death, the effect of sin, can never be abolished until the cause of it is removed. So long as sin reigns death must continue its devastating work upon the human family.

6. There is nothing gained by making light of, or treating with indifference, this sad and lamentable condition of humanity, other than the display of a woeful lack of common sense on the

part of those who indulge in this fatal kind of levity,—more befitting a lunatic than a sage.

7. We as rational creatures should flee from sin and its allurements as from a deadly serpent. This is wisdom. "The prudent man seeth the evil and hideth himself, but the simple pass on and are punished."

8. To accomplish man's emancipation from the thraldom of sin, his nature must be changed, and "the old man with his deeds put off."

9. Man's fallen nature was inherited from Adam, the progenitor of the race, which could not be otherwise.

10. Left to himself, man's depravity is illimitable, as described in Rom. 1: 21-32, and attested by his history of all time.

11. The moral law, given to Adam, the transgression of which brought the penalty, death, could not come by evolutionary process, as atheists teach, but was the production of Omniscience, in corroboration of Bible testimony, showing that Revelation and Science agree.

12. The law of Moses "entered that the offence might abound," and was the first *written* law we have any record of, therefore called, *the Law*. This law could not give life; but the penalty of it being inflicted conditionally, it pointed to a law which could give life, called in the New Testament, "the Law of Life." In this function of it the law of Moses was typical of "the Law of life."

With these facts before us, the way is open for the consideration of the Plan of Redemption in the light of Reason and Revelation.

CHAPTER III.

REDEMPTION BY THE ATONEMENT.

"For the law having a shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things, can never with those sacrifices which they offered year by year continually make the comers thereunto perfect." (Heb. 10:1).

"But now once in the end of the world hath he (Christ) appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." (Chap. 9:26).

In the last chapter we showed that man as a race was placed under the penalty of *eternal death* through the transgression of Adam, and that in the very nature of the circumstances involved there could be no release. We also showed that another law was subsequently given, called "the Law of Moses," which prescribed obedience; and while it passed the sentence of death upon the offender, or transgressor, it acquitted the innocent, thereby signifying conditions of life and death, relatively. And that this law did not offer life even to the obedient, but permitted those to live who did not transgress it, in which it represented a condition of things in the future under which man, fallen man, would be pardoned from under the power and penalty of eternal death, and brought back, as it were, to be placed on probation, or trial, as Adam was before he fell, and thus delivered from the Adamic penalty. In this capacity the "Law had

a shadow of good things to come;" while in that it could not confer life, it was "not in the very image of the things to come." Or to put it in the language of the Apostle Paul, it was "what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh." (Rom. 8: 3,) and being faulty (Heb. 8: 7), it made "nothing perfect," while "the bringing in of a better hope did." (Heb. 7: 19). As this law "could never make the comers thereunto perfect," it must, in God's redemptive economy, point out and give place to a system that would carry with it all the requisites involved in the accomplishment of man's salvation. It is incumbent upon us, therefore, to deal with the *representatives* of the "things" first, rather than with the "things" themselves, or with the "shadow" before coming to the Substance "of good things to come," which will bring us to consider some features of

THE LEVITICAL PRIESTHOOD.

The imperfections of the law are only equaled by those of the priesthood. For we have in this Economy an erring mortal man for a priest, and a perishable animal, as a species of sacrifice. Says the Apostle, "If perfection were by the Levitical priesthood, (for under it the people received the law), what further need was there that another priest should rise after the order of Melchisedec, and not be called after the order of Aaron?" It is very evident that if this Levitical institution with all its legal and sacrificial significance, could have perfected man in

redemption there would have been no need for Christ, of another and higher order of priests, to appear at the end of that Economy to do it "by the sacrifice of himself."

The question may arise here, why was this system of things instituted at all then, if it were not sufficient to accomplish man's salvation? We reply, God never intended it for this purpose. We apprehend that He had two grand objects in view in instituting the Levitical system: 1. It was to show man in the most effectual manner his total incapability to save himself, or even to work righteousness in his natural condition. All that there was possible for man to do in and through things earthly to that end, seemed done in this institution, only to picture to him that "by the law was the knowledge of sin;" that a higher power must come to the rescue if man's salvation would be effected. 2. It served as a fine illustration of that system that could save him, with its offerings, sacrifices, priestly mediations, and all there was about it of ritualistic moment. For while "it was not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats could take away sins," it was quite feasible that these should serve as illustrations of a blood that could cancel sins. In this sense the tabernacle with all its appurtenances served as "patterns of the true tabernacle which the Lord pitched." We cannot do better in the consideration of this system of worship than to let the Apostle Paul outline it for us. In his Epistle to the Hebrews he draws a very graphic

picture of the ritualism of the Aronic Priesthood. He says:

"Then verily the first covenant had also ordinances of divine services, and a worldly sanctuary. For there was a tabernacle made; the first, wherein was the candlestick, and the table, and the shewbread; which is called the sanctuary. And after the second vail, the tabernacle which is called the Holiest of all; which had the golden censer, and the ark of the covenant overlaid round about with gold, wherein was the golden pot that had manna, and Aaron's rod that budded, and the tables of the covenant; and over it the cherubims of glory shadowing the mercy seat; of which we cannot now speak particularly. Now when these things were thus ordained, the priests went always into the first tabernacle, accomplishing the service of God. But into the second went the high alone once every year, not without blood, which he offered for himself, and for the errors of the perple: the Holy Ghost this signifying, that the way into the holiest of all was not yet made manifest, while as the first tabernacle was yet standing; which was a figure for the time then present, in which were offered both gifts and sacrifices, that could not make him that did the service perfect, as pertaining to conscience; which stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances, imposed on them until the time of reformation." (Heb. 9. 1–10.)

We have here given a complete system of ritualistic service;—all the parts of it were very

significant for what they were intended to represent, in the portraiture of the wonderful scheme of redemption. Let us look at them in the order they are laid down by the Apostle here, and then at what they represent. They are as follows:

1. The Tabernacle. As related to the sacrifices, there were: (1) the outer enclosure where the sacrifices were slain; (2) the sanctuary, where the subordinate priests officiated; and (3) the *Sanctum sanctorum*, or Holy of holies, where none but the high priest entered to do service. In the sanctuary proper, and after the "first vail," were, (*a*) "the candlestick," (*b*) "the table;" (*c*) "the shewbread." After "the second vail." in the "Holies," were, (*a*) "the golden censer;" (*b*) "the ark of the covenant," in which were, "the golden pot" containing "the manna," "Aaron's rod that budded, and the tables of the covenant," and over it "the cherubims of glory."

2. Sacrifices. These were, (1) sheep; (2) cattle; (3) goats; and (4) turtle-doves.

3. Priests. These consisted of two orders: (1) the subordinate Priests; (2) the high Priesthood.

Thus we have outlined the grand system of tabernacle-worship. Let us now look at what some of these elements typify in the gospel Economy.

The first we noted of these was the outer enclosure of the tabernacle where the animals were slain and offered. (Lev. 4 : 14, 15).

1. This represents the world, in its anti-christian spirit, where Christ suffered and was offered.

in sacrifice; and where millions of His followers have been also immolated.

2. The sanctuary where the subordinate priests accomplished their services, signified the gospel privileges, or the body ecclesiastical of the gospel dispensation with all its gracious bestowments. The subordinate priests here represent the ministers of Christ in their work of soul-saving. Then there was the candlestick of pure gold for illuminating the inside of that part of the tabernacle. This is said to emblematize the church; but it is more than this. For there are church organizations which do not signify *light*. This is something that gives light, or rather, is the *source* of light, which cannot be said of the visible church: and what is this in the gospel dispensation but the Holy Spirit? It is true that Christ's people are called "the light of the world," and they are also told to let their "light shine;" but the light they possess is only *borrowed* light, and they *reflect* this, only. Christ said of Himself, "*I am the light of the world.*" So whether we speak of it as coming from Him or from the Holy Spirit, it has reference to the same source of light.

The *table* is significant. Cruden says that "table," in one sense, signifies provision for food, either for body or soul. Jamieson, Fausset, and Brown give its signification as that of *life*.

The *shewbread* has a place in the gospel economy, also. It prefigures the Eucharist, or Communion.

3. The *Holiest of all*, signified Heaven itself. In the type, the High Priest entered alone once a year with the blood of the victim to make atonement for himself and the people. In the antitype, Christ the High Priest enters into Heaven to make atonement for man.

(1) The golden censer, filled with incense, answered to the prayers of the people of God for all coming time.

(2) The ark contained the law on the two tables of stone, representing Heaven as the source of law and order. Hence it was called "the ark of the covenant" or law, as it is termed in different places. With the cherubim overshadowing, it signified the presence of God. It contained the pot of manna, and Aaron's budding rod. The former of these signified the bread of eternal life, "which came down from Heaven, which if a man eat of it he will never die." (John 6: 50, 51). And the latter (the budding rod) signified regeneration of the natural man, through the power of God. Aaron's rod came into conspicuous notice before. While in the court of Pharaoh it took upon it, by miracle, the form and life of the serpent, the most befitting emblem of the old fallen nature that possesses all the race of mankind. But here in the typical heaven it puts forth buds, manifesting the vegetable life, emblematical of the life of the "new creature." It had vegetable life in the first place, and to resume that would be but legitimate, while it would be a wonderful display of miraculous power in turning a dry rod into a budding bush, as it

were. In this thought we can learn a great truth. Regeneration means *second birth*, without which no man can enter the kingdom of God, (see John 3: 3); and it does not rise out of *man*, but has its source *in Heaven;* it is of God and comes from God. "*Born from above*" is the meaning of John 3: 3, 5.

(3) And again: among the notable things here is "the mercy seat." I do not know what thought occupied the mind of the Apostle Paul when he came to this part of the analysis, if it was not the same one that occupies my mind this minute, judging from what he said in this connection. When he gets to "the mercy seat" he seems to pause, as if at a loss how to proceed with so vast a theme, and then dismisses it with these concluding words, "*Of which we cannot now speak particularly.*" He well knew that when he had reached this point in unfolding the wonderful plan of redemption in the type that he had come to that part which represented the *core* of it all. This was the indescribable part of the work. It was that which represented the *mercy of God*; and who will pretend to *describe* this, when "the *half* has never been told?" It was in this that the salvation of poor sinning humanity had birth and hence the inadequacy of human speech to depict it.

(4) In the Holiest place the cherubim are situated on either side of this "mercy seat" with their wings overshadowing it, representing the mercy and protecting care of the Lord over His creatures. This seems to be the meaning given

to one use of wings when thus expressed in Bible metaphor. Jesus uses this figure of wing-protection when speaking to Jerusalem and warning her of dangers to come, taking the familiar example of the domestic fowl protecting "her brood under her wings," to illustrate His own fostering care. (Luke 13:34). David speaks of the Lord as protecting and shielding him under His wings. (See Psalms 17:8; 57:1; and 91:4). The figure is most sublime and invites our contemplation. However, we shall find this thought and theme of mercy pervading all other thoughts connected with the plan of salvation from first to last.

4. The Priesthood, we have referred to, represented the two phases of gospel work,—the divine and the human. The High priest in his annual offerings in the Holiest of holies, prefigured Christ, the Melchisedec High Priest, appearing in the presence of God, in Heaven itself, in atonement for perishing humanity, while the subordinate priests answer to the evangelistic work, also done by God through human agencies and instrumentalities. But this phase of the work was peculiar for one thing in the offerings, and that was its diurnal, or daily observance. These priests were engaged in offering up sacrifices *each day*. This suggests to us the force of what was meant in that expression of Christ where He, in referring to this same work to be done, said, "If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross *daily* and follow me." (Heb. 10:11; Matt. 16:24). The followers of Him should labor thus *daily*.

5. The Sacrifices represented among others two very important things in the great system of antitypes: 1, they, (the animals), with their shed blood, all pointed to the Great Sacrifice to be offered "in the end of the world," or Jewish age in the person of Jesus Christ "once for all," as has been already expressed; and 2, these sacrifices typified another class of offerings, or sacrifices, peculiar to the age to which they pointed. These latter were offered by the true and spiritual people in all ages of the world; but in the Dispensation typified by the Jewish, it was to be the *only* kind of offerings made,—Christ having removed all others. In the 51st Psalm, at the 17th verse, we find this kind of sacrifices mentioned. The Psalmist here compares both classes—the typical and the antitypical, discarding the former and owning the latter. Typical: "Thou (Lord) desirest *not sacrifice*; else would I give it; thou delightest *not in burnt offering.*" Antitypical: "The sacrifices of God are a *broken spirit: a broken and a contrite heart*, O God, thou wilt not despise." (Vv. 16, 17). And the New Testament breathes the same spirit of sacrifice. The Apostle, in speaking of these spiritual offerings, says: "By him (Christ) therefore let us offer the *sacrifice of praise* to God continually, that is, *the fruit of our lips giving thanks to his name. But to do good and to communicate forget not; for with such sacrifices God is well pleased.*" (Heb. 13:15, 16). This is the carrying out of the same thought

expressed by the Psalmist in the passage above referred to. (See v. 15).

This kind of sacrifice is said to be "well pleasing to God," because it is the true sacrifice, reaching the heart; while the literal, typical offering was only external, and ineffectual in that it did not emanate from a "contrite heart," or "make him that did the service perfect, as pertaining to conscience." For "the law having a shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things, can never with those sacrifices * * * make the comers thereunto perfect. They would have ceased to be offered, because that the worshippers once purged should have had no more conscience of sins."

We have here contrasted the real needs of the human heart with the lack in those offerings to relieve the needs. Just like all systems of ritualistic religion, the worshippers are not edified by these; but rather condemnation results from the observance, and that alone, of the mere ceremony. God is such a reader of the human heart that He knows when the affections are enlisted in the service and when they are not. And just here we see a second antitype reached by this Jewish system of sacrifice. As we have said, it typified the true worship, and gave place to it, when Christ "appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself;" while in the nearer image of it, it represented a species of spurious worship in the Gospel dispensation, called "christian worship," of which Christendom is full. This may seem an unpleasant

thing to say; but if the facts bear us out in this why should we hesitate to utter it? I am certain, however, that we have in the world of today more of the spurious, in antitype of the Jewish, than we have of the genuine,—a fact that no candid observing Christian individual will presume to deny. And how could it be otherwise? Human nature is just the same today that it was in the Jewish dispensation, whether in Jew or Gentile. And we know enough of what it was in that people during their history; for the same nation, or race, that stained their hands with the blood of the animal in sacrifice, in the type, were guilty of the blood of the holy Christ in antitype. In this act of violence the Jew only showed out what was in his fallen nature ineffaced and ineffected by the closest adherence to all the conventionalities peculiar to his religious tenets. So that instead of the Jew being made better by this system, his depravity was the more developed, to say the least. The law tended to show what was in his nature, more than to effect a reformation in his life. Of course it could do no more than this while the old fallen nature remained unchanged. Just so far as the divine element entered into him, and the carnal nature became subdued, just that far was reformation effected and no farther. We see this change wrought in many of ancient fame, to which the Apostle refers in the 11th chapter of this Epistle to the Hebrews.

The Jews in their apostasy and consequent blindness could not appreciate their religious privileges, heaven-bestowed as they were; and they came to value the gift or offering from its temporal worth more than from what it signified in its religious aspect, and hence at a later period in their history we find the Savior condemning them for their sacrilege and covetousness. He said to them: "Ye fools and blind: for whether is greater, the gift, or the altar that sanctifieth the gift?" "Woe unto you, ye blind guides, which say, * * * Whosoever shall swear by the altar, it is nothing; but whosoever sweareth by the gift that is upon it, he is guilty." (See Matt. 23:16—21). It was the altar that sanctified the gift, and they had turned it about, and said that the gift sanctified the altar, because they valued and prized the gift more than the altar and all it represented. In that Economy, as they had every means to know, the altar was a sanctified and sacred thing from the very fact of its existence. Sanctity gave birth to the purpose of the altar; and it must and did in the very nature of it, sanctify whatever was placed thereon, in the type.

When we come to look for the counterpart in the antitype, we find that the altar corresponds to the *motive*, and the offering to that which the motive prompts to do. This seems both Scriptural and logical. Let us see if this is not correct. To illustrate: Two men, Mr. A and Mr. B, give to the cause of God $100 each. Mr. A has no particular interest in the cause, and so

gives his $100 *for display and a name among men.* Mr. B *has a deep interest in that cause, and without regard to what people may think or say about it, he gives "as unto the Lord" and for His glory alone.* Now, if the "altar sanctifies the gift" in the type, we have only to find what made the offering acceptable in this illustration and we shall then have found the altar in the antitype. Really, A's gift could not be an acceptable one, inasmuch as he did not offer it unto the Lord, but *to his own vanity*; while B's was fully acceptable. We see, then, what it was that made the difference,—it was the *motive* with which the gift was made; it sanctifies the gift, or offering. And what is true in this illustration is true of *all* such in the Christian Economy. It is not the great amount we do, but the motives actuating the doing that consecrates or desecrates. Jesus taught this doctrine in the following language to His disciples. Hear it: "Take heed that ye do not your alms before men *to be seen of them*; otherwise ye have no reward of your Father which is in heaven. Therefore, when thou doest thine alms, do not sound a trumpet before thee, as the hypocrites do in the synagogues and in the streets, *that they may have glory of men.* Verily I say unto you, They have their reward." (Matt. 6; 1, 2).

In this Scripture Christ only recognizes one kind of offering, while He condemns the other. The Pharisee gave alms as well as the other; but he did it with entirely a different motive, a wrong motive; and that motive condemned him.

The other was characterized by a righteous motive, and that sanctified the alms-offering.

This subject may be considered as tending toward a digression from the main line of thought—that of the Jewish worship; but it is no deviation, for we were describing the types peculiar to the Levitical priesthood and tracing their antitypes into that of the Melchisedec; or into the gospel Economy. And in this investigation, if the reader have been observing he has discovered each part of this system traced to and merged into its antitype, or the thing it represented; inasmuch as these all were calculated to serve their relative purposes in the wisdom of God, in shadowing forth the "good things to come," when the end of that Economy should be reached.

We find during that dispensation, in process of time, that the tabernacle worship gave place to that of the temple, when that system took on a more permanent form in its localization at Jerusalem, where it remained until nullified by the greater, and at which place it was to meet the antitype, or the substance of which it was but the symbol; at which time it ceased to be *legally* observed, though the Jews continued their devotion to it, and thereby brought condemnation again upon themselves. So blinded had they become to the true state of things, that they did not recognize the true system of service when it was introduced; in view of which fact if they had heeded the teachings of the prophets they certainly would have understood

that a greater High Priest than Aaron must eventually appear upon the scene and offer Himself once for all as an effectual sacrifice to God for sin; and that *their* system must give place to *this*. (See Luke 24: 25, 26, 46, 47).

This brings us to consider something of the *nature* of

THAT OFFERING WHICH COULD CANCEL SIN.

We have seen that the offering up of animals was a futile affair in the cancellation of sin; that they never could atone for man's guilt, but were *representations* of the great and effectual offering. It is not necessary for us to give the reason why such sacrifices were ineffectual. Every person who has given the subject any thoughtful consideration knows that the animal kingdom, as well the human, is under the curse, and the sentence of death alike passed upon all; therefore there was no life, either brute or human, that could atone for transgression and redeem man from death. This being so we must look outside of and beyond the human race for an atoning sacrifice. What is true in reason the Scriptures give evidence of. We read: "None of them can by any means redeem his brother, or give to God a ransom for him." (Psal. 49 : 7). And again: "He saw that there was no man, and wondered that there was no intercessor: therefore his arm brought salvation unto him; and his righteousness, it sustained him." (Isa. 59: 16). None in the human family, and we may say that no one among the angelic hosts,

could effect man's redemption from the fall; therefore He is said to have looked in vain, as it were, to these and all other sources for a deliverer; and is represented as "*wondering* that there was no intercessor." Nothing short of a God could create man, to begin with. as we have shown in a former chapter, and when he fell by transgression, none less than a God could redeem him. Watts very beautifully expresses this thought in the following stanza:

> "His sovereign power, without our aid,
> Made us of clay, and formed us men;
> And when, like wand'ring sheep, we strayed,
> He brought us to His fold again."

In the hands of Deity "is the life of flesh;" and He alone holds the power to take it or restore it, at pleasure; therefore we must dissociate our thoughts from any supposed plan or scheme, having for its object man's redemption, which leaves out God as "the author and finisher" of it. How can we arrive at any other conclusion? Let no man deceive you in this, dear reader. All the sophistry under heaven can never alter this fact. And when men get smarter than themselves, and set up the claim that the One appointed of God to redeem sinners, was not a divine being, they say by that assertion *that he was not the Savior!* For we prove that nothing short of divinity could effect the salvation of mankind. If it could be done short of that, will not someone of that wise class be kind enough to just tell us how it is to be brought about? We have previously shown that

man is a dying creature, and has no power to extricate himself from the grasp of death; that he is a sinner and equally unable of himself to overcome it. How then in the name of reason is he going to save himself, or be saved by one as human as he is? If Jesus was no more than man, as infidels tell us, then he was not the Savior; for it is an axiom known to metaphysics that redemption cannot arise out of the object to be redeemed. To assume this would be to confound cause and effect. In physics we must discriminate between these. No effect can be the *cause* of itself. The cause must be a thing separate from and outside of the effect. We carry this axiom into the realm of metaphysics and apply it there. Man is a lost creature, and in a helpless condition. His redemption from this condition, therefore, would be an effect produced by a cause, or agent outside of and above him. It would be foolishness to say that the cause, of which redemption is the effect, lay in the thing to be effected, or the object to be operated upon; or that redemption, the effect, was the cause of itself. As this would be contrary to philosophy and common sense, we must admit, be we ever so sceptical, that when human redemption is effected it must be a power outside of and above the human that will do it; and just as much above it as was that in man's origin, or creation. Hence the divinity of the Savior of sinners.

And again: the conditions of redemption demand a life not inhered in the human. It

must be a life not forfeited by the fall of Adam, as that of all his posterity was thus forfeited. It must be a life upon which no law could lay claim to inflict penalties; but a life free and independent of all laws, being above them. And such a life could come from none other than the divine source, from God. The one who forfeited man's right to life was a son of God, being the first of the human creation; "the offspring of God." So the conditionalities of the restitution would demand just the work of the Son of God, as "by and for Him all things were created," to be in keeping with the divine plan, of which we see so many examples in His word abounding with nicety of adaptation. And so it is said of him in this puissant purpose, by the great Apostle, that he was "declared to be *the Son of God with power.*"

With the fact of it being the *act* of God to redeem man should be considered, in the next place, something of the *nature* of that act. God always works by means, and through means to the accomplishment of His wonderful purposes. In order to reach man's condition this Mediator and Redeemer must come where man is, and relate himself to him by natural ties. Hence he takes upon himself man's nature, and becomes in one sense, very man. He could not reach man's condition and effect his redemption short of this. So we read of him thus: "Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death,

that is, the devil; and deliver them who through fear of death were all their life time subject to bondage. For verily he took not on him the nature of angels; but he took on him the seed of Abraham. Wherefore in all things it behooved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people." (Heb. 2:14-17). And, to the assuming of these conditions in human nature, it is stated in this language: "Wherefore when he cometh into the world, he saith, sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but *a body hast thou prepared me.* * * * Then said I, lo, I come (in the volume of the book it is written of me), to do thy will, O God." (Heb. 10:6, 7).

In this incarnation of the Redeemer, so clearly and explicitly taught in these passages to which attention has just been directed, is given the *human* side of redemption; while, as the Son of God and as God, the *divine* side of it. With this double nature in him we can see how he could approach both parties—*man and God*—and bring together the offending and the offended; and thus place them at-one-ment, (for that is what the word, "atonement," signifies). Man had offended God by sinning against Him; and now there is, in consequence, a wide gulf between God and man. God, as God, cannot go over to man, and man live. Said He to Moses, "No man can see my face, and live." If "meek" Moses could not see the face of Deity, and continue to live, it is very certain that an offending rebel

could not). And, on the other hand, man could not pass from his condition of iniquity over to Deity. I suppose we could use no more adequate terms to express the difference existing between these conditions, than our conception of what is meant by *hell and heaven*; with man so low in depravity, and God so exalted in holiness. And now this gulf, so wide, must be bridged over, or man can never be redeemed. But He who *made* man *knows how to save* him: and so a way is devised in the mind of the Omniscient One. And let me say just here, that it was the best, the shortest, the easiest, if not the *only*, way that it could be accomplished. For it is certain that Omniscience would do nothing *unnecessary*, or make any *mistakes* in this great work. But God must reach man by some means, as man can never, nor will ever, reach God. And so the Son of God, Christ, is clothed in human flesh, or "vailed?" (Heb. 10 20) and appears among men, as very man, "in the likeness of sinful flesh," that he might "by a sacrifice for sin condemn sin in the flesh." (Rom. 8:3). And thus "God was manifested in the flesh," (1 Tim. 3:16); or as John says, "The word (the Logos) was made flesh and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth. (John 1:14). In this way, and in this *only*, God could come in touch with sinful humanity, and humanity be brought in touch with Him. Divinity and humanity thus came together in the person of Jesus Christ. In this dual nature, or blending of the two natures in Christ, as it were, we

can see how he could approach both God and man. "Tempted in all points" like man, he could fill man's part in bearing his infirmities and succoring him; while his divine nature rendered him insusceptible to the practice of sin; so that he could be tempted, as he must be in the very nature of the case, to meet man's condition, and yet never commit sin. And in this way "he is able to save to the uttermost all that come unto God by him," And though "holy, harmless, undefiled," and exalted, "he humbled himself, and was made lower than the angels for the suffering of death, that he might bring us to God." (Heb. 2:9; 7:25, 26).

In this to us most mysterious affair—the uniting, as it were, of humanity and divinity—we should not lose sight of the wonderful exaltation of man, fallen man, to heaven and to God, in the humiliation of Jesus Christ our Lord. Man never stood so closely related to God during all the previous dispensations of time in point of fact, as when "made nigh by the blood of Christ;"—before which he "was far off," (Eph. 2:13);—and at which time Peter tells us that He (Christ) "suffered that he might bring us to God." (1 Pet. 3:18). This does not imply an approach to God in the sense of an *unconditional* pardon through the atonement of Christ; but a removing out of the way all things that made man's approach to God impossible. And to this effect the Apostle Paul speaks of the removal of the hindrance, or barrier, in Col. 2:14, in this language: "And you, being dead in your sins and

the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath he quickened together with him, having forgiven you all trespasses; blotting out the handwriting of ordinance that was against us, which was contrary to us, and *took it out of the way*, nailing it to his cross." (See verse 13). This "Handwriting of ordinances" that stood in our way, and which Christ removed, was the Law which spoke death to the transgressor. It constituted "the letter" that Paul said "killeth." It stood there as a constant menace to our life, reminding us that death was the price to be paid for its transgression, as "the wages of sin." (Rom. 6:23). Unless this condemnation could be removed, pardon could not be granted. So it was the work of Jesus to "take it out of the way;" to "abolish in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances; * * * that he might reconcile both (Jews and Gentiles) unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby." The following upon this "enmity," what it was, and its removal, as stated here in Eph. 2: 15, 16, is from Jamieson, Faussett and Brown's Bible Commentary, which I append for the reader's benefit, as explanatory of this all important thought:

"This law was 'the partition' or 'fence,' which embodied the expression of the 'enmity' (the 'wrath' of God against our sin, and our enmity to him, verse 3) (Rom. 4:15; 5:20; 7:10, 11; 8:7), Christ has in, or by, His crucified flesh, abolished it, so far as its condemning and enmity-creating power is concerned (Col. 2:14), subsisting for

it the law of love, which is the everlasting spirit of the law, and which flows from the realization in the soul of His love in His death for us. Translate what follows, 'That He might make the two (Jews and Gentiles) into one new man.' Not that He might merely reconcile the two to each other, but incorporate the two, reconciled in Him to God, into one new man; the old man to which both belonged, the enemy of God, having been slain in His flesh on the cross. * * * '*Slain the enmity*,' viz., that had been between man and God; and so that between Jew and Gentile which had resulted from it. By His being *slain* He *slew* it."

This "enmity" being removed from between man and his Maker, the way for his approach to God is open and cleared; and He who cleared the way must be recognized and owned of those coming to God by Him, or to them the work is done in vain. Or in other words, He (Christ) *is* the "way." He did not only *clear* the way, but in doing this *He became the way*, to use a figure of speech. Said Thomas to the Savior, "How can we know the way?" Jesus answered, "*I am the way*, * * * no man cometh unto the Father, *but by me*." (John 14:5, 6). Said John, speaking of the Redeemer, "As many as received him, to them gave he power (mar. *the right*, or, *privilege*) to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name." (John 1:12). So they who receive Him as the way and means of their salvation have the right and privilege to become the *sons* of God. This seems to be the

most exalted relation to God that man can obtain. Jesus is the Son of God, and so the sinner is made, through Him, a son of God by adoption. And what an adoption it is! The slave of sin; the obedient servant of Satan; "the child of wrath;" "serving diverse lusts;" fathoming the depths of human depravity and wretchedness; exalted to the sonship of the Highest; made the "child of God;" a brother of the Lord Jesus Christ, and an heir of glory!

And while the great and marvelous truth of Jesus Christ assuming our nature and being made an offering for our sin to redeem us from the "curse of the law, being made a curse for us," is so clearly taught in the Scriptures, the *how* or the *way* that such a thing was possible, remains a sealed mystery; and no doubt will remain such as long as the gospel is, in the economy of God, preached as a means of salvation; or while probation continues. Whatever it may please our heavenly Father to reveal unto His children in the world to come with reference to the nature of this wonderful scheme of redemption, in all its possibilities, we know not; but that it is not known by us *now*, is, in itself, a reason why we should *not* know it. For we may rest assured that if it had been a *sine qua non*, an indispensable condition, with us that we should know and understand all about the nature of the workings of the divine plan in order for it to effect our salvation, it would have been revealed to us in all its minutiae; as it is not, it is best that we should *not know it*. The blending

of the human and divine natures in the person of Christ, and how things,—if I may be allowed this term to express it,—how things so incongruous could be united, we do not understand; yet we know it is so because the Lord has said it, and that is enough for any believing child of God. Says Abbott, in his "History of Christianity," when touching the theme of Christology: "*It is impossible for us to comprehend the nature of the union of God and man in the person of Jesus. The sacred historian, in announcing that the Son of God 'was made flesh and dwelt among us,' makes no attempt to solve the mystery.*"

In the attempt to know more than is knowable of the nature of our redemption through the atonement, great men, even, have made ridiculous work of it. Under "Atonement," in *Patristic Doctrine*, by Schaff in Encyclopaedia, is the following:

"It is, however, certain, that, more or less clearly, they (the Fathers) always held the doctrine of expiation (atonement) and satisfaction subsequently held by the whole church; while together with this, and often disguising the more biblical view, there prevailed from the time of Origen (d. 254) to that of Anselm (d. 1109), and especially emphasized by Irenaeus, and taught even by Augustine, *a belief that Christ was offered to Satan as a ransom in the behalf of man*, in whom he had acquired rights of conquest. This they derived from such passages as Col. 2: 15 and Heb. 2:14."

To introduce the Devil as a partner in the devising of the plan of man's salvation is to ascribe to his Satanic majesty more power and benevolence than New Testament doctrine, or reason, is wont to allow. But such was the view of those great men, with many other inconsistencies they held. And others, in their eagerness to account for the real nature of the demands laid upon Christ in atoning for sin, are reputed to have imputed to Him "who knew no sin," *the real guilt of all the sins committed;* thus making Him the *worst criminal that ever trod earth!* This could be little less than blasphemy, to say the least.

HISTORIC.

It is befitting this great subject that we should give in brief the opinions of some of the noted men of history, as to their views of the atonement. We will, therefore, call the reader's attention to the following history:

"1. *The Anselmic Doctrine.*—The view which had been implicitly received by the Fathers was first scientifically defined by Anselm (d. 1109), Archbishop of Canterbury, in his epoch-making book, *Cur Deus Homo?* He taught that sin is debt (guilt); that, under the government of God, it is absolutely necessary that this debt should be paid, *i. e.* that the penalty incurred by the guilt of sin should be suffered; that this necessity has its ground in the infinite perfections of the divine nature; that this penalty must be inflicted upon the sinner in person, unless a substitute can be found having all legal qualifications for

his office. This was alone realized in Jesus Christ, a divine person embracing a human nature. The best of the schoolmen, such as Bonaventura, Alexander Hales, Albertus Magnus, and Thomas Aquinas, agreed with Anselm, except that, while holding the moral necessity for an atonement, they insisted that God possessed power to forgive sin by mere will, as involved in the metaphysical notion of omnipotence.

"Abelard (d. 1142) resolved the moral perfections of God into benevolence and the liberty of indifference. He held that sin could be abolished and the sinner received into favor, by the simple volition of God. Duns Scotus (d. 1308) denied that sin is an infinite evil, or that the sacrifice of Christ has an infinite value, and held that God accepted by a sovereign act the work of Christ as a sufficient compensation to His law, instead of the condign punishment of sinners.

"The 'Reformers before the Reformation,' *e.g.*, Wycliffe (d. 1384) and John Wessel (d. 1489) and the ancient Waldenses. held the strict Anselmic doctrine. This has subsequently been adopted in the creeds of the entire Christian Church. (*Dec. Conc. Trent.*, sess. 6, ch. 7.) 'Jesus Christ, who when we were enemies merited justification for us by his most sacred passion on the tree, and satisfied God the Father for us.'

"2. The *Moral Influence Theory* was taught by Abelard, and has since, in various forms, been taught by Socinus, and such Trinitarians as Maurice, Jowett, Bushnell, etc.

"According to Abelard, benevolence is the only divine attribute concerned in human redemption. Christ died for the twofold purpose of subduing the rebellion, and removing the guilty fears of men by the transcendent exhibition of divine love.

"Socinus adopted this view, and emphasized the additional purpose of the death of Christ as the necessary prerequisite to his resurrection, whereby he brought life and immortality to light (*Rac. Cat.*, p. 265).

"Frederick Denison Maurice (d. 1872), in his *Theological Essays*, London, 1853, and elsewhere, taught that the sufferings and death of Christ were the only complete sacrifice of self-surrender of the spirit and body to God ever accomplished, designed 'to illustrate the principle of self-sacrifice as due from all God's intelligent creatures to Him who made them.'

"Horace Bushnell (d. 1876), in his *Vicarious Sacrifice*, N. Y., 1866, taught that Christ suffered with us through sympathy and fellowship, the result of which was to give him a moral power over men, spiritually quickening them, and moulding them by his love and example.

McLeod Campbell (d. 1872), in his *Nature of the Atonement*, London, 1856, taught that Christ has by his sympathy, at once with us and with the righteous law we have broken, so identified himself with us as sinners, that he has offered up to God a perfect confession and adequate repentance of our sins. This repentance meets all the demands of law, which, according to Maurice

are repentance *or* punishment. This appears to occupy the middle ground between the 'moral' and 'satisfaction' theories.

"3. The *Governmental Theory of the Atonement* was first propounded by Hugo Grotius (d. 1645), a great lawyer, in his work against the Socinians: *Defensio Fidei Catholicoe de Satisfactione Christi.* He taught that the law under which man is held is, including precept and penalty, a positive product of the divine will. The right to relax its demands at will belongs to God's prerogative as moral governor. But since the gratuitous remission of the penalty in the case of some sinners would weaken the motives restraining from disobedience the subjects of the divine government in general, by affording an example of impunity, the *benevolence* of God requires, that, as a precondition of the forgiveness of any sinner, he should furnish such an example of suffering in Christ as will exhibit his determination that sin shall not escape with impunity. This view has been represented subsequently by the Supernaturalists of the last age in Germany, as Staudlin, Flatt, Storr, and in America, by Jonathan Edwards, Jr., Smalley, Maxey, Emmons, Park, and others.

"The Remonstrants, or Arminians, of the 17th century in Holland, held substantially the same ground, while they adhered more closely to the use of biblical language and metaphors. Limborch, Apol. Thes. 3: 21, 6. 'The death of Christ is called a sacrifice for sin; but sacrifices are not payments of debts, nor are they full satisfactions

for sins; but a gratuitous remission is granted when they are offered.'

"All these various theories which have been propounded in the different schools of Protestant theologians, have, in like manner, been advocated in the various schools of Catholic theologians. (See Oxenham: The *Catholic Doctrine of the Atonement*, London, 1869.)

"4. The *Mystical Theory*, which exists in various forms, may be generally stated thus: The reconciliation effected by Christ is brought about by the mysterious union of God and man, accomplished by his incarnation. This was held by the Platonizing Fathers, by followers of Scotus Erigena during the middle ages, by Osiander and Schwenkfeld at the Reformation, and the disciples of Schleiermacher among modern German theologians." (*Encyclopaedia of Religious Knowledge* by *Schaff*).

If we had no other proof that God had not revealed to man the very *mystery* of the *nature* of the Atonement in Christ, the foregoing conflicting theories would be sufficient to establish it. I give this history for one reason to show this fact. Not that I regard such diversity of opinion as sceptics do—a reason against the doctrine—but contrariwise, the strongest of evidence in favor of it. If the doctrine had been a scheme gotten up by some "cunning fellows," just to deceive, as they say, then certainly under such searching theological scrutiny as exhibited by these master-minds, its falacy would have been detected and exposed without "a break in the

jury," or a dissenting voice. But the fact of the secret not being revealed, and their trying to know all about it, furnish a ground fruitful for their differences of opinion.

The Scriptures, and particularly the New Testament, declare the *fact* that the blood of Jesus Christ can cleanse man from sin (1 John 1:7); just *how* it can do it is not stated, and men labor in vain to find out. Upon the first, or the atoning efficacy of the death and sufferings of Christ, all Christendom is agreed; while they are divided as to the *nature* of it, as we have just seen. Says Chambers: (in Library of Universal Knowledge), "So fundamental is the doctrine of the Atonement in the Christian religion, that it does not, like many other doctrines, form a ground of distinction among the different bodies into which the Christian world has been divided. All churches may be said to be equally orthodox on this point. The church of Rome, the Greek church, the various Protestant churches—established and dissenting—all agree, taking their standards as a criterion, in resting the sinner's hope of salvation on the mediatorial work or Atonement of Jesus Christ. Nevertheless, there have been from the very beginning of speculative Christian theology, and still continue to be, within the bosom of the several churches, various ways of conceiving and explaining the exact nature and mode of operation of this mediatorial work."

The idea of mediation is as old as the race. It manifested itself with the first created pair upon the fall. God told Adam, after the transgression,

that in consequence of it, the serpent that beguiled Eve should eventually be vanquished and exterminated by the seed of the woman. This seed refers to Christ. Thus the germ of the gospel was preached in the Garden of Eden. Adam understood it and began to offer up sacrifices in type of it. And so the idea here given birth to, grew with the race, and stamped itself upon all systems of religion ever known to man. To "propitiate the gods" was the great object of all heathen rites; and every system of idolatry had its means of "propitiation" peculiar to itself. Some offered brute sacrifices, and others *human*. The latter species of sacrifice was common among the more barbarous tribes of earth. The people possessing the land of Canaan before the Israelites entered it, the Moabites, the Ammonites, the Druids of ancient Britain, and the original Mexicans, are samples of that portion of the human race who offered in sacrifice to false gods, their fellow creatures; thus adding murder to the sin of idolatry.

But whatever means man in his sinful ignorance saw fit to employ in the performance of this special feature of what he conceived to be his religious duty, the thought of *mediation* was coupled with it; though the notions entertained with regard to those means were ever so dark and devilish. That somebody *must die*, something *must suffer for him*, seemed to be an idea that he could not dissociate from his mind. This thought of mediation, I say, was born in, and grew with the

race of mankind, and it pervades all systems of religion, heathen as well as Christian.

I cannot understand John 11:50; 18:14 in any other light than that there was found among the Jews even in Christ's day, a lingering expectation that there must eventually appear a great personage who would by his death make an atonement for their sins, notwithstanding their terrible apostasy. How can we conveniently come to any other conclusion when we take into consideration that to which their system of sacrifices pointed. It seems that this was what Caiaphas the high priest reminded them of whether he intended it or not. Jamieson, Fausset, and Brown agree with Rice in thinking that he gave utterance to a prophecy that he was unconscious of while condemning Jesus to death; that he thought the Jewish nation would perish if Jesus were permitted to live. The Revised Version of the text reads: "Caiaphas being high priest that year, said unto them, Ye know nothing at all, nor do ye take account that it is expedient for you that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not. Now this he said not of himself; but being high priest that year, he prophesied that Jesus should die for the nation." These two verses, 50, 51, of John 11, read in the light of the contest, verse 52, seem to signify more than the simple intent in the mind of Caiaphas of getting Jesus out of the way to save the Jewish nation from the violence of the Romans—if we *should happen* to cross the track of some standard Commenta-

tors in taking this position. Let us see if this is not clearly the logical inference to be drawn from the subject of their conversation on that occasion. Jesus had just raised Lazarus from the dead. There were Jews there who did not believe on Him; and they went and told the Pharisees about it, and there was called a council consisting of the Pharisees and chief priests. By reading verses 47 and 48 we learn the *nature* of the business that called them together. The fear of this council was that if Jesus were let alone, "all men," or many of them, would believe on Him, and in consequence of this, the Romans would come, and do what? *Kill* them all? No; take their place and nation away; or in other words, dispossess them. This would be strange work for the disciples of Christ to do—kill their Jewish brethren; for if "all men" believed on Him then, as they were anticipating, would that not include both Jews and Romans? But for fear of the Romans, and to get Jesus out of the way to allay this fear, are the things which occupy the minds of this Jewish council just now—when the high priest, Caiaphas, rises up and derides them for their *ignorance*, telling them that they know *nothing* at all. Now if he had been of their opinion, that Jesus should die to save the Jewish nation from the vengeance of the Romans, he would not have told the council that they were ignorant and knew nothing about it. But he disagreed with them as to *how* the death of Jesus would save the Jewish nation, and hence the rebuke dealt

them. There is no question but he meant the *atoning virtue* of Christ's death. (See v. 52.) But enough on this point.

With the universality, or catholicity, of the belief that mediation for man is essential, is there anything strange in the fact of there being a consensus of opinion among all the churches of Christendom as to the *efficaciousness* of the mediation of Jesus Christ? This is no more than we should expect to find among people claiming the Christian name. This is right As to which of them is *nearest to the truth* in interpreting the Atonement, and however *loyal* or *disloyal* they may be to the cause they represent, are matters we are not considering here; but will notice them in their proper connections. We are not, however, endorsing all the theories, and speculations upon this great subject that have become current. Truth, so far as it is revealed, is very desirable.

We establish this fact, then, namely, that the essentiality of mediation, or atonement, is a *racial* conception. It has stamped itself upon the minds of the most barbarous peoples of earth for all time, as seen in the different religions, in the offerings peculiar to them, as we have already intimated. It would seem as if where Revelation was needed to teach man this truth, that Nature would not fail to impress it upon the victims of the Fall, leaving it with Revelation to make known and introduce what she could not—*the true source and substance* of that mediation, and identify the Son of God as the One

in whom this "desire of all nations" (Hag. 2:7) could be realized. To the heathen it was by *instinct* to the Jews, or Israel, by *ritual* in the offering up of beastly sacrifices, pointing to Him as the outcome and end of *all* offerings; to the church by the *Revelation*—the Scriptures—concerning Him, as "the true light that now shineth," when "the darkness is past." (1 John 2:8.)

With these facts before us, evincing the needs of a true mediator, by universal attestation, we are now prepared to turn our attention to the Revelation of Him, and learn what that says relative to the great Offering made for sin. And in doing so we shall confine our thoughts mainly to the New Testament Scriptures; not because the Old Testament is lacking in atonement doctrine; for it abounds with it, as seen in the grand sacerdotal system covering so many centuries,—to which we have devoted the fore part of this chapter,—and mentioned in the Psalms with recurring frequency, in Isaiah, Daniel, Zechariah, and other Old Testament Writers. The New Testament, however, is principally a testament of the ministery, sufferings, and expiation of Jesus Christ, and for that reason, our source of appeal upon this great subject.

At the close of the Jewish dispensation, when that Economy of sacrifices must cease and give place to its great antitype,—the sacrifice of Christ — John the Baptist, the forerunner of Him, on meeting Jesus in Bethabara beyond Jor-

dan, and just when the latter came to enter upon His wonderful mission, found it nessary to introduce Him to mankind as "the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world," and added by way of affirmation, "This is he of whom I said, After me cometh a man which is preferred before me; for he was before me." Israel had been accustomed to offering the literal lamb in sacrifice for sin, which could not take away sin in the least degree; now as the true offering for sin has appeared John points them to that, with the assurance that this Lamb would be efficacious in canceling sin, and that to *a universal extent*—"the sin of the world." We do well to heed the instruction thus given; for we are included in that word, "world." (John 1: 29, 30.)

John speaks of the great motive which prompted God to make this offering. So that while some may look upon the whole affair with characteristic indifference, being unmoved by all the appeals it may offer in the name of gratitude, they should reverently consider *why it was* that this wonderful plan was devised, and so "unspeakable a gift" bestowed upon the unworthy, sinful race of mankind. He says, "God so *loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life.*" (John 3: 16.)

The little word, "so," in this Scripture, is an adverb of degree and modifies the word "love," and tells the extent of God's love. So much for the *grammar* of the text. Now for the *logic* of it. If, now, we can estimate the worth of

God's "only begotten Son," then we can tell just how much "God loved the world; for He gave him." But you say, "This could never be estimated." Then the *extent* to which "God loved the world" can never be "estimated." Or, to put it in other words, if we can estimate the *cost* of the offering made for the world's redemption, then can we estimate the extent, or degree, of that love which God had for the world. But as we cannot estimate this "cost," we can no more estimate the love which produced the price. But keep this in mind, dear reader, that you are a *part* of that "world." If the "price" of the redemption of this "world" is *infinite*, and cannot be "estimated," or computed, by man, then, on this hypothesis, the price paid for *your redemption* is "infinite," and cannot be "computed." For if the "price" of your redemption is finite, limited, then that of the world is, as you are a *part* of the world, and the whole is diminishable by a part, and therefore not infinite. But the cost of the "world's" redemption is infinite, as we have just seen, and hence yours is. If, then, the price paid for your salvation is so vast that it is beyond all human computation, be careful how you regard it. Do not sell it for naught, as thousands in the world are doing. But we pass to the consideration of the subject, as recorded in the Word.

If we can learn the extent of our loss in Adam, we can as certainly learn the extent of our restoration in Christ. But this we cannot do in our imperfect state of being: we can only

"*know in part*". Can we comprehend all that is expressed in the following language:" For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous?" The restitution seems to be equal to the loss sustained, as stated in this text. Whatever and how-much-ever is implied in that phrase, "made sinners," will indicate as much as Christ is made for us in undoing the work of sin to redeem us therefrom. Let us see what he was made for us. Bear in mind, that "were made sinners," is in the *passive voice*, and so it will be in keeping to consider our deliverer. It is true that we must consider Him largely in the *active voice*, as *performing*, *doing;* it is due us to also consider Him as *passive being acted upon*, to accomplish the great purposes of God in Him. It is said of Jesus Christ, that though He were a son, yet He learned obedience by the things which He *suffered*.

1. The Apostle says, "When the fullness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, *made* of a woman, *made* under the law." Thus the first act in the redemptive plan is passive with regard to Christ, in the assuming of our nature and condition. He suffered Himself to be made *man* in order to save *man;* subjected Himself to the law that governed *man*, that He might fulfill the law and remove its claims from off *man*. He "was *made* of the seed of David according to the flesh." (Rom. 1: 3.) "The Word was *made* flesh and dwelt among us." (John 1: 14.) As we have noticed this fact already, in the fore-

part of this chapter, we will not stop to enlarge upon it here, only to add, that in this birth and incarnation He became the second Adam. "The first man, Adam, was *made* a living soul; the last Adam was *made* a quickening spirit." (1 Cor. 15: 45.) As the first Adam was the *head* of a race of *natural* beings, so the second Adam, Jesus Christ, is the *head* of a race of *spiritual* beings; and so we find the "child," the "son," meaning Christ at His birth, and "the everlasting Father"—father of a "spiritual race," mentioned in reference to the same individual—and that in the same verse. (Isaiah 9: 6.)

2. He is said to *have been made* sin for us (2 Cor. 5: 21.) *The Emphatic Diaglott* gives the rendering of the text thus: "For Him who knew no Sin, He *made* a Sin offering on our behalf that we might become God's Righteousness in Him." This reading gives a better sense to the passage than King James' Version. It is not possible that Christ could become sin itself and yet it be true that He "knew *no sin*." In this "offering" He was made for sin, He evidently canceled sin, just as the animal was represented as doing in the type, prefiguring the real true "sin-offering." And it is in this sense that the Apostle Paul uses it in another place, where he says: "Christ hath loved us, and hath given himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet-smelling savor," (Eph. 5: 2); only, in this latter quotation He (Christ) is spoken of in *active voice*, reflexively, as *making* the offering Himself; while in the former quota-

tion; as the *victim offered by the Father*. Both statements are perfectly true; Christ, as we have just said, willingly submitted Himself to be made an offering for the sin of the world, as stated in John 10: 17, 18; 15: 13. It is in this *passive sense* that Isaiah speaks of Him, when he says: "We did esteem him *stricken, and smitten of God.*" (Isa. 53: 4.) In keeping with this again, is that expressed in Heb. 10: 10, "Through the *offering of the body of Jesus Christ* once for all."

3. Then, too, *He bore our griefs*. Isaiah says: "Surely he hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows." (Isa. 53:4). There is nothing in the wide world that will cause grief like sin. In fine, it is the legitimate cause of all the griefs that flesh is heir to. Therefore, when Jesus took it upon Him to suffer the penalty for sin, He assumed all the griefs and sorrows that sin entails. This would follow in the very nature of things. When He presumed to take away sin He must take the consequences sin gives, which are suffering and death. O, the grief that was imbodied in that life! No wonder the prophet designates Him as "*the man of sorrows and acquainted with grief!*" And "we hid as it were our faces from him." What does this mean, if it does not in part, this, that He could not look for aid in the least degree to those for whose sins He was suffering, as they would be utterly powerless to render any assistance whatever; but He must "tread the wine-press *alone*." Also there would be the hiding of the

face in contempt from Him by His enemies, as a literal fulfillment of the prophecy; while the figurative meaning is true in a general sense.

As evidence of this, that He could receive no real substantial succor from mortals, take His experience. When in Gethsemane's garden, with all the sins of a guilty world upon Him, the victim finds no help this side of heaven. "And they came to a place which was named Gethsemane; and he saith to his disciples, Sit ye here, while I go and pray yonder. And he took with him Peter and the two sons of Zebedee, and began to be sorrowful and very heavy. Then saith he unto them, My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death." (Matt. 26:36-38). If there ever was a time when His earthly friends had reasons to console "the man of sorrows," it is now; but in place of doing so, they hide their faces in slumber during all this terrible conflict going on between the powers of light and darkness. Was Satan there, as on the mount of "temptation," picturing to Him the awful sufferings He must endure if He finishes what He has undertaken, and trying to persuade Him to abandon it, that he might thereby, overthrow the plan of salvation? It was in a garden that his Satanic majesty met and defeated the first Adam, and brought upon posterity for all time the untold curse of sin and death; it was in a garden also that he met his *defeat and overthrow* by the second Adam, Christ. For upon the issue of Gethsemane hung *not only the salvation of man* but the *de-*

struction of the Devil. Read carefully Genesis 3:15 in the light of Hebrews 2:14, and see if it did not. This was the last conflict because Satan was conquered and routed here. But while all hell was active, heaven was not silent. No mortal has learned the interest manifested in heaven at that time. When the agony of the divine sufferer became so intense that He sweat "great drops of blood," a heavenly messenger appears upon the scene, and takes into his angelic embrace the drooping head with throbbing temples, and with that soft, white hand wipes the bloody sweat from that brow, lovely in the agonies of despair, and whispers words of comfort into the ear of the weeping Savior, thus "strengthening" Him. (Luke 22:43). We are ready to ask with emotions ineffecable, O, suffering Lamb of God, "Was ever grief like thine?"

"While Nature was sinking in silence to rest,
And the last beams of daylight shone dim in the west;
I strayed near a garden, there fell on my ear,
The voice of deep anguish from one that was there.
The tones of his agony they melted my heart,
While earnestly pleading the lost sinners part.

We have sufficient reasons for believing that a crisis was reached in Gethsemane; and that this was the real "battle ground," so to speak: and that Satan and his hosts were here conquered and doomed. This terrible struggle, nigh unto death, (Heb. 5:7-9); and the nature of that prayer, from what little there is recorded of it, (Matt. 26:38-46); and the, what appears to be, victory of Christ on leaving the place

(vv. 45, 46), are some of the reasons we adduce in support of this view. And do we think that Satan and his company submitted without a desperate resistence, and a manifestation of the keenest remorse at their defeat, which defeat presaged their eternal destruction? If Christ partook of "flesh and blood" nature that "through death He might destroy him that had the power of death, the evil," (if there is any philosophy in this language), His death meant the destruction of Satan; and to prevent His death, was to have it fail of its purpose. Hence the strong opposition offered by the Devil. To defeat man's salvation and at the same time prevent his own extermination, seem to be hinted in the thought he threw into the mind of Peter on a certain occasion, as recorded in Matthew 16:22. The Savior only too well understood the import of the language of Peter addressed to Him at that time. The Devil would prevent the death of Christ even here if he could. "Then Peter took him and began to rebuke him, saying, *be it far from thee, Lord: this (death) shall not be unto thee.*" The reply to this clearly shows whom Jesus recognized as the author of it, when he said, "Get thee behind me, *Satan;* thou art an offence unto me." There was, doutless, never such a fierce besetting of the Savior by Satanic power and subtilty in all His life, either before or after, as *was in Gethsemane;* and why not, when upon the decisions of this time and place *hung the destiny of Satan's Empire?* The decisions made here were

to be *final;* and to repair from this to the final act in the drama, that of crucifixion, which would be carrying into effect the sentence already determined, viz: that of the fatal "bruising of the serpent's head," as predicted four thousand years before; was enough to stimulate all the devils in demondom in a strike to prevent it.

But imagine the consternation and grief among those fallen angels when foiled in their purpose. If they "*trembled*" before, they *weep* now. All hell is in mourning! They could seduce *Adam and Eve, and all their posterity*, but here is *one* that they *cannot* seduce; one they cannot conquer; one to whom they *must* submit, and acknowledge as supreme ruler, "the Holy One of God," (Mark 1:24; Lu. 4:34). "Art thou come to destroy us? is uttered with *sevenfold emphasis.* I cannot but believe that here was the greatest commotion among the demons there ever was, in view of what is recorded as awaiting them, in Matt. 25:41. They are represented as "trembling" in view of retribution (James 2:19); and now that it is finally sealed, their fears are aroused as never before. The grand crisis has arrived, to which they have looked forth with such dire anticipation. If Milton portrays the whole fraternity of demons as characterized by *a stolid indifference in view of their doom*, I cannot. He represents Satan as *preferring rule in hell to service in heaven;* while the Bible represents him and his hosts as being *fearful* in view of approaching doom. If

the eyes of the disciples could have been opened to see what Christ saw, we should know more about it; but it was a scene closed to human vision, being within the spiritual realm.

4. He not only "bore our griefs and carried our sorrows," but He was "*made a curse for us.*" For "it is written, cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree." (Gal. 3:13). Under the law the criminal that was executed by being hanged on a tree was considered "cursed of God." (Deut. 21:23). "Christ's bearing the *particular* curse of *hanging on the tree*, is a sample of the *general* curse which He representatively bore. Not that the Jews put to death malefactors by hanging; but *after* having put them to death otherwise, in order to brand them with peculiar ignominy, they hung the bodies on a tree, and such malefactors were accursed by the law. God's providence ordered it so that to fulfill the prophecy of the curse and other prophecies, Jesus should be crucified, and so hung on the tree, though that death was not a Jewish mode of execution. The Jews, accordingly, in contempt, call Him 'the *hanged* one,' *Tolvi*, and Christians, 'worshippers of the hanged one,' and make it their great objection that He died the accursed death. (TRYPHO, in *Justin Martyr*, p. 249.) Hung between heaven and earth as though unworthy of either. The intent of 'Christ becoming a curse for us,' 'to the end that upon the Gentiles the blessing of Abraham (*i. e.*, *promised to* Abraham, *viz.*, justification by faith) might come in Christ Jesus.' " (*Bible*

Com. by Jamieson, Fausset, and Brown.) Said Peter, in speaking of the same thing, "Who his own self bare our sins in his own body *on a tree;*" "the God of our fathers raised up Jesus, whom ye slew and *hanged on a tree.*" (1 Pet. 2:24; Acts 5:30.)

"Upon the *Cross* uplifted high,
Where the Savior deigns *to die*"

The Son of man they did betray;
He was condemned and led away—
Think, O my soul, on that great day,
Look on Mount Calvary.

Behold Him Lamb-like led along,
Surrounded by a wicked throng;
Accused by each lying tongue,
And thus the lamb of God they hung
Upon the Accursed Tree!"

"Come, O my soul, to Calvary! to Calvary! to Calvary;
And see the Man who died for thee *upon the Accursed Tree.*"

If Gethsemane had been sufficient to expiate man's guilt, *Calvary* would never have been introduced; but the latter brings us to the real act in this great drama, without which pardon to sinners could not be offered. This may seem clearer when we consider the certitude of the Apostle Paul's reasoning on this point. He says, "*Without the shedding of blood there is no remission.*" (Heb. 9:22). In this he carries the mind back to the order of sacrifices under "the law," which he tells us could ever "take away sins" (Heb. 10:4, 11), but pointed to the blood of Christ as doing it. No amount of suffering and grief could atone for sin; if such could, there would have been no offering up of animals in the

type, but *sufferings without the shedding of blood*, to prefigure and be in keeping with the antitype. And then, if the sufferings of Gethsemane were sufficient, the "cup" pressed to the lips of our Lord and Savior would have passed from Him, and He spared the terrible experience of imbibing its bitter contents. But no; He must *drink it;* He must *die* to effect man's redemption. And so the tragic scenes of Calvary must be enacted. Because man is cursed Christ must "be made a curse" to redeem him. In view of which fact He said in His conversation to Nicodemus, "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.)

The record of Jesus' death by crucifixion as given by the Evangelists may be found in Matthew 27th chapter, Mark 15th, Luke 23d, and John 19th. As these are accessible to nearly every one, we will leave this record to speak for itself, and not stop to repeat it here; to notice some points connected with the event. These points are as follows:

1. *The time.* The Apostle Paul is particular to state, that in *due time* Christ died for the ungodly; and also, that it was in the *fullness of the time.* (Rom. 5:6; Gal. 4:4.) The Israelitish Passover, instituted by Moses in Egypt, which was a type of the offering up of Christ, was about 1,524 years before; and the *time* for the typical to give place to the real, in the economy of God, had come, when the *substance* would

chase away the shadows. Not only the Jewish Passover, but all other sacrificial types, as such, *virtually* ceased when the great Antitype, to which they all pointed, was reached. The Jewish "lamb without spot" was of no farther service when "the lamb of God" appeared to take its place. The Jewish Passover was an annual festival observed in commemoration of Israel's deliverance from Egyptian bondage, and at the same time pointed ahead to a greater deliverance, viz., a deliverance from *the bondage of sin and death*. It was observed on the 14th day of the first month, which prefigured that Christ should suffer death in that month and on that day of the month. It was made in the evening, or afternoon, Josephus says, from the ninth to the eleventh hour, which would be in our time, from 3 to 5 P. M. Jesus expired on the cross at 3 P. M.

2. *The place* for the antitype of all sacrifices to be offered, was fixed upon *as Jerusalem* (Matt. 16:21; 20:17, 18.) This was the chief city of the Jews, and the centralization of their system of worship was here. It was befitting that type and antitype should meet on the same ground, as well as in point of time. And what a sad thought it is to us that the Jews could not see that upon this *sacred place*, and at this time, the true and real sacrifice for sin—that to which all their offerings referred them--was to be made. But such is the blindness of unbelief. No wonder Jesus wept in view of such a possibility. "And when he was come near, he beheld

the city, and wept over it, saying, If thou *hadst known*, even thou, at least in *this thy day*, the things which belong unto thy peace! but now they are hid from thine eyes." (Luke 19:41, 42.)

It was here that the ground had been so often crimsoned by the blood of sacrificial offerings; it was here that God designed the soil should receive the blood of the offering sufficient to cleanse from all the stains of sin. If the blood of the animal sanctified the vessels of the ministry, and everything else it touched, then surely it was sanctified ground that received the purple life-giving streams that flowed from the wounds of the Christ of God. If there were a place on earth for importance from where salvation should *flow*, it was *Jerusalem*. Zechariah seems to fix this as the spot selected of divine providence, in that it was to come out of the house of David according to the flesh, and *it* was the *home* of David. He says, "There shall be a fountain opened to the house of David and to the inhabitants of *Jerusalem* for sin and for uncleanness." (Zech. 13:1.) Christ came of the house or lineage of David, according to the flesh, and of course salvation coming through this channel it must begin here, as peculiar to that line and that tribe of Juda; hence Christ could say to the woman of Samaria, "*Salvation* is of the *Jews*." (John 4:22.) As I said, it began here, and from here it radiated to all parts of the world, making *Jerusalem the focal centre*. "Repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his

name among all nations, *beginning at Jerusalem.*" The message must go from here because redemption was purchased here, in the offering made.

3. *The mode of death* is also note-worthy. While this "mode" of execution was in itself a curse, it was also peculiar to Christ in the *manner* of expiring. Any other "mode" would not seem to answer the purpose as well. When we consider that He was atoning for sin, we must view Him as meeting the sinner's condi tion under its consuming power. Sin, like leprosy, kills *slow but sure.* No sinner dies, in consequence of what he is, *suddenly*, the execution of the penalty upon criminals aside. Many sinners live to be very old. "Because sentence against an evil work *is not executed speedily*, therefore the heart of the sons of men is fully set in them to do evil." (Eccl. 8:11.) This is why men grow old in sin; the penalty, death, is not visited upon them as soon as they commit the "evil." "The wages of sin is death, but the wages do not come, as a rule, till the work is done. It is because of the tardiness of the resultant work of sin that men are the willing victims of it, together with "the pleasure" of it; and hence this coiling serpent fastens its deadly embrace about the human victim until it, being "the sting of death," *has done its fatal work.* "Sin, *when it is finished*, bringeth forth death." (Jam. 1:15.) Therefore, because of the slow executive work of sin upon victimized humanity, Jesus, in bearing "our sins in His

own body on the tree," must die *a slow tortuous death*. Think of it, dear reader, 'the pleasures of sin" to the sinner, caused the pains of hell to the sufferer, "who knew no sin," that the one who deserved hell might be delivered from them! "By whose stripes," said the prophet, "we are healed;" on whom "the Lord hath laid the iniquity of us all." The *carnal sports* of sinners made *agonies* for Christ; and if they prefer these to the obedience of the gospel, they must have the consequences that go with them. The ingratitude of the unsaved toward the One who suffered so much to redeem them, is only equalled by that of the demons; and such ingratitude deserves to be punished, with all their other sins in their own bodies; which punishment will be visited upon the finally impenitent in the great day of retribution, when outraged Love and insulted Mercy will step aside, and let Justice take her course.

The *manner* of Christ's death could effect none other than a slow torturing death. The iron spikes, driven into hands and feet, would tear apart the muscular structure and interrupt circulation in the three systems—the arterial, the veinous, and the capiliary; in which case they would pierce those members of the body at the extremities of arteries and veins, where those two systems communicate by means of the capillaries which receive the blood from the arteries and pass it to the veins, whence it is returned to the lungs and heart. The wounds being made at the extremity of circulation, the

bleeding would be comparatively slow; and a good *space of time* would be consumed before the victim could bleed to death. Then the *weight of the body* would hang upon the wounds made by the spikes, thus intensifying as well as prolonging the agonizing pains of a torturing death. Says Edersheim: "*The crucified might hang for hours, even days, in the unutterable anguish of suffering, till consciousness at last failed.*" (Rice's Com.) We are not told at what *hour* Jesus was nailed to the cross; but it was between 9 A. M. and 12 M., as the trial was early in the morning, and the final sentence or delivering up for crucifixion was probably about 9, when the execution would soon follow; and He expired about 3 P. M., making it between *three* and *five hours* He was dying. And He would not have expired as soon as He did from the wounds alone, as may be seen in the case of the malefactors who were crucified at the same time, and whose legs the soldiers broke before the setting of the sun to hasten the work of death, that their bodies might not hang there on the Sabbath day. (John 19:30-33.)

During those hours of torture Christ must have suffered all it was possible for a being to suffer, in order to satisfy to the fullest extent the claims of justice against transgression, in that He was paying the penalty *for* transgression. And in order for this to be effectually carried out, *time* must become a prominent factor in it. It was *sad* "time" to Him, but profitable to us, in what it secures to us, as His

followers, deliverance from death and the right of life eternal.

But why did Christ expire before the thieves? The same *mode* was administered to both. There must have been another cause which hastened His demise, as the physical injuries, it is supposable, were of a character to prolong rather than hasten it. It is not stated what the reason of this was; but we can infer from the circumstances governing their deaths, respectively, why such was the case. The burden He was bearing—the sins of the whole world—and the Father forsaking Him, were more than his humanity could endure, and He doubtless died of a broken heart! This is the opinion of a number of writers upon the subject. There seems to have passed but a few minutes, according to the record from the utterance of these words "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" till He closed His eyes in death. He could stand all the contumely of that wretched rabble about the cross, and the intrigues of devils, and the wounds of torture; but when the *Father* left Him the burden was too much for Him, and death came to His relief. In dying *for* the sinner He must, in a sense, die *like* the sinner, *God-forsaken.* All sinners die forsaken of God, being condemned of Him.

Our friends may leave us, and all else we hold dear be separated from us, and we still continue to live; but when *God* abandons us, it is then, to us, if never before, that life is intolerable. When God leaves us all is gone. How

many dying sinners have realized this, when they have been brought face to face with the monster, Death, and kind friends have gathered about the dying pillow, to render, if possible, some aid and consolation to the departing; but there was a void that friends or the world could not fill. *God* is not there; He has forsaken that man, that woman, and he or she must enter the dark valley *alone*. In this situation all is darkness. No ray of hope to illuminate the dark passage is there for such; but *God-forsaken* in this hour of death! Lost! *lost*! LOST! is the dismal wail that comes back to the friendly survivors!

But coming back to the thought of the agonies and bleeding heart of this precious sufferer, let us look in imagination upon the scene. And in endeavoring to do so we cannot avail ourselves of a more graphic representation of it than that drawn by the pen of Lew. Wallace. As we said, it is a look of the imagination, for we do not present it with the thought that it was a real narrative of what an eye-witness saw; and yet it carries with it a palpable probability. For the benefit, therefore, of those of my readers, who may not have read "A Tale of The Christ," by the author just referred to, I will append a short extract from it on the Crucifixion. We come upon the scene somewhat abruptly, in this extract, and find the Savior dying. Ben Hur, a converted Jew, witnesses the tragic event. It is as follows:

"Over the way, in front of the cross, however, there were surprise and consternation. The cunning casuists there put the assumption underlying the question and the admission underlying the answer together. For saying through the land that he was the Messiah, they had brought the Nazarene to the cross; and, lo! on the cross, more confidently than ever, he had not only reasserted himself, but promised the enjoyment of Paradise to a malefactor. They trembled at what they were doing. The pontiff, with all his pride, was afraid. Where got the man his confidence except from Truth? And what should the Truth be but God? A very little now would put them all to flight.

The breathing of the Nazarene grew harder; his sighs became great gasps. Only three hours upon the cross, and he was dying!

The intelligence was carried from man to man until every one knew it; and then everything hushed; the breeze faltered and died; a stifling vapor loaded the air; heat was superadded to darkness; nor might any one unknowing the fact have thought that off the hill, out under the overhanging pall, there were three millions of people waiting awe-struck what should happen next—they were so still!

Then there went out through the gloom, over the heads of such as were on the hill within hearing of the dying man, a cry of despair, if not reproach: 'My God! my God! why hast thou forsaken me?' The voice startled all who heard it. One it touched uncontrollably.

The soldiers in coming had brought with them a vessel of wine and water, and set it down a little way from Ben Hur. With a sponge dipped into the liquor, and put on the end of a stick, they could moisten the tongue of a sufferer at their pleasure. Ben Hur thought of the draught he had had at the well near Nazareth; an impulse seized him; catching up the sponge, he dipped it into the vessel, and started for the cross.

'Let him be!' the people in the way shouted, angrily. 'Let him be!' Without minding them, he ran on, and put the sponge to the Nazarene's lips. Too late, too late!

The face then plainly seen by Ben Hur, bruised and black with blood and dust as it was, lighted nevertheless with a sudden glow; the eyes opened wide, and fixed upon some one visible to them alone in the far heavens; and there were content and relief, even triumph, in the shout the victim gave.

'It is finished! It is finished!'

So a hero, dying in the doing of a great deed, celebrates his success with a last cheer.

The light in the eyes went out; slowly the crowned head sank upon the laboring breast. Ben Hur thought the struggle over; but the fainting soul recollected itself, so that he and those around him caught the other and last words, spoken in a low voice, as if to one listening close by: 'Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit.'

A tremor shook the tortured body; there was

a scream of fiercest anguish, and the mission and the earthly life were over at once. *The heart with all its love, was broken; for of that, O reader, the Man died.*"

4. The Phenomena accompanying the crucifixion are very significant. Those sacred writers tell us that there was great darkness over all the land from the sixth to the ninth hour. This was doubtless *universal* in its spread. Says Cruden, upon Luke 23:44, "At His passion *universal darkness was upon the whole earth.*" If the analogy hold good, the natural obscuration should extend as far as the darkness of sin and death, which would envelope the entire surface of this sphere, or "as far as the curse is found."

This darkness was on till Jesus expired, when it disappeared—was driven away by the effulgent rays of the sun; signifying the power of Christ's death to dissipate the *moral* darkness that hung over men's lives. So striking is this analogy that Christ is called "the Sun of righteousness," in the Scriptures. (Mal. 4:2.) Truly "the darkness is passed, and the true light now shineth." (1 John 2:8).

Then the mighty earthquake had a meaning to it, of which we may learn something. During it "the vail of the temple was rent in twain." This "vail" was between "the Holy Place" and "the Most Holy." We noticed in the tabernacle-type, that none but the high priest went into the Most Holy Place, and that "once a year" to make an atonement for the people; that this was a prerogative peculiar to his rank in the priest-

hood; the subordinate priests officiated in the Holy Place, or Sanctuary. Now when this veil, or partition, in the temple was removed, it threw both places into one, and thus did away with sacerdotal distinctions. Before, the people approached God through the high priest in his annual visits into this Most Holy Place. Now the earthly high priesthood disappears from the scene, because it has reached its end, and must give place to that of the Melchisedec, the heavenly High Priesthood, in the great Offering made "once for all." "The Holy Ghost," said the Apostle, "this signifying, that the way into the holiest of all was not yet made manifest, while the first tabernacle was yet standing." When Christ expired, this "way into the Holiest" was "made manifest;" i. e., the earthly tabernacle was virtually swept away, and brought the worshipers to look, as it were, into "the Holy Place not made with hands," or Heaven itself. Thus the rending of the veil meant the opening up of "a new and living way" of access to God, (Heb. 10:19-22), when Jesus would take the place of all earthly mediators, and the people reach God through Him. "*I am the way*," said He: "*no man cometh unto the Father, but by me.*" (John 14:6.)

How the Catholic people can recognize this all important fact, and still find use for an *earthly* mediator, to stand between them and God, as did the high priests of Aaron's priesthood with Israel, is more than I can understand.

5. We notice in the next place, *Christ's Resur-*

rection. The offering made on Calvary, in the death of the all-sufficient Sacrifice, would not avail if death *could have held him.* Says the Apostle, in speaking of Christ, He "was delivered for our offenses, and *raised again for our justification.*" We could not be justified unless our mediator could be brought again from the dead. He must go down into Death in order to conquer that "last enemy" of mankind. He invaded the realm of the King of Terrors, and, so to speak, wrested from that monster the Keys by which he locked up all the millions of earth within his silent domain. Hence, Christ could say after He rose from the dead: "I am he that liveth, and was dead; and, behold, I am alive for evermore, Amen; and have *the keys of hell and of death.*" (Rev. 1:18.) This "last enemy" could never be "destroyed" so long as he held under his power Him who is said to be "the conqueror of Death," Jesus the Lord. In dying, He broke the power of Satan, and delivered man from the thraldom of sin; in rising again, He broke the power of Death, and delivered man from the thraldom of this grim monster. Thus at one stroke He swept from the arena of human life man's two great enemies. Thank God for this conqueror!

So the Apostle Paul, in his masterly argument in proof of the resurrection, concludes that if "dead persons *rise not*" *from the dead*, Christ's rising never delivered them from the power and dominion of Death; and if He did not deliver *them* from the power and dominion of Death, *no*

more did He deliver Himself, and hence *He never arose from the dead*; and has not conquered Death; therefore he was not the Savior of men. So the resurrection of Christ was a *pledge* of the resurrection of dead men. The two resurrections are inseparately connected; and to ignore one would be to deny the other. "*If the dead rise not, then is Christ not raised; and if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins. Then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished.*" (1 Cor. 15:16-18.)

"But now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the first fruits of them that slept. For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead." So we see that *the deliverance from death* was as much a part of Christ's expiatory work as was *the deliverance from sin*. "*Delivered for our offences, and raised again for our justification*," (Rom. 4:25.) Who dares to say that it is not so?

6. *His Ascension to heaven*. But we see the work of redemption not completed yet. We are here; sin is here yet; death is here: we are still under the curse. If Christ "appeared" in this world "to put away" its "sin by the sacrifice of Himself," and the world is never delivered from sin, then the object for which He came will never be accomplished. This is an axiomatic truth. If the world shall always roll on in sin without any termination to it, then it is not true, that "the Lamb of God taketh away the sin of the world," as is stated by John the Baptist. (John 1:29.) Just as long, then, as

the curse remains untaken away, and Sin and Death continue to reign, just that long is redemption unfinished. The present mundane state of things is said to be waiting in anxious expectation for the deliverance from the curse of Sin and Death. "For we know that the *whole creation groaneth and traveleth in pain together until now. And not only they, but ourselves, 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.*" (Rom. 8:22, 23.)

In the type, it should be remembered, the atonement was not finished when the victim was slain, and its blood caught by the high priest. *He had to pass into the Holy of Holies* with that blood, and sprinkle it upon and before the mercy seat, in atonement for the place and congregation of the Children of Israel. (Lev. 16:13, 14.) So in the antitype, our High Priest, the Lord Jesus Christ, must pass, with the significance of the blood He shed for the sins of the world, into that place represented bv the Holy of Holies, or into Heaven, to complete the work of atonement. "Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true; *but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us.*" (Heb. 9:24).

If all the redemptive work was completed as soon as Christ expired, as some think, why should He find it necessary to ascend on high for the purpose of "appearing in the presence of God for us?" But what did He tell the disciples He was going to heaven to accomplish

for them? A very important work must be done for them in heaven, and that was "to prepare a place for them" (John 14:2); another object still pertaining to salvation was the "sending of the Holy Spirit," to guide them in the work of saving men, to encourage the hearts, and sanctify and empower the human agencies for this great mission (John 16:7). And yet there was something still beside these to "appear" there for. We have seen by the type that the very thing that atones, or represents it, after the offering was made, was taken into the Most Holy Place and applied in cleansing, and purifying—that was the blood. It was sprinkled "*upon* the mercy seat," to show that *earthly* things as well as *human beings* had to be cleansed, or sanctified before they would be accepted of by God; and not as representing anything in heaven that would need purifying; for all the things in heaven *pure and holy*; *intrinsically so.* This blood was then *sprinkled before* the mercy seat seven times. The "mercy seat" represented God's throne in heaven, and sprinkling it before this would represent it being placed before God and He looking upon it as the price paid for man's redemption; as the angel looking upon the blood sprinkled upon "the lintel and posts of the door" of the Israelites, (Exod. 12:22, 23), saw sufficient in it to grant them immunity from the scourge of death. The septenary character, "seven," here used, is a complete number, so considered throughout the Old and New Testaments; and in all the cleans-

ings under the Law, "seven" sprinklings were made. It doubtless had reference to completeness.

We observed before in the consideration of this subject of atonement that there were *two* sides to it—man's side and God's side; so the blood would needs be applied on *two* sides; on man's side and *for* man, *when shed*—as in the type, sprinkled upon the people (Heb. 9:19; Exod. 24:8); on God's side *when brought into His presence in Heaven* by Him who made the offering—as in type, when taken within the veil and sprinkled before the mercy seat. The blood must speak in two places; *on earth when shed; in heaven when presented there* by the great Melchisedec High Priest. This is the "sprinkling of blood that speaketh better things than that of Abel." (Heb. 12:24.)

We would not presume to enquire into so great a matter as this, with any expectation of knowing *all* the importance attached to Christ's return on high, but only so far as it might concern *our redemption*. Heaven was His home, where He lived with the Father before man or the world was; to ascend there would be, in a word, but a return home to reside with the blessed Father of spirits, until all "his foes were made His footstool." In relation to us, it is said by the Apostle Peter that the heavens would receive Him *until* the times of restitution of all things, when God would send Him back here to accomplish this, (Acts 3:20, 21), and complete the work of redemption.

In the Aaronic type after the priest had finished atoning for the people in the Holiest Place, he returned to bless the congregation of Israel, as a result of the offering made, when "the glory of the Lord appeared unto all the people;" and in consequence there was great rejoicing among them. (Lev. 9:22-24.)

So when we connect type and antitype, we find that the great culminating blessing promised to spirtual Israel, is bestowed *when* Christ our Great High Priest *returns* from His sacerdotal relations to the Father. Says the Apostle, "Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and *unto themthat look for him shall he appear a second time* without sin (a sin-offering) *unto salvation.*" (Heb. 9:28.) "The glory of the Lord appeared unto all the people," in type, when the high priest came out to bless them; which prefigures the glory in which Christ will be revealed when He returns with purchased redemption to His people. "*The Son of man shall come in his glory*, and all the holy angels with him." (Matt. 24:31.) "Looking for that blessed hope and the *glorious appearing* of the great God and our Savior Jesus Christ," (Titus 2:13); "*When his glory shall be revealed, ye may be glad also with exceeding joy,*" (1 Peter 4:13); "The Son of man shall come in the *glory of his Father with* his angels; *and then shall he reward every man according to his works,*" (Matt. 16:27); "*Then look up, and lift up your heads; for your redemption draweth nigh.*" (Luke 21:28.)

With these considerations before us, we see how important is the return of our Great High Priest from that Sanctuary on high to finish the work of salvation, in the accomplishment of this last great act in the redemptive series, which is the *crowning act.*

Thus we have noticed our Surety, Christ, in brief: *passively*, as the victim, suffering and being offered for the sins of humanity; *actively* as priest, when He overcame Death, and, in a figure, took His own blood and ascended into heaven to present it there in atonement for us. In Him we have seen *offering* and *offerer*, *sacrifice* and *priest*, embodied. "It is of necessity," said the Apostle, "that this man have somewhat also to offer"; and finding no sufficient sacrifice to "offer," He gave Himself. "Once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." As a philanthropist and benefactor, during the three years of His life, that we have account of, He was characterized by a devotedness to benevolent activities; so that His was a superlatively active life, in relieving the wants and sufferings of mankind. Said He, "My Father worketh hitherto, *and I work.*" But it was in the *suffering*, *bearing*, *and being slain for us* that He became *passive.*

As He was "made under the law," He became a priest at the age of thirty years—that being the age at which men were made priests—and entered upon His sacerdotal work there, in all that part of it which preceded the final offering of "Himself," in fulfilling the law, and in giving

to men a "perfect law," the "law of life," etc. This very important part of His work we have not attempted to dwell upon, together with the philanthropical acts of His earthly life, it not being within the scope of the subject of the "Atonement" to do so.

And now, dear reader, we have tried to tell you in this rather desultory manner, something of the price paid for your redemption; and as best we understood, some of the reasons for the *plan* of that "redemption;" as well, what the Scriptures say of it in part only; and will now leave it, and pass to another subject of relative importance. And in taking our leave of the subject, we hope the story so imperfectly told of the love, sufferings, and death of our blessed Redeemer may lead many souls to that wounded side and bleeding heart for succor and safety from the wrath to come, before the calls of mercy cease. Amen.

CHAPTER IV.

THE CONDITIONS OF SALVATION; OR WHAT WE MUST DO TO BE SAVED.

It might be asked us, "Why write upon a subject that is so generally written upon, as is this, when the religious world abounds with productions along this line?" Our answer is implied in the question. It is mainly because there is so *much* written on the subject that we attempt the task; not because of any notoriety that we would wish to share with the numerous writers of this class, bv any means; but on account of the wholesome (?) *variety* of opinion that abounds. The question as to what constitutes the "conditions of salvation" is frequenty asked, and as variously answered by theologians. If I might be allowed the expression, this is the rock upon which Christendom is divided. There are just as many diversities of opinion with regard to what the integrity and identity of obediential submission to gospel requirements really are, as there are separate denominations. Their very existence as such proves what we say, without looking into the respective tenets of their faith. If there did not exist those differences, then there would be no cause for distinctive denominational lines, and they would as essentially flow

together as two drops of water will unite. There are so many lines of difference, and hence the corresponding number of denominational bodies.

It may be said that those differences of opinion among the several christian bodies are *nonessentials*. But how *nonessential* are they *held to be* when they grow and ripen into *distinct organized religious systems*. They are essential enough to *separate upon; form different lines of labor upon*; band together in characteristically *distinct laities upon; ordain and maintain separate ministeries upon;* and *wear names as distinguishing as are the appelations of families or individuals*. Certain it is, then, that these different churches or denominations regard the things that set them into separate companies, a little *more* than *nonessentials*. Whether they esteem these divergencies of nonessential import or not, as a matter of *theory*, in *practice* they make them quite essential. Each church seems to be treading in a different path, as though they thought their own peculiar way was the only one that led to heaven and glory.

Now just to the extent each of these denominations believes in the *essentiality* of its own way of viewing the "conditions of salvation," will the answer to enquirers along that line be tinged with the differential hue of denominationalism. Therefore we must in the very nature of the case look for something of a *different* answer from each one; and those "*nonessentials*" be made *quite essential*. We do not say that each has a

different religion, a different faith; and that they hold to as many different sources of salvation as there are denominations, not that; for they all claim the same Head, Christ Jesus the Lord; but that each will put forth views peculiar to the notions that gave it existence, and smack of the sentiments that characterized its founder, be they never so ultra. Great or small as are those denominational differences of opinions, there is one thing certain, they cannot *all* be correct, as *truth* never conflicts *with itself*. But *one* way can be the *right way*, and the right way *one* way.

How bewildering to the lost soul is this confusion of things. If he enquire of a representative of one religious body concerning the way of salvation, the denominational bias of the latter will dictate to him that it is his duty to point such to *his* own particular church and creed, and *his* ideal of the *source* and *centre* of salvation. He goes to the next—a representative of another religious body—and upon the same enquiry, he receives this man's opinion of *where* salvation is to be found—in *his church*. And he can go on until he has finished the grand round, and the replies have been as varied as are the *denominational castes* of those churches.

The tendency of this condition of things leads many to doubt the way of salvation; and in consequence they turn away their ears from the gospel message. Confusion upon things pertaining to salvation is not what the sinner, who is enquiring the way to peace and pardon, ought

to hear. God is not the author of confusion, and why should the way of life be so mixed and confounded as to present this many sided aspect to those whom Christ died to save? The servant of God was instructed to "*prepare the way of the Lord*, and makes His paths *straight*, and the rough places *plain*." (Isa. 40:4; Matt. 3:1-3.) This meant to simplify and make that way easy of comprehension to the ignorant and benighted of earth. And what there was in the message of salvation peculiar to John the Baptist in this respect, is peculiar to every servant of Christ in the proclamation of the gospel of salvation. Is it wise, then, to point sinners to the church for this salvation? It may be said that sinners are pointed to Christ *through* the church. But why put the church *between* the sinner and Christ? This is precisely what the Church of Rome does. In the Roman Catholic Faith, it is the *Church first* and *final*; just as though salvation was something inherent in, and must grow out of that institution from the very fact of its existence. When this course is imitated by Protestants, it verily looks as though they too believed somewhat in the *church's* infallibility! But suppose the individual, on coming into the church, does not find Christ there! he certainly has not found salvation there then! When churches become cold and formal, having lost their spirituality—and we fear this is the condition with many—it is very evident that the Lord is not reigning among them, (Rev. 3:15-17); how then is the individual to obtain salvation in a church of this nature?

Instead of such churches being *helps* in the work of salvation, they are *hindrances* to it. Judging from much we see in and of churches, which is a fair criterion, it would seem there must be a great deal of *spurious* work done under the name of "*conversion.*" Of such doing it would be reasonable to infer that there had been conversions *to the church* instead of *to Christ.* It is very evident that a church cannot give to those coming among them any more than they possess. If they do not have the Lord and Savior among them, how are they to impart Him to others? We do not think we misrepresent matters when we say, that there does really seem to be a *much greater* eagerness manifested by churches to get *names* and *accessions*, than *to lead the erring to Christ.* It may be that they think in introducing them to the churches respectively, that they are, *ipso facto*, introducing them to the Redeemer. So does the Roman Catholic think, in regard to his church. With him, *outside of the church* means *outside of salvation*; for as he deems it, "there is salvation in *none other!*" With such, it would appear, that "church" and "Christ" were regarded as synonymous terms, both meaning the same. The nominal church with all her formalities, *want* of power and spirituality, etc., set up as equivalent with her Lord and Master certainly smacks strongly of Romanism. If you think this an unwarranted statement, dear reader, please do not be too hasty in deciding; but stop until you have taken a look at all the nominal churches of

Christendom, and compare their work, what it is, with what it ought to be, and would be, were those ecclesiastical agencies electrified with spiritual energy and power for the conquest of Satan's kingdom; and at the same time observe *the zeal in them for an increased membership* on this same low plane; with apparent lack of desire to get up into that higher condition of spiritual life, where they could move heaven in behalf of a perishing world; and then you will see if statistical facts do not verify what I say.

It is time that this *real distinction* between the present *status* of the nominal churches of Christendom, as a means of salvation, and *Jesus Christ*, as the *only* "*name* under heaven given among men, *whereby* we must be saved," were made as marked as the *necessities for it* demand. And we are happy to know that this is being done to some extent by men whom God has raised up in this time of religious lukewarmness for this very purpose. We should feel that we were not doing *our* duty in so important a matter, if we did not help to make such distinction more perspicuous by proclaiming to humanity that "*the gospel*," and *it only*, "*is the power of God unto Salvation*, to every one that believeth." There can be no *substitute* offered, that will take the place of this gospel, however much people may think to the contrary, while indulging in the vain notion that salvation can come out of either *churches* or their *creeds*, or both together, *as such*.

With these facts before us, then, how supremely important it is that we turn away from that which savors so strongly of the human, and look to the divine source for salvation. And this can be the more easily done when we have broken away from the restraint peculiar to denominational predilections. For when the love for a *particular church* surpasses our love for Christ and His Truth, and takes the place of those, it is then that we feel reluctant to sever the ties that bind us; and it seems almost, like a re-conversion when Christ rises so high above these in our estimation, that we are drawn out of our denominational rut towards Him, as "the Chiefest among ten thousand, and the One altogether lovely." We would not persuade people to leave their respective churches, but would induce them *to not leave Christ* for the churches; or in other words, do not "love the creature more than the Creator." Remember that commandment which is, "*Thou shalt have no other Gods before me.*" (Deut. 5:7.) It is certain that if the church takes the *preference* to Christ in our affections, it becomes a species of idolatry, on the principle that whatever we *love the best*, that we worship. I would say, then, love Christ *first*, and the church *second and for His sake.* Consider the church as a servant of Christ only *as it serves Him.* When it departs from Him and serves the world and the flesh, it is not His servant, legitimately speaking. It is then that we should come out of *it.* We should regard the church as simply a *means* to

an end, and not an *end* in itself; and then it can never become our idol; but will serve the purpose it was intended to in the divine economy. This is the *use* of the church; the other is the *abuse* of it. As it is but the creature, it should be subservient to Him, and never become His rival in our adoration. The poet has said, "To love the creatue more than the Creator, is mad idolatry."

Divesting ourselves of all prejudices and preconceived notions, let us come to the fountain of eternal Truth, and with the docility of children, "receive the ingrafted word," "which is able to make us wise unto salvation." What this "word" does not teach we are under no obligation to believe. What, then, does it say concerning the "Conditions of Salvation?" The question involving those "Conditions," was both asked and answered in Apostolic times, as recorded in the New Testament Scriptures.

In Acts 16:30, 31, we find both question and answer with reference to salvation. Paul and Silas were imprisoned in the jail at Philippi of Macedonia for preaching and teaching the way of life eternal. During the night God shook the old prison with an earthquake, and the doors flew open, and their fetters fell from off them, thus removing all that stood between them and liberty. The jailor, supposing the prisoners escaped, when he saw the prison doors wide open, drew his sword to take his own life, when the Apostle Paul prevented him, telling him that they were yet there. On learning this,

the jailor rushed into the prison, quaking with fear, "and brought them out, and said, Sirs, WHAT MUST I DO TO BE SAVED?" Thus we have propounded the question which involved salvation. Now let us notice very carefully the answer to this all-important interrogation; for it carries with it the essentials to the obtainment of eternal life. Answer: "And they, (Paul and Silas) said, BELIEVE ON THE LORD JESUS CHRIST, AND THOU SHALT BE SAVED AND THY HOUSE." We have here the same thought as that expressed in the epistle of the Apostle Paul to the Church at Rome, which reads thus: "Therefore BEING JUSTIFIED BY FAITH, WE HAVE PEACE WITH GOD THROUGH OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST."

I understand the words, "*belief*," and "*faith*," as they are used in these two texts, (Acts 16:31; Rom. 5:1), to be of synonymous import—meaning the same. "Believing on the Lord Jesus Christ, is equivalent to "being justified by faith" in Him, so far as salvation is concerned; while the two expressions differ in grammatical construction.

Does this *saving* "*faith*" come BEFORE "*repentance?*" If it does *precede* "repentance," in its ordinal relation, "repentance" is *unnecessary;* as men can be saved *without* it! If a man is "*saved*" and "*justified by faith*," he cannot be any more so, can he? Therefore, "repentance," is ruled out! But if "repentance" *precedes* "faith," it becomes quite an important factor in "the conditions of salvation." "But," says one,

"must not a man *believe* before he can repent?" Believe what? "Believe that Jesus is the Son of God." He must believe *more* than this, or he will not get ahead of the devils; for *they* believe this, (James 2:19); yea, they go farther than this, and claim it a matter of *knowledge* with them, (Matt. 8:29); and they are devils still. If he does not believe more than devils, and wicked men—for they too believe this– it is certain that it cannot save him any more than it effects *their* salvation. A man may *believe that "Jesus is the Son of God,"* and *then be lost.* Almost every sinner in the country believes this, and yet they are not "justified" nor "saved." Surely, then, this is not the "faith" that *justifies;* and consequently not the "faith" of Acts 16:31, or Romans 5:1. And more than this, this faith of "*assent,*" which is not *the faith* of the gospel, will *never* bring "repentance;" for if it would, wicked men and devils would repent. Here is where many thousands have gone astray. They have supposed this "faith of assent" was the "*saving faith*" of the gospel, and went no further, considering the belief *that Jesus is the Son of God*, all that was necessary, and that they were saved because they believed this much. This is *enchanted ground; beware of it.* Believing *that Jesus is the Son of God;* and "believing ON the Lord Jesus Christ," are *two* very *different* things. If they were identical, "universal salvation," including the "Devil" and his hosts, would follow, assuredly; for the devils and

wicked people believe, as we have just observed, that Jesus is the Son of God.

As we have noticed in brief the "*faith of assent*," let us look at the "*faith of justification*," or "*faith*" *that saves*. To understand this correctly, let us begin at the beginning. And we enquire: *Where* does the work of salvation begin, as we see it manifested? About the first thing we see affecting the sinner, as a result of careful hearing the gospel, is "Conviction." We say of him, "He is under conviction." And what is "conviction?" Webster gives as the meaning of the word, "the act of proving, finding, or adjudging, guilty of an offense. The state of being convinced or convicted; strong persuasion or belief; especially, the state of being convicted of sin, or by ones own conscience." A man under "conviction," then, is a man convinced of the *guilt* of *his* transgressions; and that *he* has incurred the penalty thereof, which is eternal death—"the wages of sin." (Rom. 6:23.) The doom of the sinner is now painted before his mental vision in all its horrors, amid the lashings of a guilty conscience. He *feels* that he is a lost man. Like the frightened sinner in Bunyan's Dream, he looks in all directions for escape, but finds it not. As the condition of the awakened sinner is so graphically described by Bunyan, I quote from him upon this point:

"As I walked through the wilderness of this world I lighted on a certain place where was a den (jail), and laid me down in that place to

sleep; and as I slept, I dreamed a dream. In my dream I saw a man clothed with rags, standing in a certain place, with his face from his own house, a book in his hand, and a great burden upon his back. I looked, and saw him open the book, and read therein; and as he read, he wept and trembled; and not being able longer to contain, he brake out with a lamentable cry, saying, '*What shall I do?*'

"In this plight, therefore, he went home, and restrained himself as long as he could, that his wife and children should not perceive his distress; but he could not be silent long, because that his trouble increased; wherefore, at length, he brake his mind to his wife and children, and thus he began to talk to them: 'O my dear wife! said he, and you the children of my bowels, I your dear friend am myself undone, by reason of a burden that lieth hard upon me: moreover, I am certainly informed, that this our city, will be burned with fire from Heaven; in which fearful overthrow, both myself with thee, my wife, and you, my sweet babes, shall miserably come to ruin, except the which yet I see not some way of escape may be found, whereby we may be delivered.'

"Now, I saw upon a time, when he was walking in the fields, and greatly distressed in his mind; and as he read, he bursted out, as he had done before, crying '*What shall I do to be saved?*'

"I saw also that he looked *this* way and *that* way, as if he would run, yet he stood still, because as I perceived he could not tell which way

to go. I looked then, and saw the man named Evangelist, coming to him, who asked, 'Wherefore dost thou cry?'

"He answered, 'Sir, I perceive by the book in my hand, that I am condemned to die, and after that to come to judgment; and I find that I am not willing to do the first, nor able to do the second.'

"Then said Evangelist, 'Why not willing to die, since this life is attended with so many evils?' The man answered, 'Because I fear that this burden that is upon my back will sink me lower than the grave, and I shall fall into *Tophet*. And, Sir, if I be not fit to go to prison, I am not fit to go to judgment, and from thence to execution; and the thoughts of these things make me cry.'

"Then said Evangelist, 'If this be thy condition, why standest thou still?' He answered, 'Because I know not whither to go.' Then he gave him a parchment roll, and there was written within, 'FLEE FROM THE WRATH TO COME!' The man therefore read it, and looking upon Evangelist very carefully, said, '*Whither* must I flee?' Then said Evangelist, pointing his finger over a very wide field, 'Do you see yonder Wicket-gate?' The man said, 'No.' Then said the other, 'Do you see yonder shining light?' He said, 'I think I do.' Then said Evangelist, 'Keep that light in your eye, and go up directly thereto, so shalt thou see the gate; at the which, when thou knockest, it shall be told thee what thou shalt do.' So I saw in my dream, that the

man *began to run.* Now he had not ran far from his own door, before his wife and children perceiving it, began to cry after him to return; but the man put his fingers in his ears, and ran on, crying "Life! life! eternal life!"

I have given this extract from Bunyan's "Pilgrim's Progress" for the benefit of those of my readers who may not have read that wonderful production. In this extract the "convicted" sinner is fairly represented by the man with "the burden" on his back. The "great burden" that is crushing him to earth is his sin which threatens to ruin him. The "book," he holds in his hand, and from which he is reading, is the Bible. Evangelist is the minister of the gospel, who, farther along in the narrative, points him to "One hanging upon a cross," found within the "Wicket-gate," which, when he beholds the "burden" falls from his back and is seen no more. This is where he *believes on the Lord Jesus Christ*, and *receives pardon.* This case, though in figure, is a fair sample of a true conversion. The Spirit of God operating upon the sinner's heart awakening him to the consequences of sin, places him under conviction; and thus is begun "Godly sorrow" which "works repentance" (2 Cor. 7:10.) Says one of Bunyan's Commentators upon this subject, "No soul was ever in earnest for salvation, *till there was a cry in his heart to be saved.*"

The man is not relieved of his burden *until he looks upon the One hanging on the cross—the only* remedy for sin. And when he does this, it is

"faith" taking hold of the promise, in which act *he "believes on the Lord Jesus Christ,"* and is saved. This is really what *"believing on Him"* constitutes and no amount of sophistry can change the fact.

Now which comes first, *"salvation,"* or *"repentance?" To "believe on the Lord Jesus Christ"* is to "be saved;" and now if it comes *before* "repentance," then certainly "repentance" is unnecessary, as we have already shown. But as "repentance" is absolutely a *"condition" of "salvation,"* and no man can be saved without it, it follows that it must *precede* the "faith" *that "justifies."* (Rom. 5:1.) *"Except ye repent,* ye shall all likewise perish," said Christ. (Luke 13:3, 5.) Says Andrew Fuller, who is quaintly styled "the Franklin of theology," *"To receive Christ is to believe in him;* and *to believe in Christ is to receive him.* There are some slight shades of difference between these and some other terms which are used to express faith in Christ; such as *believing, trusting, receiving,* etc., but they must be the same in substance, or they would not be used in the New Testament as convertible terms."

It has been aptly observed by some one, I do not remember who, that "faith" is the beggar's hand by which he reaches out and receives the gift. It is *by "faith"* that we obtain the promises. (Heb. 6:12; 11:33.) Says Paul, "By grace are ye saved, THROUGH FAITH." (Ephes. 2:8.) The meaning of this text is this: It was "grace," the grace of God, that provided the

means of redemption, "and not we ourselves," as in the rest of the verse it reads, but "the grace of God that bringeth salvation," (Titus 2:11); and being brought to us, "faith" is the means, or, so to speak, the instrument by which we reach out and lay hold of it; so that it is "*through faith*" that we are saved. In his "debate" with Wilkes, Rev. Ditzler makes the following observations on "faith" and "repentance."

"He and their people argue, from metaphysics, can a man be supposed to repent who has no faith? This grows out of a wrong conception of the true nature of repentance and faith both.

We are willing to test it by an appeal to metaphysics. We all know that a man will not repent in a Scripture sense, unless he believes there is a God offended, a Christ to save, etc. But right here is where they err. The admission that there is a God who hates sin, a Christ who saves sinners, *is not that reliance of the heart on the atonement that brings pardon—'the faith that works by love and purifies the heart.'*

"The very essence of repentance is a painful consciousness of our own self-deficiencies and helplessness as sinners, who have done evils we cannot undo—committed sins we cannot undo or blot out. Now, the whole idea of *Bible faith is, to rely on Christ to do that for us—blot out our sins—that we cannot do ourselves—to look to the blood of Christ, in its merit, to cover our sins, to wash us from defilement.* But who would think of applying thus to another for help, for aid, for mercy and gracious interposition, unless he

felt the *need* of it? But that *feeling of its need is the essence of repentance. That is repentance.* A 'Godly sorrow that worketh repentance,' is the Bible idea of it."

This has the true gospel ring. It shows that no sinner will rely on Christ for his salvation until he is brought *to feel that he is a sinner;* and *that he does not* realize this before he is convicted of the guilt of his transgressions. And this is the order laid down in the New Testament. Says the Apostle Paul, "With the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation." (Rom. 10: 10). If "faith" come *before* "repentance," then a man obtains righteousness before he repents! according to this text,—"believeth unto righteousness." But he cannot be righteous before God *until* he repents (Acts 3: 19); therefore he must repent *before* he *can "believe unto righteousness."* "Confession," in this text, cannot be construed to signify "repentance," with "belief" placed before it; for the context (v. 9) reverses the order and names "confession" first, and "belief" second. But "confession" is never used for "repentance." Webster gives as the meaning of "confession," in his secondary definition, "acknowledgment of belief; profession of one's faith," and cites Rom. 10: 10, the text before us, as a sample of it. These two words are not synonyms; they are from different words in the original. The Greek term for "confession" is *'omologia;* while that for "repentance" is *metanoia.* Robinson defines the former thus:

"*Assent, accord, agreement;* in New Testament, *confession, profession*, subjective." The latter he defines: *Change of mind* or *purpose, repentance;* in a religious sense, *repentance, penitence*, implying sorrow for unbelief and sin, and a turning from them unto God and the gospel of Christ." The following is the Scriptural order, showing that "repentance" always precedes "faith":

Mark 1: 15, "Repent ye, and believe the gospel."

Matt. 21: 23, "Ye believed him not; and when ye had seen it, repented not afterward, that ye might believe him."

Acts 20: 21, "Testifying to the Jews and also to the Greeks, repentance towards God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ."

Acts 3: 19, "Repent ye therefore, and be converted."

Heb. 6: 1, "Repentance from dead works, and faith toward God."

Acts 26: 20, "That they should repent and turn to God."

Such passages might be multiplied, but we give these as samples only to show what was the mind of the Holy Spirit as to whither "*saving faith*" could *precede* "repentance," or not. In our humble opinion it would be hard to imagine a greater metaphysical absurdity than, that a man can be justified by "faith" *before* repentance!

To prove, or to attempt to prove, that the "faith" of the gospel is nothing more than an *assent* to the claim of Jesus being the Son of God, we are cited to Acts 8: 37, where Philip and

the eunuch are brought to view. But unfortunately for such a claim, that 37th verse is not in the original. I have consulted the Emphatic Greek Diaglott, and other copies of the Greek text, and also Greek scholars, and find that the verse is wanting. It would appear rather strange that a man of Philip's type should be so ignorant of the true requirements of the gospel as to baptize a man that did not believe any more than it is possible for *all sinners* to believe,—simply that Jesus Christ is the Son of God! No; he did more than this; he "believed ON the Lord Jesus Christ"—taking him for *his personal* Savior,—in keeping with the teaching of all the rest of the apostles.

The difference between the "faith"—if it might be termed "faith"—of *assent*, and the "faith of *justification*," is that the first is a belief ABOUT Christ, i. e., a belief based upon historic credibility—just as we would believe the history of the conquest of England by William Duke of Normandy; the history of the career of Napoleon; or *any* other portion of history; while the second or latter is a belief ON Christ as one that enters into the very life and being of such believer, represented as *resting*, *depending upon Him for support*, without which he would fall; in which sense He is set forth as *being*, not simply giving, such sustenance, as expressed in the language of Holy Writ: "The Lord IS my strength and song, and IS BECOME MY SALVATION" (Psal. 118: 14); "THE ROCK OF MY SALVATION," etc. The first "belief" is common to all

the civilized, unregenerate, nations on earth. They all, as nations, "believe" the *story* ABOUT the man Christ Jesus; while in and of the constituency of those "nations" there are many that believe ON Him, which means that they have salvation. Mr. Ditzler, to whom reference has been made, thinks that there are not *two* "faiths," but *two degrees* of "faith." We cannot help thinking, however, that if what we have denominated the "faith of *assent*" is a "*degree*" of "faith," it certainly is a very *small* "degree." So *small* that it never *saves any one!* It is good as far as it goes, but it don't go far enough.

This "faith," or degree of "faith," precedes "repentance;" but the great defect of it is that it precedes repentance so far that repentance never overtakes it, and more than that, there is no apparent tendency in that direction. They are farther apart now than when they set out, and will continue to diverge to the end of time, being more heterogeneous than homogeneous in make up, figuratively speaking.

The characteristic difference between these two "faiths"—if we may be allowed to continue the dualistic classification—is that the "faith" of salvation, or saving "faith," is philanthropic in its effects; while the "faith" of assent is misanthropic in its effects. For while the former is the "faith" of JUSTIFICATION,—in that that man is *justified through it* (Rom. 5: 1); the latter is rather the "faith" of CONDEMNATION,—in that it condemns men for not complying with the condi-

tions the gospel holds out to them, on the principle that "to him that knoweth to do good, and doeth it not, to him it is sin" (Jas. 4:17). This "faith" condemns all who do not embrace salvation, so far as it reaches (Matt. 24: 14; John 3:19). Think you, dear reader, that the guilty men and women of this enlightened, gospel-privileged, country are not in a greater condemnation, from what they know of the truth, and refuse to obey, than they would be had they never known it? *Believing that Jesus Christ is the Son of God and refusing to be saved by Him*, brings a condemnation that, unless removed, will eventuate in damnation. That is just how saving this "faith," or degree of "faith," is. The man who *refuses* to believe that Jesus Christ is the Savior of men, and the man who assents to this great truth, but refuses to believe ON Him, as his Savior, are alike under condemnation.

It would be no more unreasonable, if it were as much so, to place "conversion" *before* "conviction," than to put the "saving faith" of the gospel *before* "repentance!" "Conviction," in the very nature of it, must *precede* "conversion;" so must "repentance" *precede* that—"faith"—which justifies and saves. This seems so palpable to the unsophisticated intelligence that argument ought to be unnecessary; though we have discussed the question for the purpose of elucidation, that the reader might the more readily discern between truth and sophistory; and also to show how vitally important the truth becomes

on a subject of such gravity as that of our redemption from sin and eternal death.

The case of the Pentecostal "conversions" will be in point. After Peter had preached that soul-stirring sermon under the power of the Holy Ghost, many of his audience were moved to exclaim: "Men and brethren, *what shall we do?*" Now, let us observe very closely the answer to the interrogation, and mark the requirements.

We find as a result of this sermon, accompanied as it was by the spirit's power, that these men were convicted of their sin when the Apostle charged home to them the crime of crucifying the Lord Jesus Christ, for the record says: "They were pricked in their hearts." Here then is "conviction" as the first thing after hearing the word of truth. Then comes the important question, "What shall we do?" Now, notice what the next thing is: "Then Peter said unto them, REPENT!" This then was the first thing for them to do. Now we wish to enquire *if they had believed* ON the Lord Jesus Christ yet, up to this time? As we have said, they had been *convicted* of their sin in crucifying Him, etc. We think there is no sane man living who will say that they had yet, up to this, "believed" ON Him. (Men "*believe unto righteousness*," and "are *justified by faith*.") Which side of "faith" then is repentance? Believing on the Lord Jesus Christ" *remits sins* (Acts 16:31); but their sins *were not yet remitted* (see v. 38), and could not be remitted *before* they repented of them; hence the injunction, "*repent!*" If "repentance" is the first

thing in order, then "faith" in Christ as THEIR PERSONAL SAVIOR must *succeed*, and *not precede*, "repentance." *By "faith" they must lay hold on the Son of God* and be saved from their sins, as they can do it in *no other way*. They might "repent" till "doomsday" and still be unsaved. "Faith" must *lay hold on the remedy*. If "repentance" were all that was necessary, "faith" would never have been mentioned. So they accept of Christ by "faith," "*believing in Him with the whole heart;*" and as an outward expression of this inward change, they receive the ordinance of baptism, a symbol of what "faith" in a crucified and risen Redeemer really signifies. And so we read that the next thing in order after "repentance," was, "And be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins" (Acts 2: 38). Not that the *mere ordinance of water baptism* was sufficient to remit their sins, but the *thing it symbolized*—"*faith*"—or reliance upon the Christ of God for redemption. And this "remission" took place *just where faith laid hold on Christ*, and *not* before or after. As a result of their compliance with these requisitions there were "three thousand" conversions. The effective work upon them first manifested itself in "conviction;" this by the power of the Spirit was the first phase of it; and it eventuated in "conversion." So that "conviction" is the beginning, and "conversion" the end, or result, of this redemptive process. And the next thing in order was the "gift of the Spirit."

If, however, there had been no "conviction," there would have been no "conversion," as there can be no true "repentance" without "conviction," and no "faith" on Christ without "repentance," and no "salvation" without "faith." This is the true order of the work. The one follows the other in logical succession. But for all this, the order is often reverted and perverted in the present loose way of gaining accessions to the church. Many persons are taken into membership without "conviction," "repentance," or "faith;" and are styled "converts." But as they are not "converted," no marvel if their after-lives give attestation to the fact. I do not mean to say that these essentials to salvation are not enjoined upon them by the church; but that there is much that is called "repentance" and "faith" that are not such. There can be no true "conversion" to *God, where there is not real deep heart-searching "repentance" for past sins.* The sinner must be made to feel that he is a lost individual before he will truly seek pardon. Real contrition cannot take place without this. "Conversion" is not something thrown over the faults of our lives to hide them and thus make us *appear* better, as some seem to think; but it is an *uncovering* of our evils, and a rooting out of our hearts everything that is sinful, a *separating* of ourselves from sin, that the monster shall not be our ruin. In a word it is a salvation FROM sin, and not a salvation IN it. True "conversion" to God through Christ is virtually a *death to sin*; and "how

shall we *that our dead to sin*, live any longer therein?" If we have not died to sin we have not been truly converted to God, as that is what "conversion" imports. And this brings us to consider the relative significance of the

ORDINANCE OF WATER BAPTISM.

The reason we have not placed it among the ordinals, under "the conditions of salvation," as something added to these, is because we did not consider it a separate thing, but a something implied in these. By some it is counted in among the numerals as though it were something distinct from them. I have heard them numbered over in this way: 1 Preaching; 2 Hearing; 3 Believing; 4 Conviction; 5 Repentance; 6 Confession; 7 Baptism. The construction is beautiful to look at, but the classification will not bear the Biblical test. By the misplacement they do not fit, as has already been shown. This arrangement is rather too technical in appearance, and savors somewhat of *human ingenuity*.

In looking at this "ordinance" in the light of Reason and Revelation, we enquire, in the first place, *What is baptism?* The answers to this will not be uniform. One will say that *it is pouring water on the head of a person in sacred rite.* Another will say "*it is sprinkling the liquid upon the candidate.*" And a third will say "*it is putting the candidate into the water.*" As we are not discussing *modes* of the ordinance now, we will simply say, that,

if this is their *highest ideal* of what constitutes "baptism," we think they are *all wrong!* If we can determine what "baptism," *really is*, perhaps we shall be able to tell which of these modes is nearest right. The "ordinance" must express a *design*; and until we have found the "design" we have not found what "baptism" is. In this I make a distinction between "ordinance" and "baptism." The "ordinance" is *merely a representation of "baptism,"* and not "baptism" in reality. I am aware that it is termed "baptism," as though the "ordinance" itself were all that was meant by the word "baptism." So we speak of the "bread" and "wine," and call them "the communion, "when strictly speaking and in reality they are *not* "the communion." The meaning of the word is "agreement," "harmony;" and when we observe the rite we express the "agreement" existing between us and our Lord, and also our faith of receiving life from Him, in the acts of manducation and deglutition—chewing and swallowing—as we do to sustain temporal life by taking into the system the elements of nutrition. So that the "bread" and "wine" are but the "*emblems*" of the "communion." If we believed in the doctrine of "transubstantiation," with the Roman Catholics, which is that the real substance of Christ's body and blood are in the "bread" and "wine," by a miracle, then we might consider the "bread" and "wine" the *communion itself* and *not a figure* of it. So is the "ordinance" or rite of "baptism"

a "figure" or *"symbol,"* and a very strong figure from the fact of what it represents.

"Baptism" in itself is death. Let us see if it is not. The "ordinance," or rite, in all instances in the New Testament where mention is made of its import, has that meaning.

On one occasion James and John came to Jesus and requested seats with Him in glory, one on His right hand and the other on His left, when he addressed them in this language: "Ye know not what ye ask: can ye drink of the cup that I drink of? and *be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with?"* What did Jesus mean by "baptism" here, if He did not mean *"death?"* The answer to these two questions is in the affirmative. Jesus replied: "Ye shall indeed drink of the cup that I drink of; and *with the baptism that I am baptized withal shall ye be baptized"* (Mark 10: 37–39). In the reply, he meant their death. In Luke 12: 50 He makes allusion to His death again in these words: I have *a baptism to be baptized with;* and how am I pained till it be accomplished?" Clark, Olshausen, Jamieson, Fausset and Brown, with Rice, commentators, say that He had reference to death in both instances. I do not think this interpretation of His words here can be set aside.

From this then we see that there is a "baptism" that does not have reference to "water." In a word, it is "baptism" of which "water is but the *"symbol."* Jesus received the "symbol" of His "baptism" when baptized of John in the Jordan. If we will keep this thought in mind

it will the better qualify us to understand wherein the "ordinance" does, and does not serve its purpose in its application to individiduals. Let us consider the meaning of the "ordinance" in its different representations. They are as follows:

I. As the "ordinance" is a *trope* or *figure of death* it must apply to us in whatever species of death is common to such a relation. The first of these is the "*death*" *to sin*. The elements of this death seem present in the remorse and anguish of a soul under the deep "conviction" of his guilt, though the individual does not expire until "faith" deals the final and fatal blow. Can the miseries of dying exceed those born of true "conviction" for sin?—a sample of which we had in Bunyan's sin-burdened man, looking in all directions for relief and finding it not. If there is a similitude of our conception of hell, so far as *mental* suffering goes, this is it. Genuine conviction knows no pardon as long as it lasts. It is only when the individual can give vent to his pent up emotions in contrition that pardon seems possible. This is really the work of "death"—a dying to sin—to be completed only when "faith" lays hold on the bleeding victim as the price paid for his ransom. There is just as real a death here as there is in our passing out of the natural life, only that it is of a spiritual character. It is a "putting off of the old man with his deeds" (Col. 3:9), a destruction of "the body of the sins of the flesh." It is a sort of mutual dying—we "die to sin," and "sin"

dies from us. It is the death of "the old man," the "old" Adamic nature, which is carnal and opposed to God. This "old man" always dies hard. The greater the hold he has on his victim, the more mighty is the effort to break that hold; and the more anguish felt and demonstration manifested in the dislodgment. But harder or easier, those who are saved must die this death; they *must die to sin before they can live to God.* I care not how much fine philosophy may be spun out in opposition to this, it remains the same stubborn immutable fact as before: that "sin cannot reign in these mortal bodies, to bring forth fruit unto death," and we, while in this condition, be *justified;* which thing would be to *justify the sinner in his sins.* Such was evidently the Apostle's idea of it when he uttered the following language:

"Know ye not, that so many of us *as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into His death?* Therefore we *are buried with Him by baptism into death:* that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, *even so we also should walk in the newness of life.* For if we have been planted together in the likeness of death, we shall be also in the likeness of His resurrection: *knowing this, that our old man is crucified with Him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin. For he that is dead is freed from sin. Now if we be dead with Christ, we believe we shall also live with Him. Knowing that Christ being raised from the dead dieth no*

more; death hath no more dominion over Him. For in that He died, He died unto sin once: but in that He liveth, He liveth unto God. Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through our Lord Jesus Christ." (Rom. 6:3-13.)

This was the Apostle Paul's idea of what takes place at conversion, and will bear putting against some of the modern improvements(?) made upon the plan of man's salvation, which advocate the saving the man in his sins. In this Scripture the Apostle draws a very striking analogy between Christ's death and that of the penitent sinner. There is a sense in which Christ slew sin when "He bore our sins in His own body on the tree:" He broke its power over man on the condition that man forever renounce his allegiance to it, and accept emancipation therefrom (John 8:34, 36; Rom. 6:16-18; 1 Peter 2:24), as He could not save man in any other way; for as long as sin remained in the individual it would "bring forth fruit unto death" eternal, and it could not do otherwise. And then in the next place, we are said to "*be buried with Him by baptism into death;*" that as He died for us, to put away our sins "by the sacrifice of Himself;" so we must *die to sin* in order to *be made free from its power*, without which we can never be delivered from it. Jesus is represented as *passing under the sceptre of "the King of Terrors,"* into the unseen, as an evanescent type. So *when we die to sin* we are said *to be "baptized,"* or immersed, "*into*

His death"—"buried with Him by baptism into death"—"planted together in the likeness of His death," for this express purpose: "*That like as Christ was raised up from the dead*"—out of the unseen—"by the glory of the Father, *even so we*"—*being delivered, raised from* "*dead works*"—"*should walk in newness of life.*" "For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection."

We certainly cannot fail to see the analogy in the explanation given by the Apostle here in this sixth chapter of Romans. It follows the order of "literal" disease or departure. (1) There is *the death* of the individual—the *extinction* of life and being—"a cessation of all the vital functions, when those functions have not only ceased to act, but have lost all susceptibility of renewed action;" and consequently he is unconscious to all going on in the world of life and motion. This is Webster's definition of literal, natural death. (2) Then comes the *burial*, as the next thing in order, when the "literal" man disappears from sight entirely—"lost to view." First, *life disappears*, then the *body disappears*, and the individual is gone under the power and dominion of the death to return not again until a *resurrection* shall reproduce him.

Now let us carry out the analogy: When the person dies to sin, all the functions of a depraved nature have not only ceased to act—in the commission of sins—but will have lost, in the provisions of the Spirit, all susceptibility of

renewed action, which signifies *extinction.* As when a man dies out of this world, he is dead to the world and all that is in it; so when a man dies to "sin," he becomes dead to all lusts, passions, carnal desires, and influences peculiar to it, and his relations to sin cease; as it is utterly impossible for a person to be dead and alive at the same time, in the same species of life and death—"death" being the antithesis of "life"—the presence of the one signifying the absence of the other. Says Rev. James Kerr upon this point:

"They that are Christ's are *dead to sin*, for by their baptism they have come under the most solemn obligations to be conformed to Christ, in his burial, and resurrection: that is, to be dead to sin, as one *who is naturally dead, is dead to all the things of this world; and to be alive to holiness, as one that is alive from the dead. This is what every one who has been baptized into Christ, is under solemn obligations to be;* and what every one *who has been baptized by the Holy Ghost, in reality is.*"

This seems plain enough when we consider the subject in its true light. It would be deemed a great absurdity for a person to suppose, in regard to the "literal death," that a man could be a corpse, and at the same time a living being. But I want to ask if it is any more absurd than to suppose a man can be dead in a spiritual sense, and at the same time, and in the same sense, alive! Any one can see that the thing is an impossibility. When you say

that a person is "dead to sin," you say by that expression that "sin" is a dead letter to him; he is just as dead to dead works as is the "corpse" to all the vital energies consequent upon organized existence. I think this is a self-evident truth, and no far-fetched analogy.

We have thus looked at the *reason* of it; and to turn our thoughts for a moment to the *Word* again, can there be any thing different got out of that? All prejudice and theoretical bias aside, can you dig out of the sixth chapter of Romans, the one before us, anything other than complete "death to sin?" Let us repeat a little of it again by way of refreshing our memory: "Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with him (Christ), that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin. For he that is dead is freed from sin. * * * Reckon yourselves *to be dead indeed unto sin.*" If this Scripture does not mean what it says, won't some one please tell us *what* it does mean? And Colossians 2:11, 12, is to the same import. We read: "And ye are complete in him, which is the head of all principality and power: in whom (Christ) also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, *in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ: buried with Him in baptism; wherein also ye are risen with Him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised Him from the dead.*"

In this Scripture as in the other (Rom. 6), the same figures are kept up. There is first,

the death—the "putting off of the body of the sins of the flesh;" second, the burial—"buried with Him in baptism;" and third, resurrection, —"ye are risen with Him."

Among the many notable things in these Scriptures is the close connection between the three conditions, or acts, of the redemptive process—"death," "burial," and "resurrection." They are so linked together that to separate them would be to destroy the force of each. For the subject no sooner dies to sin than he is represented as having passed, by baptism, into death; and in this very act, to have passed into another state of existence, answering to the "resurrection:" buried with Him in baptism, WHEREIN (in which thing) also ye are risen with Him *through the faith of the operation of God.*" Of course this must necessarily be so; for as soon as a person dies to sin he is then alive to God through Christ, though he is represented in the figure as *rising* from the dead to show forth that spiritual existence consequent upon his deliverance from "the body of death," and "dead works," expressed in "newness of life."

But this rising from "dead works" is so connected and associated with the "resurrection" of Christ in both these chapters, as in others, that it is plain this redemption from sin, represented as rising from the "death" of sin, is dependent upon, and had its birth in the event of Christ's rising from the dead. As we are said to die with Him—to be "planted with Him in the likeness of His death"—"buried with Him

by baptism into death;" so we are said to "rise with Him" (Col. 3:1),—to be "in the likeness of His resurrection." In demonstration of Christ's "resurrection" (1 Cor. 15:14, 17), the Apostle makes our deliverance from sin depend upon His deliverance from death: "*If Christ be not raised * * * ye are yet in your sins.*" He "was delivered for our offenses, and *raised again for our justification.*" (Rom. 4:25.)

Then we read again: "Christ being raised from the dead dieth no more; death hath no more dominion over him." Of the converts in the same chapter (Rom. 6:13, 14), we read: "Yield yourselves unto God, *as those that are alive from the dead. * * Sin shall not have dominion over you.*" Christ being raised from the dead dies not again, for "death has no more dominion over Him:" the individual who has died to sin, and is alive unto God, "alive from the dead," to carry out the comparison, *dies not again*, for "*sin has no more dominion over*" *him;* because he "*is freed from sin.*" By careful reading of the 9th, 10th and 11th verses of this chapter, the candid reader cannot fail to see that such is the conclusion to be drawn. The thought of the Apostle seems to be that the death of Christ effected once for all the believer's redemption, and now to purchase it *over again* for him would require another such a death and offering. Read carefully Heb. 6:4-6 and 10:2.

This "death" to sin cannot be appropriately termed "a *change of heart,*" or "a *change of nature.*" "Death" does not imply "*change,*"

but "destruction," "demolition." As well talk about "sin" being changed into "righteousness," as to say that the carnal nature must be changed into a spiritual, holy nature. That "old nature" dies, as we have said, and a "new nature" takes its place; in which condition the man is termed "*a new creature*" (2 Cor. 5:17.) If the "old nature" was simply changed, then it would only be the "*old*" *creature vamped over;* and it ought to read that way. Then the text, "If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new;" ought to read: "If any man be in Christ, he is an old creature made over; old things have been repaired; behold, all old things are made new." This kind of botch-work would not answer in salvation; it might in other matters to some extent. The Apostle in speaking of "the carnal mind," which we sometimes use synonymously with the words "carnal nature" says of it thus: "The carnal mind *is enmity against God:* for it is not subject to the law of God, NEITHER INDEED CAN BE." So we may white-wash it over as much as we will, and it remains the same *old* "*enmity against God*" —not being susceptible of reformation, or regeneration in the least degree; and as it can never get any better than itself, it is folly to expect righteousness to emanate therefrom.

Thus we have given us in the Word, the meaning of "baptism," in a *primary* sense; and we find it to mean "death"—"death to sin." This being so, and involving, as we have shown, an

overwhelming of the person in the element of death, and a rising therefrom to live a new life in Christ; what MODE in the ordinance would best express the design of "baptism?" We have noticed such expressions in Romans 6th and Col. 2d, as "buried with him by baptism into death;" "baptized into his death;" "planted together in the likeness of his death," etc. I will leave the reader to decide which of the three modes used—"*sprinkling*," "*pouring*," or "*immersing*"—comes the nearest to expressing the *design* of "baptism." It should be borne in mind, however, that the element of "death" is not represented *as falling on the individual* in "baptism," and thus being *applied to him;* but *he* is represented as *passing into it*, as signified by these terms, and *is thus applied to it.*

From what has been said in regard to the subject of "baptism," showing it to be a "death to sin," it is very evident that the "*ordinance*," being but the *symbol*, cannot change the individual's condition. It is not the real "baptism" for that reason, as has been shown; for the real "baptism" is the *dying of the old nature*, called the "old man;" the destruction of the "body of sin;" the "crucifying of the flesh with the affections and lusts" (Rom. 6:6; Col. 3:9; Gal. 5:24)—while this is in no real sense true of the *simple* "*ordinance;* "for if it were, EVERY ONE WHO had *received the* "*ordinance*" *would be, to all intents*, "dead to sin!" which we are certain that no person outside of a lunatic asylum will claim, in the face of a world of facts to the con-

trary. If the individual coming to Christ have not received an answer of peace and pardon, we do not see how the application of "*water*" will bring it. And for this sufficient reason we would not advise such to go into the water until he had received an evidence that his sins were forgiven him. It has been said that some persuasions, notably the Baptists, baptize or immerse persons *because they are saved*, or *pardoned*. Surely it would not be the right thing to do to baptize them BEFORE *they* were *saved*, or forgiven—unless we could conceive of the "ordinance" and not "faith," the all-sufficient and efficacious thing; and if this *rite* of baptism is the great remitting act or agency, then "faith," as such, "is made void." For if the individual's sins are not remitted until they are remitted by the "*rite* of baptism," then the great and essential thing to salvation is this "*ordinance*." Then instead of it reading: "Therefore being justified BY FAITH, we have peace," etc., it should read thus: "Therefore being justified BY THE ORDINANCE OF WATER BAPTISM, we have peace," etc. (Rom. 5:1.) To say that "faith" must cooperate with the "ordinance" does not help out of the difficulty, because, according to this doctrine, it matter not how long and how strong one might exercise "faith" in Christ as the Savior of sinners, he could not be delivered from the guilt of his sins until the *ordinance* delivered him; therefore it is the "ordinance" and not "faith" that saves us! But inasmuch as we are taught in the Scriptures

of the New Testament that the blessings of peace and pardon come *through "faith"* (Rom. 3:28; Gal. 2:16; 3:9; 5:6; Phil. 3:9). we are slow to attribute to a bare "ordinance" an undue importance. If the individual, on accepting of the conditions of salvation, do not receive an answer of pardon, instead of *going into the water to find it*, he should go again to a *throne grace;* and if he have not cast himself entirely upon the Lord he should do so, making an *unconditional surrender of all he has and is*, and he will find that the trouble lies with *himself*, and not in any great saving power inherent in an *external rite*—being assured that He who *cannot lie* has said: "Him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out" (John 6:37.) If the heart is not altogether right and contrite before God, it is very evident to any rational intelligence that "water" applied to the person in *any form* CANNOT *right it*. This doctrine smells too strongly of Popery. The votaries of that religion hold so implicitly to the saving efficacy of "water," that, let their sins be what they may, they think, or pretend to think, that when the "consecrated water" is sprinkled upon them they are made holy in consequence.

In dismissing this phase of the subject, we would say that we regard "baptism," as taught in the 6th chapter of Romans and the 2d chapter of Col., and referred to in Rom. 13:14: Gal. 3:27; Eph. 2:1; 4:22, and Col. 3.9, 10—the *sine qua non*, or indispensible condition, to salvation. In other words, except a person "dies to sin"

he cannot be saved. This is what Peter affirmed also when he said: "The like figure whereunto baptism doth also now save us (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ" (1 Pet. 3:21.) It is *only when* we become "*dead*" to the service of sin that we can possess a "good conscience toward" a sin-hating God. And this is accomplished *not by the aquatic emblem*, but, by the "baptism," itself—when the individual has "put off the body of the sins of flesh," and in toto become "a new creature" in Christ Jesus, with all the significance of this "figure" of death.

II. The "ordinance" of baptism, in the second place, is trophical or metaphorical of *literal* "death," both as an agent, and as a state or condition. Says the Apostle Paul in his argument on the resurrecton of the dead: "What shall they do which are baptized *for the dead*, if the dead rise not at all? Why are they then *baptized for the dead?* And why stand we in jeopardy every hour?" Wilson, in his diaglott, renders the verse (1 Cor. 15:29) thus: "what will those do who are BEING IMMERSED on behalf of the DEAD? If the dead are not raised at all, why then are they immersed on their behalf?"

It is thought by some critics that the Apostle in this text makes allusion to a pratice at Corinth of baptizing a living person in *behalf* of a friend who died unbaptized. Supposing the Apostle here has reference to the christian "ordinance" of baptism, this construction placed upon the

passage seems untenable. (1) It is not probable that there were Christians in St. Paul's day so ignored of the gospel of their salvation as to believe it a thing of *proxy*. If they had accepted of Christ and His teaching they could not but understand that *each one* must answer for *himself* to God (Rom. 14:12; Gal. 6:5); and that, one could not believe or receive the ordinance of baptism for another, and thus make salvation effective by a system of proxy, or substitution. (2) If then there had been such heretical christians at Corinth—if such a thing were probable —it is strange that there is no direct censure dealt them by the Apostle.

The argument here adduced by the Apostle Paul, was *not* to note the consequences to false systems of theology in case there were no resurrection of the dead; but to recount the effects of a no-resurrection theory upon the gospel he was preaching if the former were true, or so demonstrated. (See vs. 16, 18 and 32). It is safe to say that in his strong plea for the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead, staking the hope of the Christian upon its verity, the Apostle alluded to the fact of that striking resemblance —the "ordinance of baptism," or immersion, as *a figure*, bears to literal *death*, *burial*, and *resurrection*; for in it there are the typical death, burial, and rising again, so represented at least. For the benefit of my readers, I will give what Clarke says upon this text. After quoting Matt. 20:22, 23; Mark 10:38; and Luke 12:50, where sufferings and martyrdom are repre-

sented by immersion he sums up the Apostle's meaning as follows:

"If there be no resurrection of the dead, those who, in becoming Christians, expose themselves to all manner of privations, crosses, severe sufferings, and a violent death, can have no reward, nor any motive sufficient to induce them to expose themselves to such miseries. But as they receive baptism as an *emblem of death*, in *voluntarily going under water;* so they receive it as an emblem of the *resurrection* unto eternal *life*, in *coming up out of the water;* thus *they are baptized for the dead*, in perfect faith of *the resurrection*. The three following verses (30, 31, 32) seem to confirm this sense."

But Clarke is only one among many writers who so understands this text. Holding the doctrine of resurrection as essential to salvation, as shown by the Apostle in this 15th chapter of 1 Corinthians, they could not help seeing that there must be *something* in the economy of the gospel to represent it, and what is there given, but this figure to express its import? Every great gospel truth is so represented. Take Christ as an offering for sin, and all the Jewish sacrifices peculiar to the Levitical economy, served as figures, or types of Him, as we have pointed out in a previous chapter. Again: the *true passover* in Christ had its shadow in the paschal lamb connected with the Exodus (See 1 Cor. 5:7; Exodus 12.) The land of Canaan represented the eternal inheritance of the people of God (Heb. 4:9.) And many more such signifi-

cant types or representations could be shown; but these, together with the use of the "ordinance" of baptism No. "I," are sufficient at present, to convince the most incredulous minds, that God, in all His great doings, deals in symbols, or metaphors, to illustrate the truths that underlie them. And would it not be strange if a doctrine characterized by New Testament prominence as is that of the resurrection, should fail to be so symbolized or illustrated? It would almost seem from the plentitude of figures representing all the other doctrines of the gospel, used as affirmations of their truth, that if that of the resurrection were left without a representative it were an argument against its veraciousness.

But the resurrection, as a truth, has a representative figure, and that is the *ordinance* of baptism, and as neither of the other modes has any resemblance to it whatever, nothing but *immersion* can prefigure it. There is first the *death;* and then the *interment*, or *burial*, when the grave or tomb envelopes the dead saint, and he has disappeared entirely from sight, and then he *reappears* in the great gathering time by the fiat of the Lord Jesus Christ, and this will constitute a *resurrection* from the dead. In the "ordinance" of immersion, as we have shown, there is represented a *death to sin;* and then a *burial* in the liquid grave, when the candidate passes into a symbolical death—which would be real if left there a moment; and then lastly comes the resurrection in the figure, when the

believer is raised up out of this element of symbolical death by the physical power of the operator.

In the first signification of the ordinance, which is a "death to sin," as has been shown, there is the transformation, or renewal of the spiritual man—a change from nature to grace: in the second signification, or resurrection, there is the "change of this vile *body*," and the "fashioning of it like unto the glorious body" of the Redeemer (Phil. 3:21.) The first deals with the *inner*, and the second with the *outer*, man. The former is a *redemption from sin;* the latter is a *redemption from death.* So that redemption is not complete, as is very evident, until the deliverance from *death* takes place, which can never be without a resurrection to immortality, when the subject can die no more.

This being the baptism to which Christ referred in Matt. 20:22, 23; Mark 10:39; and Luke 12:50, of which all Christians are partakers, and of which immersion is but the symbol, how very important it is that we give our minds to the contemplation of it. There is no theme within the range of our finite conceptions of such moment as is this theme of man's redemption from sin and *consequent death.*

III. The "ordinance" is also symbolical of *moral cleansing.* Water is a *purifying* element, as we know. It is a detergent of universal application, and has been through time. Under the law, the leper was commanded to wash himself and his clothes thoroughly in water before

he was ceremonially and virtually cleansed of his leprosy. (Lev. 14:8, 9.) The laver occupied an important place in the ritual of the tabernacle, to be used by the priests in removing the filth of the flesh (Exodus 30:19.) So important was this sacerdotal observance in the type that the lives of the priests depended upon it, (Exodus 30:20, 21)—not that the water removed any *moral* stain, whatever, but that it pointed to a cleansing that would, without which death would be inevitable.

The figure evidently signifies this in Titus 3:5, "According to his mercy he saved us, *by the washing of regeneration*," and also in Eph. 5:26, "That he might *sanctify* and *cleanse it* (the church) *with the washing of water by the word.*" In these two passages of Scripture nothing more than the symbolical, or figurative import of water is meant. The thought is, that as water is used in physical cleansing, so the regenerative spiritual agency is employed in cleansing from the defilement of sin and depravity; for no one ought to be so absurd as to suppose that *literal water* could accomplish this. Water can cleanse the clothes and skins of people; but never their *consciences* and *characters*, however wisely applied. Alexander Cruden says the ordinance of baptism "*signifies inward spiritual washing, whereby the gifts and graces of the Spirit, signified by the outward sign, are really and actually bestowed.*" This is the meaning of 1 Cor. 6:11, where the Apostle, speaking of the different classes of wicked persons—

thieves, the covetous, drunkards, revilers, extortioners, etc.—whom he affirms shall not inherit the kingdom of God, says to those Corinthians, "Such were some of you, but ye *are washed*, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified *in the Lord Jesus*, and *by the Spirit of our God.*" To the same import is Acts 22:16, the words of Ananias to Paul at the time of the latter's conversion. "And now why tarriest thou? Arise and *be baptized and wash away thy sins*, calling on the name of the Lord." Say Jamieson and Brown on this text, "This way of speaking arises from baptism being the visible seal of remission, calling on the name of the Lord—rather, having called, i. e., *after* having done so; referring to the confession of Christ which *preceded* baptism." Evidently the ordinance of baptism here, could do no more than to symbolize or emblematize the real regenerative act of the Holy Spirit in applying the *all cleansing blood of Christ* to the heart and conscience of the pentitent Soul; as 1 John 1:7 would assure us in believing that *nothing but the blood of Christ* can do this "*washing*," or *cleansing*. "*The blood of Jesus* "*Christ cleanseth us from all sin.*" And also Revelation 7:14 and 1:5: "These are they which came out of great tribulation, and *have washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb.*" "Unto him that loved us, and *washed us from our sins in his own blood.*" So that the "washing" in all these, and other places as well, have reference to a cleansing of which the element of water is the type and symbol of *purifi-*

cation. Neither does it signify that "blood" and "water" are *united* or *mixed* in the ordinance; because, if so, *then every one who received the water would also get the efficacy of the blood;* and in that case *all who are baptized by water would be cleansed from sin*, the "blood of Christ" being applied in the water.

There are some who think that the symbol and substance *are united* in the ordinance. The following is copied from the "Christian Guide" of Louisville, Ky., by Rev. F. Adkins (See "*Disciples and Baptists*," by F. Adkins). The editor says:

"The Baptists, from time immemorial, have demanded *blood before water*, i. e., an application of the cleansing power of the blood of Christ to the sinner *before baptism;* while Pedobaptists demand *water before blood.* Disciples occupy the medium ground, baptism for remission—BLOOD IN WATER." This gives to the rite the power and efficacy of salvation, stripping it of all its symbolism. But who is prepared for the conclusions? It is very plain to see what absurdities must grow out of such an untenable position.

There could be no more suitable emblem employed in the great redemptive plan, to signify, or prefigure, the *cleansing from the pollutions of sin and iniquity*, than this very ordinance of water baptism, in its time and place. While there is power in the blood of Christ to *cleanse* from all sin, water that washes the filth off of literal objects, and so effectually purifies and

cleanses, is very befitting to illustrate that fact. Says Rev. Wm. Reid (in "*The Blood of Jesus*"), in regard to *the cleansing power* of the atonement announced in the gospel: "The whole race, and every individual 'man,' is utterly depraved in heart, his will averse from good, his conscience is defiled, his understanding is darkened, his affections are alienated from God and set upon unworthy objects, his desires are corrupt, his appetites ungoverned; and, unless the Holy Spirit impart a new nature, and work an entire change on the whole faculties of his mind by '*the washing of water through the word*,' *cleansing away his filthiness of spirit as water cleanses away outward defilement*, he must remain an unfit subject for God's holy kingdom."

Wm. Cowper has beautifully expressed this idea of the sin-cleansing blood in that memorable hymn:

> "There is a *fountain* filled with blood,
> Drawn from Immanuel's veins;
> And sinners *plunged beneath that flood*,
> *Loose all their guilty stains.*
>
> The dying thief rejoiced to see
> That *fountain in his day;*
> *And there may I, though vile as he,*
> *Wash all my sins away.*"

Said David: *Wash me thoroughly from mine iniquity, and cleanse me from my sin.* * * * *Wash me*, and I shall be whiter than snow." (Psal. 51 : 2, 7.)

Thus the thought of *cleansing* from the defilement and filthiness of sin is conceived in the minds of men and plainly taught in the sacred

Scriptures, as we have noticed. And this great truth, like others, must necessarily have a figure, or symbol, to represent it; and what could more forcibly illustrate it than the application of *water* in the *ordinance* of baptism? It is *an outward sign* of *an inward cleansing*. This fact being established, what *mode* would the most suitably express it? Would not that which answers the nearest to what is demanded —*a washing?* Then, surely, a few drops of water, sprinkled upon the head or in the face, could in no possible way be construed into a WASHING. No one ever performs ablutions by droppings of water. There is no similarity existing between ablution and aspersion—washing and sprinkling; and therefore it is the wrong figure to represent a cleansing from sin.

And pouring a small stream of water upon the head of a person would be rather a novel way of expressing the thorough cleansing of the *entire* man. As the *whole* man is involved in the malady, and so represented in the word of truth; —as a befitting description of the permeating nature of sin, the prophet says of it: "From the sole of the foot even unto the head there is no soundness in it; but wounds and bruises, and putrifying sores." (Isa. 1: 6.) And as the *whole* man is represented as being embraced in the remedy for an entire cleansing (1 John 1: 7, 9), to fully express this in the symbol of purification, it is due that he pass *entirely into the element which so symbolizes it.* For if we would be true to the befitting nicety of facts to their rep-

resentative figures, we would conclude that a *partial* cleansing in the symbol calls for a *partial* cleansing in the substance, and nothing more. But we do not want to be understood in this as saying that the symbolic, or ritualistic, measures and controls the substantial cleansing; for, this idea we impugn; but only so far *as the law of similis* is involved do we think the figure stands related to the fact it is designed to represent, in all its analogous bearings, or at least as nearly so as it is possible for it to be.

I am aware of the fact that there were *sprinklings* and *pourings* under the law, and that these are frequently brought forward in argument as evidence of the *mode* of "baptism." But one could with equal propriety prove the present obligatoriness of *circumcision*, as to go back to the law for the ordinance of Christian baptism. The shadows of Judaism are past, and we have reached the substance in Christ; therefore we have a right to come to the New Testament for authority. And where in it do we find either of these modes enjoined upon the candidate? The word "baptize" is *baptizo* in the Greek, and does not signify to *sprinkle*, or *pour*, but to *dip*, to *immerse*. Robinson says the word *baptizo* means *to dip in, to sink, to immerse*. Also *to wash, to lave, to cleanse by washing*, to *perform ablution*. (See *Greek and English Lexicon of the New Testament by E. Robinson, D.D.*)

As we have already observed, the "ordinance" or figure must express a *design*, and in

order to do so there must be a *likeness*, or *resemblance*, between it and that which it is intended to shadow forth, or symbolize. And what resemblance is there between either of these modes or manners of *slightly and scrimpingly applyingly water upon the head or in the face*, and the *washing of the entire person?* None whatever. It is very evident then that either one of these modes is insufficient to express what they are made to express by many. But if we should concede that affusion and aspersion were sufficient to express *washing*—a thing unlikely, as we have seen—how are they, or either of them, to prefigure the two species of death, as we have noticed them in "I" and "II"? There is nothing in either of these modes to resemble, or typify in the least degree, "*death*," "*burial*," and *resurrection*." And those who make use of them have to ignore entirely this meaning the New Testament gives to the "ordinance." (Rom. 6: 3–6).

We will now take our leave of the subject of baptism, or the ordinance, and turn our attention to the next consecutive theme that seems to be of relative inportance.

In this chapter we have tried to present what we understand to be "the conditions of salvation;" and whether we have discharged the obligations devolving on us in such an undertaking, and adhered to the word of truth with reason and common sense, we will leave the impartial reader to judge. We have this consolation, however, that while we are sure we

have crossed some popular lines of thought in the presentation of these views, we have been equally as conscientious in the attempt to place before the reader the way of life eternal.

The only apology we have to offer for taking up so much space in discussing the subject of the "ordinance" of baptism in its different phases in the same chapter, is that we consider it a part of what has been placed before it, in the chapter; and to have placed it in a separate chapter, and by itself, in a book of this nature would be to detach it from its logical connections.

While we leave the subject with leaving the chapter, we shall have to touch upon it again incidentally in the chapter on the "Kingdom." We cannot well avoid this advertence in attempting to identify that "kingdom," and ascertain who its subjects are. So that we trust we shall not have exhausted the patience of the candid reader and made the theme odius in his eyes from the much controverted character of it. He should remember, however, that what is true in a material sense—that men do not find gold on top of the ground, but deep down into the earth, and that by much digging—is also true in in this spirtual sense—the great truths of the gospel do not seem to lie upon the surface to be seen by the eye of the natural man, but out of his sight, to be searched for; and we should "search for them as for hid treasure." (Pro. 2:4, and 1 Tim. 3:16.)

CHAPTER V.

THE KINGDOM.

In the preceding chapter we reached that point at which the individual was made a "perfect man in Christ Jesus;" and being saved and cleansed from sin by the atoning blood of the Redeemer, he is prepared for better relations and associations than he had before. There must be adaptation between the saved man and the conditions under which he lives, in order to have spiritual growth and development. So in the divine economy there has been provision made for this. The kingdom of Christ, or the kingdom of God, is brought to our notice in the New Testament Scriptures, as a *place* or *condition*, characterized by its freedom from sin. There is much said in the Word of truth about "the righteous inheriting the kingdom." (Matt. 5: 3.)

Before attempting to show "what" that "kingdom" is, we will try to show *what it* is *not*. For some people have a vague idea of what the kingdom is; of its nature, character, purpose, etc. It is quite commonly thought that the *church* is the "kingdom." And this brings us to ask the question, Is the *literal church organization* the kingdom of God? If it is, then there are just as many kingdoms as there are separate church organizations, no more and no less. That is, if

the "organization" has anything to do with establishing the identity of the church; and I suppose it has, for without the "organization" there could be no church, as such. Dr. Webster gives this definition of the verb, "organize." "To arrange or constitute in parts, each having a special function, act, office, or relation; to systematize; to get into working order;—applied to products of the human intellect, or to human *institutions and undertakings*, as a science, a government, an army, a war, etc."

From this definition of the word, it would be hard to conceive of such a thing as a literal *un*organized church. *Chaos* would be the better name for it. And if it were "chaos," which means *confusion, disorder*, then it would not be a "church." So we see that "church" and "organization," in their literal import, cannot be divorced. Then there are as many "churches," as there are "organizations," and consequently as many "kingdoms" as there are "churches!" It may be said that all the organizations are included in the "kingdom." If so then *the "organization"* is not the "kingdom" as they are not identical; for a part cannot be equal to the whole. The "kingdom" is invariably spoken of in the *singular* number; while the church is frequently used in the plural number; and when the local "organization" is referred to, the New Testament writers frequently use the plural number. (As samples see Acts 9:31; 15:41; 16:5; 19:37; Rom. 16:4; 1 Cor. 7:17; 11:16; 14:33; 16:1; Rev. 1:4, 11,20, 2:7).

It is clear then that "organization" and "kingdom" are not the same, or there would be as many "kingdoms" as there are "organizations;" but there is only ONE "kingdom;" while of "organizations," it may be said, "their name is *Legion*," for they are *many*.

Nor are these multiplied "organizations" the *constituent elements* of the kingdom. To think they are, is to entertain a very low, and materialistic view of that kingdom. One's appreciation, or estimate, of any thing cannot rate higher than his conception of it. To suppose the "kingdom" of God composed of a heterogenious mass of church organizations, of all the *discordant sects of Christendom*, would be to take a very *low* and *inappreciative* view of that kingdom, to say the least. Our conception of it being low, our ideas with regard to the qualifications for admission into it, will be correspondingly low. It is very plain that if the kingdom of God is composed of the various church organizations, it cannot be any greater, grander, purer than they are.

If the church is the kingdom, then *to be in the church, is to be in the kingdom*, without regard to *how* the individual may get into it. If his *name* is on the church roll he is in that kingdom of which *Christ* said that *none could enter* without a *second birth!* Christ told Nicodemus (John 3), that except a man was born of Water and Spirit *he could not get into the kingdom of God*, which could mean nothing short of *regeneration* as a qualification for admission. Some have concluded that because "water," is mentioned here in con-

nection with the second birth—which (birth) constitutes the fitness for entering the kindom—and that because "water" baptism, or immersion, is a requisite qualification to membership in their church; that therefore the ordinance of baptism is the "water" referred to, and their *church the kingdom*, thereby establishing the doctrine of "baptismal regeneration," or regeneration consequent upon the observance of the *ordinance* of immersion! They reason syllogistically as folows:—

Persons enter the kingdom through immersion;

Persons enter the church through immersion;

Therefore the church is the kingdom.

But this reasoning is false, as is plain to be seen. In logic, when either of the premises is wrong the conclusion must be. In this syllogism the major premise is false. Persons do not "enter the kingdom *through immersion;*" they enter the kingdom by a *second* "*birth*," or *regeneration*. Therefore the church *is not* the kingdom. But to identify the requirement of entering the kingdom with that of entering the church, they must needs reason something like this:

The birth of *water* (of John 3:5) is regeneration;

Immersion is the birth of water. Therefore "immersion" is *regeneration*.

The object is to *identify immersion with regeneration* in order to establish the identity of the church and kingdom. But a greater

impossibility could not well be conceived of. In this syllogism the major proposition again is false, and the minor proposition—"immersion is the birth of water"—is disputed by reputed theological writers. To claim the major proposition—"the birth of water is regeneration"—would be to incur the guilt of repudiating the "birth of the Spirit" in the same (fifth) verse; while the reference to this new birth in the sixth and eighth verses, as well throughout the epistles of the Apostles wherever mention is made of it, terms it "*born of the Spirit*," and never once appellated "*born of water*," or "birth of water," or "regenerated by water," a fact significant of the force and scope of the expression, "*born of the Spirit*," without any allusion whatever to a "birth of water." That Jesus here had reference to a *spiritual nature* consequent upon such a "birth," and not simply to the observance of an external ordinance, is affirmed by the sixth verse: "That which is *born of the Spirit* IS SPIRIT."

And, bearing upon the import of the minor proposition of this syllogism, we will give the reader Rice's view of the text in the following extract. He says:—

"Without changing the truth, Jesus puts it into a new form, a stronger statement of the new birth than before (in the third verse), but in language reflecting similar truth in the Old Testament. What is it to be born of water and the Spirit? Is it not clearly another expression for 'born anew?' Nicodemus was amazed at the first answer, and Jesus proceeds to explain

the truth, in different, and, to Nicodemus, in plainer terms. There is therefore *no reference to baptismal regeneration* here unless the 'born anew' means that. Is it intended to teach that baptism is a necessary part of the new birth? If so, how can we explain the promise to the penitent thief on the cross? Is it not evident that water is referred to, as in the Old Testament, as a symbol of purification?

Westcott ingeniously suggests that the grouping of 'water and Spirit' in the new birth refers back to creation, when, by the brooding of the Spirit of God upon the face of the waters, the earth came forth out of chaos, a new birth. Water does surely signify purification, as spirit does life. The words may have looked forward to Christian baptism *not as necessary* to spiritual birth, but AS *a sign* of it, although this view is strenuously opposed to Calvin, Zwingli, Charnock, Ryle, Lampe, and other great theologians. *It is not likely that there is any direct reference to Christian baptism here.* This is more probable from the change in the last clause, from 'see,' of verse 3, to 'enter,' as in this verse. The first form is the truth solely from the spiritual, and, to the natural man, the invisible side. The second is the truth from the Jewish side; the change it accomplishes, including a purification, and an entry into the kingdom. The priest went through a purification familiar to Nicodemus. But whatever the interpretation, it must be acknowledged that the phrase in verse 5 is a

repetition of the same truth stated in verse 3." (*People's Commentary on John.*)

So we see that immersion, or the ordinance of baptism, answers to regeneration correspondingly as well as the literal church organization answers to the kingdom of God when applied to John 3: 3, 5, not any better.

But let us compare the kingdom of God, as described in the New Testament Scriptures, characteristically with the modern church, and see how nearly they resemble each other.

I have shown in the preceding chapter that a "new creature" is *a regenerated creature*, which, of course, is the result of a "new" or "second birth," when, and *not until* that, can he *enter* the kingdom of God, according to John 3:3, 5; and more than that he cannot even *see* that kingdom before he is born anew (verse 3). Does this not mean that he has become *dead to sin* and *alive to God?* If it does not, I am ready to confess that I do not understand the sense of words. That it means none but the righteous can enter that kingdom, in keeping with the text before us. I quote, 1 Corinthians 6: 9, 10: "Know ye not that the unrighteous *shall not* inherit the kingdom of God? *Be not deceived: neither fornicators, nor idolators, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind, nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners shall inherit the kingdom of God.*" The Apostle goes on here to say to these brethren: "And such were some of you; but *ye are washed*, but *ye are sanctified* but *ye are justified in the name*

of the Lord Jesus and by the Spirit of our God." Here is Spiritual birth again.

Other characteristics of the kingdom of God are given by the Apostle in Rom. 14:17: "The kingdom of God is *not* meat and drink; *but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost.*"

As we have seen that characteristic purity and goodness, and nothing different, qualify the kingdom of God and those in it, let us now look at the modern church and see if that fills the bill in coming up to this high standard of moral and spiritual excellence.

Without the least desire to indulge in any sort of opprobrious language toward the nominal church, or betray a disposition to underrate the work and worth of it in this dark world, I would like to ask if there is a rational individual of candor in the civilized world who will claim *that there is no manner of evil in the churches of Christendom?* I am certain that no such person can be found. Everyone knows that there is much hypocrisy in the churches of to-day; and that there are *sinful people in the church* as well as out of it; and that the nominal church *is not characterized* by a regenerated membership universally. Then as all that are in the kingdom of God are righteous and regenerated by a new birth, and as there can be no evil within it, it follows that the church and the kingdom of God are not the same, but are very much in open contrast to each other.

Perhaps the reader thinks I am fighting a man of straw here; that there are none so foolish as

to claim the identity of the *visible, literal church with the kingdom of God*, seeing the two are so unlike; but to convince you that he is a *real man*, and not made of "straw," I will refer you to the words of Mr. L. B. Wilkes in his debate with Mr. J. Ditzler. Mr. Wilkes is a representative man, and speaks the sentiments of thousands. Mr. Ditzler, orthodox, claimed that the kingdom of God was identical with the *invisible* church, and that, being a spiritual church there could none enter it but the regenerate, and thus be in harmony with the requirements of the kingdom of John 3:3, 5; that Mr. Wilkes had no faith in the existence of such a church, and that nothing but *a visible, literal, organized church was all*, and the only church in existence, and this, with him, was the kingdom of God—I will give his own words. In his reply to Mr. Ditzler he says:—

"My friend tells me, after reading from the Discipline of his church, that the Fathers of the Methodist church used the words "church" and "kingdom" in a two-fold sense; that they sometimes speak of the church or kingdom as being *invisible*, and then as a kingdom or church *visible*. * * * I will say, however, *that the thing is a myth.* * * * *I know nothing of that mythical thing called* the *invisible church; and if it have no existence, of course there can be no such thing as membership in it.*" "*I know nothing of an invisible church.*" (*Debate on Baptism* between J. Ditzler and L. B. Wilkes, pp. 28, 46.)

We see from this that Mr. Wilkes had no faith in an *invisible church*, and consequently none in

an *invisible kingdom*. Now that he had faith in a *literal, visible church*, and that this *he believed to be the kingdom of God*, or *kingdom of Christ*, and considered them interchangeable, synonymonous terms, I will give you his own words again. They are as follows:—

"When Christ came, and when the Apostles went forth to preach, including the *reign*, as I may call it, of John the Baptist, and of the Christian dispensation proper, *there never was a Jew, however good he might have been, either recognized as a member of the provisional government, under John the Baptist*, in his day, or of *the Christian church; there never was a Jew, however good, good enough to belong to the church*, or so good that he was recognized as a *member of the church; but it was said to the very best people that existed at that time, including the Apostles themselves, and John the Baptist, that they were not in the church of Jesus Christ.* In Matt. 18: 2, we read that *the Apostles contended with one another as to who should be the greatest in the* KINGDOM OF HEAVEN. The Savior brought a little child into their midst, and said to them: '*Except you become converted, and be as little children, you shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven.*' *Of course the Apostles were not then in it.* * * * *The Apostles were not in the* KINGDOM OF JESUS CHRIST; *neither were those devout persons that came together from all quarters on the day of Pentecost; neither were the Jews that worshipped in their own country, serving God, and praising and loving God. Not one of those de-*

vout persons, gathered there from the four quarters of the earth, for the purpose of worshipping God, not even one of them was in THE CHURCH *of Jesus Christ. In order to be in that* CHURCH *they had to believe in the Savior, and be like him,* that they might live. They had *to repent of their sins and be* BAPTIZED *in the name of Jesus Christ, in order that they might belong to the* CHURCH." (Pp. 64–65, *Debate on Baptism.*)

This language of Mr. Wilkes speaks for itself. In it he uses the word "*church*" for "*kingdom,*" and *vice versa.* The church (visible) means *the kingdom*, and *the kingdom* means *the church.* And, to get into this kingdom, you "*believe, repent*, and *be baptised.*" These are his premises. Now, let us have the conclusion, which is: *that every one who gets into the church—becomes a member of it—is born again—is regenerated;* for Jesus says *that no one can enter the kingdom unless he is born again.* Then the church being the kingdom, all who are in the church are in the kingdom, and therefore born again! Who, among the children of men, is so fatuitous as to accept so absurb a conclusion? I repeat the conclusion: All the men and women throughout Christendom, whose names are on the church record, *are in verity born again—are new creatures in Christ!* on the hypothesis that the *church is the kingdom of God* (John 3:5). This ludicrous conclusion is the outgrowth of the doctrine of "baptismal regeneration," which is a myth.

But why did Bro. Wilkes exclude all those good people mentioned in the above extract—

those righteous Jews, the Apostles, John the Baptist, and *all* the rest of the good people back there? Because his ideal kingdom—the church—was not in existence yet. There was no church according to his notion, until the day of Pentecost; and then Peter organized the first church; and, in doing this, *set up the kingdom.* All the good of Old Testament times were left out in the cold, as there was no kingdom in existence there. But where is the proof that there was no church in existence till the day of Pentecost? There is none; but the proof is that there *was* a church in existence before that. The 47th verse of that 2d chapter of Acts reads: "*And the Lord added to the church* daily such as should be saved." This has reference to Pentecost. Now, how could they *add* to the church *before* it was in existence? If it had no existence until the day of Pentecost, how could they, at that time, *add* to it?

The kingdom of God is *invisible to all outside* of it (John 3: 3); the church is *visible to all outside.* So that there are no lines or features of similarity common to both. The system that seeks to identify them, as is plain to be seen, is replete with sophistry and misleading in its tendency. For, persuade people that they are in the kingdom of Jesus Christ simply because they are *church members*, and the consequences of it are easily imagined. Convince the ignorant individual that the church, as he sees it, is the kingdom of God, and that the ordinance of

immersion is regeneration into it—"baptismal regeneration"—and he is a badly deceived soul.

Those who teach this doctrine are prone to lay great stress upon the saving efficacy of this, to them, regenerative act. They claim that forgiveness does not come until the candidate has been under the water. I have this in print by a leader among them: "*Between repentance and pardon God has placed an ordinance.*" We know what "ordinance" is meant—the *ordinance* of *baptism*. But does not the experience of every child of God within the range of our knowledge, together with the examples given in the New Testament, contradict this? Let us see if this holds good in the cases of pardon in New Testament times. And we will begin with the "thief on the cross" of Luke 23: 43: "And he said unto Jesus, Lord, remember me when thou comest in Thy kingdom. And Jesus said unto him, Verily I say unto thee to-day shalt thou be with me in paradise." Here was pardon *without* water.

Mark 2: 4-6: In this instance it was an invalid brought to Jesus on a bed. When Jesus saw the faith of the sick and that of his friends, he said unto the sick of the palsay, "Son *thy sins be forgiven thee.*" This man was healed as well as pardoned, and took up his bed and went to his own house. After he got home he might have received the ordinance of baptism, but, if we can believe St. Mark, he certainly did not *before* his sins were forgiven. This we will term Case No. 2.

Luke 7: 47, 50: Jesus visited the home of Simon the Pharisee, and, while seated at the table, a wicked woman entered with an alabaster box of ointment. She was repenting of her sinful life, and gave expression thereto in tears; and, with the precious ointment, anointed the feet of Jesus, when that reader of hearts said of her to Simon: "Wherefore I say unto thee, Her *sins, which are many, are forgiven.*" "And he said unto the woman: *Thy faith has saved thee; go in peace.*" Another pardon *before* immersion. This is Case No. 3.

Matt. 9:20–22: This was a woman who had been diseased with an issue of blood for twelve years, whose faith in the Savior was so strong that she said if she could but touch His garment she would be made whole. And she realized the result of what her faith prompted her to do. "Jesus turned him about, and, when he saw her, he said: Daughter, *be of good comfort; thy faith hath made thee whole.*" Another case of salvation *without "water."* This is Case No. 4.

Luke 13: 11–13. is another woman. She had been bowed down by a spirit of infirmity for eighteen years; and, when the compassionate Jesus saw her, He did not wait for any ritualistic ceremony to be performed, but called her unto him and said: "Woman, thou art loosed from thine infirmity." And he laid his hands on her: and immediately she was made straight, and glorified God. Another case of redemption *without the efficacy of "water."* This is Case No. 5.

And there were great companies of people healed by the Savior on various occasions (Matt. 4: 24; 12:15), all of whom, it is fair to suppose, were *pardoned at the same time;* as to "heal the broken-hearted," and "set at liberty the captives" of sin (Luke 4: 18) seem to be as much of His mission at least as the healing of physical diseases, in all of which there is no mention made of the application of the ordinance of "water" for the remission of their sins. Of course there was "the bringing forth of fruits meet for repentance" (Matt. 3: 8); but there was present the reader of hearts, and outward demonstrations were not necessary.

Then, leaving the four Gospels, we have examples of healing and pardon recorded in the Acts of the Apostles. In the third chapter we find Peter and John at the temple exercising the power divine delegated to them by high heaven, in restoring the impotent man to health; and it is not foreign to the matter in hand to say that God forgave or pardoned him as well. There was much healing done by the Apostles (Acts 5:15,16), at which times God forgave the iniquities of those He healed, and they doubtless joined the company of the blood-washed. And, strange to say that no mention is made in all these instances of the "ordinance" of baptism, if it is such an essential factor in the procuring of pardon!

Then again, in the tenth chapter of this Book (Acts), we have an instance of a man who was forgiven, and, with his family, had received the

gift of the Holy Spirit *before* he and they were immersed. This man was Cornelius, a Gentile.

We have cited the several instances as samples of the many to show that "between repentance and pardon" God has *not* placed "an ordinance."

The theory that puts the "ordinance" as prerequisite to pardon seeks to hide the fact of pardon in all these instances referred to where the ordinance is not mentioned in connection with them. The case of Cornelius stands forth among the examples of pardon *preceding* the "ordinance" of baptism, in which "baptismal regeneration" played no part; and what is true in one case is true in all cases, hypothetically. For if God forgave the sins of Cornelius *before* he had received the "ordinance" of baptism, who dares to say that He would not do it in *any* or *every other instance*? And especially when we find Jesus in His earthly ministry doing this *very* thing (see Mark 2: 5; Luke 7: 47, 48, 50; Matt. 9: 20, 22), thereby establishing a *precedent* for all probationary time. And shall we not adhere to this divine *precedent* as holding good through apostolic, and, as well, post-apostolic times? It is only begging the question to say that God did not adhere to the same principle during the time of the Apostle's ministry and on, that He observed in the ministry of the Lord Jesus.

If "water," then, was *not essential* to pardon when Jesus was on earth, *was* it essential at any

subsequent period? If so, on what principle? Evidently on no other principle than that of a material and radical *change in the means of salvation.* The practice of Christ in pardoning sins showed that the observance of the ordinance was not essential to it, as in the Scriptures just referred to. Now, if it *became essential to pardon after* this, then there was as really a change made in the means of salvation as ever there was a change in anything in this world, and this fact cannot be denied. This being true, then, God is changeable; for just as true as His *plans* change, *He* changes. But we are reminded that God does not change. By Malachi He says: "I am the Lord, I *change not.*" (Mal. 3: 6.) James says of Him that there is *no variableness, neither shadow of turning* with Him. (Jam. 1:17.) Paul speaks of the "*immutability*" of *His counsel.* (Heb. 6: 17.) It is Scripturally and reasonably certain, then, that God changes not, and hence His plans and designs change not, but remain immutable; therefore "water," not being recognized as essential to salvation or the pardon of sins by God during the earthly ministry of His Son Jesus Christ, as adduced in the cases just cited, it follows that it was *never subsequently* so recognized by Him. And this fact He farther attested and exemplified in the case of Cornelius, who was pardoned and received the gift of the Holy Spirit *before* the "ordinance of water baptism was administered to him (Acts 10: 44); and not alone in the case of Cornelius did God give evi-

dence of this during the apostolic ministry, but in many instances where He stretched forth His hand in healing the souls, as well as the bodies, of those whom Satan held in bondage, as in the case of the impotent men at the temple, of Acts 3, and also those recorded in chapter 5 and verse 16.

We have cited these cases to show that "between repentance and pardon" GOD HAS NOT placed an "ordinance;" that the theory is as foreign to the spirit of the Gospel as is that of the "literal church" to the identity of the "spiritual kingdom" of Jesus Christ. And to this does not the experience of thousands and tens of thousands attest? What about the many great modern revivals, in which so many have sought and obtained peace and pardon, that proved as real as their physical existence to them, and *that* just *when* and *where* they trusted in Christ as the only means of salvation, and that, too, *before* they were baptized in water?

Thus we see there is about as much identity existing between the mere "ordinance" of baptism and "regeneration," as there is between the *literal, visible, organized church*, and the *spiritual, invisible "kingdom" of Jesus Christ*, no more. For while the "ordinance" is held to be the great preponderating qualifier for admission into the literal, so-called, kingdom, the church; real regeneration—the new birth—is the condition, and the *only* condition, upon which admission into the kingdom of God will be granted. (John 3: 3). The two conditions are as wide

apart as the poles. A change from nature to grace, from the natural to the spiritual man, is the work effected by regeneration; and to suppose this possible by a *dip under water* is the sheerest puerility. It is nothing more nor less than the *substituting of the ritual* for the *real*–the *symbolical* for the *substantial.*

No one can read up the subject candidly without being struck with the untenableness of the theory, which proclaims to the world that the *nominal church* is, in point of fact, the *veritable kingdom of God* (John 3: 3, 5); and that the "ordinance" of water baptism implies, and is, the *regenerative act* by which persons are *born the second time* and placed into it. It would be hard to conceive of lines of greater dissimilarity than exist between the two, *the church* and *the kingdom.*

We have heard persons refer to the parable of the tares of Matthew 13: 24–30 to prove that the kingdom of God is the church. Because it is said in that parable that the "wheat and tare" should be allowed to grow together until time of harvest, they infer that this has reference to the two classes in the church—the righteous and the unrighteous. They would therefore advocate the theory *of leaving in the church all who entered it*, opposing church discipline, for fear that in rooting up these human tares—the wicked church members—they might, perchance, root up some of the wheat—the good members! They could break one positive command to keep a supposed command clothed in metaphor. In

speaking of a representative of a flagitious class of persons who was in the church, the Apostle Paul commanded to *put away that evil one* from the company, or church. But these very conscientious brethren would not attempt to do this for fear of pulling up some of the righteous members in the church, and thus break a commandment! But what seems a little strange in regard to this interpretation of that parable is that these brethren should find "church" here, where it is not mentioned, or even hinted at. They read into it that the "field," where the tares and wheat were sown, is the church; thus reading *into* it what they cannot read *out* of it. But the Great Teacher interpreted the "field" to mean the "*world*," and not the "church." (See verse 38.) As we will touch upon this parable again in our next chapter, in showing what is meant by the word "kingdom" in this connection, we will not dwell longer upon it here.

In the canvass for identity of "church" and "kingdom" it would be very necessary to show that both terms were derivities of the same root-word. If their etymology is different, their meaning must be. And such is the case with these two terms; their derivations differ widely. The word "church" is in the Greek, "*ekklesia*," and is defined "congregation," "an assembly of Christians," when the word is used in a Christian sense. While the word "kingdom" in the Greek is "*basileia*," and is defined "dominion," "reign," "rule," "the exercise of kingly power." (*Robinson's Greek*

and English Lexicon of the New Testament.) According to these meanings there is considerable of difference in the two words—just about as much difference as there would be between *subjects* and *rule.* If the "church" is the "assembly" of Christians, it looks as though they were the "*subjects*" of the kingdom rather than the "*kingdom*" *itself*, for they are subject to heaven's rule and government if they are Christians. Instead, then, of the "kingdom" being *within the "church," the "church" would be in the kingdom;* that is on the principle that the church, or assembly, had received the spiritual birth; none else could enter it.

It may be said that the "kingdom" has reference to the *organization* of the church rather than to the *persons composing* the church. But this subterfuge would not help matters any, as it would be placing *human limits* to the spiritual realm. As far, then, as *the organization extended would be the extent of the "kingdom,"* and no farther. And as the "organization" is the *human* side of the church—proved so by the multiplicity and diversity of them—then this ecclesiastical "kingdom" would be limited by human boundaries, beyond and out of which could be no exercise of saving power. In this case there would be, as we have before observed, *as great a number and variety of kingdoms as there are man-made organizations!* And then, instead of the "kingdom of God" being *peace*, as the Apostle tells us in Romans 14: 17, it would be *pieces*, and a *good many pieces* at that.

But "Christ is not divided," neither is His Kingdom divided, by being minced up into a thousand different human organizations!

CHAPTER VI.

THE KINGDOM OF GOD—WHAT IT IS.

In the last chapter we tried to disabuse the mind of the uninformed but candid reader of the popular error of *the kingdom of God being the literal church.* However successful we have been in the effort to accomplish the object aimed at, we will leave the unbiased to judge. In this undertaking we labored to show "what the kingdom *is not;*" it will be our object now to try to show "what it *is.*" In this search for truth we will be guided by reason and Revelation, as we have endeavored to do thus far in writing this book, and shall seek to do to the end of it.

The kingdom of God in the Scriptures must be understood in a two-fold sense—the *figurative* and the *literal.* We are free to confess that we do not see how it can be understood in any other way. Not that there are *two* kingdoms, but *one* kingdom in two phases. We never read in the Word of Truth of "the *kingdoms* of God," in the plural, but invariably of "the *kingdom* of God" in the singular number; and the reason of this is evident from the fact that there is but *one* brought to view in the Scriptures. By the "figurative," we mean the "spiritual," as distinguished from the "literal"

character of it. It will be in place to consider that kingdom in its figurative or *spiritualistic* import first, and our relation to it as Christians; and afterward the "*literal*," and also how we stand related to *it*.

There is a spiritual kingdon in existence here on the earth, and the righteous are the inheriters of it. This idea seems so thoroughly orthodox that it may appear like presumption in me to state a fact so generally conceded, as though I were the first to make the discovery. I lay no claims to originality in the matter, however. The doctrine is as old as the gospel. The reason I make the statement is because there are those who deny it. They admit the reality of a *literal* kingdom, but deny the possibility of there being a *spiritual* kingdom, or a kingdom on earth of a spiritual character. So that I shall seek to prove, in the face of this theory to the contrary, that a spiritual kingdom does exist here on earth.

This kingdom is known by different names, or appellations, such as "the kingdom of grace," "the reign of grace," "the reign of Christ in the hearts of His people," "the reign of the Holy Spirit," etc. Now, while these are not Scriptural phrases, but phrases common to our vocabulary, at the same time they express the thought conveyed by the word "kingdom" in the sense we used it here. Whether we term it "the kingdom of grace," or "the kingdom of Christ's spiritual reign," "the reign of grace," or "the reign of the Holy Spirit," the truth of

the doctrine is taught in the Scriptures just the same; and God help us if it is not true, while we know so well of the existence of the opposite kingdom and its power.

It is not often that we find people denying that Satan has a kingdom in this world. This is universally attested, and needs no argument to prove it. In the teachings of Christ this fact was recognized. (See Matt. 12:26). Why, then, should it be thought "a thing incredible" that there should be a kingdom of light as well as a kingdom of darkness? Surely, it cannot be argued that such a kingdom is not necessary. The very exigency of the case would demand it. Think of a universal kingdom of darkness and destruction, of such power as to control and subject to its sway the entire world, without any opposing force to counteract it! Before this power of evil, man is helpless to resist; he can impose no effectual barriers to impede its hellish progress, nor array forces to successfully contend with it in battle! Tell me, then, that there is no kingdom of light and succor to oppose it, and rescue the victims from its damning rule and mortal ravage! As well tell me that man has no Savior! I care not by what name you call it. Call it "the reign of grace," if you choose, or "the spiritual reign of Christ;" for certain it is, that there is a power of God in some form being exercised on the behalf of His people in delivering them from the will and power of their great enemy, the Devil. The Apostle Paul said, "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." In this Scripture we have both powers—that of "sin" and that of "grace"—represented as "abounding" and "reigning." It will not do to say that nothing more is meant in this passage than simply the offer of the favor of God, or the abounding of the favor of God in his willingness to forgive sinners; for the word "reign" here does not have that signification; but means "sovereignty," "rule," "dominion," "supreme power." It is from the Greek word "*basileuo.*" In the 17th verse of this 5th chapter of Romans we read of the "reign of grace" again. "For if by one man's offence death reigned by one; much more they which receive abundance of grace and the gift of righteous, *shall reign in life by one, Jesus Christ.*"

Now that we have it declared in the word of God that there is a "reign of grace" countering the "reign of sin," what is there improper in calling it a "kingdom of grace?" I do not know what else could be made of it. Although the phrase, "kingdom of grace" is not named in the Bible, yet "the reign of grace" is there, and that answers the same purpose. To say that it means a "change through Christ from the power of darkness into the liberty of Christianity," as some explain Col. 1: 13, does not alter the reign of grace in the fact of that Christianity. But while we are sure that there is such a blessing as a "kingdom of God," or "kingdom of

grace," now in the world, we do not consider it as a final goal to which all our hopes aspire. It is the place in which we live, so to speak, until the great consummation. In other words, it is a joyous foretaste of what is to come in the gladsome future, "when the mists shall have rolled away," and sin and death shall be destroyed, and there will be no more curse. In Ephesians 1: 13, 14, the Apostle Paul speaks of a foretaste or earnest of what is to come, in the following language: "In whom also, after that ye believed, ye were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise, which is the earnest of our inheritance, until the redemption of the purchased possession, unto the praise of His glory." In commenting upon this text together with Romans 8: 23, and 2 Cor. 1:22, Cruden has these words: "These phrases signify the assurance which the Spirit of adoption does give believers of their heavenly inheritance. For as the first fruits were pledges to the Jews of the ensuing crop; and as he that receives the earnest, is sure to have the full sum paid him, or the full bargain made good, when the person that gives it is honest and faithful; so the graces wrought in the heart by the Spirit of God, such as love, joy, peace, etc., are pledges of that abundance and fullness of joy and felicity, which believers partake of in their heavenly inheritance. Yet these graces and comforts which the godly enjoy here, are but first fruits in regard of their order; they precede the full harvest; and in regard of their quantity, they are but a handful in comparison of the whole

seal and earnest; though they both imply assurance, yet they differ thus; sealing especially refers to the understanding; earnest to the affections. Though the seal assures us, yet it is not part of the inheritance; but the earnest so assures us, that it gives a part of the inheritance; it works that joy in the heart which is a foretaste of heaven, and which the saints are filled with here."

This "fore-taste" of the Spirit of promise as "an earnest of our inheritance" is, in other words, the "spiritual kingdom."

To this truth the Apostle Paul gives his sanction, where he says: "The kingdom of God is not meat and drink; but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost." (Rom. 14:17). There is no doubt but the Apostle considered himself already in that "kingdom;" for he says, in Col. 1:13, "God hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of His dear Son."

If the "kingdom of God" is "righteousness," "peace," and "joy in the Holy Ghost" it certainly is, in this sense, a condition; then wherever this condition of things abounds there exists in this spiritualistic sense, "the kingdom of God." Is there not then a reign of that Holy Spirit where this condition of things prevails? There certainly is. If it is a reign of the "Spirit" then it is the "kingdom" of the "Spirit;" for these terms— "reign" and "kingdom"—are used in the New Testament synonymously.

Every true child of God realizes something of the controlling, comforting, influence of the Holy Spirit of God. Such are said to be "kept by the power of God" (1 Pet. 1: 5). This *controlling power is indispensable* with the Christian's triumphing over the powers of darkness. Said the Apostle to the Ephesian brethren, "Finally, my brethren, be strong in the Lord, and *in the power of his might.*" (Eph. 6: 10). And again to the Roman brethren: "That ye may abound in hope, through *the power of the Holy Ghost.*" (Rom. 15: 13). There is a power goes with the child of God that all the opposing forces of darkness cannot withstand, and it is from *God* and not of *man.* It is the irresistible power of the Holy Spirit of God. It made Peter bold on the day of Penticost; Luther strong at the Diet of Worms; Cranmer firm and complacent amid the flames at Oxford. Without it, man is but a poor, weak creature.

Then, as to the *comforting* influence of the Holy Spirit, too much cannot be said. So characteristic is this of Him that He is called "The Comforter." (John 14: 26). "Then had the churches rest throughout all Judea and Galilee and Samaria, and were edified; and walking in the fear of the Lord, and in the *comfort of the Holy Ghost.*" (Acts 9: 31.)

"I will pray the Father, and He will give you another *Comforter*, that He may abide with you forever; even the Spirit of truth, whom the world cannot receive; because it seeth Him not, neither knoweth Him; but ye know Him; for He

dwelleth with you, and shall be in you." (John 14: 16, 17.)

"Ye became followers of us, and of the Lord, having received the word in affliction, with *joy of the Holy Ghost.*" (1 Thes. 1: 6.)

"I have spoken to you, that my joy might remain in you, and *that your joy might be full.*" (John 15: 11.)

"And the disciples were filled with *joy* and *with the Holy Ghost.*" (Acts 13: 52.)

"I am exceeding joyful in all our tribulations; I am *filled with the comfort.*" (2 Cor. 7: 4.)

What shall we call this blissful condition if not a "reign of the Spirit?" I know not by what more appropriate name to designate it. A system that could explain away all true sense of a "spiritual reign," or "reign of the spirit," in the face of all these declarations to the contrary, could on the same principle explain away the doctrine of grace in the gospel.

But the burden of the message of John the Baptist was to make known to the people of Israel that the "kingdom of God" *was at hand.* "In those days came John the Baptist, preaching in the wilderness of Judea, and saying, Repent ye; for the *kingdom of God is at hand.*" (Matt. 3: 1, 2. It will not change the fact any to call it "the king of heaven," or "majesty of heaven," unless we can conceive of a "king" minus a kingdom. What would be the sense of proclaiming to the people the approach of a king, or majesty, when he did not stand so related to them, nor would not for two thousand years to

come, when he would come as judge of quick and dead? We understand that Jesus was prophet, priest, and king. If He did not hold all three offices at the same time, then why was He introduced to them as a *king*, when He stood related to them really as a *priest*, to mediate for their sins? Why was He not proclaimed as a Savior *exclusively*, if He was not, nor would be a king and have a kingdom in no sense for a period of two thousand years or so. Yes, he had a kingdom, but it was so purely spiritual in its nature and workings, that the natural Jew could not understand it. And the greatest secret of it was that it was the first and only kingdom, that had been introduced to humanity, that could triumph over *sin*, and deliver from its enthralling power those long held in captivity,—the most significant and wonderful of all kingdoms for this reason.

Said Nathaniel to Jesus, recognizing His royalty, "Rabbi, thou *art the king of Israel*." (John 1: 49.) In fulfillment of a prophecy by Zechariah (Ch. 9), recorded in Matthew 21, we find Christ riding into Jerusalem upon an ass, as a king. Said the prophet, "Tell ye the daughter of Sion, Behold, thy *king cometh unto thee*, meek, and sitting upon an ass, and a colt the foal of an ass." Will it be said that He here came to reign over the Jews in the flesh, in a literal sense? Some so interpret this Scripture. But this is incorrect; for Christ's kingdom was *not* a kingdom after the flesh, as the kingdom of Israel was while ever it was a kingdom. He

told Pilate that His kingdom *was not of this world;* that if it were He would defend it with the sword by His servants, like all earthly kingdoms are defended. (John 18: 36.)

When Jesus sent forth the seventy to teach, and heal the sick, etc., he made it the burden of their message to proclaim that the kingdom of God was come nigh unto the people, saying to these missionaries: "Into whatsoever city ye enter, and they receive you, eat such things as are set before you; and heal the sick that are therein, *and say* unto them, *the kingdom of God is come nigh unto you.*" (Luke 10; 8, 9.) "But into whatsoever city ye enter, and they receive you not, go your ways out into the streets of the same, and say, even the very dust of your city, which cleaveth on us, we do wipe off against you; notwithstanding, *Be ye sure of this, that the kingdom of God is come nigh unto you*" (Vs. 10, 11). Wilson, in his *Emphatic Diaglott of the New Testament*, translates "kingdom" in both these verses, thus: "Know this, That the *Kingdom of God has approached you.*" The word here as in the other texts, is from the Greek word "*basileia*," kingdom.

Now, if that "kingdom" was in no sense nearer than two thousand years, at the judgment day, how could it be said to be *nigh unto them*, when it was in reality in the distant future? The reply of Jesus to the scribe confirms the thought that this "kingdom" had reference to other than the approach of the literal king dom at the judgment day. When the scribe had

answered Him wisely concerning the two great commandments—love to God and love to our neighbor,—Jesus said to him, "Thou art *not far* from the kingdom of God." (Mark 12: 34.) If the kingdom to be introduced at the second advent of Jesus Christ is referred to here, the scribe was no nearer to it than any of his contemporaries. But if Jesus had reference to that kingdom which the Apostle tells us "is righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost" (Rom. 14:17), then it is easy to see how the scribe was nearer it than many others.

This kingdom must have come with the king, or when Christ entered upon his ministry. Says Luke, "The law and the prophets were *until* John: since that time the *kingdom of God is preached.*" John's ministry marked the close of the old dispensation, and ushered in the new.

If the kingdom was not introduced until the day of Pentecost, as some claim, then "the law and the prophets" were a good space *beyond* John and his ministry; and it ought to read so. Then it would read: "The law and the prophets were until the day of Pentecost, *after* John, and *beyond* his ministry! Those who hold that the literal church is the kingdom of God, endeavor to run "the law and prophets" up to the day of Pentecost, and begin the new dispensation there. They see neither kingdom nor church in existence until this time. Then they think they see a kingdom set up in the organization of a visible church. Because Jesus said to Peter, "On this rock," meaning

Himself (1 Cor. 3:11; Isa. 28:16), "will I build my church," they infer that there was no church in existence when He spoke these words; and that He had direct reference to Pentecost, when He would build it, because He used the future tense of the verb. But did Jesus refer in this instance to the *visible* church? We think not; but to the *spiritual* church, composed of the elect, or redeemed, from the fact that "the gates of hell" would not prevail against it; which meant that "the powers of darkness" could not overthrow it—that it would not perish, which cannot be said of the vast number of the literal church organizations that have come and gone; and against which the powers of evil did prevail. I know of but *one* church that has stood the assaults of the powers of darkness unmoved, and that is "the *spiritual* church." And as to the Savior saying that He *would build* it—using the future tense of the verb—He could not do other and be true to the facts in the case; for that spiritual church was not only *unbuilt at that time*, but *remains unfinished to the present time*, and will not be completed entirely until the last man and the last woman have been added to it—which work is still going on. For the "church" has reference to an assembly of persons, or congregation, and is not simply an institution, *per se*.

But again: In His talk to Peter, Christ told him that He would give unto him "the keys of the kingdom of Heaven" (Matt. 16:18, 19), which meant that He would instruct him in the

"mysteries of *the kingdom of heaven*," which "mysteries" the disciples were to understand, (Matt. 13: 11); and with these "keys" Peter opened not the literal church, but "the kingdom of heaven" to the Jews first, on the day of Pentecost, when He revealed to them the mysteries of redemption; and to the Gentiles next, at the house of Cornelius the Gentile, after he had learned the meaning of the vision upon the house-top in Joppa—that God had granted repentance unto life to the Gentiles. (For these respective "keys," see Acts 2: 22—36, and Acts 10: 34—43.)

Now if this is the same "kingdom" that is mentioned in John 3: 3, 5, into which Jesus said *none but the truly converted*, or *regenerated could enter*—and we have just all the reason in the world for believing it to be—we can understand what is meant by what follows in this same (19th) verse; for the work done by the Apostle would bear the scrutiny and receive the sanction of Heaven: "Whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." With the thought of there being so much done by churches in the way of accessions to membership that does not meet with heaven's sanction, the *thoroughness* of the work accorded Peter by the Lord, here expressed, is timely indeed. Spasmodic revivals—that prolific source of an unregenerate church-membership—were things unknown to the legislative economy of this "kingdom of heaven." No man or woman *unchanged*

in heart can pass within its sacred limits. A spiritual birth is *indispensable* with admission into it.

Into this "kingdom" Peter admitted Jews on the day of Pentecost, as he had the keys of it; and it is certain that he could not unlock it before it had an existence; therefore it must have existed anterior to Pentecost. And more than that there is no such declaration made, as that the "spiritual kingdom" of Jesus Christ was set up on the day of Pentecost. It is a pure assumption without the least shade of evidence, Scriptural or circumstantial, to support it. And all this confusing of ideas arises from a forced interpretation of the word.

The Pentecostal event was the fulfillment of a prophecy uttered over 800 years before by the prophet Joel, and was given as a wonderful confirmation of the gospel to the world then represented at Jerusalem (Joel 2: 28, 29; Acts 2: 16–18); and also given as a power to the disciples to qualify them for the greater work of the gospel that lay before them. "Ye shall receive *power*, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you; *and ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem, and in Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth.*" (Act 1: 8.) So *thoroughly* did the Apostle Peter realize this power conferred upon him at Pentecost to fit him for effectual gospel preaching, that he makes mention of it in one of his epistles, as the main qualification for the work. He says: "Unto whom (the prophets) it was revealed, that not unto themselves, but unto us they did minister

the things, which are now reported unto you by them that *preached the gospel unto you with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven.*" (1 Peter 1: 12.)

If such an outpouring of the Holy Ghost was essential to the existence of the kingdom of God, then there has been no kingdom of God since the day of Pentecost; for there has been no such "outpouring" since that time. And, on the other hand, if this "outpouring" were not essential to mark the existence of that "kingdom" *since* the day of Pentecost, then it was not essential to mark its existence *before* that time; and, therefore, Pentecost does not mark the setting up of the kingdom of God.

If it should be said here, in opposition to this, that the "Holy Ghost," or "Holy Spirit," was never given to men until the day of Pentecost," we remark: If this "opposition" prove anything, it proves too much; in that it proves none of the prophets, or any others of all previous time, were inspired by the Spirit of God; and then what becomes of our claim to the authenticity of the Old Testament Scriptures? This might do very well for "higher critics," or atheists, but is hardly compatible with the faith of those calling themselves Christians. In the very face of this opposition we are obliged to read, that "the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men *of God spake as they were moved* BY THE HOLY SPIRIT." (2 Peter 1: 21.) Said Peter concerning David: "The HOLY GHOST SPAKE BY THE MOUTH OF

DAVID BEFORE concerning Judas," etc. (Acts 1: 16.) In the fifty-first Psalm we find David in prayer to God, saying: "Cast me not away from thy presence; and TAKE NOT THY HOLY SPIRIT FROM ME." JOHN THE BAPTIST WAS "FILLED WITH THE HOLY GHOST." (Luke 1: 15.) "Then said Jesus unto them again, Peace be unto you: as my Father hath sent me, even so send I you. And when He had said this, He breathed on them, and saith unto them, RECEIVE YE THE HOLY GHOST." (John 20: 21–22.) And we might go on multiplying quotations on this point, but it is not necessary to do so, as we know that no one who believes the Bible will contradict it.

As we have already remarked, and reiterated it, those who enter the kingdom of God are *born again—born of the Spirit*—as stated in John 3rd. They are the *first* born of the Spirit; i. e., they received the first Spiritual birth. Said Jesus, "Ye must be born again." The first birth here referred to was the *natural* birth; so to be born "again" would mean "spiritual birth" (verse 6), and would be the first birth of the Spirit. This class of persons is identical with that company mentioned in Hebrews 12: 23, called "the church of the *first born:*" and as there is no such *literal* church, as "the church of the first born," known to Christendom, it must be a *spiritual* church. It is that one against which "the gates of hell shall not prevail"—the great body of the "redeemed," "out of all nations," and I may say, out of all denominations, of all times and all climes; these, the Apostle tells us in this Scrip-

ture are "written in heaven," or as John says, "written in the Lamb's book of life." (Rev. 21: 27;) and for number they are "a great multitude that no man *could* number." (Rev. 7: 9.) They are redeemed from *sin* and translated into the spiritual kingdom of Jesus Christ, having received the first birth—the birth of regeneration. They are at one with God and Christ, and in the language of the Psalmist can say, "Whom have I in heaven but thee? and there is none upon earth that I desire beside thee." The Lord is their sun and their song, and their portion forever; and to serve and glorify Him, constitute the great business of their lives. They are fully won and weaned from the ungodly pleasures and fascinations of this wicked world. Having tasted the sweets of redeeming love, their joy knows no bounds—a "joy unspeakable and full of glory." (1 Pet. 1: 8.) They have entered that spiritual "land of Beulah"—that lies *beyond* "the valley of the shadow of death"—which John Bunyan describes as having sunshine all the time. This blissful condition of present salvation from sin, to a life of righteousness, peace and joy in the Holy Ghost, we call "the spiritual kingdom of God," or "the kingdom of grace," pointing to the *eternal* felicities which lie beyond these mortal shores. The greatest privilege on earth to man is that *he may enter it if he will.*

CHAPTER VII.

THE KINGDOM OF GOD—WHAT IT IS.

There is taught in the sacred Scriptures the doctrine of a Literal kingdom of God, or kingdom of Christ. I do not mean by "literal" that it is not also "spiritual." It is the "spiritual" literalized.

We observed in the preceding chapter that the "spiritual kingdom" is a foretaste of what is to come, and not the realization of *future* bliss. It is the *forerunner* of that which is to come. The Apostle Paul alludes to the ineffable, or unspeakable, grandeur and felicity of that literal kingdom in a quotation from the prophecy of Isaiah (ch. 64:4), in this language: "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him." (1 Cor. 2:9.) Of this he says again: "We know in part. But when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away. * * * For now we see through a glass, darkly; but then face to face; now I know in part; but then shall I know even as also I am known." (1 Cor. 13:9, 10 and 12.)

The "spiritual kingdom" is not the "perfect" kingdom because founded in a world of sin and death, but it is the very best that we could have under the circumstances. Its chief function in

this world is *to save men from sin and point them to that state of redemption from death to be realized at the revelation of Jesus Christ.* In view of the condition of things under the curse, and in anticipation of that beyond, this same Apostle says: "For we know that the whole creation 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." (Rom. 8:22, 23.) This is but a repetition of that longing desire, or hope, which has animated the hearts and fructified the labors of God's people for all time. They looked forth to this grand epoch as the time when God would "destroy the face of the covering cast over all people, and swallow up death in victory; and take the rebuke of His people from off all the earth." With ecstatic emotion the prophet prospects that eventful crisis in this glad acclaim: "And it shall be said in that day, Lo, this is our God; we have waited for Him, and He will save us; this is the Lord; we have waited for Him, we will be glad and rejoice in His salvation" (Isa. 25:7, 8, 9.)

The spiritual kindom, of which we have been speaking, is *microcosmic* in that it finds expression *in the hearts and lives of men*—the *human* world. The *literal* kingdom, or the kingdom literalized, is *macrocosmic* in its characteristic manifestation, and will fill the *mundane* world —our earth—with the glory of the infinite Jeho-

vah. In this wonderful economy we see manifested this fact, that God's blessings begin with men in their hearts and work outward, eventuating in the emancipation and redemption of the entire man, soul, spirit, and body. Or in other words, heaven begins *in man* and lands man *in heaven*. It is not enough for us to have heaven *within*, we need heaven *without*. God would *prepare us first*, and then the *place for us afterwards*. He is now, and has been for ages, preparing—making ready—a people for His name; and when He has finished this great work of human redemption, He will then bring to them that glorious kingdom, in all the nicety of adaptation, and bid them enter in.

> "He will polish and refine them
> From worthless dross and tin,
> And to His heavenly kingdom
> He'll bid them enter in."

When the disciples were taught to pray, "Thy kingdom come; Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven," they were taught to pray for the literal, visible kingdom of God to come and take the place of all earthly kingdoms—for the verification of that declaration made by the Lord to Moses in the wilderness in view of that rest of which the land of Canaan was the type—"As truly as I live, all the earth shall be filled with the glory of the Lord." (Num. 14:21.) This declaration will never be verified as long as there is sin in the world. The curse must be removed ere this blissful state of things can come, and the peaceful sceptre of Jesus Christ

sway over this earth to its remotest bounds. And who does not desire to see the time come when "there shall be no more curse?" God has declared that such a condition of things shall yet be realized upon this earth, now under the pall of transgression. "For the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the glory of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea." (Isa. 11:9; Hab. 2:14.) There is no system or parry of reasoning by which such declarations as this can be interpreted to not involve the wiping out of the curse. There is no sense in which "the earth can be filled with the knowledge of the glory of the Lord," and His "will be done on earth as it is in heaven," while sin remains in it. It will be when the petition "thy kingdom come" is answered in a literal sense, and not before, that such a Godlike, universal condition of felicity can exist in this world of ours.

1. It was in God's design that the earth should be the home of His people. He created the earth, and placed man upon it; and gave him dominion over it. He says by Isaiah the prophet, that He formed it *to be inhabited.* (Isa. 45:18.) Says the Psalmist when looking at this design: "The heaven, even the heavens, are the Lord's; but the *earth hath he given to the children of men.*" (Psal. 115:16.) Man has an inalienable birthright here upon the earth; for he was created on it and of it. "The Lord God formed man *of the dust of the earth.*" (Gen. 2:7.) "The first man was of *the earth, earthy.*" (1 Cor. 15:47.)

2. The curse did not frustrate God's design. If it did, then He created the earth in vain. But we read in regard to this: "He created it *not in vain*," but "formed it *to be inhabited*." (Isa. 45:18.) Must we concede that the Devil overthrew the plan of God when he caused our first parents to fall? If after the final destiny of sinners, and redemption is finished, the earth rolls back into chaos again, as some think, then God's plan was as certainly overthrown. If it was in the great plan of the Creator when He formed man upon the earth, that it was to be his eternal home, and because of sin's introduction, he only lives on it a short period under the curse, that plan falls through. But how can we reconcile this theory with the omnipotent character of God, expressed in these words: "I am God, and there is none else; I am God, and there is none like me * * * *my counsel shall stand*, and *I will do all my own pleasure?*" (Isa. 46:9, 10.) It may be said that the plan of God in this was conditioned upon obedience; and that man would have continued to inherit the earth if he had not sinned. But did not God know whether man would sin or not beforehand? To say that He did not, would be to impeach His omniscience; and on the principle that *one* of His attributes could be successfully disputed, *every one of them* could; and this would prove that He is not God, the Creator of heaven and earth. To say that He did know before, that man would sin, would be to estabilsh the immutability of that design. So we read of His foresight thus:

"I declare the end from the beginning, and from ancient times the things that are not yet done." (Isa. 46:10.)

3. The Holy Scriptures throughout attest the carrying out of this original design, and making the earth the territory upon which will be established the literal kingdom of God, as we shall proceed to show. And it will be in place to notice first

THE PROMISE MADE TO ABRAHAM.

We are told in the sacred narrative, how God made promise to Abraham, that He would give to him and his seed the earth for a possession, and we are told that when He could swear by no greater he swear Himself that He would fulfill that promise. The candid reader cannot fail to see *two* promises involved in what the Lord told Abraham—the temporal and the eternal. The 12th and 13th chapters of Genesis contain the covenant of a temporal inheritance to the literal seed of Abraham; while the 15th chapter makes this temporal inheritance a pledge of the eternal to Abraham and his spiritual seed. Of the temporal inheritance we read: "Now the Lord had said unto Abram, Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred and from thy father's house, unto a land I will shew thee; and I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee and make thy name great; and thou shalt be a blessing; and I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee; and in thee shall all the families

of the earth be blessed. * * * * * And the Lord appeared unto Abram, and said, Unto *thy seed will I give this land.*" "And the Lord said unto Abram after that lot was separated from him, Lift up now thine eyes and look from the place where thou art northward, and southward, and eastward, and westward; for all the land thou seest, to thee will I give it, and *to thy seed forever.* Arise, walk through the land in the length of it, and in the breadth of it; for I will give it unto thee." (Gen. 12:1-3, 7, 13, 14-17.)

This promise had reference to the temporal possession of the land of Canaan by the natural seed of Abraham, as the dimensions intimate. He was called out of the land of the Chaldees to the land which the Lord would shew him—the land of Canaan, to receive that land for a possession to his literal descendants. In confirmation of this promise, the Lord told Abraham to arise and view the territory, and walk through the length and breadth of it, and then says: "Unto thy seed will I give this land." (Ch. 12:7.) This same promise is referred to again in the latter half of the 15th chapter, where the boundaries are named and the ten nations who then possessed the land are mentioned.

The fulfilment of this promise has passed into history. God verified unto the literal seed of Abraham the promise here made, when the twelve tribes of Israel under Joshua, the son of Nun, entered and took possession of the land of Canaan and dwelt there. To this fact we find

Nehemiah giving testimony, where he says: "Thou art the Lord the God, who didst choose Abram, and broughtest him forth out of Ur of the Chaldees, and gavest him the name of Abraham; and foundest his heart faithful before thee, and madest a covenant with him to give the land of the Canaanites, the Hittites, the Amorites, and the Perizzites, and the Jebusites, and the Girgashites, to give it, I say, to his seed AND HAST PERFORMED THY WORDS; for thou art righteous." (Neh. 9:7, 8.) It is certain that this promise of the temporal inheritance of the land of Canaan to the natural seed of Abraham was fulfilled, as this sacred writer, Nehemiah, tells us, and as the history of that people shows.

But *all* that was promised to Abraham in the way of inheritance was not fulfilled in this temporal possession, as we shall see by further reference to the Scriptures. It will be noticed that Abraham did not *participate* in the promise given to the temporal seed, already fulfilled; yet God made a covenant with him that *he* should realize the fulfilment of the promise made to him. But that made to him would be a much greater one than this temporal promise to his natural seed, as it would embrace his spiritual posterity, and be *eternal* in point of duration.

In the 15th chapter of Genesis, God made a covenant with Abraham and confirmed it by an oath, and ratified it by sacrifice. In this solemn ceremony, Abraham takes the necessary animals for the offering, and divides them by divine direction, and places one piece over against

another. As the birds of prey descended upon the carcasses Abraham drove them away; and at the going down of the sun, "a deep sleep fell upon Abraham; and a horror of great darkness came over him," signifying to him that he would pass into the state of death before realizing the fulfilment of the promise—*that it lay on the other side of the grave*, in the immortal realm, where death could not dispossess him of that inheritance, as it would his literal seed the temporal inheritance. Said the Lord to Abraham, "Thou shalt go to thy father's in peace; thou shalt be buried in a good old age."

Stephen speaks of this promise made to Abraham in this language: "Then came he (Abraham) out of the land of the Chaldeans, and dwelt in Charran; and from thence, when his father was dead, he removed him into this land, wherein ye now dwell. And He GAVE HIM NON-INHERITANCE IN IT, NO, NOT SO MUCH AS TO SET HIS FOOT ON: yet HE PROMISED HE WOULD GIVE IT TO HIM FOR A POSSESSION, when as yet he had no child." (Acts 7:4, 5.) We learn from this testimony of Stephen's, (1) that God never fulfilled His promise to Abraham, in that He gave him "not so much as to set his foot on" of that inheritance; (2) that He promised to do so, as involved in the covenant just referred to. From this it is certain that Abraham must yet receive the fulfilment of that promise, as God cannot fail; of whom the Apostle Paul in allusion to this very thing says: "When God made promise to Abraham, because He could swear

by no greater, He swear by Himself, saying, Surely blessing I will bless thee, and multiplying I will multiply thee." (Heb. 6:13, 14.) It was the earth, not heaven, that God promised him.

Now that this promise has reference to salvation in Christ, is very plain. In this same chapter (Heb. 6) the apostle goes on to say; "Wherein God, willing more abundantly to show unto the heirs of promise the immutability of His counsel, confirmed it by an oath; that by two immutable things, in which it was impossible for God to lie, we might have a strong consolation, who have fled for refuge to lay hold on the hope set before us; which hope we have as an anchor to the soul, both sure and steadfast, and which entereth into that within the vail; whither the forerunner is for us entered, even Jesus, made an high priest forever after the order of Melchisedec."

It is easy to see in this language that the "promise" gave birth to the "hope" of the gospel here spoken of. In view of this promise made to Abraham, the believer has "strong consolation" in the refuge Jesus Christ, as the "hope" of eternal life. "Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, and to seeds, as of many; but as of one. And to thy seed, *which is Christ.*" This reveals the true seed of Abraham—they are the *spiritual* and not the fleshly seed. "There *is neither Jew nor Greek*, there *is neither bond nor free*, there *is neither male nor female;* for ye are *all*

one in Christ Jesus. And *if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise.*" (Gal. 3:16, 28, 29.) To become the true seed of Abraham, then, is to accept of the conditions of salvation in Christ.

It should be borne in mind that this blessing *was located on the earth.* It was the inhabitants of earth that were to receive the promise with Abraham. Not the whole race of mankind, but that portion of it called "the faithful," like their prototype, Abraham. (Gal. 3:9.) Theirs was to be an *everlasting* possession, unlike the inheritance to the *natural* seed which was cut short by death. The *temporal* promise only covered a small part of the earth's surface—the land of Canaan; but the *eternal* embraced the whole earth. Said Paul, in writing to the church at Rome, "For the promise that, he (Abraham) should be the heir of the *world*, was not to Abraham, or to his seed, through the law, but through the righteousness of faith." (Ch. 4:13.) The "world" in this text is from the Greek word "*cosmos*," and is defined by Robinson, "order of the universe," "the world," "this lower world as the abode of man," "the earth." It does not mean just the inhabitants of the earth, as some think; for if it did, then Abraham would be heir to all the wicked as well as to all the righteous; and, inasmuch as they all would be his by heirship, if God punished the wicked, He would punish Abraham's heirs: and this would hardly tally with the promise, which spoke *blessings to his heirs.* And more than that,

the "world" is not the *heir*, in this text, as it would be if it had reference to the *people* instead of the earth; but *Abraham* is the heir—God made him heir to the earth, or world. In the other case *they* would be the heirs; but being such legitimately they will with him inherit what God made him heir of, and that is the world. In the first dominion God gave the world to Adam, and through unfaithfulness he lost it; and now Abraham obtains it through faithfulness, or as Paul puts it, "though the righteousness of faith."

So in speaking of the promise to the faithful of all time, the Bible holds out to them this very promise. Says David: "Trust in the Lord, and do good; so shalt thou dwell in the land." This cannot be construed to mean temporal sojourn here among the wicked; for the verse preceding this one says that it will be *when they are cut down* like the grass. (Psal. 37:2, 3.) Verse 9: "Evil doers shall be cut off; but those that wait upon the Lord, shall inherit the earth." Vv. 10, 11. "For yet a little while, and the wicked shall not be: yea, thou shalt diligently consider his place, and it shall not be. But *the meek shall inherit the earth; and shall delight themselves in the abundance of peace.*" Verse 22: *Such as be blessed of Him shall inherit the earth; and they that be cursed of Him shall be cut off.*" Verse 29: "*The righteous shall inherit the land, and dwell therein forever.*" Verse 34: "Wait on the Lord, and keep His way, and He shall exalt thee *to*

inherit the land; when the wicked are cut off thou shalt see it."

There is no sense in which these promises can be applied to the righteous of the *present time;* for the wicked have more of the earth's inheritance *now* than they do. Said Jesus, in that memorable sermon on the mount, among other beatitudes, "Blessed are the meek; *for they shall inherit the earth.*" Surely the Lord would not teach His people to grab up earthly possessions, when he everywhere taught the opposite doctrine, as would be the fact if this Scripture (Matt. 5:5) together with what has just been cited, has reference to earthly inheritance in this life. No, it cannot have a fulfilment *under the curse;* but *beyond* it, in the kingdom of God on the earth—for which we are taught to pray, "Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done on earth, as it is in heaven." This is the same kingdom that Christ speaks of in Matthew 25:34, where His second appearing is referred to. He says: "Then shall the *king* say unto them on the right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, *inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world.*"

Jesus is represented as going into a far country to receive for Himself a kingdom, and returning again with it, in the parable of the nobleman, at which time of return He calls together His servants and reckons with them. This is fulfilled when He comes in judgment, as instanced in the Scripture just referred to. (Luke 19:12-28.) Jesus is said to be seated at

the right hand of the Father in glory till His foes are made His footstool. (Psal. 110:1; Matt. 22:44), at the end of which time He will return with the right to reign. This is what is meant by His receiving a kingdom and returning with it. Said He to His disciples: "I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me." (Luke 22:29.) The earth will be the scene of that kingdom. It was the place of David's reign; and we are told that Christ, the Son of David, will have the kingdom, or throne of His father David, and reign over the house of Israel"—spiritual Israel of course. "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will raise unto David a *righteous branch*, and a *King shall reign* and *prosper*, and *shall execute judgment and justice in the earth:* this is his name whereby he shall be called, THE LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS." (Psal. 89:36, 132:17; Isa. 11:1, 32:1; Jer. 23:5, 6.) This thought is more fully expressed by the Prophet Daniel. He tells us in the interpretation of the dream of Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, of a stone cut out without hands, which smote the great metallic image upon the feet, breaking it to pieces; that the stone became a great mountain, and filled the whole earth. This image in the dream represented the consecutive universal governments of earth, beginning with that of Babylon and ending with that of Rome, or the fragmentary governments of the Roman power. In the interpretation of this stone, he says that it symbolizes the "kingdom of God." "In the days of these kings shall

the God of heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed: and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand forever." (Dan. 2:34, 44.) The kingdom of God, it will be seen, occupies the same territory that those kingdoms preceding it did. They were universal in their time of succession and reign—extending over the then civilized world; while the kingdom of God will cover the same territory and all the rest of the earth beside; for it is to "*fill the whole earth.*"

This scripture is thought by some expositors to refer to the *first* advent of Christ; and the smiting of the image by the stone to have reference to the *gospel converting the world.* But this cannot be true for two reasons, at least: 1. This kingdom was to be "set up in the days of *these* kings"—*not* in the days of those universal kings, represented by the different sections of the metallic image, for they never reigned at the same time; and therefore it could not be in their days. But it was to be set up in the days of the kings, or kingdoms, represented by the *toes* of the image, meaning the divided state of the last one of the four universal kingdoms, or empires; which would bring it in the days of the cotemporaneous existence of these sectional kingdoms into which the Roman Empire—the last of the universal kingdoms—was divided. And the planting, or founding of the gospel was *before* this, and when Rome was a solid, universal empire. (See *History of De-*

cline and Fall of Roman Empire by E. Gibbon.

2. Our other reason for not believing that it means the conversion of the world by the gospel, is that it is *nowhere* taught in the Scriptures that the gospel will ever convert the world, but that the opposite view—gathering out of the world a people of God—is taught. How long does the reader think it would take at the present rate of progress for the gospel to convert the world? I am candid when I say, *Eternity* would not accomplish it. The gospel is not reaching the masses of humanity. It has been preached for nearly nineteen centuries—long enough at least to give strong indications of the possibility of its accomplishment—and the nations of earth to-day are still out of Christ, *as nations*, both civilized and uncivilized; while it is true that *God is taking out of those "nations of earth" a people for his name.* I am aware of the fact that the nations of Europe, for example, are called "Christian nations." If by this is meant that they are not Mohammedan, with a single exception, or heathen, by way of distinction, they are appropriately termed "Christian nations;" but if by this appellation is meant, "*the followers of Jesus Christ*," it is misnomer, for they *are not Christians.* If there were no other evidence to prove this negation, what has passed in the land of Armenia during the last two years and a half would sufficiently establish it beyond all controversy. While about 75,000 Armenian Christians have been put to death by the "bloody Turk" in all the diabolical modes of torture that the

genius of hell could invent, these "Christian (?) nations" have looked on with stolid indifference, showing no disposition whatever to stop the work of extermination. If the reason be asked for, it is at hand: These "nations" *value lands more than lives*, and for fear there would not be an equal division made of the possessions of the miserable Turk when the work of "grabbing" begun, so that each might get enough to satisfy his imperial greed in their jealousy of each other, these Christians (?) *preferred* the murdering of all these harmless, defenseless, men, women, and little children, to any such unequal dividing of the spoil! This is very properly termed by some humane persons of our country, "*the crime of Christendom.*" But why cite one instance of national insubordination, and want of fealty to the cause of Christianity, when the history of every one of these nations is written in blood; and what is true of these is true of all more or less. There is no pious NATION on earth. But there are people *in* all nations—of every kindred and tribe of earth who will make up the body of the Christian fraternity of our time; and the number is small when compared with the population of even the civilized portion of the world. So that the conversion of the world is a thing foreign to the evangelizing reach of the gospel of the Son of God. The Bible does not hint at such a doctrine as the "world's conversion." It *does* however teach that the world will *not be converted;* that "wicked men and seducers will wax worse and worse, deceiving

and being deceived;" that because of the abounding of "iniquity the love of many will wax cold; that the tares in the parable of the sower (Matt. 13), representing the wicked beyond the reach of the gospel, never turn to wheat, but continue to be tares to the harvest—end of the world—when they are gathered and burned in the fire.

But we return to the thought of the location of the kingdom of God. In the 7th chapter of the Book of Daniel, we have mention made of the universal governments of earth under a different line of symbols—nations fitly represented by ferocious beasts ready to devour each other. Each succeeds its predecessor in turn till the last, and it is eventually succeeded by the kingdom of God, represented in the 2d chapter, as we have shown, by the "stone." The prophet closes the scenes laid in this 7th chapter with this remarkable transition. He says: "And the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom UNDER THE WHOLE HEAVEN, shall be given to the people of the saints of the most High, whose kingdom is an *everlasting kingdom*, and all dominions shall serve and obey him."

The kingdom of God here spoken of has three notable characteristics over and above its predecessors, viz., 1, Greatness. While each of those earthly monarchies were great in its time, ruling over the then inhabited world, their successor, the kingdom of God, was to far surpass them, having the omnipotent One for its king. 2, Universality. The rule of those kingdoms only extended over a part of the earth's surface,

not embracing all of the Eastern Hemisphere; while the kingdom of God was said by the Prophet to spread over the entire Globe; or as described here, "*under* the whole heaven," and *not above it*, as some are inclined to think. 3, Duration. Those kingdoms were temporal, and were all to be obliterated by the sweep of time; while this kingdom was to be an *everlasting* kingdom, and one that should not be destroyed, or pass away, like its predecessors.

This same idea is expressed by John the Revelator. He says: "And the seventh angel sounded; and there were great voices in heaven, saying, *the kingdoms of this world are become the kingdom of our Lord, and of His Christ; and He shall reign for ever and ever.*" (Rev. 11:15.) The *duration* of this kingdom is expressed here also, as well the *time* of its introduction—at the "sounding of the seventh angel." The following quotations of Scripture introducing the kingdom of God synchronize with the foregoing:

2 Peter 1:11. "An entrance shall be ministered unto you abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ."

Luke 12:32, "It is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom."

Luke 19:15, "And it came to pass, that when he was returned, having received the kingdom, then he commanded these servants to be called unto him," etc.

Luke 21:31, "So likewise ye, when ye see these things come to pass know ye that the kingdom of God is nigh at hand."

Luke 22:18, "I will not drink of the fruit of the vine, until the kingdom of God shall come."

Luke 23:42, "Remember me when thou comest in thy kingdom."

Acts 4:22, "Through much tribulation we must enter into the kingdom of God."

1 Corinthians 6:9, 10, "Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Be not deceived: neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind, nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners, shall inherit the kingdom of God."

2 Timothy 4:1, "I charge thee therefore before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom."

In the parable of the "wheat and tares," Jesus says that "in the end of this world He will send forth His angels, and they shall gather out of His kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity, and shall cast them into furnace of fire; there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth. Then shall the righteous shine forth in the kingdom of their Father." (Matt. 13:40-43.) The territory of the kingdom —the earth—is what is meant in this Scripture, as He says," "The angels shall gather out of His kingdom all things that offend, and them that do iniquity," etc. To the same import is Matthew 8:12, where "the children of the kingdom" are said to "be cast out."

In our discussion of the subject of the "spiritual kingdom" we showed that entering it signified a redemption from sin; the individual was delivered from the power of evil, and translated into the kingdom of God, as the Apostle has it in Col. 1:13. This is a *spiritual* salvation. In the "literal kingdom," we noticed that it signified a redemption from death—"the redemption of our body." This embraces the corporeal, and physical, and is therefore a *literal* salvation. The entering of the former, or "spiritual kingdom," we noticed was termed a "birth"—the "first birth," being the first that has to do with our salvation. The "church of the first born" were those redeemed from sin. It is said that a first always implies a second. If this redemption from sin is the "first birth," what is the "second birth?" *Two* acts are expressed in the redemptive process—"*dying*" and "*rising again;*" *two* kingdoms, or *two phases* of the same kingdom, are brought to view—the "spiritual" and the "literal." So *two* "births" are taught in the word. We have found the "*first;*" let us look for the "*second.*" When I say "the *second,*" I have reference to *redemptive* ordinals, leaving out the natural "birth." When Jesus said to Nicodemus, "Ye must be born again," He had reference to the "birth" of *regeneration*, or "birth" of the Spirit, as has been shown. But there is yet another very essential "birth," without which man can not be a partaker of immortality. Deliverance from *death* is also called a "birth" in the Scriptures. In Colossians 1:18,

and in other places it is applied to Jesus. Says the Apostle, in speaking of Him: "He is the head of the body, the church: who is the beginning, THE FIRST BORN FROM THE DEAD." In Romans 8:29, He is said to be "*the first born among many brethern.*" In that he was the first fruits of them that slept, he was the first that was raised to an immortal life from the dominion of death. He was the " first fruits" of a great harvest from the dead—of the whole church up to the present who have gone down into death. We see then that a resurrection from the dead to an immortal life is called a "birth;" and as all the saints of God have received the "first" birth in order to their entering into the "spiritual kingdom," they must necessarily receive a "second birth, by a resurrection from the dead, in order to the entering of the "literal kingdom," which will take place at the sounding of last trump, when Jesus Christ shall appear the second time. "For the trumpet shall sound," said the Apostle, "and the dead in Christ shall rise first." (Cor. 15:52, 53; 1 Thess. 4:16.) Those living saints at that time will be changed, the same Apostle tells us, which will amount to the same thing as a resurrection; as it will be a change from mortality to immortality—an essential condition there, as "flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God," nor "corruption incorruption." Then will this vile body be changed, and fashioned like unto His glorious body.

Redemption will not be finished until this last and crowning act in the divine plan is completed. Man cannot be said to be redeemed from the curse as long as Death, the last enemy reigns. The promise is that he (Death) shall be swallowed up in victory at that time. (See 1 Cor. 15:26, 54.) This change from under the power and dominion of Death to life eternal—from mortality to immortality—will constitute the "second birth." But man must be redeemed from the *cause* before he can be manumitted from the *effect*. Sin is the direct cause of death--"the wages of sin is death" (Rom. 6:23)—"the end of those things is death" (v. 21.)

Unless, therefore, the *cause*, *sin*, is removed from us, the *effect* of that cause, death, will as surely entail itself upon us. And this is just where the work of redemption beings—at the *removal of the cause*. This order of the divine arrangement cannot be reversed, or set aside. It will not be in any way possible for any person to receive the "second birth" *first*. Or in other words, no man can be saved from death *first*, and from sin *afterward*, as too many people seem to think. As a first always *precedes* a second, the latter is not due us *until* after we have received the former. He who has never entered the spiritual kingdom—been changed from nature to grace—can never enter that kingdom for which all the saints pray. To this effect we read in reference to it. Says the Apostle: "Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Be not deceived: neither

fornicators, nor idolators, nor adulterers, nor effeminate * * * * nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners, shall inherit the kingdom of God." (1 Cor. 6:9, 10.) There will be no part nor place in that glorious realm for the ungodly. They will be rooted out of the earth—the territory of that kingdom, while the children of God will remain in it. "For the upright shall dwell in the land, and the perfect shall remain in it. But the wicked shall be cut off from the earth, and the transgressors shall be rooted out of it." (Prov. 2:21, 22.)

Some pretend to think that all the "kingdom of God" there is or ever will be, is now in this present sinful world. They claim that because the word "king," from which "kingdom" is derived, signifies rule, or reign, that after the perfect state comes there can be no "rule," or "reign," as there will be nothing that will need ruling. They think that if there ever come a time when there will be no sin, that will be the time when there will be neither king nor kingdom. Of course according to this view, sin is one of the essential featues of a kingdom. No sin, then, no king or kingdom! Strange logic indeed. I suppose the purpose for which a police force exists would illustrate their idea better. If there were no infraction of civic rule there would be no policemen. Their official function depends upon insubordination for its existence. It grows out of a civil necessity. So with the office of "king;" it is to the realm,

or country, what police authority is to the city, in the light of this theory. King means "rule," these say; and so when that time comes that there will be no troublesome subjects to rule, there will be no need of *rule*. This is their definition of "king." "The kingdom," they say, "must, from the very necessity of it, cease with transgression and disobedience."

According to this doctrine, then, there is not only at present a sinful condition of things *in heaven* and on earth, but there *will be to all eternity!* For the word declares: (2) that God is "King *eternal*," or an "*eternal King*" (1 Tim. 1:17); therefore there must be eternal transgression in heaven, the seat of His regal authority! and (2) that the kingdom to be introduced at the second appearing of Christ to earth will be one that will have *no end;* and therefore there must be eternal transgression on earth; for we read: "There was given him (Christ) dominion, and glory, and a kingdom: his dominion *is an everlasting dominion*, which *shall not pass away*, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed." "And the kingdom, and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the most High, whose kingdom *is an everlasting kingdom*." (Dan. 7:14, 27.) In Isaiah, 9th chapter, we read of the endless increase of His government. (V. 7.) This being true that the kingship of Christ on earth will be eternal, transgression on the earth will be eternal also! If there can be no kingdom with-

out sinful subjects to rule over, and this kingdom is eternal, as we have just read, then sinful subjects will be eternal. But this fanatical idea hardly merits notice, as it is self-refuting in that it is contrary to Scripture and common sense. We have noticed it for the reason that there are those who are being led astray by it. There is no theory too absurd to draw a certain class of the credulous after it. Any one can see if he will what ridiculous conclusions must be deduced from such an absurd premise. Jesus says when that kingdom comes *God's "will on earth will be done as it is done in heaven."* (Matt. 6:10.) Now allowing, as these theorists must, that "God's will" is that peace and righteousness may abound on earth—and this is the condition of things in heaven where He is "King eternal,"—it follows that wherever God's kingdom is instead of it being insubordination, and rebellion, it will be peace and righteousness; and this will be the condition that will prevail on earth when Christ is the literal, universal King here. And that "will" of God can never be effected on this earth until the personal reign of King Immanuel takes place; then "the work of righteousness shall be peace; and the effect of righteousness, quietness and assurance forever," saith the Prophet. Of the serenity and perpetuity of that kingdom we read: "Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end." (Isaiah 9:7.)

CHAPTER VIII.

SANCTIFICATION.

AS TAUGHT IN THE SCRIPTURES.

To some people there appears to be something very unpleasant about this word, "sanctification;" they have even a horror of it. One not acquainted with the word, would naturally suppose that it implied something extremely bad. to see these very sensitive persons so offended at it. I have heard the remark made by some certain ones when there was mention made of it in their presence, that when they heard of a man who had got (caught) 'sanctification' they felt it quite necessary to lock their stables, lest he steal their horses! I suppose they considered it a sort of kleptomania, or something like that, with which that man was afflicted. It is hardly proper to jest over a word that carries with it such sacredness as does this; yet one cannot help thinking, as Pope said, that it is but just "when folly grows romantic, to paint it." There is, however, in the world, one individual of note who also hates the doctrine of "sanctification"—that is the Devil. Many religious persons will talk on "justification by faith," "water baptism," "the curse of sin," "the love of God," "the blessings of the gospel," etc., with marked eloquence, who are perfectly dumb upon the subject of "sanctification," as though it were a theme unknown to Christianity and the Bible.

But what do we understand by the word "sanctification," as used in the Scriptures? To analyze the word, it is made up of three elements, as every one who has given attention to it knows. It is derived from the Latin into our language; and is from, "*sanctus*," holy; "*ficare*," to make; and the Anglicized termination, "*ion*," the act of. The meaning of it then is, "*the act of making holy.*" And this is the meaning Webster gives it. He says, It is "*the act of sanctifying or making holy; the state of being sanctified or made holy;* especially (in a Theological sense), *the act of God's grace by which the affections of men are purified, or alienated from sin and the world, and exalted to a supreme love to God;* also *the state of being thus purified or sanctified.*" He gives as the *secondary definition*, "*the act of consecrating, or setting apart for a sacred purpose; consecration.*"

Cruden gives the same signification of the word. He says that the verb, "sanctify," when applied to persons, is "*to make them holy who were impure and defiled before,*" and cites 1 Cor. 6:11, where it is so used. He says: "*This is the sense of the word in those passages of Scripture where the elect are said to be sanctified.*"

Seeing the definition of the word "sanctification" is the act of *making holy* it might not be out of place to ask concerning the meaning of the word "*holy.*" Webster gives *its* meaning thus: "1. *Set apart to the service or worship of God; hallowed; sacred; reserved from profane or common use;* as 'holy vessels;' 'a holy priest-

hood.' 2. *Spiritually whole or sound; of unimpaired innocence and virtue; free from sinful affections; pure in heart; godly; pious; irreproachable; guiltless; acceptable to God.*" From these definitions it appears that the two words are of synonymous import. "To sanctify" means to make holy, and vice versa. There are other uses of the word "sanctification;" but when applied to persons in the Scriptures, these are the significations—*the act of making holy*, and *the act of setting apart to a sacred purpose*, respectively. The first sense of the participle, "sanctified," then, would signify, "*made holy.*" A "sanctified people" would mean "a holy people," "saints;" for such they are called in the Scriptures. Both "*holy*," and "*saint*" are translated from the same Greek word, (*agios*) in the New Testament. The former word being an adjective qualifies that to which it is applied. When applied to persons, as "holy men," "holy people," it attributes to them the special quality of *holiness*. But when these people are spoken of by the sacred writers in which they wish to use a noun in place of such phrase as "holy people," etc., they employ the word, "saint," or "saints" or other sacred appellations.

From these considerations then we learn this very important truth, namely, *that "a sanctified people," signifies "a holy people,"* or "*saints;*" and that the term "sanctification" means "*holiness*" —from *sanctus*, "holy." The following passages of Scripture will serve to show us something of the extent to which these terms are used in the

Bible, as applied to the Lord's people. As the terms are of synonymous import we shall so consider them:

"Sanctify yourselves therefore, and *ye* be holy: for I am the Lord. (Lev. 20:7.) "That *ye* may remember, and do all my commandments, and be *holy* unto your God." (Num. 15:40.) "And she said unto her husband, Behold now, I perceive this is a *holy man* of God, which passeth by us continually." (2 Kings 4:9.) "Preserve my soul; for *I am holy.*" (Psal. 86:2.) "The knowledge of the *holy* is understanding." (Prov. 9:10.) "Herod feared John, knowing that he was a just *man and an holy.*" (Mar. 6:20.) "As he spake by the mouth of his *holy prophets*, which have been since the world began." (Luke 1:70.) "I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, *holy, acceptable unto God*, which is your reasonable service." (Rom. 12:1.) "If any man defile the temple of God, him shall God destroy; for the *temple of God is holy*, which *temple ye are.*" (1 Cor. 3:17.) "*We* should be *holy* and without blame before him." (Eph. 1:4.) "That he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that *it* should be *holy* and without blemish." (Eph. 5:27.) "To present *you holy* and unblameable and unreproveable in his sight." (Col. 1:22.) 'Put on therefore, as the elect of God, *holy* and beloved, bowels of mercies, kindness," etc. (Col. 312.) "I charge by the Lord that this epistle be read unto

all the holy brethren." (1 Thess. 5:27.) "Wherefore, *holy brethren*, partakers of the heavenly calling." (Heb. 3:1.) "But as he which hath called you is *holy*, so be *ye holy* in all manner of conversation." (1 Pet. 1:15.) "Ye also, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house, an *holy priesthood*, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ." (1 Pet. 2:5.) "After this manner in old time the *holy women* also, who trusted in God, adorned themselves," etc. (1 Pet. 3:5.) "The prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but *holy men* spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." (2 Pet. 1:21.) "The words spoken before by the *holy prophets.*" (2 Pet. 3:2.) "Seeing then that all these things shall be dissolved, what manner of persons ought ye to be in all *holy conversation* and *godliness?*" (V. 11.) "Rejoice over her * * * ye *holy apostles* and *prophets.*" (Rev. 18:20.) "Blessed and *holy is he* that hath part in the first resurrection." (Rev. 20:6.) "He that is unjust, let him be unjust still; and he which is filthy let him be filthy still; and he that is righteous, let him be righteous still; and *he* that *is holy*, let *him be holy* still." (Rev. 22:11.)

"HOLY PEOPLE."

"Thou art a *holy people* unto the Lord." (Deut. 7:6.) "That thou mayest be a *holy people* unto the Lord." (Deut. 26:19.) "The Lord shall establish thee a *holy people* to himself." (Deut. 28:9.) "They shall call them The *holy people.*" (Isa. 62:12.) "He shall destroy the mighty and the *holy people.*" (Dan. 8:24.) "He shall have

accomplished to scatter the power of the *holy people*." (Dan. 12:7.)

"SANCTIFIED."

"I the Lord do *sanctify* Israel." (Ezek. 37:28.) "*Sanctify* them through thy truth: thy word is truth." (John 17:17.) "That he might *sanctify* and cleanse it (the church) with the washing of water by the word." (Eph. 5:26.) "The very God of peace *sanctify* you wholly." (1 Thess. 5:23.) "That Jesus might *sanctify* the people with his own blood, suffered without the gate." (Heb. 13:12.) "That they might be *sanctified* through the truth." (John 17:19.) "To give you an inheritance among them that are *sanctified*." (Acts 20:32.) "Unto the church which is at Corinth, to them that are *sanctified* in Christ Jesus, called to be saints." (1 Cor. 1:2.) "Such were some of you, but ye are washed, but ye are *sanctified*." (1 Cor. 6:11.) "For both he that *sanctifieth* and they who are *sanctified* are all one: for which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren." (Heb. 2:11.) "By the which will we are *sanctified* through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all." (Heb. 10:10.) "By one offering he hath perfected forever them that are *sanctified*." (Heb. 10:14.) "To them that are *sanctified* by God the Father, and preserved in Jesus Christ and called." (Jude 1:1.) "But of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and *sanctification*, and redemption." (1 Cor. 1:30.) "This is the will of

God, even *your sanctification.*" (1 Thess. 4:3.) "Because God hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation through *sanctification* of the Spirit and belief of the truth." (2 Thess. 2:13.)

"SAINTS."

"*Saint*, a holy or Godly person."—*Cruden.*

"He keeps the feet of his *saints*, and the wicked shall be silent in darkness; for by strength shall no man prevail." (1 Sam. 2:9.) "Let thy *saints* rejoice in goodness." (2 Chron. 6:41.) "To which of the *saints* wilt thou turn?" (Job 5:1.) "To the *saints* that are in the earth, and to the excellent, in whom is all my delight." (Psal. 16:3.) "Sing unto the Lord, O ye *saints* of his, and give thanks at the remembrance of his holiness." (Psal. 30:4.) "O love the Lord, all ye his *saints:*" (Psal. 31:23.) "O fear the Lord, ye his *saints:* there is no want to them that fear him." (Psal. 34:9.) "The Lord forsaketh not his *saints.*" (Psal. 37:28.) "Gather my *saints* together unto me; those that have made a covenant with me by sacrifice." (Psal. 50:5.) "I will wait on thy name; for it is good before thy *saints.*" (52:9.) "God is to be feared in the assembly of his *saints.*" (89:7) "Precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of his *saints.*" (116:15.) "Let the *saints* be joyful in glory: let them sing aloud upon their beds." (149:5.) "He preserveth the way of his *saints.*" (Prov. 2:8.) "The *saints* shall take the kingdom, and possess the kingdom for ever, even forever and ever." (Dan. 7:18.) "I beheld,

and the same horn made war with the *saints*, and prevailed against them." (Dan. 7:21.) "And he shall speak great words against the most High, and shall wear out the *saints* of the most High." (V. 25.) "And the graves were opened; and many bodies of the *saints* which slept arose." (Matt. 27:52.) "How much evil he (Saul) hath done to thy *saints*." (Acts 9:13.) "Peter came down also to *the saints* at Lydda." (9:32.) "Many of *the saints* did I shut up in prison." (26:10.) "To all that be in Rome beloved of God called to be *saints*." (Rom. 1:7.) "He maketh intercession for *the saints* according to the will of God." (Rom. 8:27.) "Distributing to the necessity of *saints*." (Rom. 12:13.) "Now I go to Jerusalem to minister to *the saints*." (Rom. 15:25.) "To make a certain contribution for the poor *saints* which are at Jerusalem." (V. 26.) "That my service which I have for Jerusalem may be accepted of *the saints*." (V. 31.) "Salute *all the saints* which are with them." (16:15.) "To them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be *saints*." (1 Cor. 1:2.) "Dare any of you, having a matter against another, go to law before the unjust, and not before *the saints*." (1 Cor. 6:1.) "Do ye not know that *the saints* shall judge the world?" (V. 2.) "God is not the author of confusion, but of peace, as in all the churches of *the saints*.' (14:33.) 'Unto the church which is at Corinth, with *all the saints* which are in all Achaia." (2 Cor. 1:1.) "As touching the ministering to *the saints*, it is superfluous for me to write to you." (2 Cor.

9: 1.) "*All the saints* salute you." (13: 13). "To *the saints* which are at Ephesus, and to the faithful in Christ Jesus." (Eph. 1: 1). "I heard of your faith in the Lord Jesus, and love to *all the saints.*" (Verse 15). "That ye may know what is the hope of his calling, and what the riches of the glory of his inheritance in *the saints.*" (Verse 18). "Now therefore ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with *the saints*, and of the household of God." (2: 19). "Unto me who am less than the least of *all saints*, in this grace given, that I should preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ." (3: 8). "That ye may be able to comprehend with *all saints* what is the breadth, and length, and depth, height." (Verse 18.) "For the perfecting of *the saints*, for the work of the ministry." (4: 12). "But fornication, and all uncleanliness, or covetousness, let it not be once named among you, *as becometh saints.*" (Eph. 5: 3.) "Watching unto prayer with all perseverance and supplication for *all saints.*" (6: 18.) "To *all the saints* in Christ Jesus which are at Philippi." (Phil. 1: 1.) "To *all the saints* and faithful at Colosse." (Col. 1: 2.) "At the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ with *all his saints.*" (1 Thess. 3: 13.) "When He shall come to be glorified in his *saints.*" (2 Thess. 1: 10.) "That thou shouldest give reward to *the saints.*" (Rev. 11: 18). "It was given unto him (the Beast) to make war with *the saints.*" (Rev. 13: 7.) "Here is the patience and faith of *the saints.*" (Verse 10.) "And they

(*saints*), sing the song of Moses the servant of God, and the song of the Lamb, saying, Great and marvellous are thy works, Lord God Almighty; just and true are thy ways, thou king of *saints*." (Rev. 15: 3.) "They have shed the blood of *saints*." (Rev. 16: 6.) "The fine linen is the righteousness of *saints*." (19: 8.) "And they went up on the breadth of the earth, and compassed the camp of *the saints* about, and the beloved city: and fire came down from God out of heaven and devoured them." (20: 9.)

"HOLINESS."

"Thy people shall be willing in the day of thy power, in the beauty of *holiness*." (Psl. 110: 3.) "And an high way shall be there, and a way, and it shall be called The way of *holiness*." (Isa. 35: 8.) "That he would grant unto us, that we, being delivered out of the hand of our enemies, might serve him without fear, in *holiness* and righteousness before him, all the days of our life." (Luke 1: 74, 75.) As ye have yielded your members servants to uncleanness and to iniquity unto iniquity; even so now yield your members servants to righteousness unto *holiness*." (Rom. 6: 19). "But now being *made free from sin*, and become servants to God, ye have *your fruit unto holiness*, and the end everlasting life." (Verse 22). "Having therefore these promises, dearly beloved, let us cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, *perfecting holiness* in the fear of God." (2 Cor. 7: 1.) "Put on the new

man, which after God is created in righteousness and true *holiness*." (Eph. 4: 24). "To the end he may establish your hearts unblamable in *holiness* before God, even our father, at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ with *all his saints*." (1 Thess. 3: 13.) "For God has not called us unto uncleanness, but *unto holiness*." (1 Thess. 4: 7). "If they continue in faith and charity and *holiness* with sobriety." (1 Tim. 2: 15). "The aged woman likewise, that they be in behavior as becometh *holiness*, not false accusers, not given to much wine, teachers of good things." (Titus 2: 3.) "That we might be partakers of *his holiness*." (Heb. 12: 10.) "Follow peace with all men, and HOLINESS *without which no man shall see the Lord*." (Verse 4.)

If we may be considered prolix in our array of Scriptural authority on this theme, it is that we might the more effectually *generalize* the great principle of *Bible "sanctification."* We might have given a few examples and passed on, but it seems quite necessary to be somewhat copious in this matter in order to give the reader an idea of the prevalence of the doctrine from a Bible stand-point. And this thought is the more manifest when we take into consideration the fact that the notion abounds in our age of religious apathy that "sanctification" is not a Bible doctrine.

In this presentation of the subject we have shown that, "holy," "saint," and "sanctification" (*agiasmos*), are from the same Greekroot-word, and signify, *pure*, *pure people*, and *purity of heart*,

respectively. And in doing this we have not overlooked the truth of "sanctification" being used in the sense of "*consecration;*" or a setting apart to sacred uses. We noticed that the two words, "sanctification" and "holy," both admit this meaning of "consecration." Everything that was dedicated to divine service or use was, for that reason, considered sanctified or consecrated; for nothing but consecrated things and persons were acceptable to God under the law, shadowing forth a more complete and effectual consecration in the dispensation to follow in the "perfecting of *holiness* in the fear of God." But *consecration* was but the initiatory step in this divine procedure. All holy persons, in the true sense of that word, *were consecrated* persons; but all consecrated persons *were not holy* persons, so proved at least. Moses, by the order of the Lord, sanctified—*consecrated Israel* when they had come out of the land of Egypt, but the subsequent history of that people proved that they were not *all holy* persons; for they rebelled against God and many of them were destroyed during their wanderings of forty years in the wilderness. (Exod. 19: 10; Num. 14.) This consecration, or sanctification, as it applied to them, was a rite, peculiar to that economy. They purified their garments and their external persons; while their hearts and consciences might, and did, remain unchanged; and in this sanctified condition they were said to be "holy unto the Lord," in the sense of being set apart—consecrated to God as His peculiar

people, *separated* from the other tribes and nations of earth.

Nor is this thought of consecration any the less true in our time, as regards acceptable service to God. Holiness may, and must, *follow* consecration, but consecration, on the other hand, can *never follow* holiness. In other words, no individual can be pure and holy *before* he is separated or set apart from this wicked world to the service and glory of God. For a man to be mixed up in the affairs of the world, a participant in its pleasures, its treasures, its vanities, its time-serving schemes, etc., and yet lay claims to righteousness, is to affirm what is false. He cannot be a partaker of its evils and at the *same* time *be separate* from them. He must "come out from among them to be separate," (2 Cor. 6: 17), and for God to receive him. But he must come out of the world *before* his offerings will be acceptable to God, as truly as Israel had to leave Egypt with its abominations behind, before they could offer acceptable sacrifices unto God. When Pharaoh requested Moses to remain in the land of Egypt and serve the Lord, the latter replied: "It is not meet so to do; *for we shall sacrifice the abomination of the Egyptians to the Lord our God.* We will go three days journey into the wilderness, and sacrifice to the Lord our God, as he shall command us." (Exod. 8: 25-27.) And what was true there and then in type is true here in antitype: we cannot offer the abominations of this unrighteous world in sacrifice to God; it is but an

insult to Him to do so. Yet this thing is palpably exemplified in the doings of the worldly minded christian. With a *heart full of the world* he attempts to "offer unto God an acceptable sacrifice," consoling himself that this is well pleasing in His Sight. He has forgotten, perhaps, what the Apostle John said in speaking of the antagonism of the world to God. Hear it: "*Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world. If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him.* For all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, is NOT *of the Father*, but *is of the world.* And the world passeth away, and the lust thereof: but he that doeth the will of God abideth for ever." (John 2: 15–17.) To the same import is James 4: 4: "Know ye not that the friendship of the world *is enmity with God?* whosoever therefore *will be a friend of the world is the enemy* of God."

It is manifestly evident that there is a line of demarcation drawn *between* the *Christian* and *the world of evil.* Is it to be wondered at then that he (the Christian) should be called upon to not seek conformation to the world? To argue against this is to advocate a theory of desecration, and justify an association with evil. To disestablish this (the doctrine of separateness from the world) would as virtually *nullify* the doctrine of redemption from sin; for if we believe that at the point where God for Christ's sake forgave us our sins, we were there and then delivered from them, through faith in His name,

what would such a deliverance amount to if we were just as certain of being inthralled by sin again? If "the wages of sin is death," are we not just as much under the penalty as we were in the first place before we were delivered from it? We certainly are. Wherein then does the deliverance benefit us? It just simply amounts to no deliverance at all! I mean by this, that after we are saved from our sins—when Christ has "washed us from our sins in his own blood" (Rev. 1:5)—to then seek alliance with the wicked world, and become partakers of its evils, notwithstanding the fact that we hold to the profession of Christianity, as thousands do; our redemption has not eventually and effectually saved us. Sin is sin, whether committed by the arrant transgressor, or by the formal, unsanctified professor, and must entail like consequences upon both—those of condemnation and death. Says the Apostle Paul to the brethren at Rome in this pressing interrogation, "*How shall we that are dead to sin live any longer therein?*" Yes, how shall we? how can we, and remain uncondemned before God, when we know that whosoever commits sin transgresses the law whose penalty is death? knowing also that "Christ was manifested to take away our sin"—deliver us from it—in order to save us from the penalty. (1 John 3:4:5). This redemption in Christ is effectual with the believer just where he ceases the service of sin, and not before that; in which case "Christ becomes the *end of the law for i ghteousness to every one that believeth.*"

The fact that the great mass of professing christians in the world of to-day do not live lives of holiness to God argues *nothing against* holiness being a current Bible doctrine, as we have just noticed. If "*without* holiness no man shall see the Lord," *how is the sinning christian to stand acquitted before God?*

Was it the intention of God in the great plan of salvation to entirely redeem His people from sin, we would ask? If it was not, then sin to a certain extent is *admissible*, or *allowable*. The question now arises, What is the *limit* of admissible sinning? On what parity of reasoning is sinning *justifiable in part?* As the whole, or aggregate, of anything cannot exceed the sum of all its parts, where is the line to be drawn between *a certain number of parts* and *the whole*, in this? Are some sins so much better than others that this discrimination is made? And which are those, "better" or "admissible sins?" This would be one of the most interesting problems for solution the age could produce. Upon the solution of it men would possess a system of indulgence which would as far surpass that introduced into Germany by Tetzel under the commission of Pope Leo X, 1517, as one could well imagine. For Tetzel's system only embraced *Germany*, while this system would include *the world*. But this much desired solution is not reached yet, notwithstanding the engagedness of all the cunning that lurks within the intellects of a depraved humanity to effect such an object. The affinity existing between

sin and the unregenerate heart prompts man to a compromise with, rather than an abandonment of, the evil; hence the attempt by many to an extenuation of it, on the ground that the Bible does not condemn sin *in the absolute*. When men have proved to us by *Reason and Revelation* that a *Part* of the sins of the human heart are admissible and justifiable, we will, by those same sources of evidence, prove that *All* the sins of the human heart are admissible and justifiable. For on the principle that the Bible would justify sin in *part* it would in the *whole*, and I defy any one, from logic, to disprove it. If we admit then that "sin" possesses intrinsic worth—as it surely must if justifiable—upon the principle that, if *a little of sin is good, much of it is better*, he who owns the most of the precious article is not only the best off but the most righteous of men! But "sin," on the other hand, is *not* of intrinsic worth, and *not* "a good thing," but a *deadly evil*, a curse, as Revelation, reason, observation, and experience, have taught us; and being such, is it not reasonable to conclude that *the less* a man has of it *the better he is off?* On the *justifying* principle of it, what kind of a standard would the Bible be? To set up the claim that this Book justifies "sin" in *any* degree, is to impute to it unrighteousness, traduce its ethics, and place it on a level with any debasing system of iniquity, thereby impeaching its Author.

If, to evade the force of this argument, it should be affirmed that those who are opposed

to the doctrine of Bible "sanctification," do not claim that the Bible justifies "sin;" why then do *they* justify what *the Bible* does not? The Bible either justifies sin or condemns it. If it does not justify it, as these say, it as certainly stamps its condemnation upon it. To practice that which the Bible condemns then, would be *to live in a state of condemation.*

Those who oppose the doctrine of sanctification, or holiness, tell us *that no person can live without sinning!* This being true, then, *no person can live without condemnation!* Is this according to Bible doctrine? I read in Romans, 8th chapter, this: "There is therefore now NO *condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus*, who walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit." One of two things is true: Either the Bible does not condemn "sinning," or those who "cannot live without sinning" are not "in Christ Jesus." To live *in sin*, is *to "walk after the flesh;"* but this class that are "in Christ Jesus walk *not* after the flesh but *after the spirit;"* and therefore *do not "live in sin."* We understand that these two phrases, "after the flesh," and "in sin," are of synonymous import—both meaning the same. How much of "walking after the flesh," or "sinning," then, can be added to the life of the Christian, and he still maintain intact and uncontaminated his "walk after the Spirit?" Or how much "bad" may we incorporate with the "good." and *all remain "good?"* This moral alchemy is a new idea to science and metaphysics! By what pro-

cess of transformation is this "sinning" made over into goodness, during our pilgrimage here below? We do not limit the power of God. It is possible for Him to do anything He pleases. He might work *such* a transformation in the lives of men. But, one thing seems certain, if He *purposed to transmute* the sins of a man's life into righteousness, and *adopt that as a means of redemption*, He surely would not have recommended to him an opposite means for its accomplishment--that of deliverance FROM *sin*, as He has done in His word. We are familiar with the saying: "There is nothing impossible with God." This should not be used too unqualifiedly; for the Bible holds out the thought that there are some things which God cannot do, and that are impossible of being performed by Him. Says the Apostle, in his Epistle to Titus, "For the hope of eternal life, which God *that cannot lie*, promised before the world began." Again: "He *cannot deny himself*" (2 Tim. 2: 13.) Heb. 6: 18. "By two immutable things, in which it *was impossible for God to lie.*" We see by these quotations then that there is one thing at least that God cannot do—He cannot lie; and it is just as impossible for Him to commit any other sin. "In him is no sin." (1 John 3: 5,) If then God cannot sin, how can He change sin into righteousness? Can he turn *wrongs* into *rights? evil* into *good?* If He can then there in no such thing in His sight as "*sin;*" it being the material out of which he makes righteousness, in part

at least, so to speak. If when "sin" has passed the plastic touch of the divine hand it becomes righteousness, as it were, there no longer remains in the sight of Deity that execrable evil called "sin" but a substance out of which He creates good. It looks as though this were another thing that God could not do; for if it were He could make a much more speedy riddance of "sin" from the world by this transmutation plan than through the scheme the *Bible advocates*. We cannot harmonize the theory that God changes "sin" into righteousness with Reason or Revelation, as we see. They are opposites, and in their tendencies and nature will remain such to all eternity. A *wrong will always remain a wrong*. God will forgive a man for his wrongs he has committed during his life, or that part of his life preceding repentance; but *not one of those "wrongs"* will ever be changed into a righteous act. Sin is immutable, and so is righteousness; they are diametrically opposed to each other, and therefore have no agreement or concord with each other. Says the Apostle, "What fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? And what communion hath light with darkness?" (2 Cor. 6:14.)

If there is no possibility, then, of sin being transmuted into righteousness, as common sense and the Bible declare, then all the sins a man commits, whether they be great or small, will *remain sins*, and must, in their very nature, bring condemnation upon him to the extent they reach. But the Apostle tells us in this Scripture of

Romans 8th, to which attention has just been directed, that "there is *no condemnation* to them which are in Christ Jesus." It being true that sin is the direct cause of condemation, then, it would be reasonable to infer that where *there* is "no condemnation *there* is no sin;" and as "there is *no condemnation to them that are in Christ*, it follows that there is *no* sin imputed to them; and that this is true we are told in as plain language as possible that they "walk *not after the flesh*, but *after the Spirit*." *Not the curse of condemnation*, but *the blessing of justification*, is theirs. And to this effect we read: "*Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin.*" "Blessed is the man unto whom the Lord imputeth *not iniquity*, and in whose spirit *there is no guile*." (Rom. 4: 32; Psal. 32: 2.)

There are but *two* classes of persons in Christendom—*the justified* and *the condemned*. The former are redeemed from *the power and practice of sin*, or they *could not continue justified before God*. They are among those whom the Redeemer has washed in His blood, and consequently are clean. "The blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth us from *all* sin." (1 John 1: 7.) "If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from *all* unrighteousness." (Verse 9.) When we are cleansed from "*all* sin" and "unrighteousness," how much will there be left with us? These justified, purified ones comprise the true Church of Christ for all time. Says the Apostle in speaking of this Church, "Christ loved the church,

and gave himself for it; that he might *sanctify and cleanse it* with the washing of water by the the word, that he might present it to himself a glorious church, *not having spot, or wrinkle*, or *any such thing;* but that it *should be holy and without blemish.*" (Eph. 5: 25–27.) A church that has neither "spot," "or wrinkle," is "holy and without blemish," surely is not a church that "*cannot live without sinning*," or there would be a *great many* "*spots*," "*wrinkles*" and "*blemishes.*" Yes, this "spotless" Church *is the true Church*, and it is a "sanctified" Church. It is the Church of the redeemed—redeemed from among men; redeemed from all sin, and hence are said to be "*without spot*," "*wrinkle*," or "*blemish*"—"*holy.*" This is "*the Church of the first born;*" born into the kingdom spiritual of Jesus Christ, regenerated and have their "*fruit unto holiness.*" John saw this elect company of the redeemed as they had "come up out of great tribulation," and he says that "they had *washed* their robes and *made them white in the blood of the Lamb.*" (Rev. 7: 9, 14.) This "washing" of course must be considered like the other passages that refer to washing of this sort—notably, Ephesians 5: 26, and 1 Corinthians 6: 11, with some others, the latter of which references reads: "*Ye are washed, ye are sanctified, ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus.*" "*New creatures*" is another figure which expresses the same thought. The Apostle says, "In Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but *a new creature.*" (Rom. 6:15.)

It is certain that no man can be considered "washed," "cleansed," or a "new creature," while he is in a *sinning condition*, allied to the old man. In 2 Cor. 5: 17 we read, "If any man be in Christ, he is a *new creature;* old things *are passed away;* behold, *all things are become new.*" I do not know what "old things" the Apostle has reference to here if they are not those things that pertain to *the old carnal nature*—"the body of the sins of the flesh," which he says in Col. 2: 11, must be put off. With these still clinging to a man, "old things" cannot be said to have passed away from him, nor is he a "new creature," and hence is not in Christ.

"Cleansed," "washed," "sanctified," "purified," "made white," "renewed," etc., are the significant expressions the writers of the New Testament make use of in describing the great change that takes place in man when he is fully delivered from the filth and contaminations of sin. Such a change and renovation *are as explicitly taught and as essentially enjoined by the Lord in His word*, as is the truth of His existence. "*Put off the old man with his deeds;* and *put on the new man*," constitute a commandment just as strong as that one which reads: "*Thou shalt have no other gods before me.*" "But now ye also put off *all these; anger, wrath, malice, blasphemy, filthy communications out of your mouth.* Lie not to one another, seeing ye *have put off the old man with his deeds;* and *have put on the new man*, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him. * * *

Put on, therefore, *as the elect of God, holy and beloved, bowels of mercies, kindness, humbleness of mind, meekness, long suffering,*" etc. (Col. 3: 8–12.) "Put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ and make *no provisions for the flesh*, to fulfil the lusts thereof." (Rom. 13:14.) Can there be anything more radical along these lines than this? Truly then the New Testament teaches the doctrine *of a holy life on the part of Christ's Church* —being not only a *duty* but an *absolute necessity.*

The Apostle compares, by way of contrast, the fruits of the natural man with those of the spiritual man. In his letter to the Galatian brethren he says: "Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these: Adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, envyings, murders, drunkenness, revellings, and such like; of the which I tell you before, as I have also told you in times past, that they which do such things *shall not* inherit the kingdom of God." This is the unchanged life—the life of corruption, which works death. Notice the changed life, prolific with spiritual fruits. "But the fruit of the Spirit is *love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance: against such there is no law.*" To show that this condition applies to the true children of God, and that none of the preceding enumeration is common to them, the Apostle continues: "And they that are Christ's *have crucified the flesh with the affections and*

lusts. If we live in the Spirit, let *us* also walk in the Spirit. Let *us* not be desirous of vain glory, provoking one another, envying one another." (Chapt. 5: 19—26).

In that chapter of beatitudes, (Matt. 5th), the Savior says: "*Blessed are the pure in heart: for they shall see God.*" If this scripture has any meaning to it, it is that "the pure in heart" are the only ones of our race that will see Him. And to this agrees the Apostle Paul. He assures us that "*without holiness no man shall see the Lord.*" (Heb. 12: 14). David must have felt very keenly the essentiality of this purity of heart when he said, in his deep remorse of conscience for wrong doing, "*Create in me a clean heart*, O God; and renew a *right spirit within me.*" And again: "*Purge me with hysop*, and *I shall be clean: wash me*, and I *shall be whiter than snow*" (Psal. 51: 10, 7). So thorough does God consider this heart-cleansing that he expresses it to Israel by the Prophet Ezekial in the following strong language: "I will take you from among the heathen, and gather you out of all countries, and will bring you into your own land. Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean from *all your filthiness*, and from *all your idols will I cleanse you. A new heart will I give you*, and a *new spirit will I put within you*, and *I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you an heaat of flesh.*" (Chapt. 36:24–26). So thorough and radical, I say, does the Lord deem this change in man that He repre-

sents it by giving him "*a new heart,*" instead of *changing the old one.* This is figurative but effective language. We should not forget that God's ancient people were a striking type in this purified condition, of the redeemed of the gospel Dispensation.

The Apostle Paul keeps up the contrast between the spiritual and natural conditions, in the Epistle to the Roman church, in very strong language. He says: "The minding of the flesh is death; but the minding of the Spirit is life and peace. Because the minding of flesh is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither, indeed can be (mar. reading). So then they that are in the flesh *cannot* please God. But *ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit,* if so be that the Spirit of God *dwell in you.* If Christ be in you, the body is dead because of sin; but the Spirit is life because of righteousness * * * Therefore, brethren, we are debtors, not to the flesh, to live after the flesh. For if ye live after the flesh, ye shall die; but if ye through the Spirit do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live. For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God. For ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear; but ye have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father. The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God: and if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ." (Chapt. 8:6 17). If this language does not express emancipation from the service of sin, to a *condition of*

holiness, or *sanctification*, it is impossible to know what it does express. But there is no ambiguity of language in this: it means just what it says—*a salvation from sin to a life of perfect obedience through the Spirit of God.*

But why need we multiply Scriptural quotations on this great subject, when it is there where people can read it for themselves? The only plea I offer for this is, that so many people in the churches of our time have come to believe that there is no such doctrine as that of holiness or complete deliverance from sin, taught in the Scriptures; that it is a kind of dogma, or arbitrary dictum; peculiar to the intellectual fancy of a few old fogies; a mere vagary, having no tangible existence whatever. For such prevailing ignorance of a doctrine that so abounds throughout the sacred canon, as does this, there are causes. 1. The doctrine is repugnant to the instincts and aptitudes of the natural man, as we have shown; and hence the opposition it must receive from all unregenerate sources. 2. We have reached a period in the world's history when the doctrine of holiness is seldom ever preached in the popular pulpits of the different denominations. It is not what the *proud and fashionable* among the people want to hear; and as there is little or no demand for such preaching, it is not presented. But it may be asked just here, Why shun to declare it if it is the truth, whether the people want to hear it or not? Yes, *why?* No preacher can do his duty while he shuns to "declare the whole counsel of God" (Acts 20:27). A

strong preference for *fat salaries* and *fair sailing is* doubtless *one of the causes of a decline* in the preaching of this great and vital doctrine. It was said by some of the prophets, "As with the people so with the priest." (Isah. 24:2; Hosea 4: 9). If it is with the people to not want this unpopular doctrine preached, of course it remains for the preacher to *comply* with the wishes of his church or *step down and out*; and it takes more moral courage to back up against the tide of popular sentiment than many of these men possess; and so it comes that he conforms to their desires, and agrees to preach to them not what they *ought to hear*, but what they *want to hear*. But the Lord's directions were counter to this plan of compromise, as voiced by the Prophet Isaiah. He was instructed to "cry aloud and spare not;" to "lift up the voice like a trumpet, *and show his people their transgressions*, and the house of Jacob their sins." (Isah. 58:1). What was true in the time of Isaiah, seven centuries before Christ, is just as true in the closing decades of this 19th century, in regard God's attitude toward sin. We need an *army of Luthers* to rise up in defence of this much neglected and despised doctrine, which formed the burden of the Apostolic mission; men, like Luther, who dare to preach it regardless of the fear or favor of mortals, and in defiance of all the infernal hosts. I say we need such an army of the real veterans of the cross, so charged with the Holy Spirit's power that the forces of sin and apostasy would

fall before the sword of the Spirit in this reproduction of Apostolic preaching.

The Apostle Paul must have anticipated the religious status of our times when he wrote his Second Epistle to Timothy, where he said among other things, "The time will come when they *will not endure sound doctrine;* but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers having itching ears; and they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables." (2 Tim. 4:3:4). While it is true that we have passed "the dark ages" of papal dominance, it is just as true that we have not passed entirely beyond all the *errors* of those "ages." If it is true in figure, as D'Aubsgne says of Luther in the Reformation, that he reached over about fifteen centuries and took the hand of Paul, and reproduced the gospel in its Apostolical character and simplicity, passing over the Fathers because of the many superstitions and errors they had imbibed in common with truth; and there and then replanted in the world the pure gospel of Jesus Christ, in the very face of the opposition raised by the prevailing Apostasy of the time—it is true in a measure that we need a similar spirit to rise up and reach over about three and a half centuries and take the hand of Luther, and give the people another reproduction of the gospel as preached in Apostolic times. Luther preached *holiness of heart* with the same characteristic positiveness that we find it recorded in the epistles of St. Paul, and this with the doctrine of "justification by faith in Christ,"

constituted the mighty force by which he shook Satan's kingdom from centre to circumference, and broke the power of the Roman hierarchy, and brought in due time a state of religious toleration to all people. And yet, we cannot say that LUTHER did all this: it was God who did it *through him*. To His name be all the glory! But what was possible for Luther might be for any other true servant of God. Great possibilities are before the child of Omnipotence. We are not conscious of the good we may accomplish on this old sin-cursed earth of ours, if we will only seek to obey God rather than man.

PASSAGES OF SCRIPTURE SUPPOSED TO CONFLICT WITH THE DOCTRINE OF SANCTIFICATION.

There are a few texts of Scripture relied on by some people as evidence that Christians cannot live without committing sin. The first one is in 1 Kings 8:46, in the prayer of Solomon at the dedication of the temple. He says: "If they (God's people) sin against thee, (for there is no man that sinneth not.)" Some of the best Bible scholars render this: "For there is no man that *may not* sin." The *liability* to sin is taught in this rather than the *necessity* of it. To this agrees 1 John 2: 1: "*If* any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ, the righteous." I quote from "*Positive Theology*" by Rev. M. Grant, the words of Dr Adam Clarke upon the text under consideration. He says: "*For there is no man that may not sin.* This is the true meaning of the phrase in various parts of the Bible, and so our translators have under-

stood the original. If there be *no man that sineth not*, it is useless to say IF *they sin.*"

Another passage is found in Eccl. 7:20, and is similar to the one in 1 Kings 8:46.

Romans 3: 10: "There is none righteous, no, not one." If the reader will read this in the light of the following 8 verses he will see that the *wicked* are meant in this Scripture. Let us read verses 11 and 13 as samples: "There is *none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God. Their throat is an open sepulchre; with their tougues they have used deceit; the poison of asps is under their lips.*" This cannot be said of God's people.

1 John 1:8: "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us." We must also read this in the light of its context. Verse 7 reads: "If we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son *cleanseth us from all sin.*" Verse 9 reads: "If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to *cleanse us from all unrighteousness.*" If "the blood of Christ cleanses us from *all* sin, how much sin will there be left? Common sense says, "None." "All unrighteousness is sin." (1 John 5:17.) If we are "cleansed from *all* unrighteousness," how much sin is left? Not any. Yet verse 8, in between these two plain statements reads: "If we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us." Does John mean to teach us that when we are cleansed from *all* sin, it still remains in our hearts? A fairer contra-

diction could not well be devised. The 10th verse reads: "If we say we have not sinned we make him a liar, and his word is not in us." If we say that we have not committed sin, and therefore need no Savior to redeem us, "we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us," "*for all have sinned and come short of the glory of God.*" (Rom. 3:23.) It is very plain then that 1 John 1:8, does not teach that men must necessarily live in sin. Christ "was manifested to *take away our sins*, and in him is no sin." The promised Savior was to be called "Jesus, because he *should save his people from their sins.*" (Matt. 1:21.) "Whosoever *abideth in him sinneth not*," says John; and "whosoever *sinneth hath not seen him, neither known him.*" (1 John 3: 6.) "Abide in me, and I in you," says Jesus. (John 15:4.) Is it possible that Jesus would so mock his people by telling them to abide in Him when they could not? *Whosoever abideth in him sinneth not.*" Says the Apostle John, "Hereby know we that we dwell in him, and he in us, because he hath given of his Spirit." (1 John 4:13.) Paul tells us, that "being made *free* from sin, we become the servants of God, have our *fruit unto holiness, and* the end everlasting life." (Rom. 6: 22.) Again: It is declared that "he who committeth sin is of the devil; for the devil sinneth from the beginning. For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil. Whosoever is *born of God doth not commit sin;* for *his seed remaineth in him: and he cannot sin, because he is born of God.*" (1 John 3:8, 9.) On

this Scripture, Jamieson, Fausset, and Brown, have these remarks: "Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin—his higher nature, as one born or begotten of God doth not sin. *To be begotten of God* and *to sin*, are states mutually excluding one another. In so far as one sins, he makes it doubtful whether he be *born of God*. His seed—the living word of God, is made by the Holy Spirit the seed in us of a new life, and *the continual mean of sanctification*. Remaineth—abideth in him—as the branch in the vine, *by vital union living by his life, he cannot sin; in so far as he abides in Christ, so far he is free from all sin*. The life of sin and the life of God *mutually exclude one another, just as darkness and light*. He sineth not *so long as he abideth in Christ*." (See *Commentary*.)

SANCTIFICATION NOT JUSTIFICATION.

Cruden says: "Sanctification *differs* from Justification, *thus:*

"1. Justification, *is the absolution of a sinner from the guilt of sin and death; whereas* sanctification *is an alteration of qualities from evil to good.*

"2. Justification *consists in remission of sins through the imputation of Christ's righteousness;* santification *is the renovation of nature by the Holy Spirt.*

"3. Justification *is in nature before* sanctification, *but not in order of time; for God only sanctifies those that are justified.*"

The Roman Catholic church confounds sanctification with justification. The council of Trent (VI. 7) says that justification is not only forgiveness of sin, but the sanctification and renewal of the inner man. And this justification is held to be progressive, and obtained on the ground of faith *and good works*, in opposition to "justification by faith alone," (see Rom. 3:20:28.) The Apology of the Augsburg Confession, as formulated by Melanchthon, embodying the views of the Reformers, on the other hand, defines justification to be a forensic act, a declaration that a person is righteous. But inasmuch as this forensic act is an actual forgiveness of sins, and a reception into the new life, it is also a creative act. So that while Justification absolves, or pardons, the sinner through the merits of the atonement, and sets him at liberty, it tends to making him a new creature. In contrast with the view of the Catholic church, the Protestant confessions insist on a clear distinction being made between the instantaneous act of justification on the part of God and the continued and gradual work of sanctification.

It is a very important matter that these two terms be not confounded. We see what errors the Roman Catholic church ran into with this notion patent in her creed. I verily believe that the Devil deceives many thousands of people in Protestant churches, as he has deceived that church, by persuading them that justification is sanctification. Many people experienced, or seemed to experience, conversion, when they

felt that God for Christ's sake pardoned their sins. They deemed it true that they were in a state of justification, and of course redeemed; and that they could not be any more so; that if God forgave their sins He did it once for all, and they were by this act put beyond the power of evil, sufficiently to not be overcome by it; that in this great work of justification provisions were made for all their short comings and heart-wanderings, so incidental to this mortal life.

They seem to have forgotten that they were lost *before because of transgressions;* and that salvation which came to them when they were justified was a *deliverance from their sins, without* which deliverance they could not be saved. That they should consider themselves at liberty now to go back to the same thing that was their ruin before—sin—and continue therein, and still be acceptable in the sight of God, is a very strange view to take of redemption! But with the thought that there is no more for them to look for along these lines, and no more to be expected from them, they must, as a legitimate consequence, sink into a state of carelessness and indifference, and lose whatever spirituality they may have had in the beginning. As soon as people lose sight of the fact that salvation means not only a deliverance from sin, but *a continuance in that deliverance*, they make little use any farther of the appointed means of grace, and do not carry with them an evidence of present justification in the sight of God. If God reproved the church of Ephesus for leaving the first

works and first love, and admonished her to repent and return thereto, or serious consequences would ensue (Rev. 2:4:5.) He certainly will not excuse all this reckless indifference and vacillation on the part of the many in our time.

But when we come to see that the act of justifying us at the time of our conversion is not the end but the beginning, so to speak, of our redemption; and that a progressive work must be carried on in us, and for us, in order to our eternal triumph over all our spiritual foes, it is then that we begin to realize the importance of placing ourselves in a position to achieve this great end. And so this is what sanctification signifies. If it were *necessary* for us to be rescued from the power of sin in order to our deliverance it is just as necessary that we remain rescued to the end of life in order to remain saved; that "henceforth we should not serve sin." (Rom. 6:6.) This is what Peter meant when he said of the elect that they were "kept by the power of God unto salvation ready to be revealed in the last time." (Pet. 1:5.) They are kept from that which must eventuate in death, viz., "sin."

To wait until death to be delivered from sin is simply to not be delivered from it all. For if we are never rescued from the *cause* of death, "*sin*," it is a fact that we shall never escape *the effect*. Is this not the import of Paul's language in 1 Thess. 5: 23, where we read, "And the very God of peace *sanctify you wholly;* and I pray God your whole spirit and soul and body *be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord*

Jesus Christ?" Whether we suvive till the Lord comes, or whether death should overtake us before that event occurs, the thought is that *either* of them should find us *fully sanctified*, and consequently *blameless*. And when we are "wholly sanctified," with our "*whole spirit*, and *soul*, and *body preserved*," or kept "*blameless*," *how much* of us will there be left unsanctified and blamable? The Apostle Peter in his Second Epistle, 3rd chapter and 14th verse, expresses a similar thought. He says with reference to the same event and condition: "Wherefore, beloved, *seeing that ye look for such things*, be diligent *that ye may be found of him in peace, without spot and blameless.*" The *acceptance of the grace of God* by man is no more strongly emphasized than is the *continuity in that grace.* "Now when the congregation was broken up, many of the Jews and religious proselytes followed Paul and Barnabas: who, speaking to them, *persuaded them to continue in the grace of God.*" (Acts. 13: 43). "To them who by *patience continuance* in well doing seek for glory and honor and immortality, [God will render] eternal life." (Rom. 2: 7.) "Toward thee, goodness, *if thou continue* in his goodness: *otherwise thou shalt be cut off.*" (Ch. 11: 22.) "To present you *holy and unblamable* and *unreproveable* in his sight: *if ye continue* in the faith grounded and settled." (Col. 1: 23.) "Take heed unto thyself, and unto the doctrine; *continue in* them: *for in doing this thou shalt both save thyself, and them that hear thee.*" (1 Tim. 4: 16.) "*Continue in the*

things which thou hast learned and hast been assured of." (2 Tim. 3: 14.) "*If that which ye have heard from the beginning shall remain in you*, ye also shall *continue in the Son*, and *in the Father*. And this is the promise that he has promised us, even eternal life." (1 John 2: 24, 25.)

Justification means salvation *obtained;* sanctification is in effect salvation *retained*. To "*hold fast*" is a very important thing in the economy of grace. Says the Lord by John: "That which ye have already *hold fast till I come*." (Rev. 2: 25.) Again: "Remember therefore *how thou hast received* and *heard*, and *hold fast*." (Ch. 3: 3.) "*Hold that fast* which thou hast, that no man take thy crown." (Verse 11.) Paul presses the same necessity when he says, "Whose house are we, if we *hold fast* the confidence and the rejoicing of the hope firm unto the end." (Heb. 3: 6.) So we see that it becomes just as essential for the individual *to continue* his spiritual relation to God as it was that he ever *assume* such a relation, in order for him to be saved from the wages of sin, which is death eternal.

HOW DO WE ATTAIN UNTO SANCTIFICATION?

This question is often asked by people who are unacquainted with the doctrine of sanctification, or continued separation from sin. This, like many other theological questions, is variously answered by men, accordingly as they deem one special tenet paramount to any or all the rest. One man will teach the belief in some

certain truth, and press that as the source and substance of sanctification. If he have a mania for the ordinance of water-baptism, that and that *only*, in his estimation, must procure sanctification; all the other Scriptural instruction is of no avail *without* it. In fact better that we omit *all* the rest than leave this out. Another has a penchant for the observance of the Lord's Supper, the other ordinance of the church. So strongly is he imbued with sacramentarian ideas in regard to the importance of this rite, that he thinks it entirely essential to "growth in grace" that this ordinance be observed every Sabbath day, or oftener than *that, even*. And a third sees sanctification in nothing but the name and usages peculiar to his church and denomination. And we might go on with the enumeration, recounting the notions of men that are placed in the front ground as having in themselves the grand essentials to salvation from sin, respectively.

But amid this confusion of things let us turn our attention to the Word and learn what that says in reference to this *way of life*.

I maintain that what will justify will sanctify. God does not have *two different remedies for sin*. Sin is always the same, and demands the same remedy. Christ died to deliver us from sin and all the sad consequences it entails. As we have shown, this is *God's* part of the work. "Christ died for all, *that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him which died for them, and rose again.*" (2 Cor. 5: 15.) We

showed in Chapter IV what the conditions of justification are—that a man is justified by faith in Christ (Rom. 3: 28; 5: 1.) This is *man's part.* God provided the means of deliverance and it is man's part to accept of the same.

If, therefore, by the convicting and converting power of the Holy Spirit—for it is necessary that this Spirit of life operate upon the conscience deadened by sin, and awaken it (Eph. 2: 1)—man is brought to rely upon this all-sufficient Savior by a faith unshaken, and is justified by such reliance of faith (Acts 13: 39), and thus delivered from sin and consequent death ; would it be anything foreign to the matter in hand to conclude that these same means adhered to would effect his *continued deliverance from sin*—his sanctification? We are certain it would not be any more foreign to his sanctification than it is to his justification. And so we read: "*God hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth.*" (2 Thess. 2: 13.) *The Holy Spirit* and *faith* are the means here as in justification. "Chosen you to salvation through" two agencies for its accomplishment—*the Holy* "*Spirit,*" and *a* "*belief of the truth,*" or faith. The Holy Spirit, manifested here, is God *continuing His part of the work*; "belief of the truth," or faith, *is man's part continued.*

To say that the Holy Spirit has nothing to do with the work of salvation, as some claim, would be no more or no less than to ascribe to mortal, fallible man the power of sanctifying and saving

himself; and the declaration that "*salvation is of the Lord*," would not hold good. But if man has the power to *sanctify himself*, he has also the power to *rescue himself* from sin in the first place. Faith, of itself, cannot perform his salvation, for it is not a living person. It is the *confidence* we place in the person of God by what He has told us in His word. And as man cannot, through himself, get any better than he is by nature, reformation cannot rise out of the creature to be reformed, or *sanctification come out of the thing to be sanctified.* If man is born from above, born of God, it is certain that he is not born *of himself.* It must, in the very necessity of the conditions, require a power higher than he is to accomplish deliverance for him. Saith the Apostle upon this point: "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, *by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost.*" (Titus 4: 5.) That the disciples might learn most thoroughly the insufficiency of their strength and wisdom in the work of redemption, the Savior told them that *without him they could do nothing* (John 15: 5.) This was in reference to their sanctification. He said to them: "*Abide* in me, and I in you. As the branch connot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine; *no more can ye expect ye abide in me.* I am the vine, ye are the branches: He that abideth in me, and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit: *for without me ye can do nothing.*" This, during the Dispensation of the gospel, had

reference to the work of the Holy Spirit, as we learn by reading Matt. 28 : 20, John 7 : 38, 39, and Acts 2 : 38, 39. The first reads: "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." It is not necessary to say that this presence of Jesus to the end of the world or age was *not* His personal presence, for He would be *personally absent* from His people, the Church, until that time; but He would be *Spiritually present* with them during that period, *by the Holy Ghost;* or as Mr. Gordan, in his "Ministery of the Spirit," terms it, "*His other Self.*" The second reference reads: "He that believeth on me, as the scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water. (*But this he spake of the Spirit, which they that believe on him should receive: for the Holy Ghost was not yet given;* because that Jesus was not yet glorified.)" This explains what He meant in the last quotation by being with them "even to the end of the world;" it was by the third person of the trinity "the Holy Ghost." This was the promise He (Jesus) made to His followers. In the next quotation we shall see it verified. It reads: "Then Peter said to them, Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, *and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.*" How long was this gift to continue with His people? The next verse will answer in perfect harmony with the foregoing quotations, showing it to be to the *end* of the gospel Dispensation, or till the last convert to Christianity is made. It reads: "For the promise (of

the Holy Ghost) is to you, *and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call.*" The indispensableness of the Holy Spirit with a sanctified life is very clearly expressed in this Scripture, as in many others. "*To you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call.*" The gift is to *all* the called and for *all* time. The Lord well knew that if poor, erring humanity were left alone in this great work of salvation, failure would be inevitable; and so He, in His wise providence, would send the blessed Spirit of life and glory to reign in and rule over the hearts of His believing people, *every one of them.* This is what Peter meant when he spoke of the believers being partakers of the "divine nature." (2 Pet. 1: 4.) When the Holy Spirit dwells in us we certainly are partakers of this "divine nature." There will be produced in our lives those "fruits of the Spirit"—"love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance," (Gal. 5: 22, 23.) Without possessing the "divine nature" we cannot live holy, consecrated lives.

God's people are said to be temples in which *He dwells by His Spirit.* Says the Apostle to the saints at Corinth, "Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and *that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?* If any man defile the temple of God, him shall God destroy; for the temple *of God is holy, which temple ye are.*" (1 Cor. 3: 16, 17.) "*Ye are the temple of the living God;*

as God hath said, *I will dwell in them, and walk in them*; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people." (2 Cor. 6:16.) These human temples are *holy because God dwells in them*; and sin cannot dwell in the same temple with God. The Savior said that His Father and He would come unto the faithful ones, and make their abode with them; which signified the same as the foregoing passages. I know of only one class of persons to whom the Spirit is not promised, and they are those mentioned by the Apostle in 2 Cor. 13:5. The passage reads: "Know ye not your own selves, how that Jesus Christ is in you, except ye be reprobates." And again: "If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his." (Rom. 8: 9.) For God to own us we must possess His Spirit. We cannot claim the sonship of God unless we have the Spirit of Christ. "And because ye are sons, God hath send forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father." (Gal. 4: 6.) "For ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear; but ye have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father. The Spirit beareth witness with our spirit, that they are the children of God." (Rom. 8: 15, 16.) "As many as are *led by the spirit of God, They are the sons of God.*" (V. 14.) Says the Apostle, "That ye may be blameless and harmless, *the sons of God.*" (Phil. 2: 15.)

Our *need* of this divine spirit is manifest. Without Him what are we? None other than transgressors. This wants no demonstration.

Go where the Holy Spirit is *not* and what do we see? To a greater or less degree we see what we might expect to witness; and not confined alone to the ungodly world as such, either, I am sorry to say. It is not mine to sit in judgment upon man or men; God forbid that I should. Yet at the same time I will not lose sight of the criterion the Great Master has given, recorded in Matt. 7: 16, 18, 20, and which reads: "*By their fruits ye shall know them. A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit.*" With this infallible standard of decision before us we cannot be easily deceived. In point here are the words of John. They are: "Little children, *let no man deceive you: he that doeth righteousness is righteous*, even as He is righteous. * * * *Whosoever doeth not righteousness is not of God. In this* the children of God *are manifest*, and the children of the devil. *He that sinneth is of the devil;* for the devil sinneth from the beginning. *Whosoever* abideth in him *sinneth not:* whosoever *sinneth hath not seen him, neither known him.*" (1 John 3: 6–10.) John closes this chapter by saying: "And hereby we know he abideth in us, *by the spirit which he hath given us.*" Is there anything strange about it, that where we see *pride, selfishness, envy, jealousy, self-love, covetousness*, etc.,—the works of the flesh,—whether it be in *the world* as such, *the laity*, or *the ministry*, that we should say, "The Holy Spirit of our God," whose fruit is, "love, joy, peace, gentleness, goodness, meekness," etc.,—

is not in control there? I aver not. If "all unrighteousness is sin," and he that "sinneth hath not seen God, neither known Him," why should we attempt to change this great truth by ascribing to transgressors, of what ever name or nature, the fruits of the Spirit of God? We shall expect to be considered uncharitable in taking this position; but we are consoled by the thought that we are in good company when with John, the man "whom," it is said, "Jesus loved." If uncharitableness may be attributed to us in using such strong language, it must be applied to him manifold. John certainly must have been a very uncharitable man, viewed from a compromising standpoint, judging from the above language we have quoted from his writings, together with the following: "*Whosoever transgresseth, and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God: He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, he hath both the Father and the Son. If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed: for he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds.*" (2 John 1: 9–11.) If this doctrine is cranky John must have been a crank. "This doctrine," that he recommends here was, and is, the doctrine of *no-transgression;* and we are commanded not only *to endorse it*, but *to discountenance* any, or all, who do not endorse it. But John taught no more in this than the rest of the Apostles did. They all drew the line between sin and righteousness, and gave no hope to the transgressor

only on the conditions that he forsake his sins, all of them, in order to the obtainment of eternal life, as we have already shown.

Think you, dear reader, that Jesus did not fully comprehend the Spiritual indigence of His followers when He said: "It is expedient for you that I go away: for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart I will send him unto you?" What was true in this case respecting the *disciples*, is just as true in regard to *every believer during all ages of the Church.* Those disciples could not cope with the powers of darkness, and overcome them, human as they were, unaided by the Spirit divine. *No more can we of to-day*, succeed in our efforts to live lives of godliness without the Spirit of God. For us to argue that the gift of the Holy Spirit was *confined to that age and only necessary for the Apostles*, as some assert, is simply to attribute to ourselves and to all others this side of apostolic times, a vastly greater amount of inate goodness than possessed by them. For if it were necessary that those Apostles should have the Holy Spirit in order that *they* might overcome the world, the flesh and the Devil, and perform their christian duties, it is just as expedient that we, and all others, should receive the same spirit in order to overcome, etc.; unless it be that we all are by nature the Apostles superiors. To evade the force of this logic, it will not help matters any to say that the Holy Spirit was given to *them to work miracles*, and such like, and not for reformation of life; for

the lives of those same disciples *before* and *after* the gift of the Spirit will prove this claim false. Look at them *while* they sojourned with Jesus, and you cannot help noticing their unbelief, jealousy, revengefulness, cowardice, etc.; and then view them *after they had received the Holy Spirit*, and see how differently characterized were they. Take Peter as an illustration, when at the palace of the high priest, while his master was under trial, and hear him affirm what is false to save his life, emphasizing it with an oath. Leave the poor, erring, timid disciple here, and then go visit the scene of Pentecost at Jerusalem, when that same Peter has received the Holy Spirit, and witness the transformation that has come over him. While afraid of every foe on the former occasion, on the latter he fears not all the powers of darkness arrayed. Read the 2d of Acts, and mark the holy boldness of the now courageous Peter. What did this if not the Holy Spirit? Well, I have this to say: If this gift by the Spirit was good for *Peter and the rest of the Apostles*, it is good for all the rest of God's people. The principle that would deny us the Holy Spirit must deny the apostles of Him, and ignore all importance attaching to the descent and enduement on the day of Pentecost. For if it is not essential that we have the Holy Spirit to aid us in our Christian warfare while passing through this untoward world, no more was it that the apostles should have; and this does away with the necessity of the Holy Spirit in the work altogether. For my part, I

have no sympathy with any system of religion that negatives the work and power of the Holy Ghost, and subsitutes therefore a *rite* or *ordinance*, when we are so plainly taught *the birth and baptism of the Spirit.* Says Rev. Gordon in his "Ministry of The Spirit:" "That the presence of the personal Holy Spirit in the church was intended to be *perpetual* there can be no question. And whatsoever relations believers held to that Spirit in the beginning they have a right to claim today. We must withhold our consent from the inconsistent exegesis which would make the water baptism of the apostolic times still rigidly binding, but would relegate the baptism in the Spirit to a bygone dispensation. We hold indeed, that Pentecost was once for all, but equally that the appropriation of the Spirit by believers is *always for all*, and that the shutting up of certain great blessings of the Holy Ghost within that ideal realm called the apostolic age, however convenient it may be as an escape from fancied difficulties, may be the means of robbing believers of some of their most precious covenant rights."

We are admonished to "grieve not the Holy Spirit of God, whereby we are sealed unto the day of redemption." (Eph. 4:30) How timely this caution. How careful ought the followers of Christ to be in this, and not by neglect and indifference to the great claims of their Christian profession, give occasion of grief to this precious Companion, lest He take His departure, and leave them to the powers of darkness, to be lost,

eternally lost! How feelingly appropriate are the words of Charles Wesley in the stanza:

> "Stay, thou insulted Spirit, stay,
> Though I have done thee such despite;
> Cast not a sinner quite away,
> Nor take thine everlasting flight."

David was fearful of this when he said in that earnest prayer, recorded in Psalm 51st, "*Take not thy Holy Spirit from me.* Restore unto me the joy of thy salvation; and uphold me with *thy free Spirit.*" How many there are today who cause grief to the Spirit by following the Lord afar off. How far they may go in the direction of wrong and continue it, ere this "insulted" Guide will cease to make His presence felt, is only known to God. But it is certain that there is a limit over which when men have gone they must break company with this most important Friend. If the Jews, many of them, were condemned and lost because they resisted the Holy Spirit, we need not think that the Gentiles are going to escape while guilty of the same great offense; as the former were a specially favored people. Says Stephen, in speaking to them in condemnatory terms: "Ye stiffnecked and uncircumcised in heart and ears, ye do always *resist the Holy Ghost:* as your fathers did so do ye." (Acts 7:51).

Those Jews "resisted" the Holy Spirit by refusing to comply with His mandates to accept of the means of their salvation from sin and death; and Gentile christian do no less when they hear those silent monitiens as a "word behind" them,

"saying, This is the way, walk ye in it," when they "turn to the right hand, and when they turn to the left" (Isah. 30:21), and refuse to heed the warning, but continue to be guided by their natural inclinations.

This is the reproving, or monitary attitude of the Spirit: for He sustains such an attitude toward humanity. Said Jesus of Him: "When he is come, he will *reprove* the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment." The marginal rendering is "*convince* the world," etc. This is His attitude toward all sinners—that of reproof and conviction. He *reproves* the wrong and *approves* the right. He cannot do otherwise as expressing the holy nature and character of God. It would be impossible for Him to approve of sin in any degree, as holiness and sin can have no agreement. Therefore those sinning christians (?) are related to the Holy Spirit from a plain of reproof, the same as any other sinners; while with compassion infinite He lays His warnings and expostulations heavily upon them. As I have said, He approves of the right and reproves men for the wrong they do. This was His attitude toward the churches of Revelation.

We are invited to hear "what the Spirit says unto the churches;" and we do well to heed such invitation. He begins with "the church of Ephesus, and after noting the good things of that church, as endurance, patience, labor, etc., with remarkable commendation, He adds: "Nevertheless *I have somewhat against thee*, because thou hast left thy first love. Remember

therefore from whence thou art fallen, and repent, and do the first works; or else I will come unto thee quickly, and remove thy candlestick out of his place, except thou repent." He comes next to "the church in Smyrna," and this is so faithful in the great "tribulation," and zealous for the Master's cause, that no reproof is dealt them, but much praise and commendation. And passing next in order to the "church in Pergamos," He recounts the good deeds *they* have done; then with antithetical mien He says: "*But I have a few things against thee*, because thou hast there them that hold the doctrine of Balaam, etc., * * * Repent; or else I will come unto thee quickly, and will fight against them with the sword of my mouth." "And unto the angel of the church in Thyatira: I know thy works, and charity, and service, and faith, and thy patience, and thy works; and the last to be more than the first. Notwithstanding *I have a few things against thee*."—Sardis is the next church, and is noted, but not for good works. Says the Spirit to this church: "I know thy works, that thou hast a name, that thou livest, and art dead. Be watchful, and strengthen things which remain, that are ready to die: for I have not found thy works perfect before God. Remember therefore how thou hast received and heard, and hold fast, and repent."—Passing by the "Philadelphian church," we come to that of the "Laodiceans," and, if I am not greatly mistaken that is the church of the present age, as we come down the stream of time. I do not

mean any certain denominational body, but the nominal church; or the status of the religious denominations in general, of the closing decades of this 19th century. As this is not the time and place to give our reasons for so believing, we will not tax the reader with the evidences. But if any one thinks that simply a profession of the Christian religion regardless of righteousness is approveable in the sight of the Holy Spirit, he should seriously ponder the words of rebuke dealt this church. The Spirit says to this church: "I know thy works, that thou art *neither cold nor hot:* I would thou wert either cold or hot. So then because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will spue thee out of my mouth. Because thou sayest, I am rich, and increased with goods, and have need of nothing; and knowest not that thou art wretched, and miserable, and poor, and blind, and naked. I counsel thee to buy of me gold tried in the fire, that thou mayest be rich; and white raiment, that thou mayest be clothed, and that the shame of thy nakedness do not appear; and, anoint thine eyes with eyesalve, that thou mayest see. As many as I love I rebuke and chasten: be zealous therefore, and repent. Behold, I stand at the door, and knock; if any man hear my voice, and open the door, I will come in to him, and will sup with him, and he with me." (Rev. chaps. 2, 3.)

This last church of the seven, unlike the other six, has not one trait to be commended for. Her condition is one of spiritual poverty and blind-

ness. She is not cold, like the world, nor hot with Spiritual fever, like the true Church of Christ; but lukewarm—nauseous. The Lord prefers the cold condition to this. The unconverted, unpretending world is in a more hopeful estate than is this church. "I would thou wert either cold or hot." Notwithstanding the Spiritual poverty that characterizes this church, she boasts, of her wealth—Spiritual opulence; but she is counseled to buy of the Lord the true riches, and white raiment that she may be clothed, etc. Christ is represented as standing on the *outside* of this church, knocking at its closed door for admission—an attitude that He does not sustain to any of the other churches. Why is this, if it is not that He in the person of the Holy Spirit was shut out of this church wholly because of their conformity to evil, when they are condemned as a whole? which could not be said of the others, for it was only in part that He was excluded from four of them, the other two—Smyrna and Philadelphia—receiving no reproof. In part, I said; for I mean those in each of the four churches that did not remain faithful to Him, but went after evil things.

While this 20th verse of Rev. 3rd is generally applied to sinners, at whose hearts Jesus, in the person of the Holy Spirit, is continuing to knock for admission, it seems to have a special application to the last church of this series of seven, because of its marked characteristic of Spiritual poverty. This is a Spiritless church, and the consequences are manifest—"blindness,"

pride, self-righteousness, conceitedness, misery, destitution, with the delusive thought that she is rich in good works. Spiritual poverty is the worst kind of poverty there is.

It is the work of this Holy Spirit to reveal Christ unto the believer. Said Jesus of Him: "He shall glorify me: for he shall receive of mine, and shall shew it unto you." And there seems to be no limit to the glorious things revealed to the child of God by this most wonderful Instructor. Jesus says in the next verse: "All things that the Father hath are mine: therefore said I, that he shall take of mine, and shew it unto you." (John 16: 14, 15). These things embrace "the deep things of God," which the natural man receives not because Spiritually discerned. "Joy unspeakable and full of glory" (1 Pet. 1:8), is imparted unto the believer under all conditions of life by His indwelling. In revealing unto us Christ, is made known to us "wisdom, righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption." It was in the mission of Jesus Christ to reveal unto men, God the Father. "No man knoweth the Father save the Son. and he to whomsoever *the Son will reveal him.*" (Matt. 11: 27; Luke 10: 22.) Thus, the second person in the trinity, Christ, reveals the first person, God the Father; the third person, the Holy Spirit, reveals the second person. "The Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you." (John

14:10. In view of this Jesus taught His followers to ask the Father in earnest prayer for the bestowment of the Holy Spirit. (Luke 11:13.) Christ is our justifier; the Holy Spirit is *our sanctifier.*

With such an all-perfect and all-powerful guide and governor to direct man's course in this life, will there be any lack in the performance of all the will of God? This seemed to be the possible attainment the Apostle Paul desired and prayed that the church at Colosse should reach, when he said: "That ye may stand *perfect* and *complete in all the will of God.*" (Col. 4: 12.) There can be no limits placed to the operations of the Spirit's power. He can work and none can hinder.

It was to the possibilities of this Spirit in the hearts of His followers that Jesus had reference when he said to the disciples in the sermon on the mount: "Be ye perfect, even as your Father in heaven is perfect." (Matt. 5: 48.) If it was an impossibility for people to be perfect, why then did Jesus tell them to do what *He knew they never could do?* He certainly was the best judge of whether such a condition was attainable or not by man. He did not mean that they must be as perfect as their Father in heaven; but He assigned that as a *reason why* they should be perfect, *because God is perfect.* God is the absolute source of all perfection, and it would be absurd to suppose that Jesus meant to teach that man, to whom God would impart that grace, could become *equal to the source from*

whence all perfection comes. But Jesus would have him understand that it was *possible* for a man to be made *a perfect man, not* a perfect God. The same reason is given again why the people of God should be holy, that is given here for them to be perfect. Says Peter: "But *as he which hath called you his holy, so be ye holy in all manner of conversation;* BECAUSE IT IS WRITTEN, BE YE HOLY; FOR I AM HOLY." (1 Pet. 1: 15, 16; Lev. 19: 2.) A perfect man is the Scriptural idea of what the Christian is to be. Says the Psalmist: "Mark *the perfect man,* and behold the upright: for the end of that man is peace." (Psal. 37: 37.) The Apostle speaks of *attaining "unto a perfect man;"* and of "going on unto perfection" (Eph. 4: 13; Heb. 6: 1.), Says he to the Hebrew church: "Therefore leaving the principles of the doctrine of Christ, *let us go on unto perfection;* not laying again the foundation of repentance from dead works, and of faith toward God."

No man can read out of the Bible a commendation from God upon an *imperfect, unsanctified* condition of *individual* or *church.* There is not the slightest encouragement held out in the sacred volume toward a worldly, half-hearted, religious life. But on the contrary, all the counsels, admonitions, exhortations, and cautions are toward a life of holiness to the Lord. And yet is it not strange that churches, many of them at least, will contend that nothing more than a secular christianity is taught there? It can be accounted for on only one principle, and

that is *that they want to live just as near the world as it is possible and yet lay claims to salvation.* They appear to be satisfied with whatever they can get out of the *ritual* of the worship, independent of the Spiritual. In speaking of these two conditions, and of the *needs* of Spiritual energy, so manifest in our time, Rev. A. J. Gordon says: "If such divine enthusiasm has its perils, we believe they are less to be dreaded than that '*moderatism*' which *makes the servants of God satisfied with the letter of Scripture if only that letter be skillfully and scientifically handled*, rather than giving the *supreme place to the Spirit as the inspirer and motor of all Christian service.*" (*Ministry of The Spirit* p. 87.)

The most prominent hindrance there is to a successful worship of God in the church of today, is *mammon*, "the God of riches." "Thou shalt have no other gods before me," is just as binding upon christians of to-day as is that other commandment which says, "Thou shalt not steal." What a person loves the best is what he worships. When earthly gains are more loved and prized than God, it is *idolatry.* The Apostle tells us that covetousness is idolatry, (Col. 3: 5), and that a covetous person is an idolater. (Eph. 5: 5.) But notwithstanding this truth, there are thousands and tens of thousands of men and women in the nominal church of Christendom, who, in the very face of this inspired utterance, are "heaping together riches for the last days"—covetous, greedy,

grasping, seeking by every possible means within their power to add to their already abundant store, as if their very existence depended upon it. They want all they can get of this world and a liberal share of the next. But the most appalling thought of it is that they should so willingly surrender themselves victims to such a delusion. For while they know, or are supposed to know that the Word of God condemns covetousness and bars the gate of heaven against it, with the many other sins of the human heart, (1 Cor. 6: 10), *they will presist in it to their eternal overthrow.* They know it is affirmed thus: "*They that will be rich fall into temptation and a snare, and into many foolish and hurtful lusts, which drown men in destruction and perdition.* For *the love of money is the root of all evil:* which while some having coveted after, they have erred from the faith [been seduced,] and pierced themselves through with many sorrows." (Tim. 6: 9: 10.)

They know it is written again, that "it is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God." (Matt. 19: 24.) But to evade the force of this latter text, many say that it does not mean what it says; but has reference to a gate near Jerusalem called "the needle's eye," where camels had to be divested of their burdens and by the greatest exertions squeeze through. This is doubtless a very accommodating "needle's eye," as it has been so universally

yet, I fear, fatally used. "But Jesus saith unto them, Children, how hard it is for them that trust in riches to enter into the kingdom of God" (Mark 10: 24.)—How can a man be rich in the things of this life, and see the sufferings among the human family from want, and be a true child of God? This is why the Savior said they could not go into the kingdom of heaven. Says the Apostle John: "Whoso hath this world's good, and seeth his brother have need, and shutteth up his bowels of compassion from him, how dwelleth the love of God in him?" (1 John 3: 17.) Jesus says again: "Ye *cannot* serve God and mammon." It was this sin that cursed the Jews more than all others, (Mal. 3: 8. 9), and why should Gentile christians seek to do the same thing with an expectation that they are going to escape better.

This worldliness in the church is something that was to characterize it in the last days. Says the Apostle in reference to a state marked by a lack of spirituality: "Know this also, that in the last days perilous times shall come. For men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, without natural affection, trucebreakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good, traitors, heady, highminded, lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God; having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof: from such turn away." This is a very dark picture of the condition of things

"in the last days." As there can be no question but we are in that period designated by "the last days," it is ours to look for the things just named which are to characterize it. That this condition of temporization was to be found in the communion of the christian church is manifest from what is said in the 5th v. of this 3rd chapter of 2 Timothy, as we have just read. The Apostle says that they were to have *a form of godliness, but would deny the power of it.* It is a fact, whether we hesitate or not to say so, that so far as the "FORM *of godliness*" is concerned, there is *no lack.* Like Daniel's description of the "great image" in Nebuchadnezzar's dream. He says, "the *form* thereof is *terrible.*" If "the POWER" were equal to the "*form* of godliness," there certainly would be a force in the world for its conversion, the like of which has never been known since the gospel had birth. The "form of godliness" permeates all christian nations as it does denominations; but when we come to look for what should be commensurate "power," it is not there. That "power of the Holy Ghost" which quickens and regenerates the sons and daughters of Adam's fallen race, making them "new creatures," is something that the popular profession of our time knows but little about. They deny that religion should carry with it a *power that will win and wean* its votaries from the pleasures, follies, and vanities of a wicked world. While we believe that there are many holy men and women of God living in the world of to-day, we do believe that the nominal church,

as such, is far beneath the position the New Testament assigns to the true Church of Christ. I cannot do better than close this chapter with an extract from "*Ministry of The Spirit*" by Rev. Gordon. He says: "Our generation is rapidly losing its grip upon the supernatural; and as a consequence *the pulpit is rapidly dropping to the level of the platform.* And this decline is due we believe, more than anything else, *to an ignoring of the Holy Spirit as the supreme inspirer of preaching* * * * We want the gospel; but in the strenuous demand that it be set forth according to 'the spirit of the age' we ignore the supremacy of the Spirit of God."

CHAPTER IX.

THE DAY OF JUDGMENT—ITS OBJECT.

"Day of judgment, day of wonders,—
Hark! the trumpets awful sound,
Louder than a thousand thunders,
Shakes the vast creation round:
How the summons
Will the sinner's heart confound!"—*Newton.*

We have thus far said much respecting the day of grace; we will now speak of the day of judgment. We have discoursed at great length upon the mercy of our God manifested in the grand economy of redemption for sinners; we will now speak of His retributive justice manifested toward sinners when the call of mercy is hushed. For I conceive that the vindication of God's righteousness is due as much, or more, to the exhibition of stern justice in its time and place, as to the infinite expressions of His mercy. For imagine, if you can, a supreme Intelligence, Creator and Ruler of all, rich in grace, supplying all the needs of His creatures with temporal and eternal benefits—but One Who is destitute of equity and justice! It is very evident that no *such* Being could exist. A God of *goodness* and *injustice* could *not* be. God is infinitely good for the reason that He is infinitely just, as well as infinitely compassionate. While we read that "the earth is full of the mercy of the Lord,"

we read too that "*righteousness and judgment* are the establishment of His throne" (Psal. 33:5; 97: 2); and His divine scrutiny will be exercised in due time in "bringing every work into judgment with every secret thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil." (Eccl. 12:14.) So the very fact that we have such a God of love and mercy necessitates in our world of sin a great day of reckoning and retribution, when all wrongs will be righted, and all righteous acts rewarded. In this eschatological discussion we would address an *argumentum ad judicium*—argument to the judgment—and thus see in the very reason we possess a premise out of which the necessity for a judgment day must grow, backed as it is by divine Revelation.

There is no possible hypothesis by which to reconcile the character of an infinitely holy God with His *failure* to eventually "reward every man according to his works." Reason and Revelation both unite in attestation of this fact, however much men may say to the contrary in keeping with their sin-relishing propensities, and in their endeavors to escape the wrath and righteous judgment of God. With this certainty before us, that God "will by no means clear the guilty" (Exo. 34:7); and that "the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against *all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men*" (Rom. 1:18), *retribution is a foregone conclusion;* and "every transgression and disobedience" committed since the foundation of the world must "receive a just recompence"—excepting what is covered by

the atonement of the Savior. A judgment of the Adamic family, then, must come, as sure as God is just. This "judgment" either has come, and is now a thing of the past, or it is yet future. That it has not yet come is a fact too plain to need demonstration. Common sense and the Bible forbid relegating it to the past. Said the Apostle Paul to the Athenians: "God commandeth all men everywhere to repent: because he hath appointed *a day in the which he will judge the world in righteousness* by that man whom he hath ordained; whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead." (Acts 17:31.)

Three things in this declaration of the Apostle's demand notice. 1. The Intention of God in keeping with His holy nature to punish the finally impenitent for all their transgressions, which punishment will be in righteousness. This "intention" is expressed in "the appointment" of a "day of judgment." 2. The Evidence He has adduced of His "intention." "He hath given assurance unto all men in that he hath raised him (Christ) from the dead." Just as certain then as Jesus Christ was raised from the dead, so certain it is that there will be a "day of judgment" for this "world." To invalidate the former—the "resurrection of Christ"—would be to overthrow the gospel—a thing that the infidel world has been laboring for eighteen hundred years to accomplish, but have not realized the consummation of their nefarious project. Says the Apostle: "*Remember that Jesus Christ of the seed of David was*

raised from the dead according to my gospel." (2 Tim. 2:8). It was in the plan of God to give all judgment into the hands of Christ (John 5:22), ordaining Him judge of quick and dead (Acts 10:42; 2 Tim. 4:1; 1 Pet. 4:5); so when he went under the dominion of Death, it was that He must triumph over this "last enemy" in order to execute judgment. This He did when He broke the power of Death and wrested from that tyrant the keys of the tomb; for "it was not possible," says Peter, "that he should be holden of it." (Acts 2:24.) 3. This "day of judgment" is yet to come, and will be ushered in at the revelation of Christ from heaven. "He will judge the world." By turning to 2 Tim. 4:1 we have *the time* of the judgment located. "I charge thee therefore before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead *at His appearing and kingdom.*" And now as it is certain that Christ has not "appeared" yet, it is just as certain that the "judgment day" has not arrived yet; and as "the judgment day" has not yet arrived, the work to be effected by that "day" remains yet to be done—unless the work of that "judgment day" is done in *advance* of it; and if it is done in advance of that "day," then there is no necessity for "the day of judgment." Wherever we begin the "work" of the "judgment day" we must, *per se*, begin the "judgment day." So if *the "work"* of the judgment is in the past, *the judgment itself* is in the past. But as the "judgment" is yet in the future, and will not be introduced till "His appearing and

kingdom," *the "work"* of it is yet in the future and will not begin till that time. The "judgment day" cannot begin until the "judge" arrives, which will be at the end of the world, or gospel Dispensation.

"Judgment" may be said to comprise three elements: 1. The Investigative; 2. The Judicial; and 3. The Executive. It covers these three divisions in courts of law. The first deals with the examination of evidence precedent to a decision; the second with the rendition of a decision; and the third the execution, or carrying into effect the previously determined decision or sentence. These three steps of procedure are absolutely essential in the judiciary of earth in reaching the end desired. In the judiciary of heaven the first step at least is dispensable, as "the judge of all the earth" will not need to investigate matters to ascertain who is guilty, etc. And as to the second act in the judicial economy of heaven, whether we regard those decisions reached in the mind of God or not, one thing is certain, they are proclaimed at the *time of the "judgment"* (See Matt. 7:22, 23; 25:41; Luke 13:26, 27.) But those decisions are not made final in the mind of God while man is a probationer, or there would be no such thing as *pardon* for sinners; for if He passed the sentence of eternal death upon the transgressor while he was in the act of committing sin, mercy to sinners would be a thing unknown. I speak of this because it is often said by some, who do not understand it, that the *final* decision in the

case of sinners is reached just while they are sinners. While it is true that sin carries with it condemnation, it is true also that the condemnation is *conditional*, to be removed when the sinner forsakes his sins and turns to God. Therefore we cannot say that the second step in the matter and manner of judgment is reached while the sinner is a subject of probation. And inasmuch as the "decision" or "sentence" of doom is announced "*on the day of judgment*," and *not before*, we have a sufficient reason for retaining the second element with the third, and then we have in keeping with the thought of "judgment" and justice, the sentence of the Almighty Judge pronounced upon the criminals of earth, followed by its execution—doom made known, and doom realized as the penalty for sin.

The view is held by some that the "day of judgment" is *progressive*, and has been going on ever since man was upon the earth and will continue to the end of time. If the Bible is true this doctrine is false; for the former puts the event *forward* from the last New Testament writer. It was future from St. Paul's day. In the Scripture above referred to he says: "God hath appointed a day in which he *will judge* the world." And again: "He (Christ) shall judge the quick and dead *at his appearing and kingdom.*" And John, the last Apostolic witness saw its *future* in vision at the *close of the gospel age.* (See Rev. 20; 10-15.)

Again: It is an opinion quite commonly entertained that the "judgment day" is *whenever an*

individual dies; that at death men enter upon punishments and rewards respectively. If this doctrine is true they are judged *before* the "judgment day," or they are punished and rewarded *without* a judgment. In the first case, if they are judged and enter upon their punishments and rewards *before* the "judgment day," then a "judgment day" is a nullity, there being no tangible necessity for it, whatever. And in the second case, if there is no judgment passed upon them until the "judgment day" at the end of the world, and they receive their respective punishments and rewards when they die, then they are punished and rewarded *without* a judgment. And if thus consigned to these respective destinies *without* being judged, it might turn out when the "judgment day" came that some had been sent *to the wrong place*, seeing they were retributed *without being judged*. If it be said in reply to this, that it is not necessary for God to wait until the "judgment day" to know who is to be punished, and who rewarded, but is already cognizant of it, and therefore his decisions being made he executes them at the hour and article of death; it follows then that the "day of death" *is* "day of judgment;" and then all this New Testament talk about a "day of judgment" at the end of the world, or gospel age is of no account. Or is it necessary that there should be *two* judgment days—one *at death* and the other *at the resurrection of the dead*, and the end of the world? If the first judgment—at death—does the work of decision and execution, why should

there be a second judgment? Or is the first so faulty that it needs to be done over again? The fact that there is to be a "judgment" at the end of the world, looks as though the "judgment" at death was a very *imperfect* and *faulty affair;* or that there is *none at that time*, or there would be no demand for the second one. *Two* "judgments" are superfluous; the existence of one *obliterates* the necessity for the other. Therefore there is, logically, but *one* judgment, take place when it may. If it is at death it is *not at the end of the world;* and if it is at the end of the world, it *is not at death. That* it *is at the end of the world*, the word of God so declares; as we are told that Christ will judge the quick and the dead *at his appearing and kingdom* (2 Tim. 4:1.) This being true, then, the notion that a great many people hold of entering upon a judgment at the end of this mortal life to pass from it to the meed of eternal bliss, or to the doom of the damned, independently of a "day of judgment," when God shall call the millions of earth to account, is false.

The question is frequently asked by persons who hold this view, "What becomes of the good and the wicked when they die?" We are reasonable when we tell them that they have answered their own question—*They die.* This is what the Bible and our unsophisticated reason would teach us. The former says, "Man dieth" (Job 14:10), and affirms this of him in all cases of his departure out of this world. And when people speak of the exit of any one from life without

appeal to their educational bias they say, "he" or "she," as the case may be, "died," or "is dead." Our friends die and we lay them to rest in the grave; and what a *departure* from this truth when we conclude that they are not there, nor *any part* of them. Our instincts naturally prompt us to go to the grave and weep over the one that lies there so sacred to our memory; while our theology makes war on our emotions born of reality, and tells us we are deceived, for our loved one was *never put there!* But Job surely did not indorse this theological notion when he said, "If I wait, *the grave is my house.*" (Chap. 17:13.) He further says that it is the house appointed for *all living* (Chap. 30:23.) Yes, the grave is the place common to all this race of mortal creatures.

An incorrect translation of the word "grave" has led many to a wrong interpretation of where men go when they die. The Hebrew word in the Old Testament Scriptures for "grave" is *sheol;* it occurs sixty-five times, and is rendered hell thirty-one times, "grave" thirty-one times, and pit three times. The Greek word of the New Testament for "grave" is *hades;* it occurs eleven times, and is rendered hell ten times, and grave once. The other word translated grave in the New Testament is *mnemeion*, which is a tomb, sepulchre. With this mistranslation of the word, it is little wonder that people have conceived of a hell of fire as the ready receptacle for the expiring impenitent. The following information I transcribe verbatim from "*Posi-*

tive Theology," by Rev. M. Grant of Boston, Mass.:

"Moses Stuart, who is considered very high authority, says: 'In the Old Testiment, *sheol* is the place to which the righteous go as well as the wicked.' Again he says: 'There can be no reasonable doubt, that *sheol* does most generally mean the under-world, the grave or sepulchre, the world of the dead, in the Old Testament Scriptures. It is very clear that there are many passages where no other meaning can reasonably be assigned to it.' He says again: 'The word (*sheol*) itself means the regions of the dead in general.'

"Dr. Parkhurst, the Hebrew lexicographer says: '*Sheol* signifies that which is common to all, the common receptacle of the dead.'

"Canon Farrar says: '*Hades* * * * is the exact equivalent of the Hebrew *sheol*, and means the unseen world, as a place both for the bad and the good, (Acts 2: 27, 31.)'

"Says the learned Jahn: 'It cannot be proved by direct testimony, that the ancient Hebrews believed that there was a difference between the good and the bad in *sheol*.'

"The following is from Wakefield's translation: 'The universal meaning of *hades* is—the state of death.' '*Hades* no where means hell —gehenna, in any author whatever, sacred or profane.'

"Dr. Henry Laing's Greek and English Lexicon has the following: '*Hades*, the dark and

invisible place of the dead, the world below, the region of death, the grave.'

"Barstow's Bible Dictionery: '*Hades*, in a general sense, designates the place to which the righteous go as well as the wicked.'

"Dr. Wm. W. McLane says *hades* means 'the place or abode of all the dead,' 'irrespective of character.'

"Grimm's Greek Lexicon defines *hades*: 'Orcus, the nether world, the realm of the dead.'

"Dunbar's Lexicon: 'The place of the dead.'

"Liddell and Scott's Lexicon: '*Hades*, the world below; the grave, death.'

"Says Wm. R. Alger: 'The popular doctrine of hell is not of divine revelation, but of mythological growth,'

"Bullinger's Critical Lexicon has the following: 'All souls, and the man himself, as an individual, go in death to *hades*.'"

To these testimonies concerning the place and state of the dead, the Bible gives its sanction. Throughout the sacred canon whenever obituary mention is made of persons, indiscriminately, they are spoken of as dying, and finding the same common destination, that of *sheol* or *hades*, the grave; there to await the summons from on high that shall call them to judgment. Says Job: "As the waters fail from the sea, and the flood decayeth and drieth up: so *man lieth down*, and *riseth not: till* the heavens be no more, they shall not awake, nor be raised out of their sleep. O that thou wouldest *hide me*

in the grave, that thou wouldest keep me secret, until thy wrath be past, that thou wouldest appoint me a set time, and remember me! If a man die, shall he live again? all the days of my appointed time will I wait till my change come. Thou shalt call, and I will answer thee" (Chap. 14: 11—15.)

There are two passages in the New Testament relied upon by many as teaching the doctrine of punishment and reward at death—they are those of "the rich man and Lazarus," and "thief on the cross." But it is rather an infidel policy to array the Bible against itself. The way that sceptics argue on the Scriptures is to set up the claim that they are self-contradictory—that one portion teaches one thing, and another portion or passage, its opposite. It is an axiom in science, philosophy, metaphysics, etc., that no two facts or truths can contradict each other. Whatever conflicts with truth must be false. All truth is harmonious and infallible. If, then, we find it declared in the Word of divine truth that the "judgment day" is appointed to take place *at the end of the world*, or age, it is not true that it takes place *at the end of every man's natural life*, all *apparent* testimony to the contrary, notwithstanding. One, plain, positive statement from the Bible that rewards and punishments *follow* the work of that "judgment" at the last day forever forbids that those "rewards and punishments" can *precede* that "judgment." When I read that Christ "shall judge the quick and dead

at his appearing and kingdom," and that "*then He shall reward every man according to his works*" (2 Tim., 4: 1; Matt. 16: 27), I must in all due deference to this statement of facts discredit a theory or doctrine which affirms that this takes place at the *death of each individual! Both* these claims *cannot* be true. The *first*, coming from the source of divine authority, *is true:* therefore the *second is false*. Whatever therefore we find in the "living oracles" that *appears* to contradict this "plain" statement of truth must be explained so *as not to conflict* with it. We must then explain "the rich man and Lazarus," with "the thief on the cross," in the light of 2 Timothy 4:1 and Matthew 16:27.

THE RICH MAN AND LAZARUS.

"There was a certain rich man, which was clothed in purple and fine linen, and fared sumptuously every day; and there was a certain beggar named Lazarus, which was laid at his gate full of sores, and desiring to be fed with the crumbs that fell from the rich man's table; moreover the dogs came and licked his sores. And it came to pass that the beggar died, and was carried by angels into Abraham's bosom; the rich man also died, and was burried; and in hell he lifted up his eyes, being in torments, and seeth Abraham afar off and Lazarus in his bosom. And he cried and said, Father Abraham, have mercy on me, and send Lazarus, that he may dip the tip of his finger in water, and cool my tongue; for I am tormented in this flame. But Abraham

said, Son, remember that thou in thy lifetime receivedst thy good things, and likewise Lazarus evil things; but now he is comforted, and thou art tormented. And beside all this, between us and you there is a great gulf fixed; so that they which would pass from hence to you cannot; neither can they pass to us, that would come from thence. Then he said, I pray thee therefore, father, that thou wouldst send him to my father's house; for I have five brethren; that he may testify unto them, lest they also come into this place of torment. Abraham saith unto him, They have Moses and the prophets; let them hear them. And he said, Nay, father Abraham; but if one went unto them from the dead, they will repent. And he said unto him, If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead." (Luke 16:19–31.)

That this is of parabolic moment and not a literal narrative, is evident. The absurdities that grow out of the *literal* here, forbid such a construction to be placed upon this Scripture. And besides this, the language here used was addressed to the Pharisees, of whom it is said, "*Without a parable spake he not unto then.*" (Mark 4:34.)

The word "parable" is formed from the Greek, *parabole*, which comes from the verb *paraballein*, signifying to compare things together. It is a similitude taken from natural things, to instruct in the knowledge of things spiritual. Robinson in his N. T. Lexicon, says: "A parable is a short

discourse or comparison, usually a narrative, under which something else is figured, or in which the fictitious is employed to represent and illustrate the real. This is a favorite mode of oriental teaching, and was much employed by our Savior; so often in the first three Gospels, but not elsewhere in the N. T."

Now let us look at the "rich man and Lazarus" in the light of a *literal* occurrence, stripped of all rhetorical figures so common to the *usus loquendi*, or usage in speaking.

The striking contrast between the conditions of these two men is the first thing brought forward for our consideration. There is a very rich man who lives in lavish luxury. Nothing very uncommon in this; there are and have been many rich men in our world.

There is also his opposite—a very poor man—a beggar. Nothing uncommon in this; there are many poor, indigent persons in the world. This poor man desires "the crumbs" that fall from the rich man's table; but the "rich man" disregards his appeals born of hunger. Nothing uncommon or unusual in this; as it is a thing of frequent occurrence in this world. Many of the rich who know nothing of privation and hunger, refuse to feed the suffering among humanity. Finally the beggar dies. This is also of common occurrence; beggars die sooner than the rich from sheer want. So far there seems to be nothing but what is common and incidental to the experiences of human life throughout the world.

But now we come face to face with some things that are not of very frequent occurrence. Mark what becomes of this beggar; he "is carried by angels into Abraham's bosom." What does this mean? "O," says the opposer, "this means that his immortal spirit went to heaven when the body died!" Then "Abraham's bosom" *is* what—*heaven? Is it?* Says Webster: "*The bosom—the part of the dress worn upon the breast; an article, or portion of an article, of dress to be worn upon the breast.*" Did the angels approach Abraham with that part of Lazarus which could not die and deposit it into that part of his mantle that covers his breast? "O, no! but bosom here *represents* heaven." Then it is not a *literal occurrence.* Just as soon as one thing is selected to *represent* another, the language ceases to be literal, and becomes figurative or parabolical. But if Lazarus went to Abraham's bosom, or heaven, as they term it, then he went there a corpse; for the narrator says *that he was carried there dead.* "The beggar died, and was carried by angels into Abraham's bosom." It was that which died that was carried. So that if Abraham's bosom means heaven, then Lazarus went to heaven *dead, body and all.* But we are boldly informed in the face of what is here affirmed by Christ, that Lazarus *never died at all;* that the real Lazarus was *immortal and of course could not die;* and it was *this deathless Lazarus* that the angels transported to glory. The narrative declares that "*Lazarus, the beggar, died,*" this theory, we are combatting, says *that* "*Lazarus*

did not die." The narrative affirms that it was *a dead Lazarus that the angels carried into Abraham's bosom;* this theory claims it was *a deathless Lazarus* that they carried there. Now which testimony are we going to accept? I prefer to take the account given by Luke—that *Lazarus was dead.* Whatever it was that was taken there was dead. If it was the spirit of Lazarus that went, then it was a *dead* spirit; whatever it was, *died before* it went. If it was something that went there that never died it *was not Lazarus,* for *he died.*

So far, then, as Abraham's bosom representing something other than itself is concerned, so far have we parable conceded by the opposition. This we will call "figure 1."

The next thing that demands our attention in this narration by the Savior is "the rich man." His death seems to follow closely upon that of the beggar. "The rich man also died." Now notice what is done with him after he is dead. "*And (he) was buried.*" Whatever it was that constituted the "rich man," *died;* and that which died *was buried.* Quite different from Lazarus, for he was not buried; but carried away. And where was he *buried?* In *hades,* the Greek word for "grave," just where we deposit our dead. The next thing we hear about him is that he is in torments. "And in hell *hades* he *lifted up his eyes,* being in torments, and seeth Abraham afar off and Lazarus in his bosom," etc. Observe that there *is nothing said about an undying spirit, or soul surviving the dead "rich man,"* being in

this "hell" of torments. But it is the same *literal* "rich man" with *all his bodily organs, eyes, ears, mouth, tongue*, etc. The immortal spirit, or soul of man, about which we hear so much, is described as a being who is *immaterial, without eyes, without ears, without a tongue, without exterior or interior.* As soon as we admit that there are "*eyes*," "*ears*," "*tongue*," "*fingers*," etc., we confess that there was a *material organism.* This "rich man" has all these; and in his colloquy with Abraham, he requests the latter to send Lazarus that he may dip the tip of his finger in water and cool *his tongue.* How could *one immaterial spirit, without fingers dip its finger into material water*, and *put it upon the tongue of another immaterial spirit that had no tongue?* And then again, think of *an immaterial spirit being burned by material fire!* Or was the fire *immaterial*, too? But whoever heard of "*immaterial fire?*" It would be about as sensible as to speak of an "*immaterial* materiality." It may be said here that the fire *represents God's wrath.* Very well then, this gives us another "*figure*" of speech. Literal fire here is a figure to represent God's wrath upon the wicked "rich man," and does not mean *real* fire. Conceded then that it is figurative fire—figurative "flame,"—we will denominate this "figure 2nd."

And now, as the fire is *figurative*, the "water" must be essentially "*figurative;*" for imagine what effect *literal water* would have *in cooling down the wrath of God!* We have then with "figurative fire," "*figurative* water" also. This we

will term "figure 3rd." Then if the "flame of fire" and the "water" are figurative, the "*finger*" of Lazarus, that was requested dipped into the "water," must of necessity be "*figurative*" as well; for how could a *literal* "finger" be dipped into "*figurative* water?" Such an idea would be worse than absurd. The *finger* is a *figure* then, and this adds another to the list, giving us "figure 4th,"

Then inasmuch as "fire," "water," and "finger" are all "*figurative*," it follows that the "*tongue*" of the "rich man" must also be "figurative;" for what sense or reason would there be in supposing that a *figurative* "finger" could apply *figurative* "water" to a *literal* "*tongue*" that was being scorched by a "*figurative* flame?" None whatever; therefore we have another "*figure*" to add to the others. This is "figure 5th." And now that the "*tongue*" of the "rich man" is *figurative*, it follows that *he* must certainly be "*figurative*" as well; for who in the world would expect to see a "*literal*" man with a "*figurative*" *tongue?* Such a thing would be as great an impossibility as one could well imagine. So we have then, "figurative fire," "figurative water," a "figurative finger," "figurative tongue," and consequently a "*figurative rich man*" which gives us "figure 6th." And what is true of the "rich man" in regard to "tongue," is also true of "Lazarus" in regard to "finger." A "*literal* Lazarus" with a "*figurative*" finger would be an incongruity bordering on the ridiculous. We

have then a "*figurative*" *Lazarus* too, as has been already shown.

To sum it all up as far as we have gone, then, we have: *A "figurative" heaven, a "figurative" Lazarus, a "figurative" hell, and a "figurative" rich man.*

Still there is another feature of the subject that demands our notice, and that is the *contiguity* of hell to heaven: they are within speaking distance of each other. The "rich man" *in hell* calls to *Abraham in heaven*, and receives a response. If this is to be regarded as a literal occurrence it gets ahead of all the rest of the Bible on locating "*hell*" *and* "*heaven.*" It is the first and only time that we have any hint in that Book of those two places being *within speaking distance of each other*. Heaven is commonly referred to as being *up*, while hell is said to be *down*—in opposite directions from us. But here they are *side by side;* and yet close together as they are, there is a "*great gulf*" *between them*, that can only be bridged over by the human voice and vision. I do not know what Abraham meant by "a *great* gulf," unless he had reference to the *depth* and *length* of it, for it was not very great in *width*. Now, is this a fact that heaven and hell are within reach of the human voice from each other? They must be if this narration is to be taken as *literal;* for it is a record of facts. I do not think, though, that there is a sane man in Christendom who will assert that this is so. Then these two localities or places, so opposite in character and condition to

each other, brought so near together, are designed to represent *other* things; and hence are of *figurative import.* I would like to know in the name of reason with the grouping of all these "figures" in this narration *how much* it lacks of being a *parable.*

Now let us look at it in the light of a parable and see if we cannot learn something of the design of it. As we have remarked, Christ directed His parables at the Pharisees, and His reason for so doing is given in Matt. 13:10–17. These parables were generally of a condemnatory nature; and they were not slow to take the hint (Matt. 21: 45).

The "rich man," in the parable before us, represents these very Pharisees, or Jews to whom He was talking. They were rich in the special favors of God, granted them as a people. They were favored above all other people, mainly as the *natural seed of Abraham;* and this fact they recognized, and boasted of it. (See Luke 3:8; John 4:12; 8:33,39). Of course we must look in the meaning of this parable for *other* than *literal* wealth. Literal wealth is selected to represent *another species* of wealth. While those Jews were, many of them, wealthy in a *literal* sense, it was not the kind of wealth the Savior meant. As every one knows, in a parable one thing is never chosen to represent itself, but something else.

Lazarus, the beggar, represents the Gentiles. They were poor in the same sense that the Jews were rich. They were without the covenants and promises of God. They could not boast of lineal

descent from Abraham, to whom it was said: "In blessing I will bless thee and multiply thy seed" (Gen. 22:17). The Gentile nations of earth were very poor in a *religious* sense. They were *despised of the Jews* for this very *difference* that existed between them; and considered as dogs.

Bullinger in his *Critical Greek Lexicon* says: "*The rich man* represents the Jewish nation." "Lazarus represents the Gentiles." "*The Jews* died as a nation to all their privileges (A. D. 70)." "Their torment is described by Deut. 28:15–68." "The Gentiles have only died to their poverty and sores and therefore their burial is not mentioned." When a nation is spoken of in the Bible as being debased on account of their sins, they are represented as being brought down to hell (*hades*). Hence we read: "And thou Capernaum, exalted unto heaven, shalt be brought down to hell (*hades*). To Israel it is said: "Thou * * * didst debase thyself, even unto hell" (*hades*). The Jews have been in a debased, abandoned, God-forsaken condition for over eighteen hundred years, in consequence of rejecting Christ. They have been the butt of ridicule for, and the despised and hated of, all the nations of earth, in fulfilment of Deut. 28:15–68. In this condition of moral death they were to "be persecuted with the sword, with the famine, the pestilence, and to be removed into all the kingdoms of the earth, to be a curse, and an astonishment, and a hissing and a reproach, among all the nations whither" they would be driven. (Jer. 29:18). And one only needs to read the history of the Jews during the

gospel Dispensation, or since they crucified the Savior, to see this prediction markedly fulfilled.

And all this while the Gentiles have advanced above them in privileges of the gospel. This is where Lazarus is represented as entering Abraham's bosom. The covenant of grace is held out to them, and "they are comforted;" while this parabolical Dives, or rich man, is "tormented." This is termed "Abraham's bosom" because of the covenant relation the subjects of the gospel sustain to him. The blessing came first to the *natural* seed of Abraham, and the Apostle Paul tells us that they being "the natural branches, were broken off through unbelief, and through their fall salvation came to the Gentiles—the "decay of them was the riches of the Gentiles" (Rom. 11). The special favors peculiar to them as a people *ceased at the cross* and there remains no more preference to the *natural* seed of Abraham: the blessing comes solely through his spiritual seed. Says the Apostle: "Ye are all the children of God *by faith in Christ Jesus* * * * There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female; for ye are all one in Christ Jesus. *And if ye be Christ's then are ye Abraham's seed and heirs according to the promise*" (Gal. 3:26-29). It is easy to see in this what is meant by "Abraham's bosom."

Further: You will observe that the "rich man" claims filial relationship with Abraham; he calls him "father;" and Abraham addresses him back as "son." But *Lazarus* seems to have the relation of "son" now; as he has opened

to him the hospitable bosom of this great father of the faithful, as represented in the parable, (Rom. 4:11), being a spiritual son; while the *natural* son—the "rich man"—is rejected. This is precisely the relation the *natural* and the *spiritual* Jew would sustain to Abraham. It is by *faith* that Abraham comes into favor with God, and *not by any law of works.* Says the Apostle: "If Abraham were justified by works, he hath whereof to glory; but not before God. For what saith the scripture? Abraham *believed* God, and *it was counted* unto him *for righteousness*" (Rom. 4:3, 4). Unlike the natural Jew, Abraham is related to God and made an heir to the promises *through the covenant of grace.* The *natural* Jew stood related to God *by the covenant of works*, which was given at Mt. Sinai, and embraced the "Ten Commandments" (Deut. 4:13). Now, as "by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in His sight"—and that is all this "rich man," the Jew, has to stand on—he must remain unjustified, or condemned in the sight of his natural father Abraham, as well. And this brings us to notice the "impassible gulf" separating the "rich man" from Abraham and Lazarus. It is not reasonable to assume that because these two places are made to represent two conditions—those of the natural and spiritual seeds of Abraham, respectively—the "impassible gulf" would in such case prevent all the natural seed, to an individual, from coming over to the covenant of grace, and being saved; for in keeping with the law of parables as we have already ob-

served, no one thing can be selected to represent *itself*. Persons cannot represent *persons*, as such. So when Abraham tells the "rich man" that "they which would pass from hence to" him could not; and those which would pass from thence to where he is could not, it has reference to Judaism and Christianity which are separated by a difference as fixed as it is possible to imagine. Christianity cannot go over to Judaism; neither can Judaism go over to Christianity. In other words, Jews as a class cannot become Christians and hold to Judaism. The principles of Judaism will not amalgamate with the doctrines of the gospel of Christ. An individual may represent a *class*, *people*, or *nation;* but *not an individual*, as this would violate the laws of analogy, and *literalize* whatever was intended to be figurative. In this case, as we have seen, the "rich man" represents the Jews as a *class*, taken collectively; and "Lazarus" represents the Gentiles as a people, a race. "They that would pass from the one to the other, represent, not persons, but, *systems* so diversified as to present an impassible barrier between the two, termed in the metaphor "a great gulf."

Again: We notice that there is no desire expressed on the part of the "rich man" to go over to Lazarus, but wishes Lazarus to come to him. We would naturally think that he would manifest a disposition to get out of that place if it were a literal hell of fire he was in. But how is it with the Jews in regard to Christianity, are they willing to be Christianized? *Not they*. With all

the disbelief characteristic of them, they, *as a race*, stubbornly hold out against all the pleadings and importunities of evangilistic agents, as they did of old. When we hear of conversions to the gospel from among them, it is only in cases of *individuals* where they come, as it was in the days of Christ and His apostles.

The word in this narrative translated "hell" is *hades* in the original, which means grave, as we have before noticed. It is the word which corresponds to *sheol* in the Hebrew, the Old Testament word for grave, where Solomon says, "there is no device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom" (Eccl. 9:10). This word never signifies a hell of fire. The word *gehenna* is the one that signifies punishment in the New Testament. Says Gilbert Wakefield, who has translated the New Testament: "It must be remembered that *hades* nowhere means *hell—gehenna*—in any author whatsoever, *sacred* or *profane;* and also, that our Lord is giving his hearers a *parable* (Matt. 13: 34), and not a piece of *real history*. To them who regard the narrative as exhibiting a *reality*, it must stand as an unanswerable argument for the *purgatory* of the *Papists*. The universal meaning of *hades* is *the state of death*."

Of course, parables are not supposed to go on all fours like quadrupeds. While we may not be able to discover the exact counterpart of *all* the figures used in an unexplained parable, it does not in the least change the fact of its being a parable. What the "five brethren" of the "rich man" may signify we do not pretend to know.

Besides the Pharisees there are five other classes among the Jews: the Sadducees, Essenes, Samaritans, Herodians, and Hellenists. Some have thought as Jesus was talking to the self-righteous Pharisees, He condemned these beyond all the rest, and so personified them in the figure of a "rich man" in torments as a just punishment for sin. The "five brethren," it would seem, were some way connected with the Pharisees. Who but *Jews* and *Israelites* had "*Moses and the prophets?*"

Thus we see that insurmountable difficulties confront us when we undertake to *literalize* this narrative, and make it mean the conditions of a rich and a poor man after death in open violation of all the rest of the Bible on the same subject. As we have already remarked: when our interpretation of a passage of Scripture makes war on Reason and Revelation it must be wrong, and should be explained in the light of other Scriptures. This is precisely what a *literal* version of the "rich man" and Lazarus does, as will be seen by a reference to all the rest of the Bible upon the subject of retribution. Take as a sample the words spoken in Revelation to John in reference to the second coming of Christ: "Behold, I come quickly; *and my reward is with me. To give every man as his work shall be.*" (Chap. 22: 12).

Says Wm. Smith, in his *Dictionary of the Bible:* "In holding this view [that *hades* represents a place of torment], main reliance is placed on the parable of Dives and Lazarus; but

it is impossible to ground the proof of an important theological doctrine on a passage which confessedly abounds in Jewish metaphors."

THE THIEF ON THE CROSS.

This is another passage of Scripture thought by many to support the theory of retribution at death. The idea is that the thief went to paradise with our Savior that same day they hung upon the cross. The passage reads: "And he said unto Jesus, Lord remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom. And Jesus said unto him, Verily I say unto thee, To-day shalt thou be with me in paradise." (Luke 23; 43.) Notice, the question is, "Lord remember me when thou *comest* into thy kingdom." It is very evident that the thief understood the teaching of Christ concerning the establishment of His everlasting kingdom at the end of the world, as Christ had preached this doctrine during His whole ministry on earth,(Matt. 25; 31—34; Luke 19; 12—15; John 14; 3) and hence the request, "*when thou comest into thy kingdom.*"

The adverb "verily" means, "in very truth; beyond doubt or question; in fact; certainly," according to Webster. And *this time* of rewarding the thief would be in perfect harmony with what He had said and taught previous to this. "The Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels; and *then shall he reward every man according to his works.*" (Matt. 16: 27). Now in all candor is it right to interpret this reply to the thief in a manner that would

subvert all such declarations as this? Either the thief *was not* rewarded then, or this affirmation of the Savior in Matt. 16: 27 is *not true* in regard to *time*. It was in very truth, then, that the thief's request would be granted "*when*" He should *come* in His kingdom. We must interpret such in the light of plain, positive declarations of Christ upon the subject.

But did Jesus go to paradise that day? We think He did not. What must we understand by "paradise" as it relates to the human family? The word occurs but three times in the Bible—once in the passage under consideration; in 2 Cor. 12: 4; and in Rev. 2: 7. The original, *paradeisos*, means "an orchard of pleasure and fruits, a garden." The word is used in the Septuagint as the translation of Eden. It is commonly used in reference to the Garden of Eden from which Adam was driven for transgression (Gen. 3: 24.) Paradise was lost to Adam and his posterity. Christ is called the "second Adam." As Paradise was lost to the seed (natural) of the first Adam through disobedience, it will be restored to the seed (spiritual) of the second Adam through obedience (Rom. 5: 14, 19.) There was in Paradise "the tree of life," protected by the "flaming sword" so that those two transgressors should not put forth their hands and eat of its fruit and live forever. In the restitution state, when the "new heaven and new earth" John saw, appears, then appears also Paradise with the "tree of life." "To him that overcometh will I give to

eat of the tree of life, which is in the midst of the paradise of God" (Rev. 2: 7; 22: 2.) This was the promise made to the thief, but he could not come into possession of it before the rest of God's people, and they were not to realize it till their entrance into it at the coming of Christ (See Matt. 25: 31-34.) Where is the evidence that Paradise is in some subterranean region? When it disappeared from the first dominion—that of Adam—did God send it with all its *literalness* down into the bowels of the earth to be inhabited by a race of *immaterial ghosts?* The thing is an absurdity. Paradise, in this sense, is identical with the Catholic purgatory. The patristic mysticism in which the word has been shrouded for so many centuries has caused it in the minds of many to be grossly misunderstood, and a meaning wrested from it which is purely mythological, and not Spiritual. It is thought by some to be a synonym of heaven. If this idea be correct, it seems strange that in the many places *heaven* is mentioned throughout the Bible that the word *paradise* should not be used in its place, which would be the case if it were synonymous with heaven.

The supposition is that Jesus *meant* heaven, and that He with the thief would enter it that day. "To-day" is an adverb, and in the text before us modifies "say" instead of "shalt be." The comma should be placed after "to-day" and not before it, to be in harmony with the other Scriptures. (It should be remembered that there was no punctuation marks in the original

copies of the Bible. The system of punctuation now in use was introduced by the Ventian printer, Manutius, in the latter part of the 15th century.) Then it would read: "Verily I say unto thee to-day, with me thou shalt be in the paradise"—*amen lego soi semeron, met emou ese en to paradeiso.*

The Savior did not go to His Father in heaven that day, for He said to Mary three days later, after He had been raised from the dead: "Touch me not, for *I am not yet ascended to my Father;* but go unto my bretheren, and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father, and your Father; and to my God, and your God" (John 20:17). How in the light of reason are we to understand such Scripture as this, and Act 2:31, with the theory that Christ went directly from the cross to heaven? Peter in explication of Psal. 16:9–11 says: "He (David) seeing this before spake of *the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in hell,* neither did his flesh see corruption. *This Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we all are witnesses.*" The word translated "hell" here is *hades*, the grave, or state of the dead; and in Psal. 16:10, *sheol* has the same meaning. According to the opposing theory *Christ never rose from the dead*, for *He never died.* If He went that day to heaven, it is *not true that He died and was buried*, as the Apostle declares in 1 Cor. 15:3,4. "I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how *that Christ died* for our sins according to the scriptures; and that *he was buried*, and *that he rose again the*

cording to the scriptures." It is said that this had reference to the *body* of Christ. But how much does this weigh in the light of those Scriptural declarations of HIS BURIAL AND RESURRECTION, if what was *meant* by the term "Christ" *never died nor went into the tomb?* If the real Christ went to heaven that day, then that which was buried WAS NOT CHRIST, and then to talk about the resurrection of that which never died—the Christ—would be nonsense. Then when we have His word for it on the third day after His crucifixion that *He had not yet ascended* to the Father; and again His testimony to John on the Isle of Patmos, when He affirmed His death, saying, "*I am he* that liveth and *was dead;* and behold *I am alive* forever more, Amen; and have the keys of hell and of death," (Rev. 1:18)—it verily looks as though He did not elude death and ascend into heaven instead of descending into the tomb the day of His crucifixion. I am inclined to believe the testimony He and His Apostles have given concerning it—that "*He died, was buried,* and *rose again the third day, according to the Scriptures.*"

Following are some of the places where the resurrection of Christ is affirmed: Matt. 20:19; Mark 9:31; 10:34; Luke 18:33; 24:7, 46; Acts 1:22; 2:30, 31; 4:33; 26,23; Rom. 1:4; 4:24, 25; 6:4, 5, 9; 8:34; 1 Cor. 15:20, 21; Phil. 3:10; 1 Pet. 1:3. We have given a few of the many testimonies confirming this all-important doctrine of the *resurrection of Christ,* which are not true if Christ

never died. There must be a *death* before there can be a *resurrection from the dead.*

Those who hold the view that Christ went to heaven the day of the crucifixion also claim that "He went and preached to the spirits in prison" at the same time, in explanation of 1 Peter 3:19. How could He be in *heaven during that three days,* and *in hell preaching to the damned at the same time?* Or were there two spirit Christs, *one* in heaven with the Father, and the *other* in hell doing missionary work among the lost during the time between crucifixion and resurrection? If so why not use the *plural* instead of the *singular* number, and speak of the suffering and ministrations of the *Christs* in place of the *Christ?* This would appear reasonable enough, if there was one immortal entity, called "the soul," which went down into the region of the lost; and another immortal entity, called "the spirit," that went up to God at the same time. But, if this theory were true I should be strongly in favor of using the *plural* number in preference to the singular.

But why did He go and preach "to the spirits in prison," if this has reference to the lost in hell? If it is true that all who have died in sin are irretrievably lost and already consigned to a hell of eternal misery, why did Christ go and preach to them? Did He do it to tantalize them? If not, and the theory be true that He did descend into hell and preach to the lost, then there must be such a thing as *post-mortem probation,* and salvation for the impenitent *after* death; and if there is, where is the necessity for *ante-mortem*

probation, and a present deliverance from sin? And then the commission would have the wrong date; and instead of it being given with due reference to the *present* life, should have been so worded as to be effectual AFTER *the death of all sinners!* Then the language of St. Paul, "behold, *now* is accepted time; behold *now* is the day of salvation;" should read instead: "Behold, *after* death is the accepted time; behold *after* death is the day of salvation." (2 Cor. 6:2.)

But Christ did not go into the hell of punishment to preach to the lost when He expired on the cross; neither did He go to heaven on that day; but He died and was buried, and rose again the third day. And so the thief did not reach Paradise on that day, but will be remembered when Christ comes into His kingdom, and Paradise is restored.

Turning again to the subject of the judgment day, we would inquire as to *how* the popular notion of rewards and punishments *at death*, are to be harmonized with the *positive declarations of holy writ in opposition to it.* Turning to the 11th chapter and 18th verse of Revelation, we read with reference to the *time* and *event* of the introduction of Christ's literal kingdom: "The nations were angery, and thy wrath is come, and the time of the dead, that they should be judged, and that thou shouldest give reward unto thy servants the prophets, and to the saints, and them that fear thy name, small and great; and shouldest destroy them that destroy [corrupt] the earth."

In the thoughts upon this notable passage of New Testament Scripture we notice: 1. The *location* in time of *what is declared.* It is at the appearing of Christ and His visible kingdom, in harmony with 2 Tim. 4:1, as we see by the 15th and 17th verses. We read: "And the seventh angel sounded; and there were great voices in heaven, saying, The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ; and he shall reign forever and ever." 2. *The judgment of all the dead together with all the then living will take place at that time.* "*The time of the dead that they should be judged.*" Christ "shall judge the quick and dead *at his appearing and kingdom*" (2 Tim. 4:1.) "When the Son of man shall come in his glory * * * then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory: and before him shall be gathered *all nations;* and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats." (Matt. 25:31, 32.) "Judge nothing *before the time, until the Lord come.* (1 Cor. 4:5.) 3. *No people of all time will have received rewards or punishments till this "judging of the dead."* Following the judgment of "the dead" there come the dispensing of rewards and the retributing of punishments. "The time of the dead, that they should be judged, and that thou *shouldest give reward unto thy servants the prophets*, and *the saints*, and *them that fear thy name, small and great*; and *shouldest destroy* them which corrupt the earth." "Prophets and saints," the "small and the great" of earth

who have been redeemed by the blood of Christ, on the one hand, will be rewarded. "*Then* shall the King say unto them on the right hand [the righteous], Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world," (Matt. 25: 34.) On the other hand, the wicked of the earth those "that have corrupted the earth" with their evil doings, will He "destroy." "All the wicked will he destroy" (Psal. 145: 20.) "And to you who are troubled rest with us, *when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fires taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ: who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power; when he shall come to be glorified in his saints*" (2 Thess. 1: 7–9.)

We see that what is declared in this 11th chapter of Revelation is corroborated by other Scriptures. The whole trend of Bible thought is in this direction. It could not be otherwise and be true. What that book teaches in one place must find concurrent response throughout the sacred volume. As we have before remarked, it cannot teach two *conflicting* doctrines and maintain its veracity. If it teach the essentiality of a judgment day, and resurrection from death to the obtainment of rewards and the infliction of punishments, as in the passages just cited, it is *impossible* for it to teach also that these rewards and punishments are meted out at the hour of

death, or at any other junction previous to that judgment day.

Let us look at more of the testimony bearing along this line of thought. In the 14th chapt. of Luke and at vv. 13, 14, we read: "But when thou makest a feast, call the poor, the maimed, the lame, the blind; and thou shalt be blessed; for they cannot recompense thee: *for* THOU SHALT BE RECOMPENSED AT THE RESURRECTION OF THE JUST." How is this to be reconciled with the doctrine that the righteous are rewarded *when they go into the tomb?* Both theories *cannot be true.* But again: "Marvel not at this; for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in their graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good [shall come forth,] unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil [shall come forth] unto the resurrection of damnation." (John 5: 28, 29.) According to this statement which fell from the lips of Him that spoke as never man spoke, it does not look much as though "all that are in their graves" had been in "life," and "damnation," respectively, ever since they died. To the same import is Daniel 12: 1, 2. Speaking of the coming of Christ in solemn judgment the prophet says: "At that time shall Michael stand up, the great prince which standeth for the children of thy people: and there shall be a time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation even to that same time; and *at that time thy people shall be delivered*, every one that shall be found written in the book. *And many*

of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt."

Agreeing with the foregoing are the words of John again, as recorded in Revelation 20: 11-15, which reads as follows: "And I saw a great white throne, and him that sat on it, from whose face the earth and the heaven fled away; and there was found no place for them. *And I saw the dead, small and great stand before God; and the books were opened: and another book was opened, which is the book of life: and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works. And the sea gave up the dead which were in it; and death and hell* [margin, *grave*] delivered up the dead which were in them: and they were judged every man according to their works. And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire. This is the *second death*. And whosover was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire." On the principle that this Scripture must be mystified in its exegesis, all the other passages which treat of the punishment of the wicked must be so interpreted; for the very same agencies of punishment are employed here that are in those other texts—"fire" and the "second death." Says John: "Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection: on such the *second death* hath no power." (V. 6). Say Jamieson, Fausset and Brown upon this text: "13. Death and hell—Greek, *hades*. *The essential identity of*

the dying and risen body is hereby shown; for the sea and grave give up their dead. The body that sinned or served God shall, in righteous retribution, be the body also that shall suffer or be rewarded. The sea may have a symbolical, besides the literal, meaning, as in ch. 8:8; 12:12; so "death" and "hell" are personifications. But the literal sense need hardly be departed from." (Com. by J. F. B.)

Agreeing with the foregoing is the testimony of Paul when he was about to close up his labors on earth and seal his ministery of the gospel of the Lord Jesus with his own blood. In view of what he had labored to accomplish for his divine Master and of the reward he would receive in the great day of accounts, in his charge to Timothy he says: "For I am now ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand. I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith: *henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness*, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give me AT THAT DAY; AND NOT TO ME ONLY, BUT UNTO ALL THEM ALSO THAT LOVE HIS APPEARING." (2 Tim. 4:6-8). This is in keeping with the first verse of the chapter, where it is declared that Christ will judge the quick and the dead *at his appearing and kingdom.* It is very evident that the great Apostle did not expect that "crown of righteousness" on the day he should be decapitated; if he had he would have put it in different language, and said: "A crown of righteousness which the Lord shall give me on that day they cut my head off." No, he did not

so believe nor teach, as many modern divines do. The great burden of his message was "righteousness *and judgment to come*" (Acts 24:25). He understood that there was a great day of reckoning to come at the end of the gospel age when all people of all times and all climes would appear in solemn judgment to render an account for the deeds they had committed during the period of their mortal lives while probationers here. This great truth he failed not to keep constantly before the minds of his hearers. When about to leave the seven churches of Asia and go into Europe, at Miletus he called together the elders, and among other things in his valedictory said: "Remember that by the space of three years I ceased not to warn every one night and day with tears" (Acts 20:31). And what he did here, he did every where he went—he warned men of the ultimate consequences of sin. To the brethren at Corinth, Greece, he said: *We must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done in his body*, according to that he hath done whether it be good or bad. Knowing therefore the terror of the Lord, we persuade men" (2Cor. 5:10,11). To the brethren at Philippi, Macedonia, he expresses it as the ultimate outcome of all his endeavors to "*attain unto the resurrection of the dead:*" "*forgetting*," he says, "those things which are behind, *and reaching forth unto those things which are before*, I press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus" (Phil. 3: 11—14.) The "prize" which he here

speaks of he expected to realize at the time of the "resurrection of the dead," as we further see by reference to the last two verses of the chapter, which read: "For our conversation is in heaven; *from whence we look for the Savior, the Lord Jesus Christ: who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto His glorious body.*"

The Apostle Paul surely could not have entertained two conflicting opinions in regard to the time at which he, together with the rest of the saints, would be regarded. If he expected to be crowned with eternal life and glory as soon as he breathed his last, as some claim he did, why should he lay so much stress upon the judgment and resurrection as *the time for receiving such reward?* In the 15th chapter of 1 Cor., he goes so far as to stake the entire hope of the gospel upon the resurrection of the dead saints. He says: "Now if Christ be preached that he rose from the dead, how say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead? But if there be no resurrection of the dead, then is Christ not risen: and if Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain. Yea, and we are found false witnesses of God; because we have testified of God that he raised up Christ: *whom he raised not up, if so be that the dead rise not. For if the dead rise not, then is not Christ raised: and if Christ be not raised*, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins. *Then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished.*"

It is very plain to be seen that the Apostle lays equal emphasis on both resurrections—that of

the believer with that of Christ. The theory that would negative and render unnecessary the resurrection of the sainted dead would in so doing render unnecessary the resurrection of Christ—is the force of the Apostle's logic; and the consequence would be an overthrow of the hope of the gospel, leaving us still in our sins, branded with the sorry stigma of "false witnesses of God," from the fact that we "have testified of God that he raised up Christ from the dead, whom he raised not up *if so be that the dead rise not;*" which, if true, would prove that those who had fallen asleep in Christ had perished. But why such strong language in behalf of a resurrection to life of the dead believers if they can and do live right on, independently of a rerurrection? It is certain that if the real man *never dies* he will *never need a resurrection to life.* The firmness with which the great Apostle held to the essentiality of this doctrine is further shown in his letter to Timothy, where he notes the work of two prominent heretics—Hymenaus and Philetus—who he says have erred concerning the truth—the truth of the resurrection—"saying that the *resurrection is past already,*" and thereby "overthrow the faith of some." (2 Tim. 2:17, 18).

Of this same faith and hope he speaks to king Agrippa. He says: "And now I stand and am judged for the hope of the promise made of God unto our fathers: unto which promise our twelve tribes, instantly serving God day and night, hope to come. For which hope's sake, king Agrippa, I am accused of the Jews." That this

"hope" embraced the resurrection of the righteous dead is evident from the next verse. He adds: "Why should it be thought a thing incredible with you, *that God should raise the dead.*" (Acts 26:6--8). The same "hope" is mentioned by the Apostle when cited before Felix the governor. It is stated thus: "And have hope toward God, which they themselves also allow, *that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust.*" (Acts 24:15). To the Jewish council he identifies the "hope" thus: "*Of the hope and resurrection of the dead* am I called in question." (Ch. 23:6). When accused of the Jews for raising tumult among the people, he exhonorated himself. He said: "Certain Jews * * * ought to have been here, and object, if they had ought against me. Or else let these same say, if they have found any evil doing in me while I stood before the council, except it be for this one voice, that I cried standing among them, *Touching* the *resurrection of the dead* I am called in question by you this day." (Ch. 24:18 -21.) To the stoics he seemed " a setter-forth of strange Gods; because he preached unto them Jesus and the resurrection." And I have no doubt that if the same Apostle were here to-day, preaching resurrection doctrine with the force and ferver characteristic of him, he would be considered by some, other than stoics, a teacher of "strange" doctrines, in this time of fables.

We find the Apostles John and Paul agree in locating the time of rewards and punishments *at the judgment day and second coming of Christ;*

to their testimony agree that of Peter, James, and Jude. To the people gathered at the temple when the lame man was healed, Peter said: "Repent ye therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, *when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord;* and *he shall send Jesus Christ*, which before was preached unto you: whom the heavens must receive *until the times of the restitution of all things.*" (Acts 3:19-21). "We have not followed cunningly devised fables, when we made known unto you the power and *coming of our Lord Jesus Christ*, but were eye-witnesses of his majesty." (2 Pet. 1:16). To the elders he says: "Feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight thereof, not by constraint, but willingly; not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind; neither as being lords over God's heritage, but being examples to the flock. *And when the chief shepherd shall appear, ye shall receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away.*" (1 Pet. 5:2-4). If the Apostle Peter had believed that this "crown of glory" was "received" at the dying hour of these "elders," as many pretend to believe, he would not have been very apt to pointed them away down the stream of time to the appearing of the great "Shepherd" before they could obtain it. That he *did not* believe rewards were "reserved" for the righteous to be given at the dying hour, but until *the revelation of Christ from heaven*, is *further* confirmed. He says: "Blessed be God, * * * which hath begotten us again unto a lively hope by the

resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, to an inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, *reserved in heaven for you*, (mar., us), who are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation, *ready to be revealed in the last time.*" (1 Pet. 1:3-5). To the same import is the tenor of the third chapter of the 2nd Epistle. Read it.

Says James: "Be patient, therefore, brethren, *unto the coming of the Lord.* Behold, the husbandman waiteth for the precious fruit of the earth, and hath long patience for it, until he receive the early and latter rain. Be ye also patient; stablish your hearts: *for the coming of the Lord draweth nigh.*" (Chap. 5:7, 8).

Jude says: "The angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the *judgment of the great day.*" The parallel to this text is found in 2 Peter, 2nd chapter and at 4th verse. It reads: "For if God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell, and delivered them into chains of darkness, *to be reserved unto judgment.*" (Jude 6). The "angels" here referred to are the fallen "angels," or the Devil and his hosts, who were cast out of heaven and confined to the physical verge of our earth, and inhabit "the darkness of this present world," the "air:" the word here translated "hell" being *tartaros*, has that meaning. It would be hard to prove that the Devil and his demons were anywhere else than here, if their doings furnish any kind of

evidence. (Job 1:7; 2:2; 1 Pet. 5:8). Again at vv. 14, 15 of Jude, we read of the day of doom thus: "And Enoch also, the seventh from Adam, prophesied of these, saying, behold, *the Lord cometh with ten thousand of his saints, to execute judgment* upon all, and to convince all that are ungodly among them of all their ungodly deeds which they have ungodly committed, and of all their hard speeches which ungodly sinners have spoken against him."

With these facts before us, then, of Apostolic testimony, pointing to a *day of judgment* as the *time*, and the *only time*, of the rewards to the righteous, and justice to the guilty, what folly to represent those Apostles as teaching a doctrine as opposite to this as the poles. Think you that Paul would have placed the *crowning day at the resurrection*, if he expected the executioner's axe was the instrument by which he was to be separated from the body and made present with the Lord? Nonsense! Such an idea would be as flat a contradiction of the 15th chapter of his first Epistle to the Corinthians as his great intellect could well devise. Think of it: Paul teaching those Corinthian brethren that they together with all the faithful in Christ would not put on immortality until *the sounding of the last trump, on the resurrection morn*, and then turning around and telling them that they would be clothed with it *at the hour and article of death!* that to be absent from the body—dying—meant present with the Lord—life immortal, eternal! It would be with a poor grace, one would think,

that he could ever again attempt such another masterly appeal in behalf of the resurrection of the righteous dead. (See 1 Cor. 15:51-55). So that 2 Cor. 5:6-9, should be read in the light of the 10th verse and also of 1 Cor. 15:51-55. There is no system of philosophy under heaven that can show a necessity for a resurrection of the dead, if MEN NEVER DIE. The body being no part of the man, according to the theory we are combatting, but only a clog—the real man having survived the stroke of death, and destined to live right on—where is there the least shade of necessity for a resurrection? or what is there of *man* to be RESURRECTED? Upon the hypothesis that man does not return to dust, in contradiction to Gen. 3:19, to talk about the grave giving up that which it never had, is folly. Job said, in speaking of the death of man: "MAN DIETH *and wasteth away;* yea, *man* giveth up the ghost, and where is HE?" Not "where is the *ghost?*" The "ghost" is *one thing* here and "man" is *another*. If the "ghost" was the all important thing, as many teach, then would not his enquiry have been about the *ghost?* I guess it would. I have frequently mused over the contradiction between the Poet and Job. We used to sing the song of "The Orphan Boy." The last stanza of it contained an invitation to his parents in heaven, to look upon his prosperity. He says:

> *"Look down, dear parents, look, and see*
> *Your happy, happy orphan boy!"*

This is what the Poet says concerning the state or condition of dead parents. Now let us hear Job on the subject. It is in the same chapter (14: 20, 21,) from which we have just quoted. In his entreaty to God he says: "Thou prevailest for ever against him [man], and he passeth: thou changest his countenance, and sendest him away. His sons come to honor, and *He knoweth it not;* and they are brought low, but *He perceiveth it not of them.* It would be hard to conceive of two ideas more conflicting than are these. But this is only a sample of the contradiction to the Bible we find in the prevailing theological sentiment of our time on this subject.

Viewed from a stand-point of Bible and Reason, does not the judgment day become a grand essential? If the righteous of earth are not to be rewarded with eternal glory, and the indescribable iniquity of this world must continue, until that time, what infinite importance is wrapped up in that judicial event! To us the moment of it is incomprehensible, yet sublime, grand! We cannot help saying in the language of the Poet: "Fly swift around, ye wheels of time, and bring the welcome day!" "The whole creation 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.*" (Rom. 8: 22, 23.) For nearly six thousand years, this day has been looked for,

and prayed for. And John closes the sacred canon with this prayer upon his lips: "Even so, come, Lord Jesus." (Rev. 22:20.) I believe the event of the second coming of Christ is said to be mentioned three hundred and eighteen times in the New Testament Scriptures, so important was it considered by those sacred writers. The day of retribution is the day for which all other days were made. It is the beginning of a new world of new creatures, and the ending of an old world of sin and suffering. It is the Regenesis of a race of beings called out of the human family. It is also the time when all systems of wrong instituted by wicked men and devils, crimes and cruelties of the blood-thirsty of earth, will be *justly* dealt with. No despotic assassins, as Bogha, Tamerlane, Abdul Hamid II, and others too numerous to name, with their infernal hosts, will go unwhipped of justice. The blood of slaughtered innocence for thousands of years in the history of this wicked world *will then be avenged.* Their blood cries unto God, as is represented the blood of Abel (Gen. 4: 10), and of the martyred saints —the victims of papal fury for 1,260 years (Rev. 6: 9, 10),—and that cry is heard by the judge of all the earth, and He has sworn by His holiness to redress their wrongs. The cry goes up from savage altars upon which millions of God's dear people have been immolated, "How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth?" (Rev. 6:10.)

The thought of meeting God in solemn judgment to answer for all the doings of these mortal lives is one that ought to bring reflection to the most indifferent heart. How shall I meet that summons? should be *the question.* The considerations pertaining to things of time and sense should be of secondary importance. "Seek *first* the kingdom of God and his righteousness," is a command that no mortal can afford to turn a deaf ear to. To heed it is true wisdom. "And unto man he said, Behold, the fear of the Lord, that is wisdom; and to depart from evil is understanding." (Job 28: 28.) The words of Doddridge in the following stanzas are timely:

"And will the judge descend?
And must the dead arise,
And not a single soul escape
His all-discerning eyes?

How will my heart endure
The terrors of that day,
When earth and heaven, before his face,
Astonished, shrink away?

But, ere the trumpet shakes
The mansions of the dead,
Hark! from the gospel's cheering sound
What joyful tidings spread!

Come, sinners, seek His grace,
Whose wrath ye cannot bear;
Fly to the shelter of His cross,
And find salvation there."

CHAPTER X.

CONDITIONAL IMMORTALITY.

"To them who by patient continuance in well doing seek for * * * immortality." (Rom. 2:7).

The Bible from cover to cover teaches the fact of "immortality" being something to be sought after by the sons and daughters of Adam's fallen race, and not as of something they are already in possession of by natural endowment. As every one who has given the subject any thought knows the word signifies *exemption from death, unending existence, an undying nature, imperishableness, incorruptibility, eternal life*, etc. Mr. Barlow, in his little book on "endless being," objects to the definitions of the word "immortality," having a special reason for so doing. He says that "immortality" is *not* eternal life, and *vice versa*. He finds by reading 1 Corinthians, 15th chapter, that the righteous put on "immortality" at the second appearing of Christ; and if he did not make a difference between "immortality" and "eternal life," his theory of Christians obtaining the latter at conversion would have no apparent support. But how could a person have "eternal life" in his possession and not be immortal, or be immortalized and not have "eternal life?" The negation of "immor-

tality" must in the very nature of the case involve a negation of eternal life. Think of a person being endowed with "eternal life" and yet corruptible, perishable, by nature! For "immortality" signifies "incorruptibility." But to evade this Mr. Barlow says that incorruptibility does not mean "immortality." There are two Greek words translated "immortality" in our version of the N. T. They are "*aphtharsia*," and" *athanasia*." He says the latter, "*athanasia*" should be translated "immortality," but the former, "*aphtharsia*," should not be so translated. Robinson in his Greek Lexicon of the N. T. gives as the signifiecation of "*aphtharsia*," "*incorruption, exemption from decay.*" "Hence *in a general sense, immortality, the future life and bliss of the saint;*" and he cites 1 Cor. 15: 40, 42, 50, 53, 54; Rom. 2: 7; and 2 Tim. 1: 10, where it has these significations. To this agree Liddell and Scott, authors of a standard Greek Lexicon. They give as the meaning of "*aphtharsia*," "*incorruption, immortality.*" The verb, "*aphthartizo*," is *to make incorruptible or immortal.* The other word, "*asthanasia*" they say signifies "*immortality.*" The verb, "*athanatizo*, also means *to make immortal*—pass. : *to become or be immortal.*"

Thus we see that "eternal life" implies "*immortality*," *incorruption;* so that to possess "eternal life," one must possess "immortality."

The word is mentioned but five times in the Bible, though synonymized by words or terms

equivalent in all other places, as has been named. The places where the word is mentioned are: Rom. 2 : 7; 1 Cor. 15:53, 54; 1 Tim. 6: 16; 2 Tim. 1: 10. The first instance, as we have noticed, places "immortality" before us as an object of endeavor. "To them who by patient continuance in well doing *seek for* glory, honor, *immortality.*" The second and third places where it occurs, bestow it upon the saints at the resurrection of the dead. The fourth applies it to God at the present time exclusively. The fifth and last state the fact of its being brought to light through the gospel, and not through the Phædo of Plato.

If "immortality" be an object to be sought after by "patient continuance in well doing," it is certain that all men are *not by nature in possession of it.* But, on the other hand, if all men are born into the world with immortal natures it would be useless to tell them *to seek after such;* "for what a man seeth why doth he yet hope for? If all men are immortal by natural inheritance they need not apply to the gospel for "immortality;" and then sinners as well as saints have eternal life and can never die. Then eternal sin is as certain as eternal righteousness. For no one will claim that a race of incorrigibles will live without sinning in eternity any more than they will in time. We have a fair enough specimen of wickedness in this state of things to infer something of what it would be beyond this in the eternities. And yet we have a very vague conception of the character of what an *eternity of*

sin would be. For, in this present world, many constraining influences are brought to bear upon wicked people—they are still upon mercy's side of the grave, and on probationary grounds with God, and where the Holy Spirit is yet operating upon the minds of men to turn them to the ways of life and salvation: but placed beyond all such constraining and restraining forces and influences, face to face with hopeless fate, who can imagine to what depths of depravity this lost humanity would descend? It would be equaled only by the Devil and his hosts. Then, to the *intensity* of all this aggregated depravity, add the *eternity* of it, and we have a condition of things that lies beyond the ken of our apprehension to realize. We cannot help seeing, then, what an awful thing it would be if all mankind were born immortal. The transgressions of this present world for six thousand years, or from the creation to the judgment day, would be as nothing at all when compared with that eternal world of sin. The sin of *one* individual there would be incomparably more than all the sin committed by all the human family during the history of this present evil world from the beginning of it to the end; because the sins of the human family are limited by time, while the sin of that realm has *no* limit. So that when the "one individual" had lived long enough there in his incorrigibleness to equal all the sin ever perpetrated by *the Adamaic family* during probation, he then would be *no* nearer the end of his diabolical career than when he first entered upon it! Now *add* to the

sin, or sins, of this "one individual" the sins of the vast millions of the lost and then see what millions of worlds of iniquity there would be!

But for a very wise purpose man *is not born an immortal creature*, and therefore when he proves himself unworthy of eternal life and immortality, he will not be able to perpetuate that unworthiness beyond this brief life.

Whatever construction men may place upon Gen. 3:22, it is certain that Adam and Eve were not immortal beings. When they had sinned and forfeited their right to paradise, God said: "Behold, the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil: and now lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life and eat and live forever: therefore the Lord God sent him forth from the garden of Eden, to till the ground *from whence he was taken.* So he drove out the man; and he placed at the east of the garden of Eden, Cherubims and a flaming sword which turned every way, to keep the way of the tree of life." Varied are the opinions entertained as to the real meaning of this Scripture; but as the Word should be followed in preference to these, we will adhere to the letter of it. And we discover; (1) that Adam in this fallen condition could not live for ever, as he was taken from the dust of the earth and in consequence of sin would return to it again, as expressed in the 19th verse. "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou *return unto the ground;* for *out of it wast thou taken; for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return.*" This language was

addressed to *Adam, the person, the responsible individual*, and *not to the house in which he lived*, as the popular notion runs. (2) The precaution taken by the Lord in driving him from the garden, and protecting the tree of life from their gaining access to it, so they should not partake of it also, and "eat and live for ever," is well worthy of note. The results of eating of this tree of life, the record tells us, would have been *to live forever*, then they would have become immortal, never-dying sinners. If the commonly accepted definition for life were true, that it is "the favor and knowledge of God," then when Adam would have partaken of the tree of life and committed the second transgression, he would have had the eternal favor and knowledge of God. If eternal life means eternal happiness and the favor of God, and eternal death is eternal sin and suffering, as this doctrine is, then Adam had but to put forth his hand to the tree of life and eat of it, and he would have secured the eternal favor of God and the full fruition of peace and happiness. Strange penalty for transgression! But the definition of death is as badly out of joint as is that of life; for it makes the *sin* Adam committed the *penalty*. To dodge the force of this penalty that had for its object the return of Adam to the dust from which he was taken, as it is stated, (Chap. 3:19), this theory says that he, Adam, died a spiritual death—that is a death in trespasses and sins. Says Rev. J. D. Pope on this subject of Adam's death: "*The fact is then, the first death for our*

race was spiritual death, or *what Paul refers to as 'dead in trespasses and sins'* (Eph. 2:1,5; Col. 2: 13.)" We need no theology to teach us that Adam fell and became a sinner as soon as he disobeyed this divine injunction; but it will take a good deal more than popular theology to make the common sense mind see that *sin is the penalty for sin*. Literal death is the penalty for transgression, as announced here by the Lord—"*Dust thou* art *and unto dust shalt thou return.*" "The wages of sin is death" (Rom. 6:23); not "the wages of sin *is* sin." We know that sin is spoken of in the Scriptures in the sense of figurative death, because the sinner is dead to a life of righteousness; but to confound it with the *penalty for sin*, is absurd. Adam became a dying creature as soon as he sinned, and fully and finally expired when he had lived nine hundred and thirty years, and returned to the dust as God told him. "In dying thou shalt die," is the marginal reading.

In the face of this we are told that saint and sinner alike are immortal by nature, and must continue to live in conditions of righteousness and insubordination, respectively, to all eternity! So far as the bestowment of immortality is concerned, the saint has no more to thank the Redeemer for than has the sinner, as both received it by *inheritance from the first Adam*. If there is gratitude due any one for this natural gift—and it is said there is—it is our fallen father, Adam, and no one else: for we inherited it from him, as truly as did we this sin-

ful nature that was born with us. So then it would not be right, according to this doctrine, to accord to Christ, the *second* Adam, the honor of bringing "immortality to light through the gospel" to be sought for by, and bestowed upon, the faithful among the children of men; but to the first Adam in bestowing it upon *all his posterity* alike, irrespective of merit. But instead of this being a bestowment from the first Adam, it belongs to the *second Adam*, the Lord Jesus Christ, and He will give to His Spiritual posterity, the saints, and to none else; because none else is worthy. The first Adam could not give to his posterity what he did not himself possess. And, as he was a dying creature, destined to return to the earth, as we have noticed, he could impart none other than a dying, mortal nature to his offspring. And so it is written of him and his progeny: "The first man is of the earth, earthy. * * * As is the earthy (Adam), such are they also that are earthy" (his posterity). Of the second Adam, or Christ, and His Spiritual children it is written: "The second man is the Lord from heaven: * * * And as is the heavenly (Christ Jesus), such are they also that are heavenly (the saints). And as we *have borne the image of the earthy* (the *mortal* image), we shall also bear the image of the heavenly" (the immortal image). (1 Cor. 15:46–49). The question here arises, *When* will this change of image from the first Adam to that of the second—from the mortal to the immortal nature—take place? The answer is found in the next four verses.

Beginning with the 51st v. we read: Behold, I shew you a mystery: We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, *in the twinkling of an eye*, AT THE LAST TRUMP; for *the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised* INCORRUPTIBLE, and *we shall be changed.* For *this corruptible must put on incorruption*, and *this mortal must put on* IMMORTALITY. So WHEN *this corruptible* shall have put on *incorruption*, and this *mortal shall have put on immortality, then* shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, *Death is swallowed up in victory.* This Scripture needs no comment, as it is self-explanatory, and tells us *when* and *how* men are made immortal—namely, at the *time* of the resurrection of the dead; and being in Christ they are delivered from the power of death—the dead raised to an endless life, and the then living saints *instantaneously quickened*, or *changed*, from corruption to incorruption, and from a dying to an undying nature. And as it is the saints and they only who put on immortality here, to whom death is swallowed up in victory, the unrighteous at this period, both living and dead, *remain without it*, and must die what is termed "the second death." The distinction between the two classes here is noted by John. He says: "*Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection; on such the second death hath no power.* * * * Whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death." (Rev. 20:6, 14, 15.) Two species of resurrection are noted in the New

Testament—*the resurrection of the righteous*, as the *first*, and *the resurrection of the unrighteous, second.* Says the Apostle Paul, in reference to the first: "The Lord shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God; and the dead in Christ shall rise first." (1 Thess. 4:16). Those dead who are not included in the first resurrection are under the power and dominion of the second death, and hence cannot continue to live on. Not being partakers of immortality which must come through Christ only, they do not possess eternal life. Says John, in speaking of a certain class of criminals: "Whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer; and ye *know that no murderer hath eternal life abiding in him.*" (John 3:15). He certainly would have eternal life abiding in him if he were an immortal being. "And this is the record, that God hath given to us *eternal life*, and this life *is in his Son. He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life.*" (1 John 5:11, 12). In Him is life, out of Him is death, the wages of sin. So that the bestowment of immortality is conditioned upon obedience to the requirements of the gospel—obtained "by patient continuance in well doing."

Before touching upon the significations of "life" and "death" it might be in place to notice in brief the view of Mr. Barlow on this point. It is not a little amusing to see his attempt to prove that the righteous have eternal life, now, and at the same time claim that the

wicked have an undying nature, an endless being. He says that none but the believers in Christ have eternal life, and this they come in possession of at conversion, and quotes John 3:16, 36 in proof of it: "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life; and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life." Now how in the world he can prove by this text that the wicked will live forever is the mystery. The text declares they will not. He says the wicked have no natural immortality. These are his words: "*Eternal life is the present possession of the righteous, and of them alone. It is the life which is the outcome and inseparable attendant of the new birth.* How then can it be put on at the resurrection?" "*So far as the Bible is concerned no countenance is given to the common idea that man is naturally or inherently immortal.* No matter what the word means, if the Bible be true, *only one being has it now; only the righteous put it on at their resurrection.*" (Endless Being, pp. 36, 41.) The italics are his. In this he tells us that the wicked have *neither immortality nor eternal life*,—for these he says mean two different things—yet he says they *have eternal conscious existence!* For men to be deprived of both immortality and eternal life and yet live eternally, as Mr. Barlow claims, is truly a metaphysical novelty. But he thinks he has found a solution to the mystery that has puzzled the orthodoxw orld for so many ages. A play upon the definitions of the words, "life" and "death," is the way he solves the "mystery."

He says that "life" does not mean "existence," and that "death" does not mean "non-existence," or unconsciousness. He thinks a dead man knows a great deal more than a living man. But the Scriptures do not agree with his new fangled definitions of life and death. Let us try the Bible definition of "death" and see how it accords with his idea of dead men possessing wisdom and conscious entity. Here it is: "Put not your trust in princes, nor in the son of man, in whom there is no help. His breath goeth forth, *he returneth to his earth:* IN THAT VERY DAY HIS THOUGHTS PERISH." (Psal. 146: 3, 4.) "For the living know that they shall die; BUT THE DEAD KNOW NOT ANYTHING. Also their love, and their hatred, and their envy, IS NOW PERISHED." (Eccl. 9: 5, 6.)

Because Jesus said, "He that believeth on me *hath* everlasting life" (John 6:47), Bro. B. infers that believers receive it in reality *at conversion*, or *as soon as they believe on the* SAVIOR, placing all stress upon the *present* tense of the verb. But if he would read this 47th verse in the light of its context—for that is the way to interpret texts—he would certainly get the meaning of the Savior's words here as to WHEN the believer comes into possession of this "eternal," or "everlasting," "life." Let us read two verses of this same (6th) chapter of John's Gospel. The 54th verse reads: "Whosoever eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, *hath eternal life;* AND I WILL RAISE HIM UP AT THE LAST DAY." The 40th verse reads: "And this

is the will of him that sent me, that every one that seeth the Son, and believeth on him, *may have everlasting life:* AND I WILL RAISE HIM UP AT THE LAST DAY." This tells *when* they get "eternal life." It would be absurd to promise *to raise* up some one *that never laid down.* Four times in this chapter does Jesus mention the fact *of raising up believers "at the last day."* Why this if they have eternal life without it? Of course Bro. B. thinks this "eternal life" received at conversion, is the reward and recompense promised the believer; for this was what Jesus said He came for, that they might have life, and have it more abundantly." Let us now put this in the form of a syllogism that it may appear more conclusive.

The reward and recompense of the believer is eternal life (John 3: 6; 10; 10); *The judgment day is the time at which the believer receives that reward and recompense* (Matt. 16: 27; Luke 14: 14; 2 Cor. 5: 10; Rev. 22: 12); *Therefore, the judgment day is the time at which the believer receives "eternal life," and not at conversion.*

No stronger words can be used to express that due the righteous and unrighteous, respectively, at the day of reckoning, than the terms employed. Life eternal is promised to the former, while death eternal is announced as the doom of the latter. And there are no two words in our vocabulary that express oppositeness of meaning any more fully than do these two words. We so understand these words in our daily conversation. The word "death" is the antonym of

the word life. But these words are used accommodatedly by some, as has been observed, and the Biblical and common sense meaning changed. When applied to the future, life is said to signify happiness, and death to signify misery or miserableness. To be eternally alive then in the future world, *is to be eternally happy;* and to be eternally dead, *is to be eternally miserable.* If these be the ligitimate meanings of the words, they are just as true in this world as in the next, and should be so applied. Therefore all who are *happy* in this world *are alive;* and all *who are unhappy*, or *miserable, are dead!* Did any one ever see an *unhappy corpse?* We see that the term will not apply to the dead of this world, neither will it to the dead of the next world. A man in this world may have *a happy life*, or he *may have an unhappy life.* It does not follow that because he is *unhappy* he does not live, is dead. And a person would be thought of as one whose intelligence was considerably at fault who should so say and think. Our existence here, life, does not depend upon mental conditions, but mental conditions depend upon life for *their* existence. Joy or sorrow is all the same to a dead man—he realizes neither; while the living man is susceptible of both. But if a man's life here depended upon his mental conditions for reality, he would be not only of ephemeral existence, but a creature of *many* lives; for just as often as his mind changed from a happy to an unhappy mood, he would be said to have died; and with the return of a more

normal condition of his mentality, to be living again. In the world to come, *life* will not depend upon happiness any more than it does here, but happiness will depend upon life for its expression. When men are made immortal, and are no longer susceptible of physical disorders of any kind, and pains and aches are things unknown; and where nothing arises from without to disturb or ruffle the mind; then there will be happiness complete as a result of such a condition of things. It will be the *effect* too of a righteous life here. Said the Prophet: "*The effect* of righteousness shall be *quietness and assurance for ever.*"

The terms used in the Bible to express the doom of the wicked are in no way ambiguous, or of doubtful meaning. What would we, for instance, understand by the word "*destroy*"? We surely would not take it to mean the same as the word "*preserve*," its antonym, or opposite. When the Bible says, "The Lord *preserveth* all them that love him: but all the wicked will he *destroy*," are we to give to the word "destroy" the same signification that we do to the word "preserve" in its application here? (Psal. 145: 20.) To say that "destroy" in this text has regarded to the *peace* or *happiness* of the wicked, and means that God will "destroy" their peace, is to assert something that is very foreign to the import of this Scripture as well as to that of other texts. 1. "Wicked" is the object of the verb "destroy," here, and not "peace." If the word "peace" is to be substituted here for

"wicked," then the language is figurative, and has no reference to the final condition of the wicked or righteous whatever, as one thing is taken to represent another. 2. The Bible asserts that the "wicked" are destitute of "peace," and how is God going to destroy for them that which they do not possess? "There is no peace, saith my God, to the wicked." (Isah. 57: 20, 21). But this is literal language, and refers to the final doom of the ungodly. In 2 Thess. 1:9, the noun is employed to designate the destiny of the wicked. Says the Apostle in speaking of them: "Who [the wicked] shall be punished with everlasting *destruction* from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power." Who would think of using the word "preservation" here in lieu of the word "destruction," thereby giving to the declaration exactly an opposite meaning? But this is just what is done with this text when we make the claim that the "wicked" *cannot be destroyed:* and of course if they are immortal creatures they are not subject to destruction; and then every time the word "destruction" is applied to the wicked it should be substituted by its antonym—its opposite—"preservation." But what kind of license would this be, that would permit us to give opposite significations to the same words? With this latitude language would soon become meaningless. Dr. Webster defines the word "destroy" thus: 1. *To unbuild; to pull or tear down; to separate violently into its constituent parts; to break up the structure and organic existence of; to*

demolish. 2. *To ruin; to bring to naught; to put an end to; to annihilate; to consume.*" With these definitions of the term before us, in what possible sense is it to be applied to *that* which is *totally indestructible*, and *indiminishable?* If the wicked are indestructible why did the writers of the Bible make the woeful mistake when speaking of their punishment to apply to them the word "*destruction?*" Evidently they have used the wrong word, if the popular notion of the *indestructibility* of the wicked is a fact. Either the Bible or scholastic theology is at fault here. And while I am not ready to concede the former, I must in all honesty take broad issue with the latter, and let that Book speak in its own definite language. To use the figure of personification, I believe it means just what it says, and says just what it means. If the ungodly were immortal and destined to live as long as God Himself, as we hear it said, then that Book, the Bible, would not be slow in declaring this fact, and no such terms as "*destruction*," "*perish*," "*consume*" etc., would ever have been applied to them. If David meant to teach the *indestructibility* of the wicked what a strange way he took to express it. He says: "The wicked *shall perish*, and the enemies of the Lord *shall be as the fat of lambs*: they *shall consume: into smoke shall they consume away*" (Psal. 37: 20). Singular language this to express *continuity of life and existence!* Again: "The wicked shall see it (the salvation of the righteous), and be grieved; he shall gnash with his

teeth and *melt away.*" (Psal. 112: 10). "Fret not thyself because of evil doers, neither be thou envious against the workers of iniquity. For they shall soon be CUT DOWN *like the grass*, and WITHER AS THE GREEN HERB." "Evil doers SHALL BE CUT OFF. * * * For yet a little while, and the wicked *shall not be:* yea, thou shalt diligently consider his place, and it shall not be" (Psal. 37: 1, 2, 9, 10). It should not be overlooked that this 37th Psalm locates the infliction of this punishment just at the time when the righteous are rewarded, and so these declarations cannot be construed to mean temporal calamities to the wicked.—Malachi is equally as singular as David in describing the *continuity* and "*indestructibility*" of the finally impenitent. He says: "For, behold, the day cometh, that shall burn as an oven; and all the proud, yea all that do wickedly, shall be stubble; and the day that cometh *shall burn them up*, saith the Lord of hosts, that it shall leave them *neither root nor branch.*" (Mal. 4: 1). I am quite certain that if David and Malachi were here now and preached the punishment of the wicked in such strong language they would be denounced as "destructionists," or "annihilationists." But they are not alone in announcing that "wicked" men are not immortal; all the other writers of the Bible that have anything to say on the subject, tell the same story. Indeed they could not tell anything different and it be in harmony with the truth. All Bible doctrine is harmonious. It cannot teach that "the wicked, the enemies

of the Lord, *shall perish*," and at the same time teach also that they are *imperishable*. The harmony among the sacred writers may be seen by the following quotations in reference to the destiny of the wicked:

"The wicked is reserved to the day of *destruction*" (Job 21:30): "When all the workers of iniquity do flourish, it is that they *shall be destroyed forever*" (Psal., 92; 7): They that war against thee shall be *as nothing*, and *as a thing of naught;* and they that strive with thee *shall perish*" (Isah. 41: 11, 12): "The soul that sinneth, it *shall die*" (Ezek. 18; 4, 20): "But he will *burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire*" (Matt. 3; 12): "Broad is the way that leadeth *to destruction*, and many there be which go in thereat" (Matt. 7; 13): "*As, therefore, the tares are gathered and burned in the fire; so shall it be in the end of this world*" (Matt. 13; 40): "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life; and he that believeth not the Son *shall not see life*," (John 3; 36): "That whosoever believeth in him *might not perish*, but have eternal life" (Ch. 3; 15): "The *end* of these things *is death*" (Rom. 6; 21): "The wages of sin *is death;* but the gift of God is eternal life" (v. 23): "*Whose end is destruction*" (Phil. 3; 19): "*Whose end is to be burned*" (Heb. 6: 8): "What shall be the *end of them that obey not the gospel of God?*" (1 Pet. 4; 17.)

Many similar passages might be added to these showing the concurrence of testimony among the writers of the Bible on this subject, as there must be for the Scriptures to harmonize; but

these will serve as samples. Now if "*death*," "*destroy*," "*perish*," "*die*," "*come to naught*," "*come to an end*," "*be cut off*," "*burned up*," "*consumed*," etc., as here expressed, mean simply separation from God by a spiritual death—a death "in trespasses and sins,"—as we are told, then every sinner has reached his punishment, because he is *already separated from God by this spiritual death*,—dead in sin! But "*sin*" is no penalty *for sin*.

Ever since the serpent told mother Eve that she should "not surely die" if she ate of the forbidden fruit, credence has been given to what he said. God told Adam if he ate of the fruit of that tree he would certainly die; but the serpent, or the Devil through him, said to the woman, "Ye shall not surely die," thus contradicting what God had said: and strange to say, the same lie told there by that serpent, is to-day almost universally believed and taught. This was among the evils man came into possession of by the fall. If Eve had not believed what the serpent told her, doubtless, she would not have partaken of the fruit and fell. But she believed a lie and acted upon it, and we behold the sad consequences of it. And some way, in her posterity inheriting her fallen nature, they partook strongly of a tendency to credit what is false in preference to what is true. Wicked men to-day believe the Devil before they will believe God; hence their rebellion against God. And there is scarcely a false system of religion on earth but is based upon this very falsehood

fabricated by Satan to overthrow our first parents. These systems all affirm that man, fallible man, is an *undying* creature, *just what the serpent said he would be.* Spiritualism is founded upon this false claim. Knock this pillar from under the superstructure and "spirit-rappings," "communications with the dead," "spirit-affinities," "mediumistic" deceptions, etc., would all tumble to the ground.

The despicable Turk, who is now murdering defenseless Greek women and children, thinks, according to his religion, Islamism, that *he* is an IMMORTAL being; and that if he falls on the battle-field, or while he is slaying the followers of Christ he is wafted immediately *into a sensual paradise where he regales himself to his heart's content in all the licentious gratifications characteristic of him*, and that to *all eternity*.

Buddhism with all its superstitious nonsense has its life in a theory of *metempsychosis or transmigration of souls.* It claims that at the death of the individual *he is immediately born again*, or enters upon a new existence and in a new shape; and as to his species and shape, he may according to his merit or demerit, *be any of the innumerable orders of being composing the Buddhist universe—from a reptile to a divinity;* but his progression must not stop.

And so with Brahmanism, another mythological system of religion; among other degrading things it *holds the serpent*—the species of the creature that told the awful lie in Eden—*in*

sacred reverence, and makes it the emblem of immortality.

The religion of old China teaches the worship of ancestry, who have turned into deities and inhabit celestial regions in the heavens. They worship their dead because they think *they are not* dead.

With the belief that they were immortal beings by birthright, many heathen tribes of earth have prescribed a rite of homicide among other barbarous observances. When deaths occurred among the rich, their servants were killed that they might be with their masters to serve them in the immortal world; and frequently among the nobility, kindred sacrificed themselves in order to be with their departed friends. Cavendish, an English explorer of the 16th century, speaks of a custom among the Javanese of the surviving wives of the king, of whom there would be as many as a hundred, five days after his death repairing to a certain place by appointment, and with knives as keen as razors, stab themselves to the heart, thus committing suicide to be with their lord and master in the land of spirits.

While in a fit of despondency over the success attending the arms of Julius Cæsar and the loss of his own cause, Cato, the Roman patriot, committed suicide by stabbing himself—*stimulated to the deed by reading Plato on the immortality of the human soul.*

It is thought by some that because the idea of man's natural immortality is NATIVE, it must be

correct—assuming that it is right because *it is native*. But this reasoning would go far in justifying *human depravity*. It would stand thus on this principle: All that is NATIVE with man is right; DEPRAVITY is NATIVE with man; *therefore, depravity is right!* I should feel that it were all the stronger reason for discarding the idea, seeing that it is all the trend of the untutored, natural mind *to be wrong and go wrong*. To indorse the theory of man's inherent immortality because found in the cranium of the benighted, idolatrous heathen, looks verily like a step backward. It comes to enlightened minds with a poor grace. If we are going to endorse this part of their superstition, why not all of it, and worship their idols as well? If their instincts are so *unerring* in regard to the *first claim*, who is able, *on this principle*, to prove they are not so on the second claim in reference to the correctness of their system of worship. No, the correct conception of immortality is not of *paganic* origin, but is of divine revelation out of the mind of Jesus Christ, "who has brought life and immortality to light through the gospel."

And which of these two theories we accept and believe for truth, makes all the difference imaginable. If we are saved by "sanctification of the Spirit and BELIEF, *in the* TRUTH," "TRUTH" becomes a weighty element in the economy of our redemption. Whether *I believe I am born into this world with immortality;* or *that I am mortal by nature and must die eternally unless I look to Christ for the precious boon*, that

through Him I may "by patient continuance in well doing," make the obtainment of it the object of my life, is a world of difference to me. Gospel truth is what we should prize irrespective of the early traditions of men. The light of the gospel is calculated in the providence of God to show man that he is by nature a sinning, dying creature; that he is anything but an immortal, imperishable being. And as the sunbeam chases away the shadows, so does the mythological motion of man's *natural immortality* disappear in the light of divine truth.

Men are so certain that they possess immortality by a natural inheritance that they think it is on every page of the Bible. But alas for such a hope! It is not on *one* page of that Book. But the opposite doctrine—that man is mortal—is taught there. We read nowhere in the sacred volume of the "*immortal* man" but we do read about the "*mortal* man." The Lord asks the question through Eliphaz, "Shall *mortal man* be more just than God." (Job 4:17). And it is in this strain that the Bible speaks of him throughout. "MAN *dieth and wasteth away;* yea, MAN giveth up the ghost, and where is HE?" "MAN *lieth down*, and riseth not: till the heavens be no more, *they shall not awake*, nor be raised out of their sleep." (Job 14:10, 12.) "If he shall set his heart upon *man*, if he shall gather unto himself his spirit and his breath; *all flesh shall perish together*, and MAN *shall turn* AGAIN TO DUST." (Job 34:14, 15.) If there is something that survives the stroke of death, the Bible *does*

not recognize it as being MAN; but affirms that it is MAN *who is mortal;* that "*lies down;*" that "*turns again to dust.*"

We are told that man possesses an immortal entity, which upon the death of the body passes immediately to the ineffable joys of heaven; or to the intolerable sufferings of hell, independently of resurrection or judgment day. And that this entity is the REAL MAN; that the body which perishes is *no more a part of the man than the house a man may live in is a part of him.* This real man is termed the soul; and is inorganic, possessing none of the organs or functions upon which human life, as we see it, depends. It is said to be *immaterial;* and *being inorganic, is without eyes, without ears, nose, mouth, heart, lungs,* or *brain; without hands or feet. It has neither inside, nor outside, length, breadth or depth: has neither form, nor shape; is intangible and invisible.* This comes the nearest to denying its existence of anything I can conceive of. If I were going to describe that which has no possible existence outside the imagination, these are precisely the terms I should have to employ. And yet this *insubstantial, inorganic, immaterial, invisible* something is, after all, *the real substantial man that thinks, wills, desires, acts and does!* Now as it is certain that with all the powers we possess we have no tangible data by which to prove the existence of such an entity, it is fair to affirm that *it does not exist;* i. e., so far as it is within the range of our conceptions to demonstrate. We may *imagine*

such an existence, if we choose, until our heads are gray, but how are we going to prove it? At the very outset we are robbed of all evidence material to the establishment of such an hypothesis. Can any one produce an example of *intelligence where there is no brain?* Every body knows this would be an impossibility. Science has demonstrated to the world that the brain is the organ of thought in both man and in beast. It is claimed, I know, that there is an intelligence behind this; but how is it to be proved? Where is the evidence of it? Upon what principle of demonstration is this to be explained? I know of none. If the brain is not the organ of thought, then a man could think *without* a brain just as well as *with* one; and upon the removal, or suppression of that organ, conscious thought ought to proceed the same as before, without any interruption whatever. But does it? The observations upon this prove the opposite to be true. When sleep is perfect the individual does not dream, and is unconscious. A stunning blow upon the head will produce *unconsciousness*, as every one knows. Many instances of this fact could be cited, but as it is so well known to be true it is not necessary to give them. There is no science under heaven to demonstrate that a man can think *without a brain.* To affirm that he can is the purest assumption, contrary to science and common sense. Says Alexander G. Bell: "The possibility of thought without a brain *whereby to think* is opposed to experience, but this persistence of personal

consciousness after the death of the body involves this assumption." (*Ibid.*, p. 96.)

Lester F. Ward, A. M., at the Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D. C., said: "The consciousness, when scientifically examined, reveals itself as a quality of brain * * * It is a universal induction of science that modification of brain is accompanied by modification of consciousness, and that the destruction of brain results in destruction of consciousness. No exception to this law has ever been observed." (*Ibid.*, pp. 24, 25).

Joseph Leidy, M. D. LL. D., Professor of Anatomy and Zoology, in the University of Pennsylvania says: "Personal consciousness is observed as a condition of each and every living animal, varying from microscopic forms to man. The condition is observed to cease with death; and I know of no facts of modern science which make it otherwise than difficult to believe in the persistence of that condition, that is, 'the immortality of the personal existence.' Science has learned no more than is expressed in Eccl. 3:19; 'For that which befalleth the sons of men befalleth beasts; even one thing befalleth them; as the one dieth, so dieth the other; yea, they have all one breath; so that a man hath no preeminence above a beast." (*Science and immortality*, pp. 15, 16).

Says the distinguished F. K. C. L. Buchner: "*Unprejudiced philosophy is compelled to reject the idea of an individual immortality and of a*

personal continuance after death." (*Force and Matter*, 3rd ed., p. 232).

Aside from the thought of the brain, there are no possible criteria by which to establish the theory that any of the other functions of life can exist *without* their respective organs. How would a man go to work to prove that a person could see *without* eyes? The experiment would have demonstrated the correctness of the view long ago, if such a thing were possible. The eye is the organ of sight; and when that organ becomes impaired from injury or age, the sight is affected to the same extent; and when this organ of vision becomes useless, the person is blind, seeing nothing. How is this to be explained in harmony with the theory that there is within this human organism an infinite intelligence whose vision is unimpairable? If there be such a personal entity within, the man whose eyes have become useless ought to see just as well as the man whose eyes are perfect. And what is true with the sight is true in regard to hearing and speaking. It has never been proved that a person can hear *without ears* or speak *without a tongue*, any more than he can see *without eyes* or think *without a brain*. All these vital functions of the grand organic economy of human existence cease in the event of death; and the man is dead. Aside from the scientific consideration of this subject as observed by Dr. Leidy in the above extract, the Bible regards the death of man as a *cessation of all the functions of life*. In reference to man in death, Solomon says: "The living know

that they shall die: *but the dead know not anything*, neither have they any more a reward; for the memory of them is forgotten. Also *their love* and *their hatred*, and *their envy is now perished.*" (Eccl. 9:5, 6). Says the Psalmist: "Put not your trust in princes, nor in the son of man, in whom there is no help. *His breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth; in that very day his thoughts perish.*" (Psal. 146: 3, 4.) This language does not look much as though "he" possessed an immortal intellect that went right on thinking when death laid him down. If there were no other text in the entire Bible to prove that man does NOT possess an immortal intellect, uninterrupted by death, this one would establish it. "In that very day his THOUGHTS PERISH," puts the question beyond all cavil.

Science and the Bible, as we see, accord to man and animal an *organized existence.* The former (science) proves, as we have already observed, that man cannot think *without a brain*, see *without eyes*, hear *without ears*, nor speak *without a mouth.* This is true in regard to the animal with the exception that it does not possess the faculty of speech. (I am not comparing man with the animal in any other sense than that of life depending upon organized existence for its expression. Man is of a vastly higher type of organization than is the animal, endowed, as he is, by the Creator with wonderful powers and capabilities. Animal is the genus of which man is a species, and the highest species. Yet we have to confess that

he has descended in his lapseness as far below the animal as he is in point of eminence above it. There is hardly a depth in human depravity that man in his degeneracy has not sounded; while on the other hand man has been the agent by divine direction of accomplishing objects which angels would be proud of; but it did not prove to be an expression of the goodness inherent in his nature, but of the God in him.) In harmony with this scientific averment is the divine testimony. Hear what Solomon says in regard to the life common to man and beast. He says: "I said in mine heart concerning the estate of the sons of men, that God might manifest them, and that they might see that they themselves are beasts. For that which befalleth the sons of man befalleth beasts; even one thing befalleth them; as the one dieth, so dieth the other; yea, they have all one breath; so that a man hath no preeminence above a beast; for all is vanity. ALL GO UNTO ONE PLACE; ALL ARE OF THE DUST, AND ALL TURN TO DUST AGAIN." (Eccl. 3: 18—20.) And this language, strange as it may appear to some who have been educated to think differently, is nothing more than what is affirmed of both man and beast in the beginning. Of man's organization it is said: "The Lord God formed MAN OF THE DUST OF THE GROUND, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul." (Gen. 2.7.) Observe that it was not WHAT WAS BREATHED INTO HIM that became the soul, or man proper, but it was *that which was "formed of the dust of the ground"*

—that was THE MAN, and that became a living soul. This may be said to be the synthesis of the original organism, or the putting together of the component elements, part to part, after which the spirit, or breath, of life animated it and it—the very same "it" that was formed of the dust of the ground—became a living soul. By turning to Job, 34: 14, 15, we find mention made of the organic anlaysis, or dissolving into the original elements the divinely constructed human organism, as referred to above. It reads: "If he (God) set his heart upon man, *if he gather unto himself his spirit and his breath; all flesh shall perish together*, and *man shall turn again unto dust.*" The great mistake made by many arises from confounding the "*spirit*" or "*breath*" of these texts of Scripture, with "*man*," and making them identical. But "MAN" here is ONE THING, and "SPIRIT" is ANOTHER. It does not say that He breathed MAN into that which He created or formed out of the dust, in Gen. 2: 7; or in the dissolution by death, that He gathers to Himself *man*. But it is "MAN" that is formed of the dust in his creation; and it is THAT *which was thus formed* which returns to dust again in the dissolution: "ALL flesh shall perish together, and MAN shall turn again unto dust." The "spirit" or "breath," here spoken of, is *God's*, not man's. It is the animating, or life imparting principle of God, by which all animate creation is sustained. He is the author of life to the brute world as well as to the human. "If He gather to himself his spirit

and his breath, all flesh," brute as well as human, "would perish." Speaking of the inhabitants of the great deep and their dependence upon God for their sustenance, the Psalmist says: "That thou givest them they gather; thou openest thine hand, they are filled with good. Thou hidest thy face, they are troubled; thou takest away their breath, they die, and RETURN TO THEIR DUST." (Ch. 104 28, 29.) Job speaks of the animating power of that spirit and breath thus: "The spirit of God hath made me, and the breath of the Almighty hath given me life;" (Ch. 33:4.) When this spirit and this breath are withdrawn, man dies and returns again to dust, as Elihu says. Regarding the organization, or creation of the animal species it is said: "And God said, Let the earth bring forth the living creature after his kind, cattle, and beast of the earth after his kind: and it was so. And God made the beast of the earth after his kind: and it was so. And God made the beast of the earth after his kind." "And OUT OF THE GROUND the Lord God FORMED EVERY BEAST *of the field*, and *every fowl of the air*." (Gen. 1:24, 25; 2:19.) We see that the animal, like man, was organized out of the dust of the earth; so when Solomon said, "All are of the dust, and all turn to dust again," he spoke of that "one thing" that is common to, or "befalls," both of them—death.

Ingersoll sneers at the account the Bible gives of God creating man and beast out of the dust of the earth, and thinks it very unreason-

able. But it would not take one-tenth of the intelligence he *claims* to have, to know *that whatever turns to dust must have originated from dust*, and not from something different; that as man and beast turn to dust, they must have originated out of dust: and *as that dust could not organize itself into vital being*—a fact that does not require but a small amount of intelligence to understand—*it must have had an organizer of infinite wisdom and power to accomplish it:* whence the truth of God's creating man and beast of the dust of the earth is established by reason in accordance with the Bible declarations above referred to, Ingersoll to the contrary notwithstanding!

With the thought before us that "man dies and wastes away," and "returns to the earth from which he was taken" (Gen. 3: 19), we cannot help seeing that a RESURRECTION is an ABSOLUTE NECESSITY to reproduce him. And in view of this thought, Job asks the question: "IF A MAN DIE, SHALL HE LIVE AGAIN?" The whole tenor of the gospel upon this, points to the certainty of a resurrection from the dead, of both classes—the righteous and unrighteous. "There shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and the unjust." (Acts 24: 15.) The former class being raised *to immortality through Christ* can die no more; while the latter, having no immortality out of Christ, come forth mortal, corruptible beings *to die the second death.* They cannot continue to live because they have "no eternal life abiding in them." This fact gives

force to the doctrine of the resurrection, without which fact a resurrection could not be demonstrated.—Thomas More objected to Martin Luther because he held that all souls lie and sleep till doom's day. Wm. Tyndale responded: "And ye in putting them into heaven, hell, and purgatory, destroy the arguments wherewith Christ and Paul prove the resurrection. * * * The heathen philosophers denying *that*, did put, that the souls did ever live. * * * And again, if the souls be in heaven, tell me why they be not in as good a case as the angels be? And then, *what cause is there of the resurrection?* Archdeacon Blackburn says: "Luther, by consigning all the dead to a state of rest and sleep, left no pretense for the appearance of human souls after death." Again he says: "Luther retained to his dying moment * * * the idea of a total suspension of thought and consciousness during the interval between death and the resurrection." Again: "Luther espoused the doctrine of the sleep of the soul upon a Scriptural foundation; and then he made use of it as a confutation of purgatory and saint-worship, and continued in that belief to the last moment of his life." "Luther was clearly and indisputably on the side of those who maintain the sleep of the soul." Said Luther: "They affirm that I bring forth novelties, but I affirm that they *are not novelties but truths which have been lost sight of.* I am accused of rejecting the doctors of the church. I reject them not, but test their writings by the Bible. * * *

The majority are always on the side of falsehood." Luther's platform was: "THE WORD OF GOD, THE WHOLE WORD OF GOD, AND NOTHING BUT THE WORD OF GOD." Said Cardinal Du Perren: "Luther denies the immortality of the soul; * * * whence he drew an argument against praying to saints; showing that the saints hear not our prayers * * * Luther reckons this amongst the impieties of the Roman church, that she believes the immortality of the soul." Bayle quotes Luther as saying: "All that is said concerning the immortality of the soul, * * * is nothing else, but an invention of anti-Christ to make his pot boil."

Mosheim says of the General Baptists in the sixteenth century: "They believed that the soul between death and the resurrection at the last day, has neither pleasure nor pain; but is in a state of insensibility."

Says Edward Beecher: "The Bible does not recognize, nay, it expressly denies the natural inherent immortality of the soul." (*P. T.* by *M. Grant.*)

It is said that if there were not an immortal entity that continued to live on after the death of the body, the *identity* of the individual would be lost. That when the body returns to the dust, the *identity is gone;* and to restore that body would amount to *a new creation.* But it is hard to see how that an immortal being escaping from this body at death to live on when the latter has crumbled back to dust, is going to preserve the *identity of that body* any

better! Of course, it is plain to be seen that this aim is not to preserve the *identity of the body*, as it is claimed *its* identity is lost as soon as it has returned to the earth; so the identity is placed in something that cannot die, making it not only unnecessary but wholly impossible for that same body to be reproduced! Anyone holding this view, it is certain, *does not* believe in the resurrection doctrine, notwithstanding the prominence given to it throughout the Bible. This is precisely what the Spiritualists believe and teach. Mr. Barlow, to whom reference has been made before, holds *that all identity is lost with the dissolution of the body*, and thinks it *expedient* that there should be an *undying man within to keep that identity;* while he does a great deal of talking about *the saints putting on immortality at the resurrection of the body.* Now he is guilty, in this, of just what he accuses Messrs. White, Pettingell and Grant, viz., *of advocating a new creation in resurrection.* If he thinks a resurrection of the body is equivalent to *a new creation* or "*re-creation,*" as he terms it, then he is guilty of teaching the doctrine of *a new creation* when he teaches, as he does in his book, that saints will be clothed with immortality *at the resurrection of the dead.* Now one of these two doctrines he does not believe. If he believes it to be absolutely essential to the *preservation of the identity of the dead saint that an imperishable spirit survive the dissolution of the body*, just *so absolutely non-essential does he believe the resurrection of that body to be.*

He seems to think that unless some such theory of spirit life is maintained God could not take care of human identity in death! But when God tells us that *the grave and the sea shall give up their dead* (John 5: 28; Rev. 20: 13), it looks as though He would be able to find them go where they may. He is as able to take care of the identity of a man as he was to *create* an identity at the first. But according to Barlow's view such a thing as a resurrection of the body is simply a divine impossibility.

Among the things this doctrine of present inherent "endless existence," or "natural immortality," is responsible for, are the following:

1. It perpetuates sin. The thought that there will be a time when the curse of sin will be removed from God's fair universe, when transgression and disobedience will be unknown, is one that has consoled the hearts of God's people through all ages of the world's history—a time "when," as the prophet says, "iniquity shall have an end." But this doctrine immortalizes every sinner that ever did, does, and ever will, live, and makes him the eternal agent of Satan to blaspheme the name of Christ and of God; and to descend to depths of depravity of which he had never dreamed during his earthly career, a thought so repugnant to every righteous consideration, that many thousands of good men and women, who by early education imbibed the dogma, have renounced it.

2. It exalts and extols Death. There is no idea more foreign to the genius of the redemp-

tive gospel than is that of Death being a benefactor. The Bible nowhere complements Death as a blessing; but it does speak of it as a *curse* to the human family. The Apostle calls it "the wages of sin." Says he, "The wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life." (Rom. 6:23). He says again: "Wherefore, as by one man *sin* entered into the world, and *death by sin; and so death passed upon all men*, FOR THAT ALL HAVE SINNED." (Ch. 5:12.) Again he tells us that "*the sting of death is sin.*" Looking down the stream of time to the great consummation, he says: "*Then shall the last enemy be destroyed, which is death.*" When that shall take place he says: "Then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, *Death is swallowed up in victory. O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?*" (1 Cor. 15: 26, 55.) This monster who enters our pleasant homes and snatches away our loved ones, leaving behind stricken hearts and streaming eyes, is not a friend to our happiness and serenity; but *a dark and cruel foe that has invaded our earth.*

But the doctrine of inherent immortality *puts this enemy in the Redeemer's place*—making *him the life-giver.* He is extolled as the one who introduces the children of God into the world of eternal felicities. He is accredited with having the emancipatory power, in the exercise of which he knocks loose these mortal fetters and sends us soaring to the skies. The psalmody of our churches is pregnant with eulogies upon Death.

3. It is the pillar and ground of Spiritualism, and of all other systems of religious superstition, as we have already shown.

4. It is that upon which rests the doctrines of *the papal purgatory, indulgences, invocation of saints and veneration of the dead.* If any one doubt this let him read the tenets of the Roman Catholic faith. This is not the place to speak of the terrible sin of the doctrine of indulgences, practised by that church during the years of papal dominance. But it was the doctrine of man's natural immortality supporting the practice of indulgences, as the great Luther said, that "made the pope's pot boil." The great church of St. Peter at Rome, the largest cathedral in Christendom, is said to owe its existence mainly to the pecuniary object of indulgence crusades of the time.

5. It sends men to reward and punishment *independent of the day of judgment, in violation of the Word of God,* which teaches that a judgment day must *precede* rewards and punishments.

6. It *invalidates the Bible doctrine of the resurrection,* in that it teaches *that man never dies;* that it is only the house, useless and worthless, in which the man lived, that goes into the tomb; that he receives a new house in heaven as soon as he vacates the old one, and hence he has no need for the latter. This amounts to a subversion of the much repeated asseveration of Christ and His apostles, that "THE DEAD SHALL RISE AGAIN."

7. *It prevents people from "looking for, and hastening unto the coming of the day of God"* by a preparation of heart and life which the Scriptures so constantly enjoin upon the followers of Jesus Christ. Seeing no need for that event, it aims to discard it. In view of the importance of the reappearing of the Lord and Savior, John says: "It doth not yet appear what we shall be: but we know *that*, WHEN HE SHALL APPEAR, WE SHALL BE LIKE HIM; FOR WE SHALL SEE *him as he is.* AND EVERY MAN THAT HATH THIS HOPE IN HIM PURIFIETH HIMSELF, even as he is pure."(1 John 3:2,3). Paul said to the Thessalonian brethren: "Ye turned to God from idols to serve the living and true God; *and to wait for his Son from heaven.*" (1 Thess. 1:9). This doctrine we are opposing says to the christian world: "WAIT FOR DEATH AND THEN GO TO HEAVEN." It is that which will make the second coming of Christ one of the greatest surprises to the church and the world they have ever known. While men's minds are turned toward the event of death for reward *instead of the advent of the Savior*, they will not be in a state of expectancy for the latter event.

8. It teaches the dogma of eternal torture. There can be no conception entertained of what this means. We are pained at the magnitude and extent of human suffering in THIS WORLD. The story of human suffering for nearly six thousand years has never been told, because it is beyond the power of mortals to comprehend. Only God knows the extent of it. A *world of pain and suffering!* How vast the thought! But if the

dogma of *eternal misery* be true, the pains and agonies of *one lost individual* will be incomparably greater than *all endured by this entire world while it stands*. For there is *a limit* to the sufferings of *this world of time;* but there is NO limit to the misery of that one individual of *eternity*. There would come a time, or juncture, when he would have suffered as much as would equal the aggregate of the sufferings of this world for *all time;* now add to this world of misery as many more worlds as there would be lost individuals, and *you would have hundreds of millions of such worlds of human suffering as this!* But this is not the end of it; the work of misery has only just begun. Another such a period of duration rolls away, and as many more millions of worlds of human woe are produced; and this multiplication goes on, and on *ad infinitum!* What a dogma! The thought is so revolting to the conscience that we turn away from it in disgust. It has made more infidels than any or all the other inconsistencies ever put forth in the name of religion. They have concluded, and very correctly too, that a God of love and mercy would never inflict such infinite misery upon the creatures of his hand; and unacquainted with the subject, they have taken it for granted that this was what the Bible taught, from hearing it preached constantly; and they decided that that Book could not be true.

But how many really believe this doctrine of eternal misery? We think there are less that believe it than claim to. How many christian

persons there are claiming to believe this doctrine who have *kindred unsaved, whom they love to devotion, as it were;* yet manifest a perfect *indifference* toward them with regard to saving them from the indescribable agonies and tortures of that eternal hell awaiting them! It is very evident that they do not believe the doctrine. They may *claim* they do, but the best way to prove it is for them to act it out in the enlistment of all the powers with which God has endowed them for the rescue of dear ones; unless it be that their devotion takes on that peculiar nature which Jonathan Edwards claimed would characterize the saints in heaven. He said that the groans and screams of the damned in the flames of hell would be music in the ears of the saints in heaven; that they would respond to the cries of their lost friends with such exclamations as, "Hallelujah! Thank God!" Some one observed on reading Edwards' views that if Heaven's society was as hard hearted as that, he had no desire to enter it. No, people do not believe this awful doctrine to the extent it is claimed for. Says Bishop Foster: "The idea of the endless conscious suffering of the wicked is the most unwelcome thought ever suggested to my mind. My whole soul revolts against it. There is no sacrifice I would not make to get rid of it. It is the horror of all horrors." "I do not now see either wisdom or goodness in the plan, and possibly never may."

Said J. E. Roberts, pastor of the First Baptist Church, Kansas City, Mo. "I have heard it de-

clared from the pulpit: I was taught it in the seminary; and, God forgive me! I have preached it—that God would be glorified by the undying agonies of the eternally lost. I affirm that this is a direct contradiction of every one of Christ's teachings about God. It changes the Fatherhood to hatred, the compassion to cruelty, the love to anger, and banishes from the world that now is, and that which is to come, the God and Father whom Christ revealed."

In the preface to his *Salvator Mundi*, Samuel Cox says: "Few of the more thoughtful and cultivated preachers of the gospel now hold the dogma of everlasting torment. In a large circle of acquaintance, I hardly know one." (*Compiled by M. Grant.*)

9. It is upon the doctrine of *natural immortality* that universalism bases its claims. Being of a more pathetic makeup than the fraternity of the eternal torture school, the Universalists claim that after a period of punishment God will pardon all the immortal rebels out of hell. To this end they assert that as the atonement was for all mankind, the salvation of all mankind must be effected regardless of any conditions on man's part; and therefore whatever punishment is designed for the impenitent, must be *temporal* and not eternal, and for a *disciplinary* purpose instead of a penalty for sin. The following is by Rev. J. Hughes, Universalist: "I believe that because God loves man He will not permit any of his creatures to be 'frost-bitten,' in the sense of being punished endlessly in the future world."

"His chastisements are the chastisements of a Father, and are designed for our *correction and improvement.*"—"I do not believe in any punishment of the body in the future world."—"The body is that in which the soul and spirit reside. *It is the fleshy covering, 'house,'* or *'tabernacle,'* the outward man. *The spirit is the inward man,* the REAL *man.*"—"*After death the spirit will be more free, will have more ability, with less hinderances than before death.*"—"All men are given to Christ, that he might give them eternal life (eternal happiness). As many as God loves he has given into the hands of Christ, that he might save them. *As many as Christ died for he has given Him. He died for all.*" (Debate on the destiny of the wicked between J. Hughes and G. T. Carpenter, pp. 8, 10, 30, 56, 57, 142.)

With the light of divine truth shining upon this controverted subject, revealing the fact that man is not immortal by nature, and can receive immortality *only by obedience to gospel requirements*—that of patient continuance in well doing; that all who do not believe on the Son of God must inevitably perish. (John 3:15, 16); and that no sinner can have eternal life abiding in Him (1 John 3:15)—The bottom falls out of Universalism. The *perpetuation* of the finally impenitent cannot be while he is a *mortal* creature; and therefore the doctrine of Universal salvation cannot save him; he must die. "*The enemies of the Lord shall perish.*" There is nothing in the Bible more plainly taught than is the fact that salvation from death to eternal life and immortality

is based upon conditions of obedience to gospel requirements. "To them who by patient continuance in well doing seek for glory, honor, *immortality, God will render eternal life.*"

Says Lyman Abbott, editor of the Christian Union: "The more I study the Bible, and the more I come into communion with Him who is revealed therein, the more *un*scriptural and *impossible* seems to me the *conceptions of endless sin* * * * That immortality *is the gift of God through our Lord Jesus Christ;* that man is mortal and must *put on* immortality; that *only he can put it on who becomes through Christ a partaker of the divine nature*, and so an inheritor of Him who only hath immortality; that *eternal life* is *life eternal*, and eternal death is death eternal, and everlasting destruction is destruction without remedy or hope of restoration; this is the most natural, *as it is the simplest reading of the New Testament.*" (P. T. by M. G.)

The following is from Positive Theology: "Referring to this subject (Conditional Immortality), says Edward White, of London, ex-chairman of the great Congregational Union of England and Wales: 'It is the one form of evangelical faith, which seems likely to win the sympathy of modern Europe.' 'It is espoused with increasing energy by evangelical scholars in all parts of the world.'

"Among these he mentions Dr. Weymouth, head master of Mill Hill School, one of the best Greek scholars in the country; the late Dr. Mortimer, head master of the City School; the dean

of Peterborough, the late professor of Hebrew at Cambridge; Dr. J. Parker, of the City Temple, London; J. B. Heard, M. A., author of *The Tripartite Nature of Man;* Dr. R. W. Dale; Hugh Stowell Brown; Prof. G. G. Stokes, F. R. S., president of the Royal Society, and Mathematical professor in Cambridge University; Prof. P. G. Tait, considered the first mathematical reasoner in Scotland; Prof. Stevenson, of Nottingham; Prof. Barrett, of Royal College of Science in Dublin; and a long list of Christian medical men in all parts of the country.

"Among American writers may be named the late Dr. Horace Bushnell, Hartford, Ct.; Prof. C. F. Hudson, Cambridge, Mass.; Dr. Huntington, Worcester, Mass.; Dr. Leonard Woolsey, New Haven, Ct.; and many other eminent men, including Mr. Skefsrud, missionary to India, one of the greatest linguists in Asia, speaking nearly twenty languages.

"In Paris the doctrine is held by M. Bastide, head of the French Religious Tract Society; Prof. Sabatier, of the Protestant college, one of the foremost theological scholars of France; Dr. Meyer; Dr. Petavel; Rothe; Olnhausen, and other distinguished Germans."

SOUL AND SPIRIT.

The "immortal soul," or "immortal spirit," is no where to be found in the Word of God. And yet one would think from the frequent mention made of those phrases by people that they were on about every page of it. The words "soul" and

"spirit" are there, but the qualifying adjective "immortal" never occurs in connection with them. But instead we find the soul subject to death and destruction. (See Jos. 11:11; Psal. 30:3;49:15;86:13;89:48; Ezek. 18:4; Matt. 10:28.)

The word "soul" in the N. T. is from the Greek, "*psuche;*" in the O. T. from the Hebrew "*nephesh.*" "*Psuche*" occurs 105 times, and is rendered in some six different ways, as may be seen. It is rendered "life" and "lives" forty times; "mind" three times; "you" once; "heart" once; "us" once; "heartly" once; and "soul" forty-eight times. The word "soul" occurs in our English Bible 535 times. It is from "*nephesh*" 475 times.

The word "spirit" in the N. T. is from the Greek word "*pneuma;*" and in the O. T. from the Hebrew word "*ruach.*" "*Pneuma*" occurs 385 times, but they are not rendered "soul" once. The word "*ruach*" occurs 400 times. The Greek word "*phantasma*" in the N. T. is translated "spirit" twice. Matt. 14:26; Mark 6:49.

Says Rev. M. Grant, one of the best Biblical scholars in America: "I have examined between twenty and thirty Hebrew and Greek lexicons in their definitions of "*nephesh*" and "*psuche,*" and not one of them gives the popular *theological* definition as the *primary* meaning. Of course they must give the *theological* use of the word; but that is usually one of the last. The primary definitions of "soul" in the lexicons are in harmony with the Bible uses of the

word; but the theological correspond mainly with the pagan and papal definitions."

The theory of natural immortality sends all good people, and some that are not very good, to *heaven* at the close of their earthly lives; and that under a strong *Bible protest*. If any of the good and great men of ancient times went to heaven, the patriarch *David* surely did. But we are told in language plain enough to satisfy any truth-seeking mind that David never entered heaven. Says the Apostle Peter respecting him: "David is not ascended into the heavens." "Men and brethren, let me freely speak unto you of the patriarch David, THAT HE IS BOTH DEAD AND BURIED, and his sepulchre is with us unto this day." (Acts 2:29, 34.) How is this to be reconciled with the dogma that the *real David was something that left the body at death and ascended into the presence of God in Heaven?* If such were true, would Peter not have stated the fact with all the positiveness characteristic of some of our modern divines? I think he would. If he had thought that the body *was only the house* in which the real David lived, and when that had been vacated by death, this real and immortal David "ascended into the heavens," he certainly would never have contradicted this fact, and said that HE "HAD NOT ASCENDED *into the heavens.*" But again: we have the testimony of our Lord on this fact. Jesus positively says, "NO MAN HATH ASCENDED UP TO HEAVEN." (John 3:13.) How is this to be harmonized with the doctrine that men have been pouring into

heaven for six thousand years? It is very plain that the theory of traditional immortality and the word of God are at open war with each other. Neither the Bible nor Philosophy sustain the doctrine.

That which dies is recognized in the Bible as being the *man* the *person*, and is personified by *all the personal pronouns in the language;* and there is not *one* instance recorded of the death of an individual where his name, or the pronoun standing for his name, is applied to some abstract part, or entity, that leaves the body then. When Lazarus, the brother of Mary and Martha, departed this life, Jesus apprised the disciples of the fact, and said, "LAZARUS IS DEAD." And when he approached the sorrowing sisters, Martha said to him: "Lord, if thou hadst been here, my BROTHER *had not* DIED." The reply was "*Thy brother shall rise again.*" Martha said to him: "I know that he shall rise again *in the resurrection, at the last day.*" Jesus replied to this: "*I am the resurrection, and the life:* he that believeth in me, though *he were dead*, yet *shall he live:* and whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die." This does not look much as though Jesus regarded the dead believers already alive and in heaven. He came to the tomb, and after the stone was rolled away, He uttered a short prayer, and then cried with a loud voice; "LAZARUS *come forth!* And HE *that was* DEAD *came forth bound hand and foot with grave clothes.* * * * Jesus said to them, *Loose* HIM, and let HIM go." This is strange language

to use in regard to that which was in the tomb, if that was no part of Lazarus, but only the house in which he lived. No, the record *is reliable* when it says that "LAZARUS DIED *and was buried.*" And Jesus being the resurrection and life, raised him from the dead. (See John 11:1—44.) And those who have lived and believed in Jesus, though dead like Lazarus, will yet live when the resurrection day comes; and the living believers at that time will never die, but be changed to immortality.

To prove that sinners have immortality we are often cited to Rev. 14:11, concerning "the smoke of their torment." It is thought this has reference to the future torment of the wicked in a hell of eternity. No one conversant with the Scriptures will claim that Rev. 14:9—11, is to be taken in a literal sense. It reads: "And the third angel followed them, saying with a loud voice, if any man worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation; and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb; and the smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever; and they have no rest day nor night, who worship the beast and his image. * * * Here is the patience of the saints; here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus." This is what John saw and heard in vision con-

cerning mystical "Babylon," a name given to the church of Rome. In the 8th verse the angel said: "Babylon is fallen, is fallen, that great city, because she made all nations drink of the wine of the wrath of her fornication." This drinking she imposed on the nations, was not of literal wine; but it represents the heretical doctrines which she taught and spread among them. So the worship of "the beast and his image," practiced by her followers, was not the worship of a literal beast, but of the political powers that supported the Papal church. In the prophecies of Daniel and John, we learn that beasts, used as symbols, denote political governments. When these beast-worshipers are made to "drink of the wine of the wrath of God," it is not to be supposed that it consists in literal drinking from a literal cup; but this represents His plagues poured upon that Roman harlot. Reference is made to the same thing again in the 18th chapter. It reads thus: And he (the angel) cried mightily with a strong voice, saying, "Babylon the great is fallen, is fallen, and is become the habitation of devils, and the hold of every foul spirit, and a cage of every unclean and hateful bird. For *all nations have drunk of the wine of the wrath of her fornication*, and the kings of the earth have committed fornication with her, and the merchants of the earth are waxed rich through the abundance of her delicacies. And I heard another voice from heaven, saying, Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her plagues. For

her sins have reached unto heaven, and God hath remembered her iniquities." "*Her plagues shall come in* one day, *death and mourning, and famine;* and she shall be *utterly burned with fire* * * * And the kings of the earth, who have committed fornication and lived deliciously with her, shall bewail her, and lament for her, when they shall see *the smoke of her burning, standing afar off for fear of her torment,* saying, Alas, alas that great city Babylon, that mighty city! for in one hour is *thy judgment come.*"

In this 18th chapter the temporal judgments upon that harlot power are mentioned. "Fire" and "smoke" are used as figures to represent the certain consumption and overthrow of her power and greatness. The eye of the seer in vision sees in her desolation, "death," "mourning," and "famine." This is the cup of His wrath of which she drinks. "*In the cup she hath filled,*" says the angel, "*fill to her double.*" Every one acquainted with history knows something about the temporal judgments that have been visited upon the Papal church during the last four hundred years. From her proud seat on the scarlet colored beast, where John first saw her, (Rev. 17: 3,) she has been precipitated to the ground, and is no longer the ruler of the nations of earth. Her temporal power is gone. The symbolical fires have devoured her greatness.

With the view that Rev. 14: 11 means the punishment of the wicked after the judgment day, it is strange that this one poor fellow who

worshiped the beast and his image—and only a probable "man" at that—should be singled out as an object of God's wrath, and *the beast with old wicked "Babylon,"* both of whom were so atrociously bad, overlooked entirely! Nothing is said here about the real guilty parties being in this "fire" at all; but only the "man" who "worships the beast and his image." And it does not even say that there *is* such a "man:" it says, "IF any man worships," etc. Singular way to describe the punishment of ALL the wicked of earth, when the first man to be punished *is not yet found!* If this Scripture is to be pressed into service to prove the eternal torture of the wicked, it must as certainly fail; for if this is held it is empty; and no probability of any going into it, unless some one should take it into his head to worship the beast and his image, —that is upon the LITERAL interpretation of the text. But with the symbolical view of it—for it is symbolical—it is plain enough. The reason the angel singles out that *special sin* as a condition of entering this place of punishment, and passes over all the other sins of humanity, is that none else will be brought to participate in *the wrath poured out upon this Babylonian harlot,* only those who are associated with her in paying that reverence to the beast, or governments of earth, that they should pay to God. This sin proved the ruin of the church of Rome. She trusted in the arm of the flesh, instead of God; and of such we read: "*Cursed is he that trusteth in man,* or *maketh flesh his arm.*" (Jer. 17:5.)

She was already in this symbolical hell when John saw her. He says: "Babylon is fallen, is fallen!" and that is why it is not repeated here; while in the 18th chapter it is described, as we have seen, when the "*smoke of her torment*" is seen by the kings of the earth. There can be no stronger figures used to indicate the consumption of an object than "fire," "brimstone" and "smoke"; while they would be the most inappropriate to signify "*preservation.*"

Then it says that he, on the condition that he worship the beast and his image, has no rest day nor night. This punishment takes place during the period of *day and night*, which must be in the present condition of things; for when the "new heavens and earth," which John saw, are introduced, there will be *no more* "*night.*" Says Job: "He hath compassed the water with bounds, until the *day and night come to an end.*" (Rev. 22:5; Job 26:10.)

"For ever and ever," do not mean *eternal* only when applied to objects of that character. The Greek words, *aion*, *aionios*, rendered for ever and everlasting, are used in the Bible some two hundred times in a limited sense. They denote the longest duration of that to which they are applied. Says David: The Lord God * * * chose me to be king over Israel *for ever.* This *for ever* was limited by the life of David. Jonah said of his stay in the stomach of the great fish: "The earth with her bars was about me *for ever.*" This *for ever* was three days long. So that when applied to temporal things, these words

run parallel with their existence. When applied to God, angels, and saints in the future *they signify eternity*. If they signify the literal torment of the wicked in this text, and mean *eternal duration*, there will be one of the greatest miracles wrought that old earth has ever witnessed. Now, there *cannot* be smoke and fire without fuel; and all fuel is *combustible* or *burnable;* and it cannot be combustible without being *consumable*. This is the essential property of fuel. Without this property or quality it would not feed the flames, and there would be no fire, and consequently no smoke. *Smoke indicates the consumption of the body from which it proceeds*. There can be no smoke without such consumption. The bodies of the wicked are raised from the dead in a mortal, corruptible state, which, according to this theory, are reunited with their immortal souls, and consigned to these flames as fuel, and the work of burning proceeds. Bear in mind, this is *literal* fire and these are *literal* bodies. How long now will it be until there will be no bodies left to burn? Not very long, it is certain. And now comes the miracle. Nothing short of a miracle, and a miracle at that which taxes our powers of credulity to accept beyond anything in the name of miracles. To make these bodies burn and *smoke, and yet not burn*, and continue this to all eternity, is a miracle, the like of which the Bible contains no record. There will be fire and smoke WITHOUT ANYTHING BEING BURNED! There will be smoke and NOTHING TO CAUSE IT; as these corruptible bodies from miraculous

causes are *incombustible!* What a mystery! We read about the mystery of godliness, the mystery of Babylon, and the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, but this mystery of hell out-mysterys them all! But this idea of the eternal smoke of the wicked *without any consumption* is quite different from David's idea of it. He says: "The wicked SHALL CONSUME; INTO SMOKE SHALL THEY CONSUME AWAY" (Psal. 37: 20). If it should be claimed here in reply to this, that the bodies will consume in this fire, but the souls, being immortal, will live on and *never consume;* we remark that this does not remove the difficulty. For there would be the same *causeless smoke and fire* as before, with the introduction of an additional mystery. There was *nothing* to perpetuate the fire and smoke in the other case, as there was nothing to burn, *unless the bodies of the wicked were being consumed.* But now we have for fuel for this *material fire, immaterial, inorganic, intangible, invisible spirits*, or *ghosts!* Now imagine how this *material* fire will *inflict pain upon immaterialities* when it comes in contact with things that cannot be touched, intangible! As material fire cannot prey upon immaterial objects in any conceivable degree, I fail to see how the literal smoke of the torments of these immaterial, intangible spirits is to ascend up to all eternity! This second mystery is one that I think no metaphysician will attempt the solution of.

We see then that it is impossible for Rev. 14: 10, 11 to apply in a *literal* sense to the eternal torment of the wicked: nor no more will any other text of Scripture referring to the retribution of the wicked apply thus for the same reason. One of two things remains to be done: abandon the idea of *literal fire* as a means of punishment, and *spiritualize* it; or *literalize* the objects upon whom the punishment is to be inflicted. For the above reason the former position has been adopted by some who hold the doctrine of inherent immortality. While they refuse to give up the theory of the immortal, immaterial object of wrath, the sinner, they have endeavored to MYSTIFY the nature of the punishment to suit his condition. So we are gravely told that every time "fire" is mentioned in the Bible in reference to the punishment of the wicked it does not mean "*literal fire*," but signifies *mental anguish*, an *unhappy existence*, in consequence of being under the divine displeasure; that "fire" is *a figure* expressive of *the wrath of God* due the sinner. But with this sort of license what could we not prove from the Scriptures? If every time "fire" is spoken of as a means of punishment due the finally impenitent, it is to be understood in a FIGURATIVE sense; on this same principle what is there to prevent a FIGURATIVE meaning being put upon the object to which that *figurative* "*fire*" is applied? If the "punishment" is *figurative*, *as* surely the subject *of* such punishment must be. For think of "FIGURATIVE fire" BURNING up all the LITERAL PERSONS who

do wickedly, root and branch! (Mal. 4: 1). If "fire" DOES NOT mean "FIRE" in the many places where it is spoken of as the agent of punishment to be inflicted upon the wicked of earth, then "wicked" DOES NOT mean "WICKED;" and we could in this way prove that the wicked would never be punished at all. No, this "figuring" away the punishment of the wicked is all speculation to bolster up the unscriptural doctrine of man's natural immortality, and will not bear the tests of Bible and reason, as we have seen. Prove to me that the retribution of the wicked is a FIGURE, and I will with the same argument and by the same logic, prove that the "wicked" are a FIGURE also. But both the Bible and reason unite in announcing that "fire" is literal as a punishment, and also that the subjects of that punishment are not shadows, or ghosts; but *literal, organic beings;* that they sinned as such and will be punished as such.

The punishment due the wicked ends with the fulfillment of the 20th chapter of Revelation. The 14th and 15th verses close the scenes of executive judgment upon the Devil and his hosts, the "beast" including the Babylonian harlot, the "false prophet"—the adherents of Islamic infidelity, together with all the rest of the wicked of earth. This hell into which all these classes of God's enemies are said to be cast, is termed by the sacred writer, a "lake of fire and brimstone;" and it is located *on the earth* (V. 9), and not in *some subterranean region of mythological fame.* Peter refers to the same

awful retribution of sinners where he says: "The heavens and the earth which are now, by the same word are kept in store, *reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men.*" After this the 20th chapter closes with the wiping out of the curse, by the present earth passing through the great firy ordeal that now awaits her, or unto which she is "reserved" for the perdition of sinners; the 21st chapter opens with "*a new heaven and a new earth.*" The first verse reads: "And I saw a new heaven and a new earth; *for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away;* and there was no more sea." To the same import is 2 Peter, 3:10, 13, which read: "But the day of the Lord will come as the thief in the night; in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise *and the elements shall melt with fervent heat the earth also, and the works that are therein shall be burned up* * * * Nevertheless we according to his promise, look for *a new heaven and a new earth*, wherein dwelleth righteousness." The Greek word, *kainos*, translated "new" in these passages, has also the signification of "*renewed.*" Then read the 10th and 13th vs. of 2 Pet. 3, in the light of vs. 11 and 12, and we see that *dissolution* and *not* annihilation is meant. So say Jamieson, Fausset and Brown, with Clark. (See vs. 5, 6). Say the former upon v. 13: "As the flood was the baptism of the earth, eventuating in a renovated earth, partially delivered from the curse, *so the baptism with fire shall purify the earth so as to be the renovated abode of regenerated man, wholly*

freed from the curse." In describing that new earth Saint John says: "There shall be no more death, sorrow, nor crying, neither pain; for the former things are passed away." There will be *an infinite amount of sorrow, crying, and pain if there is an eternal hell in which the wicked are tortured and tormented during the endless ages to come!* But in this blessed state there will be no Devil, no sin, no sinner, and no death, and consequently no curse; for in it "dwelleth righteousness." The inhabitants of this realm having put on immortality will never say: "I am sick." No more death-bed scenes; no more heart-aches over the loss of dear departed ones; no more graves to weep over, and because of; for "the former things," or things of the former world, "have passed away." What a glory world that will be! Our blessed Father, who loves righteousness and hates iniquity, has omitted nothing in the preparation of that beautiful world, which would make His people comfortable and happy to all eternity. "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him." For the obtainment of this condition of immortal bliss to be manifested, and bestowed upon all the faithful "at the revelation of Jesus Christ," we are urged to "patient continuance in well doing." "Seeing ye look for such thing," said the Apostle, " be diligent that ye may be found of him *in peace, without spot, and blameless.*" And, "Seeing *that all these things shall be dissolved,*

what manner of persons ought ye to be in all holy conversation and godliness, looking for and hasting unto the coming of the day of God." The poet has beautifully expressed the ardent desire that animates the heart of the pilgrim as he looks forth with glad anticipation to that immortal home, in the following stanza:

> "On the banks beyond the stream,
> Where the fields are always green,
> There's no night, but endless day,
> There is where I want to stay.
> There's no pain, no sorrow there,
> There's no parting farewell tear;
> There's no cloud, no darkness there,
> All is bright and clear, and fair."

Having talked at considerable length in previous chapters on the MEANS of obtaining this boon of life and immortality, we did not deem it necessary to say much upon that subject here in the present chapter, our object being mainly to show *when* and *by whom* this is bestowed. In doing this I was conscious of the fact that I had crossed the well beaten track of public opinion; but holding sacred the source and substance of all divine instruction, and esteeming it paramount to this, I have labored to bring before the mind of the reader a great truth that is in the main lost sight of. And knowing too that the presentation of a doctrine so unpopular to minds long accustomed to a belief in the traditional dogma of man's inherent immortality, must awaken feelings of resentment in many instances because of its apparent

novelty, I feel called upon to exercise a due amount of charity toward all such. While not sparing the doctrine, because of its having no foundation whatever in either Reason or Revelation, I have a marked respect for the feelings of those who hold it. If we have held up to view its inconsistencies, it was that people might the more readily be convinced of its untenableness and be the better prepared to accept of the truth. It was not the people but *the error* I was fighting. I love the former but hate the latter. We are counseled to "buy the truth and sell it not." (Prov. 23:23.) Said Jesus to His Father: "*Sanctify them through thy truth: thy word is truth.*" (John 17:17.)

The fact of the second coming Christ being the juncture at which all the faithfnl of earth receive immortality, clothes that event with a sublimity and importance unequaled by the most august occurrence within the history of the human family,—being the time of the consummation of the Christian's hope to which every token in the great economy of a lost world's redemption has significantly pointed. When men's eyes become closed to this fact by accepting a doctrine that counters it, thereby leaving them in darkness with regard to the *time* and *nature* of an event which concerns their eternal welfare as nothing else can, it is but meet that those who know the truth should rise up and declare it "whether they will hear, or whether they will forbear." (Ezek. 2:7).

CHAPTER XI.

SIGNS OF CHRIST'S APPEARING.

"Tell us, when shall these things be? and what shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the world?" (Matt. 24:3.)

Having shown in the two last chapters something of the importance of the return of the Redeemer, from the fact that it is the time of the consummation of the Christian's hope, we will here call attention to some of the signs that were to precede the event, in fulfillment of our Lord's prophecy recorded in the 24th chapter of St. Matthew's Gospel.

That this great event is to take an ungodly world by *surprise finding it in perfect darkness as to the approach of the day of God, when its sin as a monument has reached unto heaven*, the Bible *solemnly affirms*. Said Jesus unto His disciples: "*As it was in the days of Noe, so shall it be also in the days of the Son of man.* They did eat, they drank, they married wives, they were given in marriage, *until the day that Noe entered into the ark, and the flood came and destroyed them all.* Likewise also *as it was in the days of Lot;* they did eat, they drank, they bought, they sold, they planted, they builded; *but the same day that Lot went out of Sodom it rained fire and brimstone from heaven, and destroyed them all.*

Even thus shall it be in the day when the son of man is revealed." (Luke 17:26—30.)

In the face of this certain prediction of a lost world's overthrow, we are told by some who ought to know better, that when that day comes it will find the world converted to God. They say that this is the aim and object of the gospel of Christ; and when it has converted the world then the second coming of the Lord will take place, and not before that. Theories are very well to talk on but they will not do to rest our eternal salvation upon. There is no Bible student that is honest with himself and God who will claim such a doctrine is Biblical. There is *no* place nor passage that says the gospel will convert the world during *any* space of time. If there were it would be a direct contradiction of the Scripture just cited, and the Bible never contradicts itsself; it could not and be true. It is this doctrine of a world's conversion that is rocking thousands to sleep in the cradle of carnal security, imagining, as they are, that all is well when the thunder-bolts of God's wrath are ready to fall upon a sinful race of beings. Saith the Apostle in speaking of this very thing: "Of the times and seasons, brethren, ye have no need that I write unto you. For yourselves know perfectly that the day of the Lord so cometh as a thief in the night. For when they shall say, peace and safety; then sudden destruction cometh upon them as travail upon a woman with child; and they shall not escape." Here we are told *how* that event will be regarded

by the world. They are to talk "peace and safety" just when the judgment day is ready to burst upon them. Just when the impending wrath of an angry God is about to find vent in the demolition of a world of impenitent sinners, they will say, "The promise is of peace and safety." There is no doubt but the world of Noah's day did the same thing. Jesus says: "They *knew not* until the flood came and took them all away." There is no reason why they should not have known; for that was the burden of Noah's message. He warned them of approaching doom; but they heeded it not, and took the consequences. So it is to be when Jesus is revealed from heaven—that event will overtake them as a thief in the night in consequence of their sin and unbelief. While on the other hand, there will be a people *ready and expecting* the event. So the Apostle continues: "*But ye brethren are not in darkness, that that day should overtake you as a thief.* Ye are all the children of the light and the children of the day; *we are not of the night nor of darkness.* Therefore *let us not sleep* as do others, but *let us watch and be sober.*" (1 Thess. 5:1–6). The line of demarkation between the unrighteous and righteous of that time is clearly drawn by the Apostle here. The former are asleep in trespasses and sins in this night of moral darkness. "They that sleep, sleep in the night" (V. 7). And it is not to be expected that a world asleep in sin are going to know anything about the signs that will herald the approach of the Lord and

usher in the eternal day. Such signs may occur on every hand, but to an unbelieving world they would not be signs of that event, and so that day must inevitably steal upon it "as a thief in the night." The Apostle Peter characterized the last days thus: "*There shall come in the last days scoffers, walking after their own lusts, and saying, Where is the promise of his coming? for since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation.*" (2 Pet. 3:3, 4). While God "will show wonders in the heavens above, and signs in the earth beneath," (Acts 2: 19), announcing the approach of the day of retribution, the last day scoffer will see *nothing in them; to him* they are *nothing more than have occurred "since the beginning of the creation."* But to the child of God those signs will be recognized as such.

When the disciples asked the Lord what would be "the sign of" his coming "and of the end of the world," they were instructed in regard to a long series of events that should occur during the gospel Dispensation. These were to be signs to the Church that the end of the age was approaching, as one after another unfolded in verification of the divine prediction. These events were to span the period of His absence dating from the destruction of the temple and city of the Jews, the last of which He told them would be "the sign of man in heaven."

The reader will notice that two questions are asked regarding two events,—the destruction of Jerusalem with its temple, and the second ap-

pearing of the Lord. Some have erroneously inferred that because "the destruction of Jerusalem" is mentioned here by the Savior, that nothing more than that event is meant in the prediction. But the absurdity of such a notion is apparent when we see what the fulfillment of the prediction calls for. The last sign appears with Christ in mid air accompanied by a retinue of holy angels whom He sends forth to gather His elect unto Him (Matt. 24:30, 31), at which time "the resurrection" of the sainted dead takes place. Was this all fulfilled at the destruction of Jerusalem? IN NO SENSE WHATEVER.

Jesus begins the prophecy with the destruction of the Jewish metropolis by Titus, the Roman general (v. 2), and then passes beyond this, enumerating events of the different characters that were to transpire long after Jerusalem was laid in heaps.

By way of guarding His followers, of all periods of the gospel Dispensation, against the flagrant deceptions of anti-Christ, the Savior begins by noting the impositions of false messiahs. "And Jesus answered: *Take heed that no man deceive you. For many shall come in my name, saying, I am Christ; and shall deceive many.*" (Vv. 4, 5). Of these there were a good number. Of noted False Christs Buck in his Theological Dictionary gives twenty-four. As space forbids our entering into detail concerning these, we cannot do much more than give their names and the dates. They were as follows:

1. Caziba or Barchocheba was the first of any note who made a noise in the world. Being dissatisfied with the state of things under Adrian, he set himself up at the head of the Jewish nation, and proclaimed himself their long expected Messiah. They accepted him as such and rebelled against the Romans, and from five to six hundred thousand of the Jews were slain. This was in the former part of the second century.

2. In the reign of Theodosius the younger, A. D. 434, another impostor arose, called Moses Cretensis. He practiced great deception upon the Jews in Crete in the name of the Messiah.

3. In the reign of Justin, A. D. 520, another impostor appeared, who called himself the son of Moses. He greatly troubled the Christians of Arabia, and was captured and slain by the Ethiopian general, Elesban.

4. In the year 529 the Jews set up one Julian for their king; and accounted him their Messiah. They rebelled against the Romans; their Messiah and thousands of them were slain by the army of Justinian.

5. In the year 571 was born Mahomet, in Arabia. At first he professed himself to be the Messiah who was promised to the Jews. "By this means," says Buck, "he drew many of that unhappy people after him."

6. In the year 721, arose another false Messiah in Spain; his name was Serenus. He deceived many.

7. About the year 1137, there appeared one in France, who was put to death and many of those who followed him.

8. In 1138, a false Messiah appeared among the Persians. He was defeated and put to death with many of his followers.

9. In 1157, a false Messiah appeared among the Jews in Cordova, Spain. Many of the Jews believed on him, and as a result nearly all the Jews in that nation were destroyed.

10. In the year 1167, another false Messiah arose in the kingdom of Fez, who brought great persecution upon the Jews.

11. In the same year an Arabian set himself up for the Messiah, and pretended to work miracles. At his own request his head was cut off as a test of his Messiahship. The cheat was discovered by this. His followers were severely punished.

12. Shortly after this a Jew who dwelt beyond the Euphrates called himself the Messiah, and drew multitudes of people after him. He perished and likewise many that followed him.

13. In the year 1174, a magician and false Christ arose in Persia, who was called David Almusser. He pretended he could make himself invisible. He was put to death, and a heavy fine laid upon his Jewish Brethren.

14. In 1176, another false Messiah appeared in Moravia, Austria, after much deception he, too, was detected and put to death.

15. In 1199, one by the name of David el David, appeared in Persia. He rebelled against the king; was captured and beheaded.

16. Another false Messiah appeared in this same century; but the historians take no notice of his name, country, or career. Mr. Buck says that no less than ten false Christs rose in the twelfth century.

17. In 1497, another false Messiah appeared in Spain, by the name of Ismael Sophus. He deluded the Jews, and he with many of them perished.

18. In 1500. Rabbi Lemlem, a German Jew of Austria, declared himself a forerunner of the Messiah, and promised to restore the Jews to their own land.

19. In 1509, one by the name of Pfeffercorn, a Jew of Cologne, Germany, pretended to be the Messiah. He afterwards affected to turn Christian.

20. In 1534, Rabbi Salomo Malcho, claiming to be the Messiah, was burnt at the stake by Charles V, of Spain.

21. In 1615, one appeared in the East Indies, and drew after him many of the Portuguese Jews.

22. In 1624, one in the Low Countries claimed to be the Messiah of the Family of David, and of the line of Nathan. He promised to destroy Rome, and to overthrow the Turkish empire.

23. In 1666, appeared the false Messiah Sabatai Sevi. He deceived many Jews of the East;

being detected turned Mohammedan, and was finally beheaded.

24. In 1682, was the last false Christ that made any considerable following. He was Rabbi Mordecai, a Jew of Germany. (*See Buck's Theol. Dictionary*).

Thus we have noticed twenty-four false Christs who arose from the 2d to the close of the 17th century, in fulfillment of our Lord's prediction.

The next sign noted by the Lord was "wars." He said: "Ye shall hear of wars and rumors of wars;" and then added: "*See that ye be not troubled; for all these things must come to pass, but the end is not yet.* For nation shall rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom." (Vv. 6, 7.

This prediction began to be fulfilled in the wars attending the disintegration of the Roman empire, in which figured the Goths, Franks, Huns, Brittans, Germans, etc., reaching from A. D., 395, the Gothic invasion under Alaric, to the seventh century. And there have been wars over the world during the gospel dispensation. These were predicted to be before the end could come; hence it was said before these came to pass, "the end is not yet."

"*And there shall be famines.* I am indebted to Rev. D. T. Taylor for the information on "famines," "pestilences," and "earthquakes," as recorded in his excellent book, "*The Great Consummation.*"

"A. D. 310, 311. England and Wales swept; starvation carrying off 40,000 persons.

400. Drought so severe that the heavens were like brass. Human flesh was sold in the market for food. In all Europe and a part of Asia and Africa many perished.

534. One of the most distressing famines ever known; continuing for years and causing multitudes to perish.

Famine scourged France in 779, 820, 899 and 1031. In 680, 829, 1031, 1124, and 1175, England was visited by drought and desolated by famine. Men lived on dogs, rats and other unclean animals; dead bodies lay in highways unburied.

1221. Famine devastated all Europe. The living could hardly bury the dead.

1352. This year 900,000 died of starvation in China.

The years 1590, '96, '98 were years of severe famine in Italy, Hungary and parts of Asia.

1764. Heat and drought destroyed the crops in India, and a terrible famine ensued affecting eighty or ninety millions of people; and 35 per cent. or 30,000,000 men, women and children died.

1775. Sixteen thousand persons starved at the Cape de Verde Islands.

1814, '16, '22, and 1831 were famine years in Ireland.

1866. Famine destroyed nearly a million lives in southern India.

"*And pestilences.*" The following are a few out of the many recorded:

"The fear of death was over all men. Property was left uncared for, cattle ran at large, crops perished in the fields. Whole villages were depopulated. Multitudes of houses empty of all their inhabitants, were, when the 'Death' subsided, seen mouldering in ruin. Iceland, Denmark, and Greenland were fatally invaded, and whole colonies perished. Monks and nuns died alone in their hiding places; all business was suspended and towns left deserted. Air and water were poisoned; fish, fowl, and sheep covered with blotches became victims. In England 5,000 sheep died in one pasture; in Spain two-thirds of the people died; in London 50,000 dead bodies were buried in one graveyard; in Lubeck 90,000 died; in Venice 100,000 died; many cities lost nine out of ten of their inhabitants; in no place whether city, town or county, died less than a third of the frightened inhabitants. In some places all died! 'This plague was so great,' wrote Dr. Webster, 'at least half or two-thirds of the human race perished in about eight years.'" This was in the 14th century.

1600. In London alone 36,000 died. In 1611, 200,000 in Constantinople; in 1654 the same number in Moscow; in 1656 an equal number in Naples perished by the plague.

1665. The great plague scourged London this year, and there died in the smitten city 97,306 persons; of these 68,509 were victims to the Oriental plague or "black death." The year

before there were 15,000 deaths; and the following, 12,838 persons died. The mortality bill was swollen to gigantic proportions by the pestilence, and the groans of London filled all the land.

1678. It is said by some authorities that the plague destroyed 4,000,000 lives in Southern Europe and northern Africa.

1719. Aleppo furnished 80,000 victims to the old plague; the next year it visited Marseilles, and from a population of 75,000 it took off 52,000 souls. Men said they saw the angel of death.

1751. This year 200,000 perished by the plague in Constantinople; and in 1775 its victims there were 150,000.

1781. In this year first appeared the dreaded Asiatic cholera.

"*And earthquakes.*" The earthquakes have been many with rapidly increasing occurrence after the Lord's prediction, as the reader can see by this table.

The following tabulation of earthquakes is taken from "*Great Consummation.*"

	Total.	Great.	Number of years.
Those recorded before A. D.....	58	4	1,700
Thence to the end of 9th century.....	197	15	900
Thence to the end of 15th century.....	532	44	600
Thence to the end of 18th century.....	2804	100	300
Thence to end of 1850.....	3240	53	50
	5831	216	.....

"*When ye therefore shall see the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel the prophet,*

stand in the holy place, (whoso readeth, let him understand.") St. Mark says, "*Stand where it ought not*" (Ch. 13:14.) Daniel speaks of this "abomination in Chapters 11:31. and 12:11. It was Papal Rome treading down the people of God, or saints, during the long period of 1,260 years. In the 7th chap. Daniel speaks of it under the figure of a "little horn" power thus: "*I beheld and the same horn made war with the saints, and prevailed against them * * * And he shall wear out the saints of the most High.*" It is estimated that this little horn power, or Papal Rome, during those years of persecution, put to death over 75,000,000 of the true followers of Christ! Truly it was an abomination of the most flagrant character. The desolating work of this abomination began in right earnest in the 6th year of the reign of the Roman Emperor Justinian, which reign commenced in A. D. 527. This Emperor issued a decree in 533 that all persons who would not subscribe to the Catholic faith should be punished as heretics: and thus the abomination was set up and the work of persecution began.

At verse 21, the Lord speaks of this tribulation on his followers, and at verse 22, says that these days of tribulation would "be shortened" for the elect's sake. This was the effect of the great Reformation of the 16th century. The tribulation did not cease with the advent of the Reformation; but this was eventually effected as a result. The Reformation was the agency by which God shortened that tribulation; and

He did shorten it, until in the latter part of the 18th century Rome had power in no nation on earth to punish heretics. The historian says that in the 18th century the *Auto da fe* (burning of heretics) became rare. Germany abolished the Inquisition in 1748-50, and France abolished torture in 1776. Says Rev. D. T. Taylor: "As a punishment for heresy, no power or nation made use of torture after the middle of the 18th century." Thus the tribulation ended.

"Immediately after the tribulation of those days shall the sun be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven." These are the next notable events in the series. They must follow in close succession to the ending of the tribulation, according to the prediction. In the year 1780, on May 19th, there was a supernatural obscuration of the sun. The phenomenon was general. The same night the moon was darkened after rising clear and bright. Whether this was the fulfillment of the prediction or not, the *future* will disclose. However it came in the right time to answer the demands of the prophecy. So significant is this triple omen, solar, lunar, and stellar, that it is recorded in sacred prophecy nine times, all referring to the second coming of the Lord. They are as follows:

"Behold, the day of the Lord cometh, cruel both with wrath and fierce anger, to lay the land desolate; and he shall destroy the sinners thereof out of it. For the stars of heaven and the constellations thereof shall not give their

light: the sun shall be darkened in his going forth, and the moon shall not cause her light to shine." (Isah. 13:9, 10). "The sun and the moon shall be dark, and the stars shall withdraw their shining." "The sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood, before the great and terrible day of the Lord come." "The sun and the moon shall be darkened, and the stars shall withdraw their shining." (Joel 2:10, 31; 3:15). "Immediately after the tribulation of those days shall the sun be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven." (Matt. 24:29). "But in those days, after the tribulation, the sun shall be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars of heaven shall fall." (Mark. 13:24, 25). "And there shall be signs in the sun, and in the moon, and in the stars." (Luke 21:25). "The sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood, before the great and notable day of the Lord come." (Acts 2:20). "And I beheld when he had opened the sixth seal, and, lo, there was a great earthquake; and the sun became black as sackcloth of hair, and the moon became as blood; and the stars of heaven fell unto the earth, even as a fig tree casteth her untimely figs, when she is shaken of a mighty wind." (Rev. 6:12, 13).

All these utterances are predictions of the same events, and *mean* something. These sacred writers all agree in placing these three signs, celestial, just before the coming of Christ in judgment. Neither can these be so explained as

to admit of a different fulfillment; therefore we must look for a darkening of the literal sun, and moon, and the falling of the stars—not the great planets—a thing absurd to suppose,—but meteoric stars in amplitude at one time, as John describes them when he says, "The stars of heaven fell unto the earth, even as a fig tree casteth her untimely figs, when she is shaken of a mighty wind." This prediction was markedly fulfilled in the year 1833, the night of November 13th. It was a shower of meteoric stars which continued to fall until morning; and so forcibly did they impress the beholder that it was the general opinion that the judgment day had come, the same as did the darkening of the sun and moon on the date above referred to, when there was no eclipse; but the sun grew dark in the heavens until it became necessary at mid-day to light candles; and at night after the full moon rose it presented to the beholder more the appearance of a "bowl of blood" than of any thing else. John says, "The moon became *as blood*." In a short time a pall of utter darkness spread itself over the world of nature, reminding people of the night of death; and many opened their Bibles at Matt. 24:29 and read this prophecy, thinking it fulfilled then.

If these signs were not fulfilled in the phenomena above referred to, and remain to take place yet in the future, then they will not be "*immediately after* the tribulation of those days," marking the career of that Papal abomination, the last

vestige of which disappeared in the 18th century, as we have already observed.

The next great event following those was to be the "*shaking of the powers of the heavens.*" "*And the powers of the heavens shall be shaken.*" This must necessarily be literal like the others; for we could not expect to find the literal and the symbolical crowded together in one verse as part of the same series. And then we find just such an event predicted elsewhere demanding a literal interpretation. Says the Apostle Paul: "But now he hath promised, saying, Yet once more I shake not the earth only, *but also heaven.* And this word, Yet once more signifieth the removing of those things that may be shaken, as of things that are made, that those things which cannot be shaken may remain." (Heb. 12:26, 27).

Following this sign is the last one. "*And then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven;*" and in consequence we read: "*Then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn;*" and then the crowning event is witnessed by a terrorized humanity: "*And they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory.*" (Verse 30.) The next verse tells what follows.

Now, right at this point in the prophecy Jesus carries the mind back to the preceding events, and says: Now learn a parable of the fig tree; When his branch is yet tender, and putteth forth leaves, ye know that summer is nigh: so likewise ye, when ye shall see all these things,

know that it (he, *margin*) is near, even at the doors." (Vv. 32, 33). Then if we are to learn any thing from this language it is that a knowledge of the coming of Christ is obtainable on the part of God's people. "Know that it is near, even at the doors," means that those individuals were to not be in darkness in reference to their proximity to the event. So near was it that the next verse reads: "Verily I say unto you, *This generation shall not pass, till all these things be fulfilled.*" Some have thought he had reference to *the generation living when he uttered the prophecy.* But this could not be, for the reason that it would put the second coming of Christ, the judgment day, and resurrection of the dead, *all in that generation;* and who is prepared for the conclusion? We have shown that all the signs predicting his return were *this side* of that generation, beginning with the "false Christs," not one of which appeared until the second century.

The word translated "generation" is "*genea,*" and while it is used to express the average of human life, *32* or *33 years*, the longest period it is made to cover is *100 years.* Says Robinson, in N. T. Greek Lexicon: "The ancient Hebrews at first reckoned the generation *at a hundred years;* see Gen. 15:16, compare v. 13 and Exo. 12:40." If this is the sense in which the Savior intended to use it in the above text—and it doubtless is—then the generation that saw the falling of the stars (1833) has not passed away yet.

When Jesus Christ sets His seal to any thing, who dares to gainsay it? He has given this line of prophecy for the special benefit of His Church, that they might know something of their whereabouts in the dispensation of time; and for men to say that no one can learn *anything about the nearness of that event*, is to impeach the testimony of Him who spoke as never man did.

A readiness to meet that event is enjoined by the Lord. He says: "*Therefore be ye also ready: for in such an hour as ye think not the Son of man cometh.*" (V. 44). It is hard for any one to be ready for something that he does not expect is going to happen. And if the Church of God is asleep to the coming of her Lord and Master, how can she be ready for that event? So important is this special truth in the economy of grace for that time, that he who heeds and teaches it is considered a faithful and wise servant. Verses 45, and 46 read: "*Who then is a faithful and wise servant*, whom his Lord hath made ruler over his household, *to give them meat in due season? Blessed is that servant, whom his Lord when he cometh shall find so doing.*" This doubtless has reference to the pastor, or shepherd, whose work is to "feed the flock of God" (1 Pet. 5:2), giving "meat in due season." No minister of the gospel can do his duty and stand acquitted before God, who ignores a subject of such gravity as the return of the Redeemer. The blood of souls will be upon him.

Another marked sign of our nearness to the coming of the Lord is that which is predicted in the 12th verse. It reads: *Because iniquity shall abound, the love of many shall wax cold.*" So nearly has the church lost sight of this polestar of the Christian's hope that she sees no beauty in it and has no desire for it, and is adrift upon the sea of time without any knowledge whatever of her whereabouts. Dangerous! dangerous is her course indeed. She bids fair to be wrecked upon the rocks of unbelief and worldly conformity. She has found a grand substitute for the return of her Lord *in the event of death, and has "made a covenant" therewith* (Isah. 28:15), thinking she can obtain eternal life independent of his coming. Her attitude toward the Lord's return is befittingly told by the poet in the following lines:

"Thy very church her portion
And calling hath forgot,
And seeks for ease and glory
Where thou, her Lord, art not.

Immers'd in sloth and folly,
Thy servants, Lord, we see;
And few of us stand ready
With joy to welcome thee."

"When the son of man cometh shall he find faith on earth?" (Luke 18:8), finds a negative response in the religious status of the nominal church of our time. Judging from the little hold the church has upon the unsaved world, sceptics have concluded that Christianity is a failure. But Christianity is not a failure; while humanity is a failure, and the religious profes-

sion of our time is a failure in the main. As far as the church fails to make herself felt in the world for God and good, just that far is she a failure. And who does not know that the church is shorn of the power to convert the unsaved masses?

The return of Christ is as unwelcome a theme to the church of the present day as is the doctrine of holiness. As we have observed in a previous chapter concerning the latter, it is not preached from the popular pulpits; and as much can be said of the former. Whoever hears the 24th chapter of Matthew, the 13th of Mark, or the 21st of Luke's Gospel discoursed upon from the pulpits of our time, unless it be an effort to put the fulfillment of this prophecy in the past at the destruction of Jerusalem, or in the remote future? This most sublime of subjects is a very unwelcome one to the worldly minded of the different communions; they do not want to hear about it. Does it not look a little as though the parable of Luke 19:12–15 had application to some extent here? In this parable Jesus has reference to his own departure and return. He says: "A certain nobleman went into a far country to receive for himself a kingdom, and to return * * * *But his citizens hated him*, and sent a messenger after him, *saying, We will not have this man to reign over us.*" When people get to where they *prefer the reign of sin and death* to that of Jesus Christ, it looks very much as though they had been hinted at in this parable, whoever they are. Inasmuch as

they do not want Him to return, they evidently *do not intend to "have this man to reign over" them.*

But let us look for an instant at the attitude of those devoted to God and His cause. The 21st chapter of Luke is a record of the same prophecy we have in this 24th chapter of Matt. The 28th verse of it reads: "*When these things begin to come to pass,* THEN LOOK UP, AND LIFT UP YOUR HEADS; *for your redemption draweth nigh.*" This thought is voiced again by the Apostle Peter, where he says: *Wherefore gird up the loins of your mind, be sober and hope to the end for the grace that is to be brought unto you at the revelation of Jesus Christ.*" (1 Pet. 1: 13.) In chapter 3rd of 2nd Pet., at vv. 11 and 12, we read in regard to the same event: "*Seeing then that all these things shall be dissolved, what manner of persons ought ye to be in all holy conversation and godliness, looking for and fasting unto the coming of the day of God.*"

Not only are there signs in the physical and religious worlds, but in the moral, political, and social. One of the last day's tokens is the rapid increase of crime. The Apostle said: "*Evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived.*" (2 Tim. 3: 13.) The criminal record of to-day is unequaled by any thing of the kind in modern times. This fact will not be disputed by any candid reader of the public press. While there is among the nations of earth much distress and perplexity (Luke 21: 25), in view of anticipated national calamities. In harmony with the anciently

uttered prophecy of Joel, the nations are unconsciously getting ready for the sanguinary conflict; "the mighty men" are being woke up on the subject of war. (See Joel 3: 9—15.) Says Daniel in reference to this great national revolution: "At that time shall Michael stand up, the great prince which standeth for the children of thy people: *and there shall be a time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation even to that same time.*" (Dan. 12: 1.)

Evangelistically and lastly. Verse 14: "*This gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations; and then shall the end come.*" It is claimed that the Word of God is translated into all the living dialects of earth, and preached by missionary agents and others to all, or, in all the nations. It is to be preached as a witness against those nations, and not as an agency assuring their conversion. On this text Rice says: "The gospel is to be preached as a testimony *to* all nations, proving that salvation is offered; a testimony *against* them, if they refuse its offers. (Compare Acts 13:46; 28:28; Matt. 21:43.) Christ does not here say that the gospel will be *received* by all nations, but *only that it shall be preached to all nations.*" (*People's Commentary on Matthew.*) In no period of the world's history when any great calamity was impending has God omitted to give warning of the same. He warned the antediluvian world, also Sodom and Gomorrah, Nineveh, Babylon, and Jerusalem. And think you He

will not give warning to the nations of the world when the greatest of all events is about to visit this earth?

We have given in brief a few out of the many signs of our Lord's appearing. To enumerate them all would take volumes. We will now leave the theme, hoping these will suffice to awaken in the minds of many a desire to go much farther into so laudible a subject of investigation as is this of coming deliverance.

In closing this volume we would say to the candid reader, that it has been our object in writing this book to present to such, truths calculated of God to separate the mind from the lusts and follies of this ungodly world and set it upon things above where Christ is seated at the right hand of God, and thus inspire an ardent longing for the greatest gift heaven has ever vouchsafed to confer upon mortal man, to be realized "when Christ, who is our life shall appear," as then shall we also "appear with him in glory." (Col. 3:1-4). This is more than bank-stocks, merchandise, or all else that the world holds out as allurements to tempt men; for what will these amount to when the time comes to part with them? A narrow place in the earth is the most that the richest can claim when Death knocks at their doors. They then must part with Time's much coveted treasures, and bid a reluctant farewell to these their tutelary gods of imagination, to "go the way of all the earth." In this book we have tried to point

the reader to the true riches;—riches that will never fade away, or be separated from their possessor because of death.

To so live and do as to meet the approval of our God, and to receive immortality and an never ending life when the history of this eventful world is completed, whether we fall asleep or remain awake till then, is what I consider the true ideal of the present life. This is the grand outcome of all this life on earth means to us. This life spent in securing that of the world of eternal fruition, then, is its "True Philosophy." That writer and reader may obtain that glorious boon with all it means, is our prayer in concluding. Amen.

"Our Savior once more upon earth shall appear,
In person as lit'ral as when he was here;
The clouds are his chariot, and glory his throne;
Whilst myriads of angels his majesty own.

Ten thousand bright saints with the Lord shall descend,
Their strains of hosannas the heavens shall rend;
Whilst the angels who sang the glad song of his Birth,
Shall gather his saints from the ends of the earth.

The kingdom shall come, and the graves shall give way,
And his saints be redeemed from their prison of clay;
For the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall come forth,
From the east, from the west, from the south, from the north.

All the nations of men are before him conveyed,
His bar of tribunal in justice arrayed;
Each tongue shall confess, whilst the Judge on the throne,
Shall the wicked condemn, and acknowledge his own.

Each eye shall behold him, in awful attire,
The saints shall be glad, and their Savior admire;
Whilst those who condemn him to die on the tree,
Shall wail, when that glorious Messiah they see.

'Twill comfort the saints to reflect on the day,
When sorrow and sighing shall vanish away ;
When they shall be crown'd with heaven's great prize,
And all tears shall forever be wiped from their eyes.

These bodies, though vile, shall be fashioned aright,
And robed in a costume of glory and light ;
On pinions immortal we'll rise at his word,
'And so shall we ever be with the Lord.'

The world shall be burned, and all Nature dissolve,
The earth on its axis shall cease to revolve ;
Whilst the heavens roll'd up, shall depart as a scroll,
And the stars into regions of darkness shall fall.

Creation, convulsed to her centre, shall quake,
At his voice the foundations of heaven shall shake ;
The sun and the moon shall grow dim with dismay,
And the earth, as at present, shall vanish away.

But celestial heavens and earth shall be made,
All garnished with glory, that never shall fade ;
The redeemed shall rejoice in that blissful abode,
Where sorrow shall never their pleasure corrode.

Unpolluted by sin, and unhurt by disease,
With their ensign of triumph, unfurl'd in the breeze ;
A crown of bright glory they ever shall wear,
And palm-wreaths of honor, triumphantly bear !

A convoy of angels, all akin to his fold,
Shall escort them safe home to that city of gold ;
Transform'd like the Savior, secure from all pain,
In his glorified presence forever to reign.

But the wicked shall sink into darkness and gloom,
Everlasting destruction,—their sentence and doom ;
From the presence of God and the Lamb they shall flee,
And the glory of heaven they never shall see.

The remedial kingdom shall come to an end,
And the sceptre of pardon—no longer extend ;
Death spoil'd of his trophies, all vanquish'd shall fall,
The saints saved in glory, and *God all in all.*''

Finis.

BT78

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 007 887 625 6