

AN ANTHOLOGY OF PRIMITIVE BAPTIST LITERATURE	10
Acknowledgments.....	10
Foreword.....	11
The Power Of Love - Sam Bryant	14
Abel.....	32
Abijah - Sylvester Hassell.....	33
Absolutism	33
Absolutism: The fatal connection - Harold Hunt.....	36
Absolutism: Objections - C. H. Cayce.....	51
Acts - The Book of - Sylvester Hassell.....	54
Acts 4:28 - Harold Hunt.....	55
Adams Transgression - Harold Hunt	72
Adoption	92
Adultery	105
Agent, Free Moral.....	126
Ahaz	127
Ahaziah	127
Albertus Magnus.....	129
Albigenses, The.....	129
Alexander	130
Alexandria, The Academy Of.....	130
Allah.....	131
Amaziah	132
Ammonius Saccas.....	132
Amon.....	132
Anabaptists.....	132
Anselm	132
Antinomianism.....	133
Antiochus IV, Epiphanes	133
Apocrypha, The.....	135
Apostolic Succession	136
Aquinas, Thomas	137
Archaeology, Biblical	137
Arianism.....	140
Arius.....	140
Ark Of The Covenant, The	140
Arminianism	140
Arminius, James.....	141
Arnold of Brescia and The Arnoldists	143
Asa	143
Associations	144
Athaliah.....	146
Atonement.....	146
Augustine, St. of Hippo	184
Augustinianism	184
Azariah.....	184

Babylonian Captivity (of the Popes).....	184
Baptism	184
Baptism, Authority to.....	192
Baptism, Burial in	194
Baptism, Infant.....	195
Baptism, John's	197
Baptism, Two Kinds of.....	198
Baptism: Believers the Proper Subjects	199
Baptism: Christ's Marriage to the Church.....	211
Baptism: Immersion the Mode.....	212
Baptism: The Purpose	221
Baptist Church, First in America	229
Baptist: Origin of the Name	230
Baptists, Strict.....	231
Baptists, The: Their Origin	232
BERNARD of France	233
Beza, Theodore	233
Bible, The.....	233
Black Death, The	281
Black Rock Address, The	282
Boleyn, Anne	299
Boniface	299
Boniface VIII, Pope	301
Browne, Robert and the Brownists	303
Bullinger, Henry	303
Burning Bush, The	303
Cain.....	304
Calvin, John	305
Campbell, Thomas and Alexander.....	348
Campbellism	349
Canaan, The Land of.....	406
Carey, William.....	408
Carlstadt	408
Cassian, John.....	408
Cathari, The.....	408
Catherine of Aragon.....	408
Chalcedon, The Council of	409
Charlemagne	409
Charles Martel.....	410
Christ - Introduction.....	411
Christ - Part 1 - The Offices of Christ.....	413
Christ: The Surety of the Covenant.	433
Christ: Our Intercessor.....	450
Christ - Part 2 - Our Prophet, Priest and King	461
Christ - Part 2 - Our Prophet, Priest and King	473
Christ - Part 3 - Christ's Humiliation	515

Christ - Part 4 - Christ's Exaltation	604
Christ, Jesus	638
Christmas	638
Christ's Person and Work.....	639
Chrysostom, John.....	639
Church Decorum, Rules of	639
Church of England, The.....	639
Church of Scotland, The	643
Church, The.....	643
Clark, John	670
Clement	670
Colossians, The Book of	670
Communion.....	671
Conservatism vs Liberalism.....	746
Constantine	752
Consubstantiation.....	757
Conversion	757
Corinthians, The Books of 1st and 2nd.....	765
Cornelius	765
Councils	767
Counseling	768
Covenanters, The	774
Covenants, The	774
Church COVENANT	808
Crandall, John	808
Create	808
Crusades, The.....	809
Darkness at the Crucifixion of Christ, Three Hours	812
David.....	813
Deacon, The, And His Duties	814
Debates.....	822
Depravity, Total	822
Dichotomy.....	831
Dinosaurs	831
Discipline	831
Divorce and Remarriage	831
Docetism	832
Donation, The, of Pepin	832
Donatists	832
Donatus and the Donatists	832
Dualism	834
Duns Scotus	834
Ebionites	834
Eck, John.....	834
Eckhart	834
Ecolampadius, John	834

Election and Predestination.....	835
Eliakim.....	847
England, The Church of.....	847
Ephesians, The Book of.....	847
Epistles, The.....	848
Erasmus, Desiderius.....	851
Eternal Children.....	852
Eternal Vital Union.....	852
Eusebius.....	853
Eutyches and Eutychianism.....	853
Evolution.....	853
Faith.....	873
Feast Days, The, Under The Law Of Moses.....	881
Feet Washing.....	886
Fellowship.....	888
Fig Tree, The.....	897
Figures.....	897
First Conventicle Act, The.....	901
Five Points of Calvinism, The.....	903
Flagellants, The.....	904
Flaming Sword, The.....	905
Flood, The Genesis.....	906
Foreign Missions.....	910
Fornication.....	919
Four Hundred Years Affliction, The.....	921
Foxes, John, Book of Martyrs.....	922
Frederick Barbarossa.....	922
Frederick Elector of Saxony.....	922
Free Moral Agency.....	922
Freemasonry.....	926
Friends, The.....	927
Fuller, Andrew.....	927
Future Identity.....	932
Galatians, The Book Of.....	932
Genesis, The Book Of.....	933
Gnosticism.....	934
Gospel Ministry, The.....	935
Gospel, The.....	935
Gospels, The Four.....	965
Great Western Schism, The.....	967
Gregory I.....	970
Heaven, Eternal.....	971
Heaven: High and Low Seats.....	973
Hebrews, The Book Of.....	974
Hell, Eternal.....	975
Henry IV, Emperor of Germany.....	984

Henry of Lausanne, and The Henricians.....	984
Henry VIII.....	984
Henry, Matthew	985
Henry, Patrick, And The Baptists	985
Heresy	986
Herod The Great	987
Hezekiah	991
Hildebrand.....	992
History Of The Church	994
Holmes, Obadiah.....	1041
Holy Orders.....	1041
The HUMANITY of Christ.....	1042
Huss, John.....	1043
Iconoclastic Controversy, The	1044
I AM, The Great.....	1045
Immaculate Conception, The	1046
Immortality Of The Soul.....	1046
Incarnation, The	1047
Independents, The	1055
Infant Salvation.....	1056
Infralapsarianism.....	1058
Innocent III.....	1058
Inquisition, The	1058
Inquisition, The Spanish	1060
Interdict, The.....	1061
Investitures, The Controversy of.....	1061
Invitation System, The	1061
Islam.....	1061
Israel, The Kingdom Of	1061
James, The Book of.....	1063
Jansenists.....	1064
Jehoahaz	1064
Jehoiachin	1064
Jehoiada.....	1064
Jehoiakim	1064
Jehoram	1065
Jehoshaphat	1066
Jeremiah	1067
Jerome of Prague.....	1069
Jerome Savonarola	1071
Jerusalem, The Fall Of.....	1071
Jesuits, The.....	1081
Jesus Christ	1085
Jews, Natural and Spiritual Jews	1086
Joash.....	1086
John of Damascus	1086

John, First, Second and Third	1086
John, The Apostle	1087
Joseph.....	1099
Josiah.....	1099
Jotham.....	1100
Judah, The Tribe Of	1100
Judas Iscariot.....	1101
Jude, The Book Of	1102
Justification	1102
Justification By Works.....	1131
Justinian	1132
Keys of the Kingdom, The.....	1132
Kiffin, William.....	1133
Knights Templar, The Order Of.....	1134
Knollys, Hanserd.....	1134
Law of God, The	1135
Luther, Martin	1170
Magna Charta, The.....	1171
Malachi	1171
Manasseh.....	1172
Manichaeism, Manichaeus and.....	1172
Marah, The Waters of	1173
Martel, Charles.....	1173
Massachusetts, Persecution in.....	1174
Mattaniah	1175
Mayflower, The.....	1175
Melanchthon, Philip.....	1175
Melchizedek	1176
Menno Simmons	1185
Mercy	1186
Messiah, Old Testament Views Of The.....	1186
Messianic Prophecy	1188
Ministry, Support Of The.....	1191
Ministry, The Gospel	1191
Mohammed and Islam.....	1195
Monergism	1199
Monophysitism	1199
Montanism	1199
Moon, The.....	1200
Moral Agent, Free.....	1201
Mordecai	1201
Moses	1201
Munster Rebellion, The	1202
Munzer, Thomas	1203
Musical Instruments.....	1203
Natural Man, The	1203

Nehemiah	1204
Neo-Platonism.....	1205
Nero, The Roman Emperor.....	1206
Nestorianism	1207
Nestorius	1207
Nestorius and Nestorianism	1207
New Wine, New Bottles	1207
Newton, Sir Isaac	1208
Nice, Council of (or Nicea).....	1209
Ninety-Five Theses	1209
Northern Kingdom, The.....	1209
Novatian and the Novatianists	1209
Pantaenus	1212
Pardon of Sin, The	1212
Pascal, Blaise	1236
Passover, The	1237
Paul, The Apostle.....	1246
Peasants' War, The.....	1259
Pelagianism	1259
Pentecost	1262
Pentecostalism.....	1262
Pepin, The Donation Of.....	1263
Persecution by Roman Emperors.....	1263
Peter Lombard.....	1266
Peter of Bruys and the Petrobrusians	1266
Peter The Hermit.....	1267
Peter The Venerable.....	1267
Peter, The Apostle.....	1267
Peter, The Books of 1st and 2nd	1269
Petrobrusians.....	1270
Pharisees	1270
Philemon, The Book Of	1271
Philippians, The Book Of	1271
Philo	1271
Philpot, J. C.....	1271
Pilgrim Fathers, The.....	1273
Pliny	1273
Plotinus	1276
Pope Eugenius III.....	1276
Pope of Rome, The	1276
Pope, The Temporal Power Of The	1277
Porphyry.....	1278
Preservation of the Saints, The	1279
Priesthood, The Mosaic	1288
Progressivism.....	1290
Prophets, The	1292

Propitiation, Atonement, and Reconciliation.....	1293
Protestant Reformation, The	1304
Protestant, The Term.....	1307
Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals, The	1307
Public Offences	1308
Public Opinion	1308
Punishment, Eternal	1308
Puritans, The	1308
Quakers, The	1309
Redemption	1310
Redemption, Arguments Against Universal	1319
Redemption, Particular	1326
Redemption, The Causes Of	1327
Redemption, The Objects Of	1337
Regeneration	1344
Rehoboam	1346
Remonstrants, The	1347
Repentance	1347
Representative Principle, The	1347
Resurrection, The.....	1348
Revelation, The Beasts Of The	1357
Revelation, The Book Of	1363
Reverend	1364
Richard Coeur-De-Lion King of England.....	1365
Robinson, John.....	1365
Romans, The Book Of	1365
Sabbath, The	1365
Sabbaths, Multiple	1370
Sacraments, The	1371
Sacrifices of The Mosaic Law, The Different	1372
Saint Peter's Cathedral	1375
Samaria And The Samaritans.....	1376
Satisfaction.....	1377
Saul of Tarsus	1407
Saul, King	1407
Scapegoat, The.....	1408
Scholastic Theology.....	1408
Schoolmen, The	1409
Scottish Covenanters, The	1409
Second Century, The.....	1409
Secret Societies	1411
Selah.....	1445
Semi-Pelagianism	1446
Servetus, Michael.....	1446
Shiloh	1446
Simmons, Menno	1446

Sin Unto Death, The	1446
Six Hundred and Sixty-six	1463
Sodom and Gomorrah	1463
Solomon	1464
Solomon's Temple spiritualized	1466
Sons of God, The	1468
Soul	1469
Soul of Man, The	1469
Spanish Inquisition, The	1470
Staupitz, John	1470
Strict Baptists	1470
Sublapsarianism (Infralapsarianism)	1470
Sunday Schools	1470
Supererogation, Works of	1471
Supralapsarianism	1471
Synergism	1472
Tabernacle, The: Symbolism	1473
Tables Of Stone, The: Symbolism	1475
Tempt	1475
Ten Virgins, The	1475
Tertullian	1477
Tetzel, John	1478
Theodore	1478
Thessalonians, The Books of 1st and 2nd	1478
Thomas A Beckett	1478
Thomas Aquinas	1479
Three Hours Darkness	1479
Time Salvation	1479
Torquemada, Thomas de	1514
Total Depravity	1514
Trajan	1521
Transubstantiation	1521
Trichotomy	1521
Trinity, The	1521
TWELVE and TWENTY, The Numbers (in Combination)	1568
Twelve Marks, The	1568
Two Seed Doctrine	1568
Ussher's Chronology	1573
Uzziah	1573
Virgin Birth, The	1574
Waldenses	1575
Wartburg, The Castle Of	1579
Welch Tract Church, The	1579
Wesley, John	1580
Whitefield, George	1581
Will, The or Free Agency	1584

Works of Supererogation	1591
Worms, Diet Of.....	1614
Wycliffe, John.....	1614
Zedekiah.....	1618
Zwingli, Ulrich.....	1619

AN ANTHOLOGY OF PRIMITIVE BAPTIST LITERATURE

**and Literature Reflecting
Primitive Baptist Thought
Conservative, Biblical,
and as doctrinally sound
as we know how to make it**

2004

**Elder Harold Hunt, Editor
2516 E. Clark Ave.
Maryville, TN 37804**

Acknowledgments

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

It is customary in a work like this to make some acknowledgments, and it is certainly proper that I should do so. The first is to my wife, Doris, who, for almost fifty years now, has either been left feeling neglected, while I buried myself in my studies, or she has been left at home feeling abandoned, while I traveled to parts unknown, preaching for the Primitive Baptists. What a Godsend she has been to me. I shudder to think where I would be today, if God had not provided me with her. Much of the credit for this work goes to her, for those countless hours she has spent doing chores that were properly mine, while I buried myself in this work. There are our four children, Stewart, Suzanne, Sophia, and Rachel, who have never received as much of my time and attention as they properly deserved. There are the Primitive Baptists themselves, who

long ago took me in, and for over forty years have generally overlooked my shortcomings. And there is my special friend, Brother Tom Hagler, whose generosity has made this work financially possible.

Elder Harold Hunt

Foreword

FOREWORD

Our Primitive Baptists have a rich heritage of literature on a wide range of subjects. In an unpublished manuscript, Elder David Pyles makes the comment, “On points of emphasis and on methods of explanation, I have long preferred the Primitive Baptists of the 19th century over any generation of Christians since the Apostles.” I would probably expand that expression to take in the early 20th century, but I agree entirely. In the first century and a half after America gained her independence our people produced some of the brightest minds the Lord’s church has known. Blessed with a hitherto unknown freedom of religion, and liberty of free speech, those brethren soared to heights previously unknown in their examination of God’s Word.

We call to mind names like Sylvester Hassell, Claud Cayce, T.S. Dalton, James Oliphant, Joseph Newman, John R. Daily, Walter Cash, and John Clark. The list goes on and on and on. Those are not the best known names among the denominational world, but for true insight into the most profound of Bible subjects, they leave the John Calvin’s, the Martin Luther’s, and the Augustus Strong’s in the dust. None of them were such linguists and rabbinical scholars as John Gill, and J. B. Lightfoot, but for sound and accurate explanations of Bible principles, not even the great Gill could keep up. We are not likely to see their kind again.

It is the great tragedy of our age that so few of our people are acquainted with the work of those men. A few days ago in talking to one of our young ministers, I mentioned the name Claud Cayce. He wanted to know, “Who is he; I never heard of him.” The brother is one of our brightest and best, and I certainly mean no reflection on him, but I fear that is the case with more of our young generation than we have been aware. They are well acquainted with writers like Arthur Pink, and John MacArthur, and John Piper, but they never heard of those able Primitive Baptist ministers of the past, who had far more insight into God’s Word than any of those writers ever had.

At the present time our people are being torn apart by a Calvinist\ Liberal Movement from one direction, and a Pseudo-Conservative Movement from the other direction. Between those two extremes are the other eighty percent of solid, conservative Primitive Baptists, who are still faithful to the Bible, and faithful to those unchangeable principles that have guided our people for two thousand years now. Truth will prevail; it always has; but we would be so much better prepared if our people were as well acquainted with our literary heritage today as we were, when I first came among the Primitive Baptists over forty years ago.

It is our purpose in this work to assemble as wide a range of quotes and articles from those men as we can put together. We have arranged the material alphabetically by topics for ease of reference. We hope that will be a benefit.

I gave up my secular employment over seventeen years ago. During most of those seventeen years I have been gathering this material. There have been numerous interruptions, but I have been working at the project regularly for the last ten years. And for the last two or three years, I have done little else.

There is a good supply of material to work with. I have a fairly large personal library. It fills one eight by ten feet book case, and eight other average size cases. I am an early riser; I usually get up by 5 o'clock every morning, and I spend most of the day in my study, much of it working on this project.

Until recently our people were in possession of "the finest collection of free grace literature to be found anywhere in the world." It contained several thousands of titles. I had hoped, that when I had exhausted my own resources, I could access that library.

It was a shock to discover that, at the very time we needed access to those books, they had been secretly sold—sold that is, without the knowledge or consent of the people who put up virtually all the money for their maintenance and preservation.

But what is done, is done. There is nothing to be gained by continuing to complain over what could not be prevented, and cannot be undone. I have heard it said that, "It is better to light a single candle, than to curse the darkness." This project is my *single candle*. I hope it will help to move the darkness just a little.

We are printing one volume at a time. For one thing, I do not want one shipment of thousands of books set off on my back porch the same day. At the time we are printing this first volume, we cannot know for sure whether there will be eight

volumes, or perhaps, ten. There will be at least eight volumes in this first printing.

We want to make the books available to everyone who is interested. We have received some generous financial assistance, which will allow us to sell the earliest printings at roughly half of the actual cost of production. We will do that until our resources are exhausted. From that point we will have to continue, as we always have, trusting God to make a way.

If you see the need for such a work as this, there are several ways in which you can help, and we certainly request the assistance of all those who love the Lord, and who love the truth of his word.

First, as you might imagine, this work is too overwhelming for any one person. We invite every reader to join us in searching the writings of ours and previous generations, looking for material that needs to be considered for future editions of this work. If you have an old Primitive Baptist book you think I should read, I would be glad to borrow it, or, if the price is reasonable, and I do not already have the same book, I would like to buy it.

And, very importantly, we want every person, who is willing to do so, to go carefully over this work. We will always have differences of opinion; we cannot expect to agree on the explanation of every passage. But if you find any expression, or any point of view, that you feel is fundamentally unsound, we hope you will call it to our attention. We cannot promise to make every change suggested, but we will give the matter our serious consideration.

On our title page we use the expression, "Conservative, Biblical, and as doctrinally sound as we know how to make it." We are serious about that pledge, and we solicit the help of every reader in achieving that goal. We want this work to be as dependable a presentation of Primitive Baptist conservatism as our people are able to produce. We are already working on the Second Edition, and we will send it to the printer as soon as this printing is exhausted. With your faithful assistance we expect the next edition to be improved and more comprehensive than this one.

More than that we request your prayers for this endeavor. There is no way we could have come this far without the Lord's help.

Elder Harold Hunt

The Power Of Love - Sam Bryant

PREFACE

The following sermon was delivered by Elder Sam Bryant at the 2002 Smoky Mountain Spring Meeting. It expresses my sentiments so much better than I can, that I asked for his permission to use it as the preface for this *Anthology*. Hlh

THE POWER OF LOVE

It is a great joy to be here at this meeting. And I have enjoyed so much the preaching, the singing, and the sweet fellowship. It has been a real boost to me personally. And I am thankful now for the opportunity to speak to you for a little while. Brother Franklin and I came up together, and as we were riding along, we were talking about exactly why we were coming. We know when you come to a meeting like this, your primary purpose ought to be to worship the Lord and be drawn closer to him, but I also love these beautiful mountains and enjoy doing some sightseeing. That's quite an incentive to come to the meeting. And, of course, I love you all; I love the fellowship of the saints and I believe there is room in our lives for all of these reasons to come together for this meeting. Now I hope you'll pray for me as I endeavor to speak to you at this time.

Brother Harold quoted tonight in his opening remarks a passage of scripture from Psalms 133:1, "Behold how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity." That helped to settle my mind on what I would try to speak on tonight. David in his life knew what it was for brethren not to dwell together in unity. His own brethren according to the flesh, at times, had it in for him. King Saul hunted him down, and tried to kill him.

There was a lot of fighting among his children. Much of David's life on this earth was spent when brethren were not dwelling together in unity. But he knew how good and pleasant it was when brethren did dwell together in unity.

And you know if you are going to have unity among the brethren, you've got to work at it, and it's not an accident. I

want to call your attention tonight to what I think would help as far as having unity among the brethren, help more than anything else, and that's in I John 4:18; "There is no fear in love; but perfect love casteth out fear: because fear hath torment. He that feareth is not made perfect in love. We love him because he first loved us. If a man say, I love God, and hateth his brother, he is a liar: for he that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen? And this commandment have we from him, That he who loveth God love his brother also."

And so in this passage that I've read to you, John talks a lot about the subject of love. He begins, first of all, I think, to talk about the love of God for us. And, you know, the more we learn about God's love for us, the more it helps us to love one another. That's a powerful motivator to love one another, when we think about how much the Lord loved us. And John said here in I John 4:18; "There is no fear in love: but perfect love casteth out fear".

Now the only perfect love I know anything about in this world is God's love. Brotherly love is a wonderful love. The love people have in marriage is a wonderful love. So is neighborly love. And what about a mother's love? Those are all wonderful manifestations of love, but they are not perfect. But God's love for us is a perfect love. And the more you and I learn about God's love for us, his perfect love for us, the less fear we will have in this world, because we'll know that he loves us with an everlasting love, and that he will take care of us. He will not leave us, nor forsake us.

And I believe God's love is an eternal love, and it's an unconditional love. Did you know, if I understand the love of God tonight, as it is presented to us in scripture, he could never love us any more than he loves us right now. And he could never love us less than he loves us right now. If you and I should read this bible through ten or twelve times a year, and go to every gospel meeting we could possibly get to, and visit all the nursing homes and hospitals weekly, and give half of our goods to feed the poor, and spend three or four hours a day in fervent diligent prayer, and lived that kind of life for the next

fifty years, you know, God wouldn't love you a bit more than He loves you right now.

Because God's love is an unconditional love, you don't make God love you more by living a better life. God forbid, but if you didn't ever go to another meeting or read the Bible again, wasted your life in this world, I don't believe God would love you a bit less than he loves you right now. You all agree with that? Now a lot of people don't understand that about God's love, because human love isn't that way. In this world, in our relationships with people, our love for one another can grow, or it can be diminished.

There are people here tonight that I've known a long time, and I love you tonight more than I've ever loved you in my life. My love has grown for you.

But my love for people can be diminished, it can grow cold. People can treat you so cruel, and betray you, and reject you, to the point where your love and respect for them can be all but destroyed. We are humans. But not God's love. It can't grow, and it can't be diminished. His love is a perfect love. And I believe God loved his people from all eternity, and he chose them in Christ, and he loved them, when he died for them on the cross. He loves them tonight. He'll love them when this world is no more.

And I want to tell you, if that doesn't make you feel safe, I don't know what it would take to make you feel safe. "Perfect love casteth out fear," and when fear comes into our hearts, and we worry about the circumstances of this life or impending danger, it's usually because we have forgotten how much God really loves us, and how much he is able to take care of us. So we need to dwell a lot on the perfect love of God. Oh my friends, "perfect love casteth out fear." I think if people, who are not Primitive Baptists, could ever come to understand God's love, as it is presented in scripture, they would have to believe like we believe. If God loves a person, and gave his Son to die for that person, to put away their sins, do you think there is any possibility that God would ever let that person be lost, spend eternity in hell? No!!

We need to know something about the love of God, the perfection of God's love. In John 13, the Bible says, "Having loved his own which were in the world, he loved them unto the end." To the end of what? To the end of his life. In other words he gave his life for his people. Now that's love. He didn't love us just enough to give us a cool drink of water, or shelter for the night. He loved us enough to give his life for us on the tree of the cross. As John said here in I John 4: "Herein is love." I John 4:10, "Herein is love, not that we loved God." Oh, we ought to love him, and I want to love him more. But my love for God is so fickle, compared to his love for me, until it's not worth mentioning. "Herein is love, not that we loved him, but that he loved us." How much did He love us? He loved us and gave—now listen to this—"Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins." Our sins have been paid for, because he loved us so much, he gave his Son to die in our room and stead.

Now let me tell you, that's love beyond comprehension. That's love beyond our ability to understand. But the more I do understand it, the less fear I have in this world. And I don't believe that anybody God loved, and Jesus died for, will ever perish in hell. They will be saved.

I like that song we sing, *Safe In His Love*. You are safe in the love of God. Oh, how we like to preach on the love of God for his children. But now the apostle says: "We love him because he first loved us. If a man say, I love God, and hateth his brother," what is he; "he is a liar: for he that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen?" That's very good logic. "And this commandment have we from him, That he who loveth God love his brother also." So you and I are commanded in scripture to love our brethren.

Now I want to notice with you in Hebrews 13:1, this expression. As he begins in the first part of this chapter, Paul gives the Hebrews a long list of admonitions. He begins by saying this to them in this concluding chapter of this marvelous book, "Let brotherly love continue." Now he didn't say to go out and get

it. I believe God puts that love in our heart. We don't have this kind of love by nature. By nature we don't love the brethren. But if we are born again, God has put love in our hearts for the brethren. Now he says, "Let brotherly love continue." If you can let it continue, obviously, you can hinder it. God's love will continue, but ours can be hindered. We don't want to do that as God's children. We want to let it flow freely in the midst of the church among the brethren. "Let brotherly love continue."

Now Paul could have had reference primarily to the Hebrew brethren loving other Hebrews. When Paul wrote this letter to them, they were going through a very trying time in their history as Hebrews. They were facing great trials and tribulations, and there was tremendous unrest among the Hebrews. They were suffering Roman domination of the Hebrew nation, and one Hebrew was set against another. And there were many Hebrews, who had come to understand that Jesus was the Savior and the Messiah. Many other Hebrews were holding on to Moses and the law, and that had caused tremendous friction among the Hebrew brethren.

Why, there was a time, even in Paul's, life that he thought he did God's will to put Hebrews to death, who believed in Jesus. And I want to tell you, that kind of friction would cause brotherly love not to flow. Paul is writing to the Hebrews, and saying to love your Hebrew brethren, that have not yet come to understand that Jesus is the Savior and the Messiah. That was a tremendous challenge to those Hebrews in the first century, to love other Hebrews, who were still observing Moses's law and putting animal offerings on the altar. What an insult to their precious Savior they loved, and knew he was the end of the law for righteousness sake. Now I want to tell you tonight, beloved, you and I are to love our brethren, who do not understand the doctrine of grace as we do. We're to love them for Jesus's sake. We're not to be hostile toward them.

In our community last year, a church of another denomination that had run down, had gotten a young preacher in from the seminary, and he had a lot of new ideas about how to build a church, and he was really building the congregation. They were having housefuls, and I heard about some of his gimmicks—like

if you get a certain number here on Sunday morning, "you can hit me in the face with a pie." You've heard those gimmicks. On Sunday, if they got a certain number there, he would get on top of the church building and preach. One Sunday, he was going to kiss a goat, if they got so many there.

Well, those people went out and got others to come in, and they had the house full. When I heard about those gimmicks, I chuckled and laughed, and thought, how ridiculous.

Sometime later, I had a funeral service with him at that particular church building. I got there a little early that day, and I saw up over the pulpit this quotation, "Whatever it takes," in broad letters, "Whatever it takes." You know my attitude toward that young preacher changed in a moment, and I thought, "If he believes what his denomination says they believe, that you've got to do something in order to get people to accept Christ and go to heaven, and if they don't, they are going to hell, I would agree with him. Whatever it takes get them to church. If me kissing a goat would save just one sinner from eternal hell, I should be willing to kiss a 1000 goats.

I admired his zeal. As a matter of fact, I wouldn't have any respect for him, if he didn't use every gimmick in the book to get them there. Now I still don't believe in his doctrine, and I'm sorry he is in the dark, because I believe Jesus did whatever it took to get us to heaven, and he did it by himself. He said on the cross, "It is finished!"

If Jesus didn't finish the work, he was deceived, because he sure thought he did! Many of our brethren don't know the truth about the finished work of Christ. What should our attitude be toward them? We ought not to ridicule them and make fun of them, we ought to love them and pray for them for Jesus's sake. Primitive Baptists have done much harm by being too harsh in our ridicule of those who differ with us in doctrine. We have to expose error, and we are bound to teach the truth, but we ought to love our brethren, who don't know the truth.

I want to tell you I was blessed in my life at the age of fourteen to find out salvation was by the grace of God, and I've been

resting in that for thirty-six years now. And I would to God all of his children could know that.

I want to tell you, Paul loved the brethren. He loved those that didn't agree with him. I want you to listen to what he said over in Romans 10. He said, "Brethren, my heart's desire and prayer to God," for who, "for Israel." And I think he is talking about God's people among the natural Jews. "My heart's desire," brethren, talking to the Gentiles in Rome, "Brethren, my heart's desire and prayer to God for Israel is, that they might be saved."

Saved from what? Not saved from eternal hell, but saved from a doctrine that enslaves them in this life. "For I bear them record that they have a zeal of God, but not according to knowledge. For they, being ignorant of God's righteousness, and going about to establish their own righteousness, have not submitted themselves unto the righteousness of God."

He was praying for his brethren. You want to know how much Paul loved his brethren among the Jews, turn back to Romans 9:1. "I say the truth in Christ, I lie not, my conscience also bearing me witness in the Holy Ghost, that I have great heaviness and continual sorrow in my heart. For I could wish that myself were accursed from Christ for my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh." Oh he loved the Hebrews. He could wish himself accursed from Christ for his brethren according to the flesh.

I don't know if I love anybody that much tonight, but Paul loved the brethren, the Hebrews, so much that he would even be accursed from Christ if his brethren could be blessed to see the truth. Oh, that's love. That man had a lot of love in his heart for the Hebrews. And let me tell you, they didn't love him in return. No sir, they turned on him, they despised him, they thought lowly of him, because he had denied Judaism, and had committed himself to Jesus Christ and him crucified. But oh, how he loved the Hebrew brethren.

And this dear man had to spend most of life among the Gentiles. Paul loved the Jews. If any man on Earth ever loved his nation, Paul loved his nation. And yet God had called him to be a minister and an apostle to the Gentiles, and for most of his life he had to be away from his brethren according to the flesh. Oh, he wanted to go to Jerusalem. He longed to go to Jerusalem. Antioch was his headquarters but Jerusalem was his heart. He loved those Jewish people. He would have chosen many times to have been among them rather than the Gentiles, but in obedience to the call of God on his life, he turned his back on his brethren according to the flesh, and went to Antioch, and went to Rome, and went to Corinth, and went to Spain.

You know what drove him to those places, the love of God in his heart for his brethren. I want to tell you, love is a powerful thing. It's the most powerful force in the universe tonight, and Paul said, "Brethren, let brotherly love continue." I'll tell you what; he did love the brethren.

Now Paul didn't say, "Love the brethren when they are as sweet as little angels dipped in sugar." Did you notice that, he just said, "Love the brethren, let brotherly love continue." You know there are brethren in the world, who are easy to love. I can look around here tonight, and see some that I feel like are very easy to love.

I guess the easiest man I've ever known in the ministry to love was my pastor and father in the ministry, Elder Cecil Darity. He is easy to love. If you couldn't love him, you needed a heart check-up big time. He is an easy man to love.

And there's a lot of brethren and sisters, that are just easy to love. You don't have to work at loving them, they're easy to be around. They are humble, God fearing; they make you feel good. You all like to be around folks like that? Oh, I do, friends. I like to be around people that are easy to be around, and not always nit-picking and finding fault, but you know that they are just lovely people. And there's people like that in the world.

But God didn't say just to love the lovely, but he said, "Let brotherly love continue." We are to love brethren when they are mean, and hateful, and spiteful, and judgmental, and devilish, and resentful. We're to love them then, isn't that right? Now that's when you find out how much you really love the brethren. You know most of us ask God to help us to love the unlovely, but when he sends an unlovely person along, we don't like that too much.

How are you going to love the unlovely, if you don't have any unlovely folks in your life? And most of us have some of those along the way.

May I say that love does not mean we have to let people walk all over us, and that we have no right to call their hand, or rebuke them when we feel they are wrong. But it does mean we have to be kind and longsuffering. Now he says, "Let brotherly love continue."

Talking about Paul's love for the Hebrews, I think he loved God's people among the Gentiles also. I think he proved that in his attitude toward the Corinthian church. Have you all ever—well I know you have—but have you *recently* read the books of First and Second Corinthians, and noticed just exactly what kind of church that church was? Listen to what Paul said in the first verse of the first chapter of First Corinthians, (I Corinthians 1:1) "Paul, called to be an apostle of Jesus Christ through the will of God, and Sosthenes our brother, unto the church of....," what? "Unto the church of God which is at Corinth."

Now when you get through reading the first book of Corinthians, you'll scratch your head and wonder is that really the church of God, because I'm telling you, that church had a lot of major problems in it. Why, here in the first chapter, Paul talks about one of the biggest problems they had, and it was a division in the church over preachers.

Some of them said, "I like Paul. If he's not preaching I won't be there. I like his depth. Oh that man can teach you something that's out of this world." And others said, "If Paul's there, I'll go to sleep. I can't follow him. He's too deep for me. But if Peter

is preaching, that old rugged fisherman, I will be there. He butchers our language, but I tell you I can relate to him." And others said, "Well I don't care a thing for him. You can have both of those fellows but if Apollos is in the pulpit, I'll be there." And some of them didn't want to hear any preacher, they just said, "Jesus is all I want."

Now they didn't have a good attitude, either I don't think. But anyway, Paul talks about the church being divided and he brings that up in the first chapter. You know, I have said I believe ninety percent of the trouble among the Old Baptists is caused by preachers, who are walking in the flesh. Would anybody here agree with that? Sometimes it is about ninety-nine percent. But you know what? The preachers were not the problem in the church in Corinth. I believe Peter and Paul and Apollos were united. They were standing together for the cause of Jesus Christ. Now there were differences in their styles and personalities and gifts, but these brethren were united under the blood stained banner of Jesus Christ.

The problem was the church was carnal and worldly. And Paul says, "I didn't die for you; you weren't baptized in my name." That's the first problem. That's enough right there to kill a church, to get divided like that. You know sometimes today when the Old Baptists have a little trouble and there's a little war, you hear a war drum beating, our brethren say, "Oh what's going to happen to us." And they just make out like this is the first time in the history of the church there has ever been any trouble.

A brother told me one time years ago, "Brother Sam, I just tell you, I'm just so discouraged I'm ready to quit." He says, "There is just so much trouble going on." I said, "Have you read the New Testament lately?" He said, "What's that got to do with it?" I said, "It's got everything to do with it. They had more problems in the first century than you've ever known in your lifetime, and, Brother, they didn't quit." And there is no place for you and me to quit tonight."

Now the Corinthian church was divided over preachers, and they had the big head. See, these were Greeks. They weren't little

short, olive-complected Jews with big noses. Brother, these were Grecians. They had all but perfected the human body. They had invented the Olympic games. Oh yes, they were brilliant intellectuals, and fine physical specimens of the human race. And Paul had gone over there as a little Jew, and they laughed at him and said, "Why he can't even talk good. He stammers when he talks."

I'll tell you, they had the big head. These Greeks were high-minded, arrogant people. They thought they were really something—even in the church, born again, and baptized. They were in the church, and still had a lot of pride in them. The first chapter deals with that. He told them that God uses the weak and foolish to confound the mighty and wise, so we would glory only in God.

Well, I could spend the whole night talking about the problems at Corinth. You know, in the fifth chapter (I Corinthians 5) they had a case of incest. That was unspeakable. And they had brethren taking one another to law, suing one another in a court of law. They had long haired hippies. They had women who weren't subject to their husbands. They had brethren getting drunk at the communion service. According to the 13th chapter (I Corinthians 13), they really didn't love each other like they should. They even had a major doctrinal problem, because some were denying the resurrection of the body. Now I'm telling you, I don't know of any of our churches as bad off as they were, do you all?

I mean, all of our churches have problems, and by the way, I want to say this, if you all are looking for a perfect church, don't ask me for directions. I don't know where one is. And if you find one, please don't join it, because if you joined it, it wouldn't be perfect anymore. Would you all say amen to that? Was that an *oh, me*, or an *amen*?

But any way, this church had a lot of problems in it, and Paul didn't let them off the hook, Brother. I'm telling you, when you read this book, you can find out why they got angry with him. He let them have it with both barrels. And we should be faithful

to point out errors today, that we see among the churches. Now why would Paul continue to labor with a church like Corinth?

You know Primitive Baptists in our day, and I think we've had this habit a long time, when a church starts doing something we don't like, the first thing we want to do is put up bars against them. unchurch them. That's just a bad habit. It has never worked. And it is very unscriptural. Some people think a church split is a sign of great strength. Well, I don't.

I believe with all my heart, we should be set for the defense of the gospel, and if there should be someone, who would trouble your church by perverting the gospel of Christ, let him be accursed. That is the individual, who would be perverting the gospel. Surely a local church has a right and duty to bar a preacher from its pulpit, if they believe he is unsound or immoral in his personal life.

But who would want to bar a church Jesus Christ has not unchurched? Not me. I might not feel comfortable visiting them, and I don't have to, if I don't feel impressed to, but it is not my business to unchurch them. You know what I really think the problem is with some brethren who want to bar churches and declare them out of order? They really don't trust Jesus as the head of the church. Do you believe He is still the head of the church today and able to sit in judgment over each church? I do. He said he would remove the candlestick. He never told one church to go over and remove the candlestick from another church. That is his job and I trust him enough to leave that in his hands.

Most churches I know have enough problems in their own local fellowship to keep them busy without trying to tend to some one else's business. And I can tell you for sure, if this church at Corinth was around today, the war drums would be heard, and many would be tempted to bar them. I don't know that I would want to raise children in that church. That church was a mess, and yet it was the church of God. Paul said it was.

Now how do you explain why Paul would continue to labor with them. I believe the explanation is given to us in I Corinthians 13

where Paul is writing on the great subject of love, and he says when he begins to define love, "Charity suffereth long, and is kind." And Paul had so much charity in his heart for these Corinthians, he was suffering long with them. Now this kind of love is not always a warm fuzzy feeling for the brethren.

This love is often a decision you make, because you know it is right to act loving and kind toward the brethren. "Charity suffereth long." Now it doesn't suffer forever, but it suffers long. It is obvious today that God did not suffer forever with the church at Laodicea. He loved them, but he told them if they did not repent, he—not a sister church—would spew them out of his mouth. And He won't suffer forever with churches today that are in disorder.

Now these people at Corinth had it in for Paul. You know, I'm probably just as bad about this as any preacher here, but some of our preachers are bad about getting it in their minds they are being persecuted today. I heard about a preacher, who was no longer being invited into a certain part of the country, and he said he was being persecuted. Now would you consider that persecution? I tell you what, when you compare your little sufferings to what Paul went through, Brother, you'll get back into reality right quick, and realize we are all on easy street today.

He straightened these Corinthians out, because he said, "I'm a fool for naming off my sufferings." Paul didn't want to brag about what he had suffered for Jesus sake, but these Corinthians had backed him into a corner, and they were questioning his apostleship. Why they were even saying he was not an apostle. He said, "Amos I not an apostle?...have I not seen Christ." He let them know, look, if I'm not an apostle, you not a church because I planted you.

Brother, I'll tell you he loved them, but they didn't intimidate him. Did they back him down and give him lockjaw? No sir, he had some tough love in his heart for these folks.

He said..... Oh, I better not get into that. My time, thirty minutes, is gone. Somebody said, "I am the last one up." Well,

I won't be stealing anybody's time. You know, some brethren, when we ordain them, we don't teach them how to tell time. I don't want to be accused of stealing another brother's time, but since I'm last, I may just stay on this just a moment more.

Paul said to the Corinthians, "I'm a fool for bringing up my sufferings." But he said, "I want to tell you something, I have suffered for Jesus sake." He begins to name off all his sufferings.

We think we suffer when somebody won't speak to us, don't look at us like we think they ought to. Brother, that's not persecution, not in the context of what my Lord went through, and what the apostles went through. We need to get over feeling pitiful for ourselves. Grow up. Get a grip and grow up.

Would you all say "amen" to that. Get back into reality and find out we're really on Easy Street. This man said, "I was beaten by the Jews, and I was beaten by the Romans." They would strip his back, and beat him with rods, and they would beat him with a whip, and gave him thirty-nine lashes on five occasions. Listen, if they put me in jail one night for preaching the gospel, I doubt if I would ever preach again, without bringing it up. Paul spent much of his life in prison. Now, let's wake up, folks.

And when he was in jail, it looks to me, like he had a good time, because Jesus was there. When he was in Philippi and they put him in the innermost stocks, I could just imagine at was concerned about his brother and would have said, "How you doing, Brother Silas?" And I can hear him saying, "Well, I'm hungry, and my back hurts from that whipping, and I'm cold, but other than that I'm alright. How are you Brother Paul?" I can hear him saying, "Brother Silas, I'm not even worthy to suffer for my Lord. Let's sing a song." And they began to sing at midnight, and the jailhouse opened, Brother. Let me tell you, when Jesus is first in your life, you don't sit around complaining, and murmuring about how bad everything is. You are talking about how good everything is. So Paul didn't bring up all his sufferings here, because he wanted to show out. But these Corinthians had backed him into a corner.

But anyway. I just want to say this tonight, you and I need to love the brethren, and we need to show love toward one another. What good is love in your heart, if you don't show it? Do you all think love is any good? There is an old poem I heard one time that says, "A bell is not a bell till you ring it. And a song is not a song till you sing it. Love is not love until you show it."

Now you could argue all night about whether a bell is a bell before you ring it. I reckon it would be a bell, before you ring it, but it's not functioning as a bell till you ring it. What good would a bell be up there if you didn't ever ring it? What good is a song if you don't sing it? And what good is love if we don't show it and manifest it?

I believe a lot of love's been shown here in this meeting. Somebody had to go to a lot of effort to get us here, and provide this place. They're not taking up any offerings for that. That's love.

There is a lot of love going on in this world. Love is a glorious thing. I suppose the greatest love in the world, from a natural standpoint, is a mother's love. I don't know of any love greater than that. We had a dear mother in our community who lost her son last week. Franklin and I conducted the funeral. He was fifty-four years old, and he had a brain tumor, and they kept him at home with Hospice assistance, and that was a wonderful thing. The family could be there right to the end. And the Hospice nurse said to his mother and to the family, "Is there anybody in the family he hasn't seen yet, that hasn't gotten here?" And they said, "Not that we know of."

She said, "Well he should have been dead three days ago. We see death all the time. He's waiting. Something is not right." She said, "I want all of you to go in there and talk to him. I want his sisters and brothers to go in there and give him permission to die. And I want you to go in there, dear mother."

And, you know, they all went in. Then the mother went in, and I'll tell you, if there's ever been a woman that loved her child,

this mother did. She's already lost two children, and this would be the third child she would have to give up to death. And she went in there, and it was the hardest thing she'd ever done, but she put her arms around him, and she hugged him, and she said, "Tom, you've suffered enough. It time to go and be with Jesus. I'll be there in a little while." And, do you know, in a few moments he left this world. Now I believe love was holding him on. He was concerned about his mother. She assured him, "Your brothers and your sisters are going to take care of me." That's love in this world folks. It's a wonderful thing. It's the most glorious thing in the world, and you and I ought to be showing love tonight.

Now when you love people, that doesn't mean you love all their ways. Now we have got to stay in reality tonight. I'll just have to confess, there are brethren, whose ways I don't like. I don't enjoy being with them. Is that ugly to say? You know when you're a preacher, you have to make a few confessions publicly. There's brethren among us that, I've known for thirty years. I love them. I appreciate their labors in the kingdom, their sacrifices for God, but they have never felt comfortable around me, and I have never really felt too comfortable around them. It's just personality clashes. And I don't think God requires us to be with people much, that we don't really feel comfortable with. I think Paul had that struggle with some of the brethren. But we can still love one another, and pray for one another, and labor together for Jesus's sake. We can reach out to one another, and show that love. I want to tell you, I don't know of a soul here tonight, that I'm not willing to shake hands with.

You know, they say there's two kinds of people in the world. There is the "Here I am" people and there is the "Hey, there you are" people. Now the "Here I am" people are those who walk in a room and they stand there and they say, "I'm here now. You all can come over and speak to me, and affirm me, and make me feel good about me. You know, just wallow all over me." You all know any folks like that? Full of insecurity. May God deliver me from insecure people. You can't love them enough for them to feel safe.

And then, there's people like Brother Cecil Darity, who would walk into a room and say, "Hey, there you are. I've been wanting to see you," and they go over and hug you and they say, "Man, it's so good to see you. You look great. I'm so happy to be with you." What kind of person are you tonight?

Now we need to lay aside petty little differences and love one another for the cause of Jesus Christ. Because there's a great cause in this world, as far as I'm concerned, greater than any man in this world tonight, and that's the precious cause of Jesus.

Now I would say, if I had to guess, I would say Paul felt a lot closer to the Philippian church than he did to the Corinthian church. What would you all say about that? He said, "I thank my God upon every remembrance of you," talking about the Philippians. That's quite a compliment to make, isn't it? When you read about that Philippian church, and their attitude, you can understand why he loved them so much. I don't know that he ever felt that way about the Corinthians, but he loved them, and he was faithful to them, and he labored long and hard to save them, as our brother said last night, "from the error of their ways." Now, beloved, I believe God's children can live together in the church in peace and harmony.

Now if you get too close to people you don't click too much with, you'll have a little fire, and we don't need that. And people have enough sense to know who they can be with a lot, and, really, anybody that you're with too much, they are going to get on your nerves. Brother Tom Hagler was good enough to invite Franklin and me, and some other good friends up to his lovely mountain home in Cashiers, North Carolina, this week, and they treated us like we were really Something. I mean they gave us a nice bedroom, two wonderful meals, best steak I ever ate in my life, and they said we just made them happy when we got there. But I am sure we made them real happy when we left.

One sister said that her children made her happy twice at Christmas time—coming and going. She said, the prettiest

Christmas lights she ever saw were the tail lights on those kids' cars.

Well, now listen, company is the same way. I love company but company is like fish. You know. After the third day! Now when we all get to heaven we are going to be together for eternity and I don't believe we'll mind being together up there, but we'll be perfect up there. We are a long way from that down here. I love my brother Franklin as much as anybody in the world. I got a reason to love him, because he's been so good to me all my life. But I tell you what, I know he's about had enough of me on this trip. And he's got to ride home with me tomorrow afternoon, and he'll be glad to get in town and let me out. Now that doesn't mean we don't love one another. That's just being real, and that's the same way in the church. And we've got to learn to be longsuffering. Somebody said, "The only way to get four Old Baptists in one accord is to put them in a Honda." Well I just don't believe that. I believe we can dwell together in unity, and be in one accord.

That reminds me of the fellow, driving through the country, and he saw a beautiful church building, "Harmony Baptist Church." Big sign out front. You know that's a beautiful name for a church, *Harmony*. He drove on through town, and he saw another beautiful church building and another sign that said "New Harmony Baptist Church." Well that's sort of been the history of the church. But it doesn't have to be. God's children can labor and toil together. On essentials there must be unity, but on non-essentials there must be charity and longsuffering.

There are people among us more liberal than others, and some more conservative than others, and they don't need to get together and fuss too much about those things. There are some things I just don't discuss with some brethren, because I know we are not going to agree. I can't change them. I don't think they are going to change me.

We all need that "Serenity Prayer." "God grant me the serenity to accept the things I can't change."

I like the new version of that. "God grant me the serenity to accept the people I can't change, the courage to change the one I can, and the wisdom to know that person is me."

Another version of that is, "God grant me the senility to forget the people I never liked, the good eyesight to recognize those I do, and enough mind to know the difference." Well, that's enough of the foolishness of this world.

But I want to tell you, I love you people for Jesus sake. And I know some of you love me with great effort, and I understand that, because I'm not real loveable a lot of the time. I understand that. But I love the Lord Jesus, and I believe he loved me, and I believe he loves you, and I know I'm a liar, if I say I love him, and don't love you. So if I don't show my love in the right way, you can talk to me about it and we'll work out something. But for goodness sake, let's all put the unity of the kingdom of heaven above any personal preferences or differences. Let's love the Hebrews and Gentiles like Paul did. "Let brotherly continue." Thank you for your wonderful attention.

Abel

ABEL Abel was the second son of Adam and Eve (Genesis 4:2). God often favors the second son. He is a figure of the obedient child of God, worshipping according to the God-ordained pattern. His offering of the firstlings of the flock (Genesis 4:4) pointed back to the animal slain (Genesis 3:21) to provide clothing for his parents, and it pointed forward to Jesus Christ, the lamb slain to atone for the sins of his people (John 1:29).

Hebrews 11:4, "By faith Abel offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain,". His sacrifice was *more excellent* because of what it represented, or symbolized; it symbolized the suffering and death of the Lord Jesus Christ, the Lamb of God. It signified the shedding of his blood. Cain brought an offering "of the fruit of the ground," a bloodless sacrifice. The one represented the substitutionary death of Jesus Christ; the other represented the works of men's hands. God's acceptance of Abel's sacrifice, and his refusal to accept the sacrifice of Cain is the first indication in the Bible that the works of man's hands are not sufficient for his salvation, and that God will not accept any religious service that suggests anything to the contrary.

Hebrews 9:22, “And almost all things are by the law purged with blood; and without shedding of blood is no remission.”

We are told (Genesis 4:4) that “God had respect unto Abel and to his offering.” God had respect, first to Abel, then to his offering. Abel was a sinner in need of salvation as surely as Cain was; but Abel brought “a more excellent sacrifice than Cain.” Abel’s sacrifice was a bloody offering; it was a confession of his own sinful condition, and his need for the suffering and death of Jesus Christ, the Lamb of God, as an atonement for his sins.

We cannot imagine the burning, bloody flesh of Abel’s sacrifice was as physically appealing as the mounds of fresh, delicious, and colorful, fruits and vegetables which Cain brought. But physical beauty is not the proper criteria; obedience to the commandment of God is. Even in its physical unattractiveness Abel’s sacrifice represented the suffering and death of the Lord. Isaiah tells us, “He hath no form nor comeliness; and when we shall see him, there is no beauty that we should desire him” (Isaiah 53:2). hlh

Abijah - Sylvester Hassell

ABIJAH Sylvester Hassell: [Abijah (called Abia in Matthew 1:7) was the grandson of Solomon, and the great-grandson of David.] Abijah, the son of Rehoboam, succeeded to the throne. He did not entirely reform abuses, but professed to be jealous for the honor of God, and reproached Jeroboam, king of Israel, with forsaking him. He made war with Jeroboam, under this plea, among others, and relying upon the Lord defeated Jeroboam, slaying five hundred thousand of his men—being one hundred thousand more than was numbered in his own army. He strengthened his kingdom greatly, and died after a short reign (II Chronicles 13; I Kings 15). (*Hassell’s History pg 125*)

Absolutism

ABSOLUTISM Absolutism, or *fatalism*, teaches that, before God ever created the world, he predestinated everything that will ever happen, good, bad, or indifferent. It teaches that he arranged all the events, and all the events leading up to, and influencing those events, so that everything that happens comes about in exact accordance to his preconceived and predestinated plan. It teaches that he predestinated everything from the rise and fall of mighty empires to the formation of every tiny snowflake.

It teaches that every event is the effect of a previous cause, and that if that cause is examined, it will itself be discovered to be the effect of a still more previous cause, so that if we trace every effect to its previous cause, we will eventually arrive at the *cause of all causes* or *the First Cause*, which they insist is God.

Or to put it another way, they insist that every cause finds its origin in God, and that cause radiates out to all the subsequent causes, so that God, *the great First Cause*, is the cause of every cause and the cause of every event that follows. It insists that every event is so ordered and arranged that, along with all the other surrounding events, it could not produce any other result than the result it does produce.

It teaches that all that takes place is somehow like one mighty machine, with all its parts playing their own individual roles, and producing the results they were intended to produce. It insists that every event is like a wheel in that great machine, driving all the other wheels, so that they are all connected together, dependent on each other, and bound up with each other so that the instant the first wheel is set in motion, the movement of all the other wheels is already determined. It insists that just as one loose wheel in the machine would upset the entire machine, so if God did not cause and control every event that ever happens, he could not intervene and control anything.

Perhaps the best known of all *Absoluters* was Elder Gilbert Beebe, who was for many years the editor of their periodical, *THE SIGNS OF THE TIMES*. That was exactly the illustration he used in his last editorial on the subject published on October 1, 1880. He says, "We look at a vast complicated machine, with its ten thousand wheels. We cannot comprehend or understand its workings, but we are told that the machinist has a perfect knowledge of all its parts save one; there is a definite use for every wheel and spring, but one is held in the machine, which has no certain motion or definite use. How long could that machine run in safety, with the unruly part liable at any moment to throw the whole into confusion."

He bases another argument on the movement of the stars: "Suppose that in what we have been contemplating of the Heavens we should find the sun and moon, and all the stars but one, held firmly to their orbits by the irresistible will and decree of God, and that one solitary star, without any fixed orbit, is allowed to range the infinity of space, wandering with more than lightning velocity, guided only by chance; where would be the safety of all the other stars?" For over one hundred years the *Absoluters* have continued to republish this article; so it obviously expresses their sentiments.

Based purely on the principle of *cause and effect*, or *action and reaction*, the Absolute argument seems to make some kind of sense. Sir Isaac Newton was the father of modern science. He was probably the greatest scientist who ever lived. His Third Law of Motion states that “for every action there is a reaction, equal and in the opposite direction.” That principle works very well in physics, and if we were dealing with physics, the Absoluter might be able to make a case.

But we are not dealing with physics, and we are not dealing with physical law; we are dealing with sinners and the moral law of God. Physical law cannot be violated, and it provides no penalties. Physical law simply states what is going to happen under certain conditions. If you throw a rock into the air, it is going to come back down. It is not possible the rock might hang in midair, and there is no penalty to be assessed against the rock if it fails to fall. On the other hand, moral law can be violated and it does provide penalties. Moral law does not state what we will do, but rather, what we ought to do. There is every possibility that we might fail to do as we should, and there are penalties to be suffered if we transgress that law.

Physical law cannot be transgressed; moral law can be, and often is. I John 3:4, “Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law: for sin is the transgression of the law.”

If sin is the transgression of the law—and that is what this verse says—and if that law cannot be violated, there can be no such thing as sin. It is at this point that, in spite of all its fancy explanations, fatalism comes to ruin.

They insist that man only does what God ordained for him to do. They make every act of man to correspond with the will of God, and by doing it, they explain sin out of existence.

They have ever so much to say about the *revealed will* of God, as opposed to the *secret will* of God. And they have a lot to say about *second causes*, but in the final analysis their doctrine always winds up teaching that man sins, because God ordained that he should sin in exactly that way, and at exactly that time.

No matter how reasonable absolutism may appear at first glance, it is based on human reasoning, and not on the Scriptures. If the Bible teaches that God predestinated everything that happens, good, bad, or indifferent, there ought to be a verse somewhere that says it in so many words. It is not enough to show that God intervenes in all sorts of situations, and in all sorts of ways. It is not enough to show that he raises up kings, and puts down kings. It is not enough to show that mighty empires have risen and fallen at his command. Nor is it enough to show that not even a sparrow can fall to the ground contrary to his will.

No person who truly believes in a sovereign, almighty God could deny any of those things. God reigns on the throne of heaven, and you can be sure that he is in charge. He is in control. The very fact that the universe still exists, and we are still living here is clear evidence that God is in control. If God ever relinquished control over his creation, it would fall to ruin.

But we must never confuse physical law with moral law. Physical law cannot be violated; it is very predictable. It is because physical law is so predictable that we have seen such an explosion in technology in recent years. Researchers can develop their products, and once they determine the principles (the physical laws) involved, they can predict what each item they manufacture will do under the stated conditions. Without the predictability of physical law our technology could not exist.

But moral law is entirely different. Those under moral law can, and often do, violate moral law. It is because of the predictability of the outcome with regard to physical law, and the unpredictability of the outcome with regard to moral law, that we see such progress in technology, at the same time we see such chaos in society itself. This is why David can say, “The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament showeth his handiwork” (Psalms 19:1) —because of the predictability of physical law, and, on the other hand, Jeremiah can say, “The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked; who can know it,” (Jeremiah 17:9) —because of rebellion against its Lawgiver. hlh

Absolutism: The fatal connection - Harold Hunt

ABSOLUTISM: The fatal connection: Harold Hunt The following is a quote from Elder R.H. Pittman’s little book of *Questions and Answers*.

“What is Absolutism?” A. It is an erroneous and strained view of the doctrine of predestination. Its advocates teach that God absolutely predestinated all things that come to pass, both good and evil; that what is going on in the world now, that which has transpired in the past, and that which will come to pass in the future was all predestinated before time, and could not be otherwise from what it was, is, or will be, that all the acts of men and devils were predestinated. This doctrine is not Bible doctrine—Elder Sylvester Hassell said it was imported from Italy. It was first published among Baptists by the paper known as *The Signs of the Times* in 1832. Since that time the doctrine has been made a hobby by a few Baptists, yet none of our churches were organized upon such a doctrine—it is not found in the articles of faith of any Baptist church. It is a left handed, confusing kind of predestination, and has been the cause of strife and division. Its advocates are not satisfied with predestination as Paul expressed it.

They seek to prop up predestination on one side by ‘absolute,’ and on the other side they spread it over ‘all things.’ The doctrine, when run to its logical conclusion, is nothing less than fatalism, for it makes God as being the author of sin, though most of its advocates deny this.”

When Elder Hassell said *Absolutism* came out of Italy he was, no doubt, referring to an Italian Catholic-turned-Protestant theologian by the name of Jerom Zanchius. Zanchius (or Zanchy, historians spell his name different ways) was born in Italy in 1516 just before the Reformation broke out in Germany. He was contemporary with Calvin, Luther, Knox, and the other great Reformers. He taught at Strasburg and later at the university of Heidelberg. Persecution drove him from Italy to Germany, and finally to England.

He wrote the proto-Absolute document entitled *The Doctrine of Absolute Predestination*. That book is the clearest, the most comprehensive, and the most logically consistent book on the subject. It became the standard statement of that doctrine. If it does not prove the doctrine, it cannot be proven. The book has continued to be published until this day. My old tattered and torn copy was republished by Baker Publishing House in 1978. It only contains 170 pages, but it gives a concise and entirely adequate explanation of what the doctrine of Absolute Predestination is all about.

In order to give as brief an explanation of the doctrine as possible, and yet look at different aspects of the subject, I will limit my remarks, for the most part, to Zanchius’s book and those theologians he quotes.

In order to make his point, Zanchius does what every Absoluter must do. **He spends most of his time proving points that were never in question.** Then, having proven those points beyond all possible challenge, he adds his Absolute conclusion to the argument, as if the points he has just proven have something to do with his conclusion. When I say those points were never in question, bear in mind that I am reading the book as a Primitive Baptist, and approaching the subject from the point of view of our people. In order to give Zanchius his credit, we need to keep in mind that he was writing, primarily, for people who believed that salvation from eternal damnation depends on the merit of the sinner. They believed it was up to the sinner to earn a home in heaven. And, considering who he was writing for, the points he spends so much time proving were the very questions that were under attack. So it was proper that he should begin by showing where he was coming from.

But the fact remains that, from our Primitive Baptist point of view, those points were never the question.

Having said all that, we need to point out that, no matter how clearly, and how conclusively, you may have proven your point, you have not accomplished anything, if your premise has no connection with your conclusion.

Zanchius spends most of his time talking about the attributes of God, and it is proper that he should do that. If Bible students spent more time studying what the Bible tells us about God and his attributes, it would clear up most of the questions in religion. There is no room for a sovereign, all-wise, almighty, God of will and purpose in most of what passes for the Christian religion of our day. Let the Bible student accept the description God gives of himself, and the petty, silly notions of the religious establishment would vanish in a moment.

Zanchius deals with the attributes of God, and up until he starts talking about the predestination of sin and wickedness he does a good job of it. Then he gets completely off the track and out of the Bible.

He shows that God is almighty, all-wise, and all-knowing, but that is not the question.

There is nothing God does not know. He knows everything there is to know—past, present, and future (Isaiah 46:9-10). He knows everything from the mightiest heavenly body to the tiniest insect. “He telleth the number of the stars; he calleth them all by their names,” (Psalms 147:4). He knows every sparrow that falls to the ground; he numbers the very hairs of your head (Matthew 10:29-30). He knows what you are going to do before you do it, and even when you are sure that is not what you are going to do (II Kings 8:12-13). He identifies kings and calls them by name long before they are born (I Kings 13:2; Isaiah 44:28; 45:1). His “eyes are in every place, beholding the evil and the good” (Proverbs 15:3). Who would dare deny any of it?

If there is a solitary atom in the farthest reaches of the universe, you can be sure that God knows everything there is to know about it. He knows where that atom is today; he knows where it was a thousand years ago; and (if time should last) he knows what its exact location will be a thousand years from now.

Long before we were born, he knew all about every member of the human family. He knew where and when we would be born, and he knew all the events and circumstances of our lives. There is not a thought that ever entered our minds, or a move that we ever made, but that he knew all about it. And he knew it from all eternity. The God we serve has never learned anything; he has never forgotten anything; he has always known everything.

But it is strange logic that thinks his knowing everything there is to know, somehow, proves that he manipulates circumstances and events in order to cause us to do everything we do. Especially it is strange logic to imagine that since he knows every sin before it is done, he must, therefore, cause men to sin—according to a foreordained schedule.

Zanchius shows the sovereignty of God in the salvation of his people, and in his dealings with them, and with the wicked, but again, that is not the question.

Of course, God is sovereign. He states it over and over again. “Is it not lawful for me to do what I will with mine own? Is thine eye evil, because I am good?” (Matthew 20:15). “And all the inhabitants of the earth are reputed as nothing; and he doeth according to his will in the army of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth; and none can stay his hand, or say unto him what doest thou?” (Daniel 4:35). Nobody has the right to challenge God for anything he does.

There is no need to multiply proof texts. God is sovereign over all creation. It is his property; we are his property; and he has the right to do with us what he will. But that is a far cry from pretending that God gave man a law, irresistibly causes him to break the law, and then punishes him for doing what he could not keep from doing.

He shows that God exercises his almighty power in creation, and in his government of the world.

That is exactly what the Bible teaches. “The young lions roar after their prey, and seek their meat from God,” (Psalms 104:21). There is not an animal in the forest, nor an insect in the grass, but that God feeds it, and provides for it.

Men can build accurate timepieces, but, no matter if their timepiece may be accurate to the thousandth of a second, they still correct it by the movement of the stars through the heavens. Who could doubt there is a God in heaven, who keeps every star on course—and on time?

He “upholds all things by the word of his power,” (Hebrews 1:3). It is by his power that every tiny electron is held in its orbit around the nucleus of its atom. His power holds every planet in its orbit around the sun, and every mighty galaxy in its course through the heavens. That power holds sway from the inner workings of the nucleus of the tiniest atom to the farthest reaches of creation, and holds it all together.

What we call *Physical Law* is nothing more than God's usual way of sustaining the created universe, and causing to operate in a consistent manner.

Zanchius talks about the providence of God as it protects and provides for his people, and for every other creature. He proves that the providence of God embraces the mightiest angel and the tiniest insect. He proves that God numbers and names every star in the sky. He shows that God feeds every animal in the forest. He shows that there is no place in the universe beyond the power, the wisdom, and the surveillance of our all-wise, all-powerful God. He makes all those arguments, and he provides indisputable proof texts to prove his point.

But, again, all of that is a far cry from saying that God causes men to sin according to some prearranged program.

It does not make any difference how well you may prove your points; it does not accomplish anything, if those points have nothing to do with the subject in question.

The question is: did God by one eternal decree absolutely and unchangeably predetermine everything that will ever happen in time and eternity? Did God predestinate all the good—and all the evil—in the world? Emphasizing the attributes of God does not prove that point.

No matter how brilliant you may be, when you study about God and his attributes, there comes a point at which you are left in wide-eyed, slack-jawed amazement. At that point our learning must give way to wonder. God is all-wise; he knows everything there is to know. You and I are not all-wise; we do not know everything, and we never will. God will always be the creator, and we will always be the creature. We will always stand in wonder and in awe of him. There are some things we will never be able to fully explain.

We should be wary of any system that tries to explain the unexplainable—any system that tries to bring God down to our level. We should beware of any system that charges God with conduct that is contrary to his own nature and attributes.

The Bible tells us all we need to know about the nature and attributes of God. We do not need to add our own philosophy. We can spend the rest of our lives studying and contemplating what we are told, and it will be the delight of our lives, if we do just that. Consider, if you will, some of what the Bible does tell us, and it will remove much of the difficulty.

First, God is infinite; he is not bound by time nor space, but you and I cannot comprehend infinity. He is eternal, but we cannot comprehend eternity.

The nearest we can come to understanding eternity is to think of it as unending time. He is (at one and the same time) the beginning and the end, the first and the last. That is not the same as saying he is the beginning, and he will be the end. He is both—at the same time. We cannot comprehend that.

That beautiful old hymn *Amazing Grace*, has cheered our hearts for generations past, but the best the writer could do was, “When we’ve been there ten thousand years.” We know what he was trying to say, and we rejoice in the thought. But days and years are the opposite of eternity. There is coming a time when days and years will end, and we will be eternally with the Lord.

One of the names of God is *I AM*. All is *one eternal now* with him. You and I are creatures of time; we are bound in time, and bound by time, but not so with God.

You and I are locked into time, and traveling through time one moment after another. That does not apply to God. He is the unchangeable one. If God were bound by time the way we are—to say the least—he would become one day older every twenty-four hours. But he does not become any older; he does not change.

Time does not encompass God the way it encompasses us. He is the “high and lofty one that inhabiteth eternity” (Isaiah 57:15). He is not bound by time; it is the other way around; he encompasses time.

What tiny, tiny little creatures of time we all are. Think about it for a moment. Each of us occupies such a tiny little spot in the universe. We are such little things that if somebody backs off more than a few hundred yards he will have trouble even seeing us. If he could back off somewhat farther, he would have trouble spotting the earth we live on, and if he backed off far enough he would have trouble seeing our sun as anything more than a tiny speck away out yonder in the night sky.

That does not apply to God; he is everywhere at one and the same time. If you could build the largest hydraulic press, you still could not compress God into the tiny little space you and I occupy.

In much the same way that we are locked into one tiny little spot in the vastness of the universe, we are also locked into one tiny instant in time. With us there is

a past, a present, and a future; but we can never possess any of it except the present. The future is always on its way; the past is forever gone; and the present lasts for such a brief instant that we can never know it until it is gone.

You may have thought about how brief a moment the present is. If you have not, do think about it for a moment.

If the present lasted for a full minute, you would never have a car wreck. You could avoid most any accident, if you had a full sixty seconds to react. If the present lasted for as much as a second you could never have a prize fight. Given a full second, any third rate boxer could get out of the way of his opponent's fist. If the present lasted the thousandth part of a second, we could not have computers. If a computer could not split every second into a million parts and beyond, it would be so slow you could never get anything done.

But as brief a moment as the present is, that is all you and I have.

But not so with God; he inhabits eternity. You could as easily compress God into the little spot you and I occupy as you could confine him to the tiny instant we call the present. He is the *I AM*. All is one eternal now with him. Being the eternal one, past, present, and future are all the same with him.

We can never entirely explain God, and there is nothing with which to compare him. "To whom then will ye liken God? Or what likeness will ye compare unto him," (Isaiah 40:18). All we can do is adore, and wonder, and worship.

We need to realize that there are some things the Bible teaches about God and his work—without explaining how he does what he does.

Much of the *how* of what God does is so far beyond our ability to comprehend, that we could not understand it—no matter how well it was explained.

Suppose some rocket scientist should take the next six months to explain to somebody like myself how they managed to build the space shuttle. Suppose he writes out every complex mathematical formula involved, and explains every intricate step. Suppose he explains all the scientific principles that must be taken into consideration. Do you suppose I could understand all he said, so I could explain it to the next person. No, of course not. He would lose me just after he said, "Now here is the way we did it..." His entire presentation would be beyond my comprehension. But even that is a very lame illustration compared to the thought of understanding some of the things God does.

The Bible tells of any number of things God does without explaining how he does it.

We are told that in the very morning of time—by the word of his power—God created the world out of nothing. He simply spoke the word, and vast worlds sprang into existence. We are convinced it is so, but it is beyond our comprehension to understand how he did it.

By the same power he speaks the word, and one dead in trespasses and sins is made alive in Christ Jesus. The Spirit of God takes up its abode in the heart of the sinner, and he is born again. Again, we are told what he does, with no explanation of how the Spirit does its mighty work.

We are told that at God's appointed time the Son of God became man. "The word became flesh and dwelt among us"(John 1:14). If the very heaven of heavens cannot contain him, it is beyond our ability to understand how he could become a tiny baby his mother could hold in her arms. Not only does the Bible not explain how he did it, it goes on to say it is a *mystery* (I Timothy 3:16). If it is a mystery, we could not understand it, even if it was explained. It would no longer be a mystery.

The most central message of the gospel is the resurrection of our Lord. He rose from the dead, and one day he will raise us, and fashion our bodies like unto his own glorious body. How will he put our sleeping dust together again, and rejoin it to our departed spirit? Again, we are told it is a *mystery* (I Corinthians 15:51). Raising the dead is not part of our job description, so we do not need to be concerned that we cannot explain how he will do it.

But that is not good enough for the theologian; he feels a need to explain everything. And if he cannot find his explanation in the Bible, he has a world of philosophy at his disposal.

Paul had some less than flattering things to say about philosophy (Colossians 2:8). The earnest Bible student is convinced the Bible provides every explanation we need. If the Bible does not provide it, we do not need it; but that does not deter our theologian friend. He finds in pagan philosophy a principle called *fate*, and it exactly fills the need. By searching the pagan philosophers he finds an explanation the Bible does not provide.

By stripping *fate* of some of its most objectionable features, and dressing it up in a *Christian* garb, he is able to remove the *mystery*. He can now explain how God can foretell the future.

The pagan doctrine teaches that everything that happens in time was predetermined long ago by a blind fate. Everything, right down to the tiniest gyration and pirouette of a falling snowflake, was determined long ago, and nothing can be changed. Almost a thousand years before Jerom Zanchius was born, a pagan prophet named Mohammed taught that, “Whatever is written is written.” Nothing can be changed; we are swept along by our *fate*.

The Absoluter strips *fate* of its *blind fate* stigma by bundling it with the omniscience of God. Hence *fate* is no longer *blind*. He strips it of its *random* nature by bundling it with the will and purpose of God. Hence, for the Absoluter, God is able to foretell the future, because he has determined to manipulate, and orchestrate everything that happens so that everything takes place just the way he determined to make it happen. It is still a pagan doctrine; but he has made it more acceptable to an inquiring (and bewildered) student of the Bible.

The Absoluter is able to remove the mystery from God’s ability to foretell the future, but what a price he pays in the transaction.

By the time he gets through explaining God, he is left with a deity that does not correspond to the God of the Bible. He is left with a deity that looks, for all the world, like the gods of the pagans.

1. My first objection to Absolutism is that it teaches that God is unable to know about sin in advance, unless he has determined to manipulate and orchestrate circumstances in order to bring about the sin.

You need to be very careful when you talk about what God cannot do. The Bible only lists three things God cannot do: he cannot lie (Hebrews 6:18); he cannot deny himself (II Timothy 2:13); and he cannot swear by one greater than himself (Hebrews 6:13). In other words, he cannot do anything that is contrary to his own nature and attributes.

But he can foretell what is going to happen in the future without in any way predestinating man’s sin. The fact that he can foretell the future is one of the proofs that he is God.

But listen to what our proto-Absoluter, Jerom Zanchius says about it, and bear in mind that he is their standard bearer.

“Therefore, His determinate plan, counsel and purpose (i.e. His own predestination of causes and effects) is *the only basis of His foreknowledge*, which foreknowledge *could neither be certain nor independent*, but as founded

on his own antecedent decree.” (*page 135*) The italics are added, but that is an exact quote; you can look it up.

Notice that Zanchius is sure God could not be certain about what was going to happen in the future except for “his own antecedent decree.” In other words, the only way he can know about the sin is for him to *decree* the sin. That sounds like dangerous reasoning to me.

But there is more; he says this “predestination of causes and effects,” this predestination of sin and wickedness, is “the only basis of his foreknowledge.” **Can you believe that anybody in his right mind would argue that God has to prop up one of his own attributes by predestinating sin?** God’s foreknowledge (his prescience if you want to be precise) is one of his attributes, and his attributes do not need to be propped up. But Zanchius is sure *the only basis* of God’s foreknowledge is “His predestination of causes and effects.” In other words, according to Zanchius, if God did not predestinate everything that is going to happen, his foreknowledge would come crashing to the ground.

But I did tell you that Zanchius borrowed this doctrine from the pagan philosophers.

But, lest anybody might think we misunderstood him, listen to him again in the same paragraph. “Again, we cannot suppose him to have foreknown anything which He had not previously decreed.” He is sure God could not have foreknown it, if he had not decreed it.

Allow me one more quote. “Now, if God foreknew this, He must have predetermined it, because His own will is the foundation of His decrees, and His decrees are the foundation of His prescience” (*page 91*). I believe that should remove all doubt about what he was saying. Zanchius was sure that God’s ability to predict sin has no foundation except his own willingness to predestinate sin.

These brilliant Absoluter theologians are so determined to explain everything about God, that they are willing to charge him with predestinating sin, in order to explain how he can foretell the future.

The Absoluter is convinced that he presents the attributes of God in a way that puts all other systems to shame. He magnifies God as no one else does. The fact is that he envisions God as having to prop up his own attributes.

He presents this imagined predestination of sin and wickedness as a crutch for his omniscience to lean on.

According to him, if omniscience did not have this crutch, it would stumble and fall. That is not the way my Bible describes God.

Isaiah 46:9-10, “Remember the former things of old; for I am God, and there is none else; I am God and there is none like me. Declaring the end from the beginning, and from ancient times the things that are not yet done, saying, My counsel shall stand and I will do all my pleasure.”

I realize the Absoluter claims that text, but before he can prove ownership, he will have to prove his notion that God is *pleased* with sin and wickedness. The things God has decreed to do are his *pleasure*.

But the Absoluter insists that God does not predestinate sin; he simply removes his restraining hand, and man sins according to his own sinful nature. He restrains the man, and keeps him from sinning, or he removes his hand, and allows him to work out his own sinful impulses. And so he goes through all of time, either restraining or permitting sin, and he does it to such a degree that all that happens takes place according to his preconceived plan.

At first glance, there seems to be some logic to the answer. Who could deny that when God removes his restraint from the sinner, he runs into every sinful excess. And who could deny that God does prevent man from being as wicked as he could be. The Absoluter is convinced that in this way he can explain everything that has happened, or will ever happen.

But when we look a little closer, we discover that the explanation falls far short of the goal. For one thing, most of what happens in time has no moral dimension at all. There is nothing either good or evil about a snowflake falling in one spot or another. There is nothing either good or evil about a bird lighting on one limb rather than another. Even if we would accept the Absoluter’s premise, it would fall far short of providing a foundation for the foreknowledge of God. It would fall far short of showing how God knows ahead of time every gyration and pirouette of every falling snowflake.

The foreknowledge of God does not need a prop, and even if it did, the Absoluter has not found a prop sufficient to carry the load.

2. My second objection to Absolutism is that it teaches that the sin of Adam was the result of God’s irresistible will.

Before he transgressed, Adam did not have a sinful nature to motivate and control him. So we come back to the question: if, as our Absoluter friend tell us,

every sin happens, because God removes his restraining power, and man simply acts out his own sinful impulses, what about the sin of Adam?

If I might repeat myself, when the Absoluter explains how it is that God can foretell every little detail about every sin that will ever be committed—without being the cause of the sin—he will tell you that God simply leaves the sinner to his own nature, and his own devices, and the nature of the sinner works its way in exactly the way God predestinated that it would.

There can be no doubt that, in judgment, God often gives people over to work their own destruction, but to use that explanation to show that God, somehow, predestinated every sin is simply a dodge.

For one thing, the explanation breaks down, when you apply it to the sin of Adam. There can be no question that God knew beforehand what Adam would do. He provided the Lord Jesus Christ as the remedy for sin, before that first sin was committed. But until he sinned, Adam did not have a sinful, corrupt nature to motivate and control him.

When it comes to the original sin of Adam, the Absoluter has no choice—**if he is going to save his pagan philosophy**—and that is to trace the sin of Adam to God himself. That is exactly what our friend Zanchius does. Listen to his explanation:

“On the whole, if God was not unwilling that Adam should fall, He must have been willing that he should, since between God’s willing and nilling there is no medium. And is it not highly rational as well as scriptural, nay, is it not absolutely necessary to suppose that the fall was not contrary to the will and determination of God? Since, if it was, His will (which the apostle represents as being irresistible, Romans 9:19) was apparently frustrated and His determination rendered of worse than none effect.” (page 89)

Notice two things: first, he points out that the will of God is *irresistible*. He is right about that; but he goes on to claim that God (irresistibly) willed that Adam should sin.

Hear him again: “Surely, if God had not willed the fall, He could, and no doubt would, have prevented it; but he did not prevent it; ergo, He willed it. And if he willed it, He certainly decreed it, for the decree of God is nothing else but the seal and ratification of His will.” (page 88) Again, notice that he ultimately traces the sin of Adam, not to rebellion on the part of Adam, but to the decree of God himself. According to Zanchius, Adam sinned, because God irresistibly willed for him to sin.

Again, “and Luther observes that ‘God permitted Adam to fall into sin because he willed that he should so fall,’” (page 46). I doubt that needs any explanation.

He goes on, “From what has been laid down, it follows that Augustine, Luther, Bucer, the scholastic divines, and other learned writers are not to be blamed for asserting that ‘God may in some sense be said to will the being and commission of sin,’” (page 54). In this statement he is sure that nobody should *be blamed* for tracing every sin on the part of every person to the will of God.

Let me say again that Absolutism is the result of bundling the pagan philosophy of fatalism with the Bible doctrines of the power, and wisdom, and purpose of God—to the great scandal of those doctrines.

By doing that it removes the stigma of being *blind* and *random* from the notion of an irresistible, unchangeable *fate*. And it explains God’s ability to know the future in a way the carnal mind can comprehend.

In other words, God is able to tell what is going to happen from the first to the last moment of time, because that is the way he is going to orchestrate and manipulate all things and make them happen. In order to do that, he finds it necessary to argue that Adam sinned, because God irresistibly willed for him to sin.

But Bible truth does not need pagan philosophy to prop it up, and any time you call on pagan philosophy to explain God and his work, you will find yourself explaining God in a way that is much more compatible to the pagan way of thinking than it is to the description he gives of himself in the Bible. That will become abundantly apparent as we look further at this Absoluter’s arguments.

3. My third objection to Absolutism is that it teaches that God is the ultimate cause of every sin.

The Absoluter bristles at that statement, and he insists that he does not believe God causes anybody to sin. He explains that God uses something he calls *second cause*, whereby he so manipulates, and orchestrates circumstances that man simply acts out his own sinful nature by reacting to those circumstances. He has a real problem when he tries to apply that notion to the sin of Adam, but we have already talked about that.

Here is what Zanchius says about *second cause*. “That God often lets the wicked go on to more ungodliness, which He does (a) negatively by withholding

that grace which alone can restrain them from evil; (b) remotely, by the providential concurrence and mediation of *second causes*, which *second causes*, meeting and acting in concert with the corruption of the reprobate's unregenerate nature, *produce sinful effects*; (c) judicially, or in a way of judgment," (page 64). Notice that he allows these *second causes*, which are themselves *providential* (provided by God) *produce sinful effects*. He thinks God provides the *second causes* that *produce sinful effects*, and he is sure this, somehow, exonerates God from causing the sin and perversion the wicked do.

But, in spite of this lame dodge, Zanchius makes it abundantly clear that he thinks God is the sole cause of everything that happens—good, bad, and indifferent.

Listen to these direct quotes. Keep in mind that we have provided the italics to point up what he is saying.

"*Whatever comes to pass*, comes to pass by virtue of this absolute omnipotent will of God," (page 50).

"The will of God is so *the cause of all things*, as to be itself without cause, for nothing can be the cause of that which is *the cause of everything*," (page 50).

He appeals to Luther for support, "God worketh all things in all men, *even wickedness in the wicked*," (page 65).

"*He produces actions* by his power alone, which actions, as neither issuing from faith, nor being wrought with a view to the divine glory, nor done in the manner prescribed by the Divine word, are on these accounts *properly denominated evil*," (page 66).

"Every work performed, *whether good or evil*, is done in strength, and by the power derived immediately from God himself," (page 66).

Again, he appeals to Luther, "God would not be a respectable Being if He were not almighty, and *the doer of all things that are done*, or if anything could come to pass in which He had no hand," (page 68).

If, in those quotes, Zanchius and Luther do not clearly and unambiguously charge God with being the *cause of all things, whether good or evil*, I confess I do not know any way words could express that doctrine. These Absoluters are so determined to provide an explanation of how God can foretell the future that they are perfectly willing to charge him with causing sin—in order to prop up their lame doctrine.

At first glance, Absolutism, like its sister doctrine, Calvinism, can be very beguiling. It seems to be a system that explains and organizes all things from the beginning to the end of time. It teaches that God is totally in charge, that nothing is beyond his control, that every motion, from the rise and fall of mighty empires to the fluctuation of every falling snowflake is according to one unchangeable master plan.

But when you scratch it just a little, you discover just below the surface, notions that are diametrically opposed to all the Bible teaches us about God and his attributes. It presents us with a god who must prop up his own attributes. It presents us with a god who is very much like us, a god who can only know the future, because he manipulates and orchestrates the future.

We can be sure that God does know everything that will ever come to pass, and he knows it down to the tiniest detail. But he knows that because he inhabits eternity. He is not bound by time the way we mortals are. That is a point the Absoluter readily acknowledges; but he never allows that fact to interfere with his system.

God is in charge; nothing is beyond his control. His power reaches to the mightiest heavenly bodies, and to the tiniest subatomic particle. But that does not mean he manipulates moral creatures and causes them to sin.

Our second article of faith says, “We believe the scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are the word of God, and the *ONLY* rule of faith and practice.” Pagan philosophy can be interesting to study, and I have spent more than my fair share of time studying it. But we should be cautious about supplementing the Bible with men’s philosophy.

We must always keep in mind that is what Absolutism is. It is the pagan doctrine of *fate* dressed up in a Christian garb and made to look like Christian doctrine.

It has been said that, “Fools rush in where angels fear to tread,” and, unwilling to stand in wide-eyed wonder at the majesty of his Maker—the Absoluter rushes in with his book of pagan philosophy in hand.

Rather than simply acknowledge that God is God, and we are not—he traces all the sin and wickedness of the world to the decrees of God, and (either overtly or covertly) charges God with being the cause of every sin. He explains God in a way that is entirely different from the pure and thrice holy God of the Bible.

To end where we began, there comes a time when we must acknowledge that no matter how brilliant you may be, when you study about God and his attributes, there comes a point at which you are left in wide-eyed, slack-jawed amazement. At that point our learning must give way to wonder.

Isaiah 55:9 “For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts.” hlh (*See also article on Acts 4:28*)

Absolutism: Objections - C. H. Cayce

ABSOLUTISM: Objections: C.H. Cayce: “If anyone fails to drink in and advocate the doctrines held to by them—that God absolutely and unconditionally predestinated all things that come to pass, and that man is an irresponsible machine, and no matter what meanness he does, he can’t help it—he is at once branded as an Arminian, or some other epithet is thrust at him, and they at once declare non-fellowship for him. This simply means that whatever their opinion is, it is the standard, and all must come up to the standard or be left out.” (*Cayce’s Editorials, vol. 1, pg. 13*)

C.H. Cayce: God did not predestinate that Adam should violate the law. God is the author of his predestination. You would surely admit this. Then, if God is the author of his predestination, and he predestinated that Adam should violate his law, then he is the author of the violation of that law. No man under heaven can escape that conclusion.

One had just as well say the moon is blue mud and then try to argue that it is not, as to say God predestinated that Adam should sin, and then try to argue that God is not the author of sin. God did predestinate the salvation of his people, and he is the author of their salvation. He is the author of His predestination.

If good, and not evil, was accomplished in Adam’s transgression, then there is no such thing as evil. The heathenish and idolatrous infidel saying, that “Whatever is, is right,” would then be true! Oh, horror of horrors! The idea that good, and not evil, is accomplished in all the crime, murder, theft, robbery, rape, wife-killing, mothers slaying their offspring—and all other crimes that are being committed all over the country! Lord, deliver us from such black, blasphemous, heathenish infidelity!

If God’s purpose was carried out in Adam, or if God predestinated that Adam should violate the law, then Adam did God’s will when he violated the law, or else God predestinated that Adam should not do his will. If God’s will was for Adam to violate the law, and he had predestinated that he do so, then God told

him to do that which it was not his will for him to do. God told him not to eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. If God had predestinated that he should eat of the fruit of that tree, then he told him not to do the thing that he had predestinated he should do.

The penalty for the violation of that law was death. If God willed and predestinated that he should violate the law, then the man is punished with death for doing God's will, and what God predestinated that he should do. I Corinthians 10:5, But with many of them God was not well pleased; for they were overthrown in the wilderness.

If God predestinated that they should do as they did, then God was not well pleased with His own predestination. If God's predestination is according to His will, then God was not well pleased with his own will in this instance, if he predestinated that they should do as they did. God did not predestinate that they should do as they did, for God is pleased with his predestination; but he was not pleased with them.

We fail to see where there is any grace in a system that puts the man in a state of sin by the predestination of God. If God predestinated that all should be sinners, and then he predestinated that some should be saved from sin, then God predestinated to save some from his own predestination. We fail to see where there is any room for grace in that kind of theory. It destroys every principle of grace. It would be as much damnation by grace as salvation by grace.

Man sinned wilfully, and by his own act brought condemnation and death. It was by man's disobedience, and not by the predestination of God. Hence, God's predestination has never damned anyone. But he did predestinate to save his chosen people from sin, and according to that predestination he saves them. His predestination to save them was grace—mercy alone. Hence they are saved by grace.

We love the doctrine of grace. Poor rebel sinners are saved by grace. Without grace we are forever lost. But we do not love the doctrine that God absolutely predestinated everything that comes to pass, and that God is the cause of our sins and wickedness. If that doctrine be true, then God absolutely predestinated that we should not believe it, and we are glad he did not leave that out. (*Cayce's Editorials, vol. 1, ppg 323,324*)

C.H. Cayce: As to whether the doctrine that God did from all eternity absolutely and unconditionally predestinate everything that comes to pass, we are willing to let just about two passages from God's word settle the matter. But in the first place we will say, without fear of successful contradiction, that the preaching of

the truth, the preaching of the gospel in its purity, has never caused trouble or division in the Old Baptist Church. Advocating the doctrine of the predestination of all things does cause trouble among them. This is enough to prove that it is not the truth. But we call attention the Jeremiah 7:8-10: “Behold, ye trust in lying words that cannot profit. Will ye steal, murder, and commit adultery, and swear falsely, and burn incense unto Baal, and walk after other gods whom ye know not; and come and stand before me in this house, and say, We are delivered to do all these abominations?”

Then in Jeremiah 7:15 and Jeremiah 7:16, “And I will cast you out of my sight, as I have cast out all your brethren, even the whole seed of Ephraim. Therefore pray not thou for this people, neither lift up cry nor prayer for them, neither make intercession to me: for I will not hear thee.” Those people were guilty of committing abominations and then claiming that they were delivered to do those things. The idea of their claim is that God determined and fixed that they should do them and that they could not do otherwise. Their claim was wrong, and God said that he would cast them out of his sight.

Next we refer to Jeremiah 19:5: “They have built also the high places of Baal, to burn their sons with fire for burnt offerings unto Baal, which I commanded not, nor spake it, neither came it into my mind.” In Jeremiah 7:31 he says, “neither came it into my heart.” Now we will give any man until the next day after the Judgment to tell how God did from all eternity absolutely and unconditionally predestinate and fix a thing that never came into his heart or mind. (*Cayce’s Editorials vol. 4, ppg 104, 105*)

C.H. Cayce: In Romans 8:29 Paul tells us that those whom the Lord foreknew he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son; and in Romans 8:30 he says that whom He did predestinate, them he also called. In the epistle of the same apostle to the Ephesians, 1st chapter and 5th verse (Ephesians 1:5), he says, “Having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself, according to the good pleasure of his will.” Verse 11, same chapter (Ephesians 1:11), he says, “In whom also we have obtained an inheritance, being predestinated according to the purpose of him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will.”

These are the only places in the sacred Scriptures where these terms are used; and it is quite clear that in each case the apostle uses them in direct reference to the salvation of the chosen, or the predestinated way he leads his people, and no one is at liberty to use them in any other way than the God of our salvation is a sovereign ruler of the universe. No one of my capacity believes stronger than I that he most assuredly overrules all evil intentions of men and devils and gets the victory to himself, and that for his people.

But until I can explain how God can predestinate a thing and yet not be the author of it, I will not say that the wicked acts of men were predestinated by Him. It is the nature of men to sin. But salvation from sin could be accomplished only by God's predestinating it. Whatever is said of the purposes of God, or of His overruling power, save in the places referred to, the apostles have seen fit to use other words than predestination; and if, as we believe, they wrote as the Holy Ghost dictated, the words they used were chosen by the Holy Ghost, and we cannot improve upon them.

When we use words not found in the Bible in an effort to make our position stronger, we weaken it instead. The strongest position is the Bible position, and its use of words the very best form. I do wish our brethren would stop using their own words and use those which the Holy Ghost gave to the apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ. These are intended for the instruction and edification of His humble poor, and do this better than any form of words that men can devise.

We all believe that our God is a sovereign; that the salvation of sinners is by the grace of God through Jesus Christ, and that we are dependent upon him for the grace that we daily need; and for all that we receive and enjoy, we desire to give Him the praise. We merit nothing but his judgments. But his mercy endureth forever. Our wrongs are in no sense chargeable to God. By man came sin, and sin is the transgression of the law, and hence contrary to the will of God. (*Cayce's Editorials vol. 4, ppg 351, 352*)

Acts - The Book of - Sylvester Hassell

The Book of ACTS: *Sylvester Hassell:* The book entitled the Acts of the Apostles forms the bridge between the gospels and the epistles. It is a direct continuation of the third gospel, by the same author, Luke, and is addressed to the same Theophilus ("friend of God"), probably a Christian convert of distinguished social position. In the Gospel Luke repeats what he heard and read; in the Acts what he heard and saw. The Gospel records the life and work of Christ; the Acts the work of the Holy Spirit, who is recognized at every step. The word *Spirit*, or *Holy Spirit*, occurs more frequently in the Acts than in any other book of the New Testament. It might properly be called "the Gospel of the Holy Spirit."

The Acts is a cheerful and encouraging book, like the third gospel. It represents the progress of Christianity from Jerusalem, the capital of Judaism, to Rome, the

capital of heathenism. It is a history of the planting of the church among the Jews by Peter, and among the Gentiles by Paul. More than three-fifths of it are devoted to Paul, and especially to his later labors and journeys, in which the author could speak from personal knowledge. Luke was in the company of Paul, including some interruptions, at least twelve years. He was again with Paul in his last captivity, shortly before Paul's martyrdom, his most faithful and devoted companion (II Timothy 4:11). He probably began the book of Acts or a preliminary diary while with Paul at Philippi, continuing it at Caesarea during Paul's two years' imprisonment there, and finishing it soon after Paul's first imprisonment in Rome, before the terrible persecution in the summer of A.D. 64, which he could hardly have left unnoticed.

The Acts and epistles supplement each other by a series of coincidences in all essential points. Paley's examination of these numerous and undesigned coincidences in his *Horae Paulinae*, and James Smith's *Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul*, furnish to readers of sound common sense and unbiased judgment with unanswerable arguments for the credibility of the Acts. No ancient work affords so many tests of veracity as the Acts, because no other has such numerous points of contacts in all directions with contemporary history, politics and topography, whether Jewish, or Greek, or Roman.

No other history of thirty years has ever been written so truthful and impartial, so important and interesting, so healthy in tone and hopeful in spirit, so aggressive and yet so genial, so cheering and inspiring, so replete with lessons of wisdom and encouragement for work in spreading the glad tidings of salvation, and yet withal so simple and modest, as the Acts of the Apostles." (*Hassell's History* ppg 204, 205)

Acts 4:28 - Harold Hunt

Acts 4:28 "For of a truth against thy holy child Jesus, whom thou hast anointed, both Herod, and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles, and the people of Israel were gathered together, **for to do whatsoever thy hand and thy counsel determined before to be done.**"

The Absoluters claim this text; it is their fortress. They are sure it establishes their doctrine as no other text does.

But before we get to that, we need to establish what we mean by *absolutism*. Absolutism is the doctrine that before God created the world, he predetermined and predestinated everything that will ever happen in time. We are told that he

arranged all the events, and all the conditions and circumstances leading up to those events so that everything that happens—good, bad, or indifferent—happens exactly the way he predestinated it to happen.

Those of us who do not believe that doctrine refuse to believe that he predestinated everything that happens. **Especially we refuse to believe that he predestinated all the sin and wickedness in the world.**

The Absoluter can come up with some mighty fancy footwork, explaining how God arranges conditions and circumstances, and something he calls *second cause*, so that a man does everything—for good or for evil—that God predestinated him do. It is amazing what elaborate tapestries he can weave in explaining how God can cause men to do every thing they do, without in any way being the cause of what they do.

The Absoluter insists that his doctrine does not make God the author of sin, but he persists in his argument that God arranged conditions and circumstances so that everything that happens—both good and evil—takes place in exactly the way he predestinated it to happen.

All of that brings us to our text. There can be no question that the crucifixion of the Lord Jesus Christ, together with the humiliation and mistreatment that was heaped on him, was the vilest, the most wicked, event in the history of the world. The Absoluter is sure that if he can prove God predestinated the wickedness that went on at Calvary, he will have no trouble in proving that God predestinated all the other wickedness in the world. And he is sure that is precisely what this text says. **But that is not what it says.** If you will stay with us for the next few minutes, I believe we can demonstrate that this text does not teach anything resembling the *Absolute* doctrine.

Two contrary forces at work

The first thing we need to point out is that there were two contrary forces at work that day, and it is impossible to imagine anything more different than those forces were. Those two forces had **two different causes**—two different sources—and, ultimately, two different ends in view. It is the failure to recognize those opposite forces—and the different causes behind those forces—that has caused most of the confusion about this text.

The first force was man at war with his Maker. That war began with the sin of Adam in the very morning of time, and it continues until this very day, but **it reached its climax at the crucifixion of our Lord.** Never in all of history has man ever raged against his Maker the way he did at Calvary.

In order to save his people from their sins, and from eternal damnation, God became man; he became incarnate in human flesh. He took on him such a nature as you and I have. As God he could not be tempted; he could not suffer, and he could not die. He became man in order to do all those things.

The adversary opposed him every step of the way; but it was especially at Calvary that he did everything within his power to destroy him. **All the wickedness that went on at Calvary was man's work.** It was the ultimate expression of his war against his Maker. That wickedness was no part of the atonement, and it was no part of redemption.

The second force at work was the grace of God working out salvation on behalf of his people. God had determined from all eternity that he would save his people, and that is what he was working out at the cross. At Calvary he worked out the atonement; he brought about the redemption of his people.

Redemption and atonement

Before we go any further we need to define redemption and atonement. They go together, and one is the inevitable result of the other. There is no way you can have one without the other, and they are so bound together there is nothing really wrong in referring to them as the same thing. We use the terms *limited atonement* and *particular redemption* interchangeably. But it seems to me they are not exactly the same thing. It is kind of like fire and heat. Fire and heat are not the same thing; but one is the inevitable result of the other.

Redemption was God's *buying back* of his people from his own righteous indignation against sin. It was his payment of their sin debt. Atonement is our *reconciliation* with God, based on the payment of our sin debt.

First, redemption is the payment of our sin debt.

I Peter 1:18-19, "Forasmuch as ye know that ye were not **redeemed** with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from your vain conversation received by tradition from your fathers; but **with the precious blood of Christ**, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot."

Revelation 5:9, "And they sung a new song, saying, Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof; for thou wast slain, and hast **redeemed** us to God **by thy blood** out of every kindred, and tongue, and people and nation."

Atonement is the reconciliation with God that was purchased, and brought about, by that redemption. It is the result of redemption.

Romans 5:10-11, “For if, when we were enemies, we were **reconciled to God** by the death of his Son, much more being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life. And not only so, but we also joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, **by whom we have now received the atonement.**”

Redemption and atonement were the work of God, and the wicked conduct of those men had nothing to do with it. They participated in their own damnation; but they did not participate in our salvation.

The Crucifixion and the Atonement

We also need to point out that the atonement and the crucifixion were not the same thing, and perhaps, that is the most important lesson to learn. **The crucifixion was man’s work; the atonement was God’s work.** They are two entirely different things, and we must never confuse the two.

Man had nothing to do with redemption, but he had everything to do with the crucifixion of the Lord. It was men who took him through the mock trial. Men beat him with whips. Men beat him until his form was more marred than any man. Men cut the timbers. Men assembled the cross. Men drove the nails. It was a man who pierced his side. Men mocked him, and ridiculed him. That was all man’s work, but nothing man did had any part in redemption.

At the very most all those men did was a reflection of what God was doing—out of their sight.

The climax of man’s rebellion

Question: if nothing the soldiers did, contributed anything to our salvation, what is the significance of the crucifixion?

The significance of the crucifixion is that it was the ultimate climax of man’s rebellion against God—his war against God.

Never in time or eternity did the ultimate good and the ultimate evil come face to face the way they did at Calvary. In the very face of the greatest evil this world has ever known God worked out the salvation of his people, and nothing they could do could stop him.

When a jeweler is showing a diamond he will often display it on a black velvet cloth. The beauty of the diamond is seen all the more clearly against the black background. God contrasted all he did on behalf of his people against all the wickedness that went on that day. **The glory of God's grace is all the more resplendent against the blackness of man's sin.**

Man has been at war with his Maker ever since Adam sinned. All during the public ministry of the Lord the adversary did all within his power to destroy him. He could not destroy him. But when his time was fully come, the Father delivered his Son into their hands, and suffered them to do their worst.

“Him being **delivered** by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain,” Acts 2:23.

Far from participating in the work, man was raging against his Maker at the very moment God was working out the salvation of his people.

Two different forces; two different causes

Again, there were two different forces, and two different causes at work that day. The cause of the atonement was the purpose, the grace, and the mercy of God. **The cause of the crucifixion was the hatred and corruption man's corrupt and depraved heart.**

It was not God that put such hatred in their heart. We are told plainly, “**They hated me without a cause.**” That is, they did not need God to cause them to hate him. Those who claim God is the cause of everything those wicked men did that day have God to argue with. God tells us in no uncertain language, “They hated me without a cause.” **Their hatred flowed naturally and freely from the corruption of their own heart.** It did not flow from the purpose and grace of God.

The Crucifixion was not the Atonement

The crucifixion was no part of the atonement. Nothing those wicked men did was any part of the atonement. **Rather the crucifixion was the time and place where God worked out the atonement.** It was the context in which God did his work; but it was not part of that work.

God had determined from all eternity that he would work out the atonement in the context of the crucifixion, and he prophesied that he would do just that. He would display his grace against the dark background of their wickedness. But their wickedness would play no part in what he was doing on behalf of his

people, and there is no way anybody can show that he predestinated their wickedness—nor any wicked thing they did.

We are simply told that God delivered his Son into their hand. Their wicked depraved heart did the rest.

“Him being **delivered** by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain,” Acts 2:23.

Old Elder Benjamin Lampton used to say, “It was not necessary for God to predestinate wickedness; man has done a very good job of that all by himself.” God delivered Jesus into their hand, and they did what their depraved heart moved them to do.

God inhabits eternity; he is not bound by time

But somebody wants to know, “How could God purpose to work out redemption in the context of the crucifixion, if he did not fix and predestinate all those men did?”

God is the eternal one; he inhabits eternity. He is not bound by time the way you and I are. All is one eternal now with him. He can look across time as easily as you and I can look across a room. But he is no more the cause of all he sees, than we are the cause of all we see.

Sin did not bring salvation

But, back to our subject, **nothing those men did contributed in any way to our salvation**. There is no way around it. If what those men did contributed to the atonement, then sin brought salvation. If what they did contributed to the atonement, then Jesus did not do the work by himself. **That would make them his helpers; it would make them joint-saviors with him**. But that is not the way the Bible tells it.

“I have trodden the winepress alone; and of the people there was **none with me**....And I looked and there was **none to help**; and I wondered that there was **none to uphold**: therefore mine own arm brought salvation unto me; and my fury it upheld me,” Isaiah 63:3,5.

He says it over and over; there was nobody involved in this work except himself. The Arminian thinks the preacher is involved; the Absoluter thinks those who nailed him to the cross were involved. They are both wrong.

One harmonious fabric

Keep in mind that the Bible is one harmonious fabric throughout. It is consistent; it never contradicts itself. If there is ever a contradiction, it is in your own mind.

Also keep in mind that in studying the Bible you begin with what is clear and undeniable. Then (with the Lord's help) you study and reason your way—step by step—toward that which is not so clear. If you start with what is most clear, and move one step after another to the next most obvious fact, by the time you finish, you will often discover that those unclear questions have fallen into place. That is certainly the case with this text.

What God determined before to be done

But somebody replies, “For all you have said, the question remains, what was it God *determined before to be done?*”

To answer the question, notice why God sent his Son in the first place. **God determined from all eternity that his Son should suffer and die on behalf of his people.**

That is what he “determined before to be done.”

That is why he came into this world. That is why he went to Calvary. God imputed our sins to his Son, and **he suffered and died to pay our sin debt.** That is what redemption is all about. That is the basis of the atonement. Our sins, and the guilt of our sins, were removed by the suffering and death of our Lord.

“For of a truth against thy holy child Jesus, whom thou hast anointed, both Herod, and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles, and the people of Israel were gathered together, for to do **whatsoever thy hand and thy counsel determined before to be done,**” Acts 4:27-28. Exactly what does he mean by what God's hand and counsel “determined before to be done?” The Absoluter tells us it involves all that went on that day. He tells us God orchestrated and manipulated every stroke and every blow that struck our Lord, that he predestinated every vile thing that was done to him.

But we must never charge God with being the author of sin, and we must never charge him with manipulating any man, and causing him to sin.

We said before that the Absoluter can come up with some mighty fancy footwork, explaining how God can arrange conditions and circumstances, and

something he calls *second cause*, so one thing inevitably leads to another, and that man does everything—for good or evil—that God predestinated him to do. It is amazing what elaborate tapestries he can weave in explaining how God can cause men to do everything they do, without being the cause of what they do.

But we do not need theological mumbo-jumbo. If we will just let the Bible explain the Bible, most subjects become fairly simple. And this subject is simple enough, if you just let the clearest texts explain those that are not so clear.

God purposed that his Son should suffer and die

It was the purpose of God that his Son should suffer and die, and up to that point that was also the purpose of those who were gathered together.

It was the purpose of that mob that Jesus should suffer and die. It is in that sense they were gathered to do what God *determined before to be done*. **They gathered together to bring about the suffering and death of the Lord.**

The same intent; different causes

But their motive, and the cause of their action were totally different from God's purpose. **God determined that his Son should give his life; the mob intended to take his life.**

The cause of what God did was the most loving and gracious of all motives. The cause of all they did was the most evil and hateful of all motives. The one sprang from the purpose, the love and mercy of God; the other sprang from the corruption of their own depraved heart.

No one can reasonably deny that they were, indeed, gathered together for to do whatsoever God's hand and counsel *determined before to be done*. They were gathered together to bring about the suffering and death of the Lord.

But God was no more the cause of all the evil they did, than they were the cause of what God did.

When you get the lesson in any text, you should let it rest. You should not stretch it out of all reason in order to make it say what it does not say. You do not have to torture and stretch this text and make it cover all the sin and wickedness that went on in connection with the suffering and death of the Lord. You should simply take the verse for what it says, and leave it at that.

Please bear with my repetition; but it cannot be emphasized too often. The Lord tells us, “They hated me without a cause.” They did not need God to predestinate that they would hate him. Their hatred—and all that sprang from that hatred—flowed naturally and freely from the corruption of their own depraved heart.

We mentioned a moment ago that if you will begin with what is clear and undeniable, and move step by step from that to the next clearest point, eventually you may very well find yourself at the question that has been troubling you, and that question may fall right into place. That is what we hope to do in the next few pages.

The Absoluter limits God’s ability to know the future

We need to realize first that God knows everything there is to know. He knows everything that will ever happen before it happens, and he has known it from all eternity. That is one of the proofs that he is God. The Absoluter tells us that God cannot know what is going to happen, unless he has determined to manipulate and orchestrate all the conditions and circumstances leading up to that event, so that whatever happens is the inevitable result of all that has gone before.

But that notion limits God. It has God using his power to prop up his foreknowledge. It would have us believe that if God did not cause all things to happen just the way they do, he could not know what would happen. They are sure his foreknowledge would come crashing to the ground.

Those who think God must make men do what they do, in order to know what they are going to do, have imagined that God is like we are. **But God is not like us.** He is not so limited that he cannot know what is going to happen without orchestrating and manipulating it to make it happen. That is one of the proofs he is God.

God knows all that will ever happen, and when he chooses to do so, he reveals to us as much as he wants us to know. Over a period of hundreds of years he inspired the prophets to write all that was needed to be known about the life and death, the ministry and crucifixion of the Lord.

There could never be any doubt that all that transpired at Calvary would come about the way God had prophesied it would.

There is ever so much God does that we cannot explain. In fact, we cannot explain the *how* of most of what God does. We cannot explain how he created

an entire universe out of nothing. He is so vast the very heaven of heavens cannot contain him, and yet he was born of a woman and lived in a body such as you and I have. We cannot explain that. We cannot explain how the Spirit does its work in regeneration. We cannot explain how he is going to raise the dead. So we should not be surprised that we cannot explain how he can know every tiny detail of what is going to happen in the future.

But it is the height of folly to try to explain the unexplain-able by insisting that God knows the future, because he pulls the strings, and makes everything—both good and evil—happen just the way it does. Nobody was ever more foolish, than when he tries to compensate for his own ignorance by charging God with being the source of all the evil in the world.

God succeeded at the cross; the mob failed

They were, indeed, gathered together for the purpose of bringing about the death of the Lord; but they totally failed. They did everything they could to kill him, and they could not do it.

Then what does it mean, when it says, “Him being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken, and by wicked hands have *crucified and slain*,” [Acts 2:23](#), or when it says they “*killed* the Lord Jesus,” [1 Thess 2:15](#). Do those verses not say plainly that they killed the Lord?

When it says they “killed the Lord,” it is talking about their sin. It is not talking about what they actually accomplished. We have the Lord’s word for it that they did not have the power to kill him.

“I am the good shepherd: the good shepherd *giveth his life* for the sheep,” John 10:11. **They did not take his life; he gave it.**

Again we are told, “Therefore doth my Father love me, because *I lay down my life* that I might take it again. No man taketh it from me, but *I lay it down of myself*. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This commandment have I received of my Father,” [John 10:17-18](#).

But the question remains, we are told over and over that they killed the Lord (Mark 8:31; 9:31). How can you say that does not indicate they were successful in killing the Lord? Again, the Lord was talking about their sin. They were, indeed guilty of killing the Lord, even though they did not succeed in accomplishing what they tried to do.

In his book entitled *Justification*, Elder J. H. Oliphant explains it very well. “Sin resides in the **will**, the **intent**; not so much in the act as in the will. A man shot with the design to kill a deer; he missed the deer and killed a friend; there was a man killed, but the crime of murder was not committed. Another man shot with the design of killing a man; he missed the man and killed a deer. **In this case there was murder, but no one killed; the crime was in the will.** In this way men may be guilty of murder, theft, adultery, etc., without the deed actually being committed. The will is the nest of sin.”

Even though they failed in their effort to kill the Lord, they were guilty of killing him, nonetheless.

They intended to kill him. They were gathered together for the purpose of killing him. They did everything necessary to be done in order to kill him—if it had been possible that he could have been killed. And they left thinking they had killed him. So they did everything necessary to incur their guilt. But for all they did, they still did not succeed in killing the Lord.

Bear in mind that the nature of the act is determined by the motive of the heart. That is a principle clearly established in law. A prosecuting attorney told me recently that he had sent men to the penitentiary on that distinction.

It was the death of our Lord that paid our sin debt. If they had actually succeeded in killing the Lord, we might conclude that their sin did, indeed, contribute to our salvation, but that is not the case. They could not kill him; he laid his life down.

With his stripes we are healed

But somebody reminds us that Isaiah says, “But he was *wounded* for our transgressions, he was *bruised* for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and *with his stripes we are healed*,” Isaiah 53:5.

They *wounded* him; they *bruised* him, and they put the *stripes* on his back. If we are healed with *his stripes*, suppose those people had just stayed at home. Then how could we be healed with his stripes? They wounded and bruised him; does that not show that what they did had some part to play in the atonement? No, it does not.

The simplest rule in Bible study is: read the context. The Bible explains itself better than any of us can explain it. If you will read just a few verses before and after, it will become clear which *wounds*, and *bruises*, and *stripes* are under consideration. It was not the marks those people put on his back.

“Surely he hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows: yet we did esteem him stricken, **smitten of God**, and afflicted,” Isaiah 53:4. It does not take a rocket scientist to figure out who laid those stripes on him. He was “stricken, *smitten of God*, and afflicted. That is the verse immediately before our text.

“But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed,” Isaiah 53:5.

Again, notice the plain language of the text. These wounds were *for our transgressions*. These bruises were *for our iniquities*. This chastisement was *for our peace*. That language does not describe anything those people did to the Lord. They were not the least concerned with making satisfaction for *our transgressions, our iniquities*. They had no interest in *our peace*. **Everything they did was to satisfy their own malice.**

Those were the stripes God the Father placed on the soul of our Lord when he was working out our redemption. They were not the stripes the soldiers put on his back.

Keep reading if you will. “All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned everyone to his own way; and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all,” Isaiah 53:6. Again in Isaiah 53:8, “For the transgression of my people was he stricken.” Again, those soldiers did not strike him to remove our transgressions. They did not strike him to satisfy the just demands of God’s righteous law; they struck him to satisfy their own malice.

The prophet will not allow us to miss the point. **“Yet it pleased the Lord to bruise him; he hath put him to grief,”** Isaiah 53:10. If anybody jumps to the conclusion that the bruises and stripes under consideration were the marks on his back, he is just not paying attention. The passage is as clear as it needs to be. “It pleased the Lord to bruise him; he hath put him to grief.” This is not talking about the soldiers; this is a transaction between God the Father and his Son.

He goes on in Isaiah 53:11. “He shall see of the travail of his soul and shall be satisfied.” He did not say, “He shall see the pain in his hands and his feet.” He did not say, “He shall see the pain in his back.” He says, **“He shall see of the travail of his soul—and shall be satisfied.”**

The agony those soldiers imposed on his body did not satisfy the righteous demands of God’s law, but the travail of his soul did. “He shall see of the travail of his soul and shall be satisfied.”

We cannot imagine how intense the agony was that he suffered in having nails driven through his hands and feet. We cannot imagine the agony of the crown of thorns pressed down on his brow. His physical suffering must have been intense beyond our ability to imagine. **But for all the excruciating physical pain he suffered, that was a small thing compared to the travail of his soul.**

For over fifty years I have preached how the Lord legally and judicially carried our sins to the cross. And that is true; he did. He carried our sins to the cross and he fully paid our sin debt. That debt will never again be required of any child of God. That is the theme of this fifty third chapter of the prophecy of Isaiah.

But then, one day, I realized that, not only did the Lord legally and judicially carry my sins to the cross. He consciously carried my sins.

As he was hanging on the cross he could consciously feel the weight and the guilt of my sins. The Lord had never been so precious to me as he was at that moment, when I first realized that he could actually feel the guilt of my sins pressing down on his soul.

If you will, think back to a time when you did something you knew was wrong. You thought about it before you did it. You argued with your conscience. You decided that at any other time, and under any other circumstances, and, perhaps, for anybody else, it would be wrong, but maybe, just this once and never again, it would be alright. When you argue with your self over whether something is wrong or not, you almost always lose.

So you went ahead and did whatever it was you were thinking about, and no sooner than you did it, your conscience woke up. Your conscience can be a very poor guide. It will be as quiet as a mouse until the deed is done, and then, when it is too late, it will wake up and accuse you.

Do you remember how guilty you felt, how helpless and undone. There was no excuse; you did it with your eyes open, and then you paid the consequences. Let me read to you a description of how you felt.

“I am poured out like water, and all my bones are out of joint; my heart is like wax; it is melted in the midst of my bowels. My strength is dried up like a potsherd; and my tongue cleaveth to my jaws; and thou has brought me into the dust of death,” Psalms 22:14-15.

If those expressions do not describe the torment of a guilty conscience, I do not know any way words can describe it.

The chapter begins with, “My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me.” Those were the very words of the Lord as he was hanging on the cross. The entire passage is a prophecy of the crucifixion. It allows us to look into the inner workings of the mind of the Lord as he was bearing and feeling the weight and the guilt of our sins.

Read the passage again and again, and feel in some small way *the travail of his soul* as he bore your sins and mine.

When you consider how you felt when your sins were pressing on your soul, suppose that at some time you should feel all the guilty consciences you have ever felt in your entire life tormenting you at the same time. Do you think you could bear the load.

Now consider that not only did the Lord consciously feel the weight and guilt of all your sins pressing on his soul as he was hanging on the cross, **he could consciously feel ALL the guilt of ALL the sins of ALL his people.**

There are people who, for one reason or another, have suffered great physical pain. I am told, and I have no doubt that it is true, that the pain of massive third degree burns is the most agonizing of all pain. There are people who know what that kind of pain is like.

But the human mind cannot conceive of *the travail of his soul* as our Lord consciously felt the weight and *all* the guilt of *all* the sins of *all* his people pressing down on him.

That was *the travail of his soul* Isaiah was talking about. That was what he carried on the cross. **It is in that sense that Isaiah said, “He shall see of the travail of his soul and be satisfied.”** That was the greatest agony of the cross. Compared to that, the physical pain, excruciating though it might be, was a little thing.

“My God, My God, why hast thou forsaken me?”

As he was hanging on the cross, suspended between heaven and earth—apparently rejected by both—the sun refused to shine, and God the Father turned his back on his own Son. It was then that in *the travail of his soul* he cried out, “My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?” **It was then that he paid the**

price of our redemption. It was then that God accepted the travail of his soul and was satisfied.

Seven hundred years before the fact Isaiah said, “He shall see of the travail of his soul and be satisfied,” Isaiah 53:11. The just demands of God’s broken law were satisfied by the travail God the Father heaped on the soul of our Lord. They were not satisfied by the marks the soldiers made on his back.

The Messianic prophecies fulfilled

All the Old Testament prophecies of the Messiah were fulfilled in Christ. The types contained in the Old Testament sacrifices found their fulfillment in him. The sacrifices symbolized him. The priesthood symbolized him. There were four necessary elements in the Old Testament sacrifices, and they found their fulfillment in the work of Christ on the cross.

First, there was the sacrifice itself; he was the sacrifice. Every little lamb that was offered pointed to him.

Isaiah 53:7, “He is brought as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before his shearers is dumb, so he openeth not his mouth.”

John 1:29, “Behold the lamb of God, which taketh away the sins of the world.”

Second, there was the priest to offer the sacrifice.

Hebrews 9:11,14, “But Christ being come **an high priest** of good things to come.....who through the eternal Spirit **offered himself** without spot to God.”

Third, there was the altar on which the sacrifice was offered. Keep in mind that the cross was not the altar on which Christ offered himself to God. If the cross, or Calvary, was the altar on which he was offered, the altar was desecrated; there were two thieves crucified at the same time and place. **The altar on which Christ offered himself to the Father was the altar of his own deity.**

Matthew 23:19, “Ye fools and blind, for whether is greater, the gift, or **the altar that sanctifieth the gift?**”

Christ was not sanctified by Mount Calvary nor by the cross. The human nature of Christ was sanctified by its union with his divine nature.

And fourth, there was the Father to either accept or reject the sacrifice. The Father imputed our sins to his Son (Isaiah 53:6); he poured out on him his wrath

against sin; and smote him (Isaiah 53:4), and bruised him, and brought him to grief (Isaiah 53:10), and was *satisfied with the travail of his soul* (Isaiah 53:11) as an *offering for sin* (Isaiah 53:10).

The alpha and the omega, our all in all

Christ Jesus is our all in all. He is the alpha and the omega, the first and the last, the beginning and the end. **The redemption was a transaction between God the Father and his Son.** God provided everything that was necessary for our redemption. He did not need any help from anybody.

He was the sacrifice; he was the priest who offered the sacrifice; he was the altar that sanctified the sacrifice; and the Father accepted the sacrifice.

That did not leave man anything to do. You cannot find any place to squeeze man into the work. Those men heaped on the body of our Lord all the abuse, and suffering, and insult they were able to come up with. But nothing they did was sufficient to kill him, and it was not sufficient to satisfy the just demands of God's righteous law.

From all eternity God chose to display his grace against the black background of man's greatest offense, but God did not need their participation in the redemption. **Had he chosen to do so, he could have done everything he did, if they had all stayed at home.**

God determined that his Son should suffer and die. Up to that point they were, indeed, gathered together to do whatsoever God's hand and counsel "determined before to be done." They were determined that he should suffer and die. But God determined that he should *give his life*; they determined to *take his life*. **God succeeded; man failed.**

Isaiah 63:3,5, "I have trodden the winepress along; and of the people there was **none with me**....And I looked and there was **none to help**; and I wondered that there was **none to uphold**; therefore mine own arm brought salvation unto me; and my fury, it upheld me."

Adam

ADAM: C.H. Cayce: Before Adam transgressed the law he was a good natural man. He did not have the God-life, or spiritual life. He was in possession of an upright natural life. He was without sin—good. When he violated the law he lost his moral uprightness. He lost his moral standing. From

then to now Adam, in nature, has had absolutely no moral or upright standing with God. He lost it in the fall.

What Christ did was not done for Adam, or for the whole race of Adam, but for those chosen out of the race of Adam.

Hence, Adam, as Adam, was not restored to anything in Christ. The Lord's chosen, Christ's bride (those who were given to Him for His bride) are restored in Christ, not simply to what they lost in Adam, but to more. They "receive double." They are given eternal life through Christ. If they were only restored to the original state, they would not reach heaven. Hence the Lord's people receive more in and through Christ than was lost in and through Adam." (*Cayces Editorials vol. 1, ppg 342,343*)

Adam: what did he lose when he sinned C.H. Cayce: When God made the man He made him a natural man—a complete man, composed of soul, body and spirit. It takes the three (soul, body and spirit) to constitute a complete man. The man was not a fit subject for heaven, for if he had been, God would have placed him there. God made no mistake, and placed the man in the garden of Eden, where he was capacitated to live and enjoy the blessings of his Creator so long as he obeyed His law.

The man was morally good and upright as he came from the plastic hand of his Creator. In his transgression he lost that moral uprightness—he was separated from it. Death is a separation. He lost his moral standing with God. He did not lose a heavenly life, for he never had it to lose. As before stated, he was not capacitated for heaven; and he stood as much in need of a higher order of life before the transgression in order that he be prepared to live in and enjoy heaven, as we need it today.

But we not only need the higher order of life in order that we live in heaven, but we also need atonement, or reconciliation, or satisfaction for our sins. Hence, as we see it, Adam was simply a natural man, composed of soul, body and spirit, with good moral standing before God before the transgression. In the transgression he lost all this moral standing, became corrupted, poisoned and contaminated with sin." (*Cayce's Editorials vol. 2, ppg 85*)

Adam: could he have kept the law: C.H. Cayce: If Adam could not have kept the law, then his condemnation for the violation of the law is not just; and if his condemnation is not just, then the law was not just. But the apostle says Romans 7:12) that the law is just. If the law is just, then the punishment for the violation of the law is just; and if the punishment is just, then the man could have kept the law. He did not have to violate it.

To say that man had to violate the law in order that God carry out His plan of salvation is to say that man had to commit sin in order to be saved in heaven. This would not only make eternal salvation conditional, but would make it conditional upon the wicked works of men. That is worse than the rankest Arminianism we ever heard.

Some people accused the apostle of preaching and teaching the principle "Let us do evil that good may come." The apostle denied the charge and said that it was a slanderous report. He did not teach that man had to violate the law in order that God carry out His plan of salvation. The man who does teach that teaches heresy of the very worst sort. He must want a cloak to hide behind to do some meanness. (*Cayce's Editorials vol. 2, ppg 182,183*)

Adams Transgression - Harold Hunt

ADAM'S TRANSGRESSION: Harold Hunt

Genesis 2:16-17, "And the Lord God commanded the man, saying, Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat; but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it, for in the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die."

Our Articles of Faith say, "**We believe in the doctrine of original sin.**" By that we mean, "We believe in the doctrine of *the origin of sin.*" It means the same thing. In other words, this is where sin started; this is the origin, the source, of sin. This is why we are the way we are; this is how we came to be sinners. We believe that when Adam partook of the forbidden fruit, he became a sinner, and all his posterity became sinners with him, and in him. Adam sinned and brought the wrath of God on all mankind.

But that raises a question. How is it that one man, eating a handful of fruit, half way round the world, and six thousand years ago, had that kind of impact on all mankind? How did one act by one man bring the wrath of God on all men? I believe the Bible makes it plain enough.

Our Federal Head

Before we look at the consequences of Adam's sin, we need to first point out that Adam stood as the federal head of all his offspring. By *federal head*, we mean that he represented us; whatever he did was as if we had done it.

But you tell me, "I don't like this representative principle. If that is what the representative principle is all about, I don't like it." Well, you live with the representative principle every day of your life, whether you like it or not. A few months ago, we elected people and sent them to Washington to represent us. For better or worse, we elect representatives, and we send them to Nashville, or Raleigh, or Washington, to do whatever it is they do. And whatever they do, they do in our name. They represent us, and whatever they do is just as if we did it.

Several years ago there was a congress that had been in session for some time, and according to the news media, they had not accomplished a thing. They got to calling them *the do nothing congress*. One evening on the six o'clock news, the news anchor made the comment that congress had been in session for so many weeks, and they had not accomplished anything yet. They only had so many weeks to go, and if they were going to do anything, they had better do it in the next six weeks.

I thought that was the best news I had heard out of Washington yet. If they could just hold out for six more weeks, we might have it made until next year. I am one of those folks who think the less they do in Washington, the better I like it.

But, anyway, Adam did stand as our representative; he stood as our federal head. If you object to his representing us, do you believe you would have done any better? Suppose God should say, "Okay, we are going to wipe out Adam's record, and from this moment forward, you are going to stand or fall on your own record. I am going to judge you on the final day, based on what you do from today until the day you die."

Bearing in mind that it is only going to take one transgression to plunge you off into eternal damnation, do you think you would

do better than Adam did? Knowing my track record, I believe I had just as soon leave it the way it is.

God Cannot Lie

Having said all of that, let us see what the Bible says about it. "And the Lord God commanded the man, saying, "Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat; but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it, for in the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die," Genesis 2:16,25.

The Bible does not mention very many things God cannot do. It says he cannot lie (Hebrews 6:18); he cannot deny himself (II Timothy 2:13); and he cannot swear by one greater than himself (Hebrews 6:13). In other words, he cannot do anything that is contrary to his own nature and attributes. But the point we are getting to is that God cannot lie. If God says it, it is right.

In the little town where I live there is a church related college, and being church related, they require their students to take the required amount of instruction in Bible. I don't know why they bother. Somebody told me his son-in-law had just graduated from that college. He said the very first thing the professor told him in the first lecture in Bible 101 was that when God told Adam, "In the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die," God lied.

I don't know why they teach the course. Why do they even pretend to believe the Bible, when they make a comment like that? God said, "In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die," and since God said it, we can be sure that, the very day Adam sinned, he died. But Adam lived to be 930 years old, so obviously God was not saying he would die a physical death the day he sinned. He did not mean that Adam was going to keel over, and fall stone cold dead on the ground the instant he ate the fruit. He died a different kind of death.

Well, if God did not mean Adam was going to die a physical death the instant he sinned, what did he mean?

I have been told that Adam did not die a physical death; he died a spiritual death. But did Adam die a spiritual death? Are we to believe that Adam had spiritual life and lost it? If Adam had spiritual life and lost it, would it not be possible that you and I might do the same thing. We have been born of the Spirit; we have spiritual life. If Adam could have spiritual life and lose it, why could we not lose our spiritual life?

The Bible says that is not going to happen. In John 10:27, the Lord says, "My sheep hear my voice and I know them, and they follow me, and I give unto them eternal life, and they shall never perish." No person who has spiritual life will ever lose it; he will *never perish*.

Adam did not die a spiritual death; he did not have spiritual life to lose. He was not a spiritual being. The Bible says that. In I Corinthians 15:46, "Howbeit that was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural and afterward that which is spiritual." Look it up; it was talking about Adam. He was first a natural man, *and afterward* a spiritual man.

As God created him, Adam was an innocent, upright, natural man; he was not a spiritual man. There was no moral dimension to being devoid of the spirit. He was simply what God made him. He was a good, upright, innocent, natural man.

For that matter, he was not yet a proper subject to live in heaven. If he had been, that is where God would have put him. He was a proper subject to live in the Garden of Eden, and that is where God put him.

Dead in Trespasses and Sins

Then he sinned, and he died; but what kind of death did he die? The Bible tells us plainly enough. Ephesians 2:1, "And you hath he quickened who were *dead in trespasses and sins*." Adam trespassed and he sinned, and **he died in trespasses and sins**. I believe a third grader could understand that, don't you?

Dying in trespasses and sins, he lost all moral standing with God. Sometimes it is said he died a moral death. That approaches the subject from a slightly different direction; but it is saying exactly the same thing. The unregenerate are dead in trespasses and sins, with no moral standing with God.

There is a principle I think we should go by in preaching. If you cannot make it simple, leave it alone. I believe the best way to preach is to preach in such manner, that the little ones can understand—and hope the old folks can keep up. So what kind of death did Adam die?

He trespassed, and he sinned, and he died in trespasses and in sins.

When did that happen? It happened the very day he sinned. God said, "For in the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." It happened in the manner, and at the time, God said it would.

His Nature Changed

I believe it happened the very instant he sinned. No sooner had Adam sinned, than there was a profound change that took place. **His very nature changed.** He immediately went from being an innocent, upright, natural man to being a wicked, sinful, depraved, natural man. In a moment we will see that the change in his nature became immediately evident. He did not fall stone cold, dead on the ground, but as soon as he sinned, it became obvious that everything was different to what it had been.

There are no degrees in death. There is no dead, deader, and deadest. As soon as Adam sinned, he was totally, completely dead in trespasses and sins, and everything he did, from that moment on, demonstrated that he was indeed dead in trespasses and sins. Physical death would come many years later, and that death was also the result of his sin; but the death he died the day he sinned was total, and it was instantaneous. In the next few pages, I hope to show the profound change that took place in Adam as soon as he sinned.

As soon as he sinned, everything was different. Before he sinned he was a good, upright, innocent, natural man. As soon as he sinned he became a wicked, sinful, depraved natural man. He was still devoid of the spirit; but he was devoid of the spirit before. After he sinned he is devoid of the Spirit—and alienated from God.

As soon as he sinned he began to demonstrate by his conduct what he had become. The Bible takes us step by step through what Adam did, and what the consequences were. It records what he did, how he did it, and what he did to us. That is what I want to notice.

In the Likeness and Image of Adam

In Genesis 1:26 we read, "And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness." On the strength of that text any number of theologians have explained that mankind is made in God's likeness and image, but the text does not say that.

Adam was created in the likeness and image of God, but when Adam began to father children, he "begat a son in *his* own likeness, after *his* image." Adam was created in the *likeness* and *image* of God; **you and I were born in the likeness and image of Adam.**

And that is our problem. We were not born with the nature Adam had before he sinned; we were born with the nature Adam possessed—after he sinned and transgressed the law of God. We are what we are, because of what Adam made us, because of what Adam did to us.

Adam was created an upright, innocent natural man. He was a natural man, but a natural man created in the likeness and image of God. Then he sinned, and he lost what he had. He became a wicked, depraved, sinful natural man. **And when he began to father children it was that wicked, sinful nature he passed on to his offspring.**

Every living creature begets offspring based on its own nature. Dogs give birth to dogs. Cats give birth to cats. And sinners give birth to sinners. Because Adam sinned every human being from that day to this has been born a sinner. The fountain was poisoned at its source. When Adam sinned, his nature became sinful, and he passed that sinful nature down to his offspring.

Children do not grow up to be sinners. We were born sinners. We came into this world with that sinful nature about us. I know there are a lot of people who have the idea that you turn into a sinner at age twelve, or perhaps, at age seven. But no, we were born sinners.

A man went to the hospital to visit his sister; she had just delivered a new baby. And he did what we all do; he went to the big plate glass window where they show the babies; and he did all the ooh's and ah's, and made silly faces. He finally went back to his sister's room and told her, "I believe that is the prettiest little sinner, I ever saw."

That offended his sister. She was just plumb upset with him. How dare he come back here and tell me my baby is a pretty little sinner? She got all put out. But a day or so later, her time was up, and they sent her home. And they sent the baby with her. About six weeks later, she called her brother. She was at her wits end, and she said, "You are right, that baby is a sinner."

We do not turn into sinners. We were born sinners. We came into this world selfish, and self centered, and always thinking about ourselves. As soon as we were able to have any kind of thoughts, we thought about ourselves. Let me ask you, suppose you set a little two year old in the middle of the floor. He is old enough to sit up and play with his toys. Put a half dozen toys around him. He only needs two, one for each hand. But there are a half dozen toys around him. He has not even noticed some of them.

Then you set another two year old among those toys. You know what is going to happen. That second baby is going to pick up one of the toys. Now what is going to happen? That first baby

may not have paid any attention to that toy until the other kid picks it up, but he will let him know right now, "That is my toy, and you put it down, and leave it alone." And if he does not put it down, he may clap the other kid over the head with one of the toys he has in his hand.

Did you ever wonder how babies seem to know that if you take an object and hit it up against the head of another kid it makes him unhappy? Did you ever wonder where they learn that? You don't have to send him to kindergarten to teach him. He comes into this world knowing how to hit, and with a strong inclination to do it. We were born sinners. We came into this world with that nature.

I have heard it said that, if you want the truth, ask a child. You have heard that, I am sure. I have heard that all my life. That is another of those things that are just not true. A child will tell you the truth, if he is not afraid of the truth. But if he is afraid of the truth, he can come up with the most bodacious lies. You can walk into the room; there are crayon marks all over the wall, and he has a crayon in his hand, but he did not do it. His little invisible friend did it. The Bible tells us, "The wicked are estranged from the womb; they go astray as soon as they are born, speaking lies." A child comes into this world knowing how to lie; you have to teach him to tell the truth; and you have to teach him the consequences of lying.

The Brightest of All Men

Bear in mind that when Adam sinned, he wilfully, deliberately, rebelled against God. He sinned, knowing full well what he was doing, and what the consequences would be. I have had people tell me the serpent tricked Adam into doing what he did. But did the serpent trick Adam? God knew somebody would say that; so he provided a text to answer the objection. Paul told the young preacher Timothy, "Adam was not deceived, but the woman, being deceived was in the transgression," [I Timothy 2:14](#). That makes it clear enough; the serpent did not deceive Adam; he did not trick him into sinning.

Adam was not deceived, but notice the rest of the verse, "But the woman being deceived was in the transgression." The serpent did trick the woman, but he did not and could not trick Adam. Adam was too bright for the devil to deceive him.

Have you ever read any of those self-improvement, self-help books that talk about how we only use ten percent of our mental capacity? Sometimes they claim we only use about three percent. I think that may still be on the high side. But when they talk about how we only use a small percent of our mental capacity, the thing they forget is that, even though the mental capacity may be there, Adam blew all the circuits.

We still have walking around sense, but we do not have the intellect Adam had before he sinned. Outside of the Lord Jesus Christ, Adam was the most brilliant man who ever lived. Does the Bible say Adam was the brightest man who ever lived? It does not say that in so many words, but it does give a very good demonstration. Read [Genesis 2:19](#). "And out of the ground the Lord God formed every beast of the field, and every fowl of the air, and brought them unto Adam to see what he would call them, and whatsoever Adam called every living creature, that was the name thereof."

How many different species of living creature do you think there are in the world? A German scientist by the name of Ernst Mayr claimed there were 17,600 different species.

That is the smallest estimate I ever read. I don't know how he came up with that exact number. It is always a guess when they tell us how many species there are, because they cannot know for sure what constitutes a species.

Nowadays, they are more likely to say there are over three hundred thousand species. Evolutionary types always inflate the number; they want to come up with more species than Noah could get on the ark, but that is a subject for another time. But suppose the smaller number is correct, and there are only 17,600 different species. If that is right, Adam came up with over 17,000 names, and more than that, he remembered the names.

Did you study a foreign language in school? Did you study French, or Spanish? Perhaps, some of you may have studied Latin. They hardly ever teach Latin any more. What is the toughest part about mastering any language? Building a vocabulary, right? If you can build a big enough vocabulary, you can get by without a grammar. If you string enough words together, and sprinkle in an assortment of prepositions, and a few adverbs of time, you can get your point across without a grammar. It may be mighty clumsy, but if you have a sufficient vocabulary, you can improvise without a grammar.

Do you know anybody who could go to the local bookstore, and buy a dual language dictionary, perhaps, a French-English, or Spanish-English dictionary, and master it in one reading. Do you know anybody who could read a dual language dictionary like a novel, and just lay it on the shelf. He will never have to look up a word; he read the book; he remembers what it said.

Do you know anybody who could do that? Of course not. Nobody you ever met could do that, but Adam could. I have checked it several times; most of those dual language dictionaries have about 15,000 entries. That is about the number of species there are supposed to be in the world. Adam gave names to every living creature—and he remembered what he had named them.

Not only could Adam have read that dual language dictionary, and recited every entry; he could have made up all the entries in the first place. Regardless of how many species there are, Adam came up with names for all of them. You and I could not come up with that many different phonetic combinations. After awhile we would exhaust all of the possibilities, and we would call something a baboon, and something else a bowboon, and maybe a booboon. We could never remember which was which; but Adam could.

Adam did not have a computer; he did not need one. His brain worked better than any computer. He was the brightest man there ever has been. The point is that the serpent could not deceive Adam. But the very instant Adam sinned, he went from

being the brightest man who ever lived to being as dumb as a post. How do I know that?

Anybody who thinks he can run into the woods, and stand behind a tree, and hide from God is as dumb as a post.

Complicit From the Beginning

The Bible takes us step by step through what transpired in the garden, but if you read carefully, you will discover that much of what people think they read is not right. Most people seem to think that when the serpent tempted Eve, she partook of the forbidden fruit, and then she went to Adam and told him what she had done. Then when Adam learned what his wife had done, he also partook of the tree. Many of you have heard it explained that way, and you are sure that is what it says. But the Bible does not say that.

Read Genesis 3:6, "And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise, she took of the fruit thereof and did eat, and gave also to her husband **with her**, and he did eat." Notice those two words: *with her*. The serpent did tempt Eve, and she did partake of the fruit before Adam did. **But she did not go anywhere to tell Adam anything.** Adam had been *with her* the whole time. He was a witness to the entire affair.

I have heard the question asked, considering that Eve partook of the tree first, what would have happened, if after Eve sinned, Adam had refused to eat? The answer I usually get is logical and reasonable enough. I am usually told, that if that had happened, Eve would have died, because of her sin, and God would have provided Adam with another wife. That is logical, and reasonable —and totally wrong. Adam was complicit in everything Eve did.

We are told that Eve "was in the transgression." It did not say, "The woman being deceived transgressed." She was in *the transgression*; there was only one transgression. What happened in the garden that day was all a unit. Adam was

involved in all that transpired. Notice, "Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in *the transgression.*" Adam stood as our federal head; he was responsible for what happened in the Garden that day, and he was involved from the very beginning.

Let us back up and see exactly what happened. Eve was not alone when she partook of the tree. Adam was there, observing what was going on the entire time. We are told he was *with her.*

All Anybody Could Want or Need

But before we look at the details, I would like for us to get the picture of these two in the garden. The Garden of Eden must have been a beautiful place. Considering all the beauty there is even now in nature, I doubt we can begin to imagine how beautiful Eden was.

And I believe Adam and Eve were probably the two most physically attractive people who ever lived. God does not create ugly. Ugly is the accumulated result of 6,000 years of sin. Our generation is the genetic leftovers after 6,000 years of depletion of the gene pool. Imagine two of the most physically attractive of all people, in the most beautiful of all surroundings, with a personal relationship totally unmarred by selfishness and sin.

Eve was without doubt the nearest and dearest thing in all world to Adam. "And the Lord God said, It is not good that the man should be alone; I will make him an help meet for him....and the Lord God caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam, and he slept; and he took one of his ribs, and closed up the flesh instead thereof. And of the rib, which the Lord God had taken from man, made he a woman and brought her unto the man. And Adam said, This is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh, she shall be called Woman because she was taken out of man," Genesis 2:18,21-23.

God took one of Adam's ribs to form a wife for him. It is significant that he did not use a bone from his foot. That might have signified that he had the right to grind her under his heel.

The husband is the head of the wife, but he has no right to take advantage of her. I love to preach on the relationship between a devoted husband and wife. When you see that relationship for what God intended it to be, no woman should ever object to the husband being the head of the wife.

He did not take a bone from his head; that might have signified that she had the right to domineer over her husband. But he took a rib, a bone from his side, signifying that she was to be constantly at his side; she was to be his constant companion. He took a bone from under his arm, signifying that she was to be the subject of his constant protection—his constant embrace. He took a bone nearest his heart, signifying that she was to be the nearest, and dearest, and most precious thing in all the world to him. The more we understand what the Bible teaches about the proper relationship between the husband and wife, the more precious, and the more dear, that relationship becomes.

I love to preach on the relationship between husbands and wives. I have spent much of my adult life running all over the country filling appointments, and sometimes pastoring churches miles away. For over six years I served a church four hundred miles away. I went down there twice every month; I went twice a lot of weeks, three times in a week on two different occasions.

The people used to talk about what a great sacrifice I was making, spending so much time going up and down the highway. I would remind them that I was not making the sacrifice; there was a little woman back in Tennessee, who was making the sacrifice. I would tell them, "I am not the one left at home, feeling to be all alone, and crying myself to sleep at night." I do not blush to tell you, that I cannot think of her without a special and warm feeling running all over me. One of the great tragedies of our Primitive Baptist people is that we have never realized what a treasure we have in our pastor's wives.

It is such a beautiful relationship God has provided between husbands and wives. That is one of the reasons he took a bone

nearest his heart to signify that she was to be the nearest, and dearest, and most precious thing in all the world to him.

The Vilest, Most Wicked of all Beings

But now we see Adam with his beautiful wife. She is the nearest and dearest thing in all the world to him, and then the serpent comes on the scene. **The most wicked, the vilest, the most contemptible being in all the universe invades this paradise.** That wicked being comes on the scene, and he begins to deceive, and to corrupt the wife of Adam.

Keep in mind that Adam knew exactly who the serpent was. Do you think God left Adam in the dark about who the serpent was? No, Adam knew exactly who he was, and what he was up to. God did not keep Adam in the dark.

So here comes this vile creature; he approaches the sweet and beautiful wife of Adam, **and Adam just stands there and does not say a thing.**

He should have told the serpent, "Now, you listen here, if you have anything to say, you talk to me; and I don't want to hear anything you have to say, so just get away and leave us both alone." He did not do it. He stood back; and did not say a word. He allowed this vile creature to deceive, and confuse, and confound his wife. Keep in mind that the serpent did not deceive Adam; he knew exactly what was going on. But he did deceive Eve. "The woman *being deceived* was in the transgression."

The serpent was deceiving Eve, and confusing her, and Adam knew it. He knew all the while this vile thing was taking advantage of his wife, and he did not say a thing. The serpent confused her, and deceived her, and persuaded her to eat the forbidden fruit. And Adam just stood there, and allowed the serpent to have his way with her.

Not a Word to Defend His Maker

"The serpent was more subtle than any beast of the field, which the Lord God had made, and he said unto the woman, Yea hath God said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden." This vile, disgusting creature challenges the word of God—the honesty of God—and Adam just stands there and does not say a word to defend his Maker.

"And the woman said unto the serpent, We may eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden, but of the fruit of the tree that is in the midst of the garden, God hath said, Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die." It has been pointed out a million times over that she told it wrong. She added the part about touching the fruit. I am not sure whether she intentionally told it wrong; Paul did say she was deceived. She may have been confused about that too.

But whether she knew she was telling it wrong or not, Adam knew; he was not deceived. He stood there, and listened as she misrepresented God and did not say a word.

"And the serpent said unto the woman, Ye shall not surely die." The serpent made God out to be a liar. God said, "You will die." The snake said, "You are not going to die." It is obvious one of them was lying. If God was telling the truth, the serpent was lying. If the serpent was telling the truth, God was lying. The serpent made God out to be a liar; Adam was standing there, and he did not say a word.

"And the serpent said unto the serpent, Ye shall not surely die, for God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil." The serpent first challenged the word of God. Then he called God a liar. And third, he said, "God is up to no good." He said, "God is holding out on you; there are some good things available for you, and God doesn't want you to have them."

Can you imagine somebody standing by and allowing this vilest of all creatures to vilify and slander God the way the serpent did, and not saying anything. That is what Adam did. **When Adam took a bite of the forbidden fruit, that was the**

visible and physical climax of what had been going on all along.

The Beginning of Feminism

We have considered the sin of Adam from the vantage point of his rebellion against God. Before we look at the consequences of Adam's sins, it would be a good idea to look at his sin from another vantage point. And looking at it from that point of view will cast light on much that is going on in the world today.

Notice exactly what Adam did. First, he abdicated his place as the head of the house. He allowed his wife to speak for him. He allowed her to make the decision for him, and he accommodated his reaction based on her decision. **That a simple description of feminism.**

It would be wrong to say that feminism and original sin are the same thing; they are not. But it is undeniable that sin and feminism came into the world at the same time, and in the same way.

It is also undeniable that feminism began, because the first man abdicated his place as the head of the house, and his wife stepped up to fill the void. It is said that, "Nature abhors a vacuum." There will always be feminism in the world, so long as the husband fails to occupy his God-appointed place as the head of the house.

It is the duty of the husband to be kind and compassionate. It is his place to love his wife as his own body (Ephesians 5:28-30), and to care for and protect her as he protects and cares for his own body, and the welfare of his wife is to be his greatest concern; but he is, nonetheless, to occupy his place as the God-appointed head of the house.

The Nature of its Father

When Adam sinned, he went from being a good, upright, innocent natural man to being a wicked, depraved, sinful natural man. His nature changed, and like the dog passing his nature

to all his offspring, Adam passed that wicked, depraved nature to all that would be born of him. When he fathered children, he fathered them, begot them, in “his own likeness, after his image” Genesis 5:3. He begot them in the *likeness* and *image* of the wicked, depraved sinner he had become. **All those born of Adam are simply Adam multiplied—multiplied in his sin and wickedness.**

A few years ago I read an article about seedless oranges. According to the article, every seedless orange in the world is traceable to a mutant orange tree that was discovered about a hundred years ago on an orange plantation in Brazil in South America. A plantation owner discovered that he had a tree on his plantation that was producing seedless oranges. And being the business man he was, he knew there would be a market for that kind of orange. He knew how to nurture and propagate the tree; so now we are able to go to the grocery store and buy seedless oranges. Every seedless orange tree in the world is traceable to that one mutant tree.

Just as every seedless orange is traceable to that one mutant tree, every sin is traceable to Adam’s partaking of that tree in the garden. When Adam sinned he became a mutant, corrupt tree, bearing corrupt fruit, and all his offspring inherit the nature of that corrupt tree, bearing the same corrupt fruit.

He Knew the Consequences

Keep in mind that Adam knew exactly what he was about to do, and what the consequences would be. Think about it; there are only two conclusions you can reach. Either Adam knew what he was doing, and what the consequences would be, or else God kept him in the dark.

Could you imagine, even for a moment, that God kept Adam in the dark about the consequences of his sin? Either God provided full disclosure, so that Adam knew all the consequences of what he was about to do, or else God blindsided him. Can you imagine that God waited until after Adam sinned, and then said, “Surprise, surprise, look what a kettle of worms you have opened up.” No, of course not.

Every sin that has ever been committed is the result of Adam's sin; it is the working out of the sinful, depraved nature Adam handed down to all his posterity. Think, for a moment, of all the sins, and all the sinners that have come in the wake of Adam's sin.

To name just a few, Adolf Hitler had six million Jews killed, simply because he did not like Jews. How did Adolf Hitler come to be the way he was? He was the way he was, because of the way Adam became when he sinned. He was the way he was, because of the sinful nature he inherited from Adam.

We read in the newspapers about people kidnaping little children, or young girls, and mistreating them, and killing them. Where did that kind of conduct come from? It came from Adam's sin.

We read about parents chaining a retarded child in a closet, and leaving it to live out its days in the dark, almost on starvation. How did that happen? That is the result of what Adam did. That vile, sinful nature has been handed down through the ages. Did Adam know about Adolf Hitler? Did he know about King Herod, or Jack the Ripper? No.

But he knew that if he did what he was about to do, there would be men like Adolf Hitler; there would be men like Saddam Hussein, and Osama ben Ladin. He knew that if he did what he was about to do, there would be untold millions of wicked human beings who would some day burn in the flames of eternal damnation.

But knowing full well what he was about to unleash on the world, he did it anyway.

Guilty of Every Sin

We have already pointed out that, no sooner than Adam sinned, he went from being the most brilliant man who ever lived to being as dumb as a post. Anybody who thinks he can run into

the woods, and stand behind a tree, and hide from God is as dumb as a post.

But, also, no sooner than he sinned, he went from being a good, upright, natural man to being as mean as a snake.

When Adam sinned, he started this entire business of sin, and it has been going on ever since. He stood as our federal head. In the sense that he introduced sin to mankind, he stands guilty of every sin mankind has ever committed.

Let me illustrate it this way. If you set a fire in one apartment of a huge apartment building, do you think that, maybe, the fire you started in one room might spread to the next room, and the next, and the next. Do you think the fire you started might burn the entire building?

Suppose they brought you to trial and your attorney explained, "Now listen, my client did not burn those other apartments; he only burned one apartment." Do you think that would cut any ice with a jury? I don't think they would not pay any attention to that. They would say, "When your client burned that one apartment, he started the fire that burned the whole building."

Suppose you set that fire in the middle of the night, and you knew there were people sleeping in the other apartments. Do you suppose you might be held accountable for the death of those people, or do you think your lawyer might get you off by explaining that you only burned one apartment?

When Adam partook of the fruit of the tree, he started the fire that burned the whole building. Every sin that has ever been committed started and spread from that one sin. He corrupted the fountain at its source, and that source—that nature—has been handed down to every person descended from him.

As Mean as a Snake

Listen to Adam's explanation. "And I heard thy voice in the garden, and I was afraid, because I was naked, and I hid myself, because I was naked. And he said, Who told thee that

thou wast naked; hast thou eaten of the tree whereof I commanded thee that thou shouldest not eat? And the man said, The woman whom thou gavest to be with me, she gave me of the tree, and I did eat" (Genesis 3:10-12).

Did you ever hear anybody say, "It's not my fault; it's that woman." "It's not my fault; I would never have been the way I am, if it was not for that woman." That is nothing new. When there were just one man and one woman in the world, the first man tried to blame his sin on his wife.

First off, Eve was deceived; she was truly confused in the matter. Paul said, "Adam was not deceived; but the woman being deceived was in the transgression." Adam knew that, in some sense, Eve was walking around in a fog; she did not entirely understand what was going on. But Adam knew exactly what was happening, and he allowed it to go on.

More than that, the commandment was given to Adam; it was not given to Eve. "And the Lord God commanded the man saying, of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat...." (Genesis 2:16). Eve did not stand as our federal head; she did not represent her offspring; Adam did.

He knew exactly what he was doing, and what the consequences would be. He knew that if he did what he was about to do, those would be the consequences, and he wilfully, deliberately, rebelliously, did it anyway. He willfully brought on the world all the wickedness that has resulted from his sin—and when God asked him about it, he tried to blame it all on his wife.

Anybody who would try to blame that on anybody— especially on the one, who up until that time had been the dearest and most precious thing in all the world to him—has to be as mean as a snake. Human language cannot express the wickedness, and the guilt of what Adam did to himself, and to all his posterity. **And he tried to blame it all on his wife; that is, he tried to blame her with every wicked act that has ever been committed.**

One other thought in closing. And this is the counter-balance to all we have said.

No sooner had Adam sinned than God took the skin of an animal to provide a covering for their nakedness. I like to think the animal was a sheep; but I don't know that; the Bible does not say. But a sheep is so often used as a symbol of Christ, I like to think God used a sheep in that first symbol.

That animal had to die in order for his skin to be a covering for Adam and Eve. The skin of that animal, whatever it may have been, was symbolic of the suffering, and death, and imputed righteousness of the Lord Jesus Christ. His imputed righteousness is the only covering we have, or need, for our sin. That skin covering their nakedness symbolized that, in spite of their sin, they were children of God, and their sins were covered by the imputed righteousness of their Savior.

If the grace of God reached such a sinner as Adam was, there is no sinner so vile that the grace of God cannot reach him. hlh

Adoption

ADOPTION*: Definition: Adoption is the legal act of taking a child out of one family and putting that child into another family. We are by nature the children of Adam. We are all descendants of our great-great-great-granddaddy Adam. Every human being is descended from Adam. He is a member of that one huge family of Adam. By grace we are taken out of that family and made members of the family of God.

There is no conflict between the doctrine of adoption and regeneration. The relation between adoption and regeneration is that regeneration, or the new birth, is one part of the adoption. Our adoption began in eternity past; it will be concluded in eternity to come, and it involves everything God does for his children in between.

Gill defines adoption as "a putting among the children; so spiritual adoption is called, Jeremiah 3:19, or putting, or taking, one for a son, who was not so by nature and birth; which is the

case of adoption by special grace; it is of such who are, *by nature, children of wrath, and aliens from the commonwealth of Israel*; and a taking these from the family of the world, to which they originally belonged, into the family of God, and household of faith, Ephesians 2:3,12,19." hlh

ADOPTION*: *Harold Hunt:* Ephesians 1:3-5, "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ; According as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world that we should be holy and without blame before him in love; having **predestinated us unto the adoption** of children by Jesus Christ unto himself, according to the good pleasure of his will."

I cannot think of a subject which I had more difficulty in understanding than I had with the subject of adoption. But, for that matter, there is probably not a simpler subject in the Bible. The problem that arose in my mind, and the problem that bothers most people, is simply this: **If we are born of the Spirit of God, why is it necessary for us to be adopted?** My wife and I have four natural born children, and the thought of adopting those children has never entered our minds. Can you imagine how people would react if I told them we were thinking about adopting those children?

The Bible does teach that we are born of the Spirit of God, and it also teaches that we are adopted. But, why are both necessary?

The Broadest of All Subjects

Most of the difficulty in understanding the adoption stems from the fact that very few Bible readers realize all that is involved in adoption. It is a much broader subject than most Bible readers have ever imagined. Outside of the subject of God himself, the subject of adoption is probably the broadest subject in the Bible. **The adoption began in eternity past; it will be concluded in eternity to come; and it involves everything God does for his children in between.**

Regeneration, or being born again, is just one part of the adoption process. Regeneration is one of the things that makes God's adoption of his children different from any other adoption that has ever taken place. But, I am getting ahead of myself. We will get to that later.

What is Adoption?

What is adoption, anyway? What does it signify for a child to be adopted? Adoption simply means the legal act of taking of a child out of one family and putting that child into another family. We are by nature the children of Adam. We are all descendants of our great-great-great granddaddy Adam. Every human being is descended from Adam. He is a member of the family of Adam. We are all descended from a single ancestor. We are all members of the one huge family of Adam.

I have noticed that if a person has kinfolks who are rich or famous, very often, it will conveniently come up in his conversation that he has some famous kinfolks. Well, I can tell you that you and I have some mighty famous kinfolks. Do you remember old King Pharaoh, who had all the little Jewish babies drowned? That was a distant cousin of yours and mine. He was a very, very distant cousin; but he was kinfolks. We are all related in Adam. Do you remember King Herod, who had all the little babies from two years old and under killed. He was kinfolks. And Adolph Hitler? He was a distant cousin. You and I came out of a mighty rough family.

We are all partakers of the same nature—all partakers of the sin of Adam—all descended from Adam. But, by grace, we are all taken out of that family and made members of God's family.

That is what adoption is all about. It is God's taking us out of Adam's family, and placing us in his family.

The Choice of the Child

Let me ask you, what is the first act of any adoption? After you have determined to adopt a child, the very first act of adoption is the choice of the child to be adopted. Can you imagine that my wife and I might decide to adopt a child, and we put a notice

in the paper: "To whom it may concern, Harold and Doris Hunt intend to adopt a child. Anybody interested in being adopted, please be at the Blount County Court House next Tuesday morning at 9:00 o'clock." That is not the way it is done. We do not send out a general call for anybody, who might want to be adopted.

The first act of the adoption is the choice, the election, of the child to be adopted.

It is no accident that what God does for his children is called adoption. The very first thing we do when we adopt a child is to choose the child to be adopted. And Paul tells us that is exactly what God did. Ephesians 1:4-5, "According as **he hath chosen us** in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love; **having predestinated us unto the adoption of children** by Jesus Christ unto himself." Adoption is the huge framework within which the rest of our salvation fits. Election, the choice of the child, is the first act of adoption.

The Legal Work

Involved in any adoption there is some legal work that must be taken care of. You cannot just spot some attractive little boy walking along the road and decide, "I think I will adopt that child." You cannot just pull over to the side of the road and invite him into your car and go on your way. That is not the way it is done; you can get in big trouble that way. There is legal work that has to be taken care of. There may be natural parents whose claim has to be satisfied.

Two of the most unhappy people I think I ever knew were two people in my home town, who took a little boy to raise without bothering to adopt him legally. His mother did not care anything about him. She did not care much about herself, and she gave the little boy to that couple to raise. They were very poor people. They could barely provide for themselves. But they provided the little boy a place in their home. They showered him with their love, and they provided him with everything they were able to provide.

But after awhile, his mother changed her way, and she changed her mind about the little boy, and one day she came to get him. That old couple would just as soon have had their right arm cut off as to give that little fellow up, but the legal work had never been taken care of. The claim of the natural parent had to be satisfied, and when she came to get the little boy, all they could do was to give him up.

There was a legal claim to be satisfied, and that is what the Lord was doing on the cross of Calvary. He was taking care of the legal work of our adoption.

Isaiah said, "He shall see of the travail of his soul, and shall be satisfied"(Isaiah 53:11). Every attribute of God will be satisfied in the salvation of his people. The love of God will be satisfied, because everybody God loves will be there. The grace of God will be satisfied, because every subject of grace will be there. And the justice of God will be satisfied, because every sin will have been paid for—atoned for.

God does not sacrifice justice in order to be merciful. I hear folks preach as if God says to Justice, "Now Justice, you be still; Justice, don't you say a word. Justice, I am going to save this child, and there is nothing you can do about it." God does not hogtie Justice in order to be merciful. The justice of God is satisfied in the salvation of his people.

Suppose you go blazing down the interstate doing ninety miles an hour, and after awhile, the patrolman catches you and pulls you over and writes you a ticket. Then you go before the judge, and you say, "Judge, I don't know why I did that; I don't make a habit of driving that way. I never have driven that fast before, and Judge, I promise you, if you let me off this time, I will never do that again." The judge may tear up the ticket and say, "That is alright. Don't you worry; I will take care of it." Now, that is mercy, but there is not a trace of justice in it.

I hear people preach as if that is the way God saves people, as if God simply says, "Now, don't you worry about it. That is alright. I am going to take care of it." But God is not a

softhearted, softheaded, old judge, sitting out there somewhere fixing speeding tickets.

The justice of God will be satisfied in the salvation of his people. There is no chance that on that final day the Justice of God will step forward and say, "That child is mine; he owes a sin debt to me; I have a claim against him; I demand what is mine." There is no chance of that, because the justice of God will be satisfied in the salvation of his people.

The Expense of Adoption

An adoption is not free; there is some expense involved. That is where redemption comes in. Paul talked about that in the Galatian letter. "But when the fullness of the time was come, God sent forth his son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons" (Galatians 4:4-5). To redeem means to buy back, to pay the purchase price. Redemption was the purchase price of adoption. And that is what the Lord did on the cross. He paid the price of our redemption, the expense of our adoption.

"For ye are bought with a price; therefore glorify God in your body and in your spirit, which are God's" I Corinthians 6:20. He bought us; he paid for us; he paid the redemption price, and he is going to have what he paid for. Sometimes you and I pay a price, and we do not get full value for our purchase price. But you can be sure that God is going to have what he paid for. God will have with him in glory every one he redeemed and paid for on the cross.

The purchase price which the Lord paid on the cross of Calvary was the most expensive transaction this old world has ever known. "Forasmuch as ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things as silver and gold from your vain conversation received by tradition from your fathers; but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot" I Peter 1:18-19.

When God created this old world, it did not tax his energies in the least. I used to think God rested on the seventh day, because he was tired. He did not rest on the Sabbath day, because he was tired; he rested, because he was through. He had created all the worlds he intended to create. God could have created ten million worlds like this and never taxed his energies in the least.

When God created this world, he only created so much gold and silver. There is no more gold and silver today than there was the day he created it. But God could have created ten million worlds like this, if he had wanted to, and he could have made every mountain on every world of gold. And he could have given ten million solid gold mountains for my redemption and yours, and that would have been such a small price to pay, compared to the price he did pay for our redemption. That would have been a bargain basement price. That would have been pocket change, compared to the price he did pay. He gave the very best heaven had for our redemption. He gave his only Son.

Both Adopted and Born

When you and I adopt a child, we are somewhat limited in what we are able to do for that child. We give him our name. We give him a place in our home. We shower him with our love, and we do everything we conceivably can for him. But there are some things we cannot do. We cannot give him the color of our eyes. We cannot give him the color of our hair, the shape of our nose, the cut of our chin, the sound of our voice.

It is in the nature of children to look like and to sound like their natural parents. I have three daughters, and to some degree or another, they all sound like my wife on the telephone. Sometimes, when I call home, if I know the girls are all there, I have to ask who I am talking to.

That used to be very confusing to one of my sons-in-law, before he became my son-in-law. One day he called to talk to my daughter, and my wife answered the phone.

He said, "Hi, whatcha doin'?"

And my wife said, "Watchin' television."

Somewhat later in the conversation he said, "Just exactly who is it I am talkin' to?"

It is in the nature of children to look like—to walk like—and sound like their natural parents, and in our old carnal nature, we look like, and walk like, and sound like our great-great-granddaddy Adam. "That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit" John 3:6.

You and I cannot give an adopted child our physical characteristics. We cannot make him look like us, and walk and talk the way we do. But God is not limited the way we are. And right here is where the new birth comes in. The new birth is one part of the adoption. He came "to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons. And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father" Galatians 4:5. Because we are sons by choice, we are made sons by birth.

We cannot make that adopted child to look like us. He was born of his natural parents, and it is his nature to look like his natural parents. But God adopts his children, who were born of Adam, and he reborns them again to look like him. We are made "partakers of the divine nature" II Peter 1:4, and in spirit we look like our heavenly Father. We look like our brothers and sisters in Christ Jesus.

In Hebrews, chapter one, Paul described the Lord in this way: "Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity; therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows" Hebrews 1:9. And in the Sermon on the Mount the Lord described his children: "Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness, for they shall be filled" Matthew 5:6. Do you notice the family resemblance? Did you ever see somebody, who, even if nobody told you, you knew that he had to be such and such a person's son? He was either his son or his brother; he looked just like him.

It is in the tendency of God's children to look alike. I am not talking about the color of their eyes, nor the cut of their chin. I am talking about those characteristics which show up in their lives as the result of the Spirit of God living in their hearts. I am talking about that love for God, and for the things of God, which is characteristic of every member of the family of God. I am talking about the expression on their face, when you talk to them about the good things of the Lord. Did you ever notice, when you are talking to somebody about the Lord and his goodness, that his face may begin to take on color, and sometimes, his eyes begin to fill and run over, and every now and then, his chin begins to tremble. I see a family resemblance there, don't you?

There have been a lot of people, down through the years, who have tried to paint pictures of the Lord. They do not know what he looked like. I know those pictures do not look like the Lord, because, for one thing, they all show him with long hair, and my Bible says, "Doth not even nature itself teach you that if a man have long hair it is a shame unto him" I Corinthians 11:14. He would never have worn his hair long, and then later inspired Paul to say that long hair was a shame to a man. Some of those pictures show him with bare feet. I don't believe the Lord went around barefoot. John said that his "shoe's latchet I am not worthy to unloose" John 1:27. So he wore shoes. The pictures I have seen don't look particularly Jewish. According to the flesh, he was "made of the seed of David" Romans 1:3. "According to the flesh" he was a Jew. Those pictures I have seen look noticeably Caucasian. In his physical appearance the Lord was so typically Jewish, and his appearance was so normal, compared to the Jews of his day, that he could stand before a crowd and preach to them for a long time, and, when, finally, his voice fell silent, he could walk back through the crowd, and they would not know who he was. He looked that much like everybody else.

But I believe we can know a little about what he looked like. I find a verse in Second Corinthians which reads: "But we all, with open face beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image from glory to glory, even as by

the Spirit of the Lord" II Corinthians 3:18. This text teaches that those who behold the glory of the Lord are literally changed into the image of the Lord. What does that mean? It means that those who love the Lord, and consistently look to him for guidance, begin to take on his characteristics.

Once in awhile it happens in nature. You may have seen it. It does not happen often. But once in awhile it happens that when two people are married so long, for many years heart answers to heart, until finally, in their old days, face answers to face. I was away on a trip some time ago, and the folks my wife and I stayed with looked very much alike. My wife can be a little skeptical at times, but even my wife noticed it. After we left, my wife commented about "how much they look alike." Once in a while it happens in nature. For years and years heart answers to heart, until, finally, in their old days, face answers to face.

But, while it only happens once in awhile in nature, it happens, as the rule, in our service toward God. The more you follow your Lord, the more you endeavor to serve him, the more you listen to him, and walk in his precepts, the more you look like him.

I don't know a lot about his physical characteristics, but I believe I do know this about him. I believe that when he stood and preached the gospel of his grace, the expression on his face was that same expression I can see in the faces of his children, when they are intently listening and being fed on the gospel message. And I believe that expression is the very expression I will see on the face of my Lord on that good morning, when I see him on that eternal day.

God is not limited as you and I are. We cannot give our adopted children the color of our eyes, nor the cut of our chin. We cannot make them look like us. But in regeneration God makes his children to begin to resemble him. They are made "partakers of the divine nature." They are still human, still mortal, still sinners of Adam's race, but the Spirit of God living in their hearts has its effect, and more and more, they resemble the family of God.

The Paperwork

Every adoption generates some paperwork. If the adoption is legal and binding, there will be documents to prove it. This adoption generated some papers. Our adoption is not recorded with paper and ink; it is written on the tables of our heart. We are taught in our hearts to know that we are the children of God. "Now he that hath wrought us for the selfsame thing is God, who also hath given unto us the earnest of the Spirit" II Corinthians 5:5.

Those of you who have been involved in real estate could teach me more than I have ever imagined about the principle of earnest money. Earnest money is given in advance of the actual transaction as a kind of pledge to bind the bargain. It is an advance payment, which indicates that you intend to carry through with the deal. God's Spirit in the hearts of his children bears witness that he intends to carry through with his promise. It is evidence that he intends to carry the recipient of that Spirit home to live with him in glory.

Can you imagine a little boy in an orphanage? He is so lonely. The people who run the place do the best they can to take care of him, but that is not like having parents to take him in their arms and love him as their own. And can you imagine that one day he hears he has been adopted by the richest, the kindest, the most gentle man in that town, and the adoption papers are on file in the front office? Do you have an idea that while he is waiting, every now and then, he would like to go to the office, and look at the adoption papers, and see that his name is written there? And don't you think he would appreciate it if somebody would show him the papers? That is what I am trying to do with this little booklet. I hope you can get just a glimpse of the adoption papers. "Now he that hath wrought us for the selfsame thing is God, who also hath given us the earnest of the Spirit"—a pledge that seals the bargain.

If you feel the Spirit of God stirring in your heart that is the earnest of your inheritance. That is your evidence that you are a heaven-bought, heaven-bound child of God. From your vantage point, that is the paperwork of your adoption. From

God's vantage point Job says, "Also now, behold my witness is in heaven, and my record is on high" Job 16:19. Paul says, "Nevertheless the foundation of God standeth sure, having this seal, The Lord knoweth them that are his" II Timothy 2:19. That is talking about the firm and sure decrees of God, written in the halls of eternity, but right now, we are looking at the evidence of the adoption as it is written in the heart of God's children, and we will save the other aspect of the question for another time.

The Evidence of Our Adoption

In Romans 8, Paul says, "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" Romans 8:15. The very first words children learn to say are Mama or Papa, or perhaps Da-da. I have never entirely figured out whether children learn to say Mama and Papa first, because we teach them to say that, or whether it is just natural for them to learn to make those sounds early, so ages ago parents learned to call themselves that. I don't know, and I am not going to worry about it, but this is another way in which our heavenly Father is like our natural parents. God delights to hear us acknowledge him as our Father, and because of that, he has "given us the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father." Abba is the Hebrew expression for father. It is a very simple sound, very much like Papa or Da-da. How simple a thing to say. It is so simple that a little child can say it—Abba, Father.

Romans 8:23, "And not only they, but ourselves also, which have the firstfruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves, groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body." In the old days the Jews had a feast called the Feast of the Firstfruits. That meant that the full crop was coming after awhile. That is what it means when we feel the Spirit of God stirring in our hearts. Those are the firstfruits —"the firstfruits of the Spirit." The full crop is coming after awhile.

The firstfruits of the Spirit are the firstfruits of the adoption. It indicates that the climax of the adoption, the final act of the adoption, is coming after awhile.

I have heard it said that we do not know anything at all about what heaven is going to be like. I believe we can know something about it. I believe it is going to be a whole lot of what we get just a little of down here. These are the firstfruits. The last fruits are like the firstfruits. There is just a lot more of it. If you have ever had the first taste of apple pie, you have a pretty good idea of what the rest of the pie is going to be like. And if you have ever felt God's Spirit moving in your heart, you have a good idea of what heaven is going to be like.

Some folks have gotten the idea from Romans 8:23, the adoption will not take place until the resurrection. But, no, the resurrection is when the adoption will finally be complete. It has been going on all along. It started a long time ago. It started in eternity past when God determined upon the adoption. The first act of the adoption was when he chose his family in Christ Jesus in eternity past. Then he did all the legal work that was necessary for our adoption in sending his son to suffer and die on the cross, and to satisfy every just claim of the law. He paid the price of our redemption. Then he sent his Spirit into our hearts in the work of regeneration.

Waiting to Go Home

Now we are waiting—waiting for the final act of adoption. I am enjoying the wait. I used to say I would like to live to be ninety years old, and preach twice a day until then. But I don't think I could quite stand up to that. I have tried preaching twice every day, and that is more than I can handle. I would not mind to live to be ninety years old, and preach once a day. I am enjoying the wait. Paul said, "For to me to live is Christ, and to die is gain" Philippians 1:21. I am not in any hurry to leave this old world.

But the older I get, and the closer I get to the end of my journey, the more I think about that day, when my heavenly Father will come for me. The last act of adoption is when the adopting father comes and gets his child, and takes him to live with him in that big house on the hill. I am looking forward, with fond anticipation, to that good day, when the final act of

adoption will come, and we will be forever at home with the Lord. hlh

Adultery

ADULTERY*: **C.H. Cayce:** We have been requested to give our views of Matthew 5:32, which reads, "But I say unto you, that whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery: and whosoever shall marry her that is divorced committeth adultery."

What is true with reference to the husband is also true with reference to the wife; if it is wrong for the wife to put away the husband, it is also wrong for the husband to put away the wife. If the Scriptures allow the wife to put her husband away and marry again, they will also allow the husband to put away his wife and marry another. Now, remember this, that what is admissible in the one is admissible in the other, for "they are no more twain, but one flesh." Then, the question is simply this, Can a man for any cause, expressed in Scripture, put away his wife and marry another, and he not be an adulterer?

In the text quoted above the Saviour tells us that if a man shall put away his wife for any other cause than that of fornication, he causes her to commit adultery. If she has committed fornication, and for this cause he puts her away, he does not cause her to commit adultery. If she has been put away for any cause, and then marries another man, the man commits adultery, in marrying one who has been put away.

Now notice the Saviour's language recorded in Matthew 19:9, "And I say unto you, Whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery: and whoso marrieth her which is put away doth commit adultery." If the wife commits fornication, and the husband puts her away on this account, and marries another, he does not commit adultery. If the husband puts his wife away for any other cause except fornication, and marries another, he commits adultery.

If the Saviour had said, "Whosoever shall put away his wife, and shall marry another, committeth adultery," then a man would have no Scriptural reason whatever to put away his wife and marry again. But the Saviour gives only one exception to this universal rule, and that one exception is, "except it be for fornication." So if the wife commits fornication, and the husband puts her away on this account and marries another he is no adulterer.

In Luke 16:18 the Saviour says, "Whosoever putteth away his wife and marrieth another, committeth adultery: and whosoever marrieth her that is put away from her husband committeth adultery." In this place it is laid down as though it was a universal rule with no exception, but the Saviour expressed the exception, and the only exception, in Matthew 19:8, as quoted above.

If the husband commits fornication, and the wife puts him away on this account, and then she marries another man, she is no adulteress. Neither is the man an adulterer whom she marries. To try to make it plainer: B commits fornication; on this account Mrs. B puts him away; then Mrs. B marries Mr. C. In this case Mrs. B is no adulteress, and Mr. C is no adulterer. This is true, by reason of the fact that Mr. B is a fornicator, and thereby becomes dead to Mrs. B, and this gives her a Scriptural right to marry again. This is clearly the exception to the rule, as laid down by the Saviour, and none have this right, except for fornication.

The language of the apostle in I Corinthians 7:15, does not contradict the Saviour's teaching. He says, "But if the unbelieving depart, let him depart. A brother or a sister is not under bondage in such case: but God hath called us to peace." If the unbelieving husband or wife departs, let them go; you are under no obligation to follow them. But the believing one should not help the unbeliever to go; but if they will depart, let them go.

But if they do go, this does not release the marriage bond. It does not give the one left the privilege of marrying another, for the apostle says in I Corinthians 7:10-11, "And unto the

married I command, yet not I, but the Lord, Let not the wife depart from her husband: but and if she depart, let her remain unmarried, or be reconciled to her husband: and let not the husband put away his wife." It is plainly taught here that if one departs the other has no right to put them away on this account, but they should remain unmarried—hold themselves in readiness at all times for a reconciliation.

If the wife puts the husband away for any other cause than for fornication and marries another, she becomes an adulteress, and the man she marries becomes an adulterer, and to continue to live in this state is simply to continue to live in adultery.

The woman who was brought to the Saviour, having been caught in the very act, is no example to resort to as an excuse, in our judgment. She was brought before the Saviour by those who were seeking to entangle and condemn our Lord. This lesson teaches us that the Saviour's mission was not to administer the law; neither was He to sit as judge to pass sentence on those who violated it. This was not His mission, which is clearly taught in this circumstance. His work was to fulfill the law, to render satisfaction to it." (*CAYCE vol. 1, ppg 299-301*)

ADULTERY: Harold Hunt: Our Primitive Baptists have no need to apologize for the firm stand the vast majority of our people have generally taken on the subject of divorce and remarriage. If we have erred, our error has been in not being as outspoken as we should have been. Ours is the high moral ground, and it is the clear teaching of the Bible. I believe, that instead of apologizing for our position, we ought to speak out loud and clear, that this is the Bible standard.

If a couple is involved in an adulterous marriage, we cannot receive them into the membership of the church. The Bible is clear enough. We wish their situation was different, but it is not. Knowing the personal satisfaction we receive from the church, it is heartbreaking to see others, who cannot enjoy that benefit, but we cannot compromise those standards God has provided for the government of his church. **The church belongs to him, and he has the right to set the**

guidelines. We must hasten to add that we are in no way complaining about those guidelines and restrictions he has left us. Those guidelines are for the benefit of the church. There is not one rule God has left us that is not for our benefit.

This is a Moral Question

And keep it always in mind that this is a moral question. So far as our churches are concerned, it is a question of church discipline. It is a question of order and disorder. We know that. But it is more than that. This is a moral question under consideration. We dare not compromise those moral standards God has laid out in his Word. The Lord told the disciples, "Ye are the light of the world" Matthew 5:14. There is a heavy responsibility resting on the church to provide an example for those around her. If the church does not provide the moral lead for this sinful age, we cannot imagine who will. Down through the ages, wherever the church has been found, it has had a profound effect on the morals of the land. To this very day America is blessed because of the presence of the church.

The Need for Compassion

There is one question we must clear up before we go any farther. Our firm stand on this question has given some people the idea that we believe there are some sins so heinous that God cannot, or will not, forgive—that perhaps, somebody might sink so low in sin, that there can never be any recovery. No, no, a thousand times no. **No sinner ever sank so low in sin, but that there can be forgiveness and pardon, if he will forsake his way and turn to the Lord.** How very compassionate we ought to be toward repenting sinners. There is many a little child of God who has made a mess of his life, and who desperately needs our help and compassion.

Far too often we are like the Levite who looked, and then, passed by on the other side. Most of us are far too complacent. We are too comfortable with our own concerns to take just a little time to deal with one who may desperately need our help.

The Bible makes it abundantly clear that **there is forgiveness available for any sin a person can repent of and turn from.** Just notice a few texts. Isaiah 55:7, "Let the wicked man forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts: and let him return unto the Lord, and he will have mercy upon him; and to our God, for he will abundantly pardon." Matthew 12:31, "Wherefore I say unto you, all manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men; but the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men." Revelation 3:21, "And I gave her space to repent of her fornication, and she repented not." The Lord pointedly says that **there is forgiveness for "all manner of sin and blasphemy."**

There was forgiveness for Paul, the chief of sinners I Timothy 1:15. The church never had a more bitter enemy than he was. He held the coats of those who stoned Stephen to death Acts 7:58, but God forgave him. There was forgiveness for Mary Magdalene, "out of whom went seven devils" Luke 8:2. There was forgiveness for Peter, who cursed and swore and said he did not even know the Lord Matthew 26:74. There was forgiveness for those at the foot of the cross, who mocked the Lord and made fun of him. No one was ever more vile than that crowd, who made all manner of fun of the Lord at the very time he was suffering and dying on behalf of his people. But our kind and compassionate Redeemer looked down from the cross and said, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do" Luke 23:34.

I am sure that if any one of us could see ourselves as the Lord sees us, we would not marvel nearly so much that he forgave those sinners, as we would marvel that he could forgive such sinners as we are.

How very compassionate we ought to be toward those sin-sick and wounded children of God, whose lives are in such need of repair. How very tender and patient we ought to be with them. How very ready to help them and guide them. There is not one of us who can square his shoulders, and throw out his chest, and say with any confidence, "I tell you, right now, I will never do the way this person has done." We don't know that. We

have no idea what our lot might be. We know what our determination is—at this present moment of time. But we ought to know that we are dependent on the grace of God to sustain us each moment of our lives.

“Wherefore let him that thinketh he standeth, take heed lest he fall,” I Corinthians 10:12.

But forgiveness of sin is not the question. There can be no question that forgiveness is available for any sin we can repent of and turn from. **We are not talking about past offenses; we are talking about a present condition.**

Only One Adequate Guide

There is only one adequate guide in the matter, and that is the Bible. Carnal human nature will lead us astray. It misunderstands and misapplies the most basic moral principles. Those principles must be taught in a clear and positive manner, and even then it resents and rebels against them. We must have an authoritative guide, if we are going to direct our lives aright. Jeremiah 10:23, “It is not in man that walketh to direct his steps.” The guide God has provided in the Bible is intended to instruct us in every aspect of our lives. That guide has never gone out of date; it is sufficient for every day and age.

Those principles God teaches in the Bible are a system of absolutes. We are living in an age which does not like absolute principles, and unchangeable values. We hear much about relative values, and situation ethics. There are relatively few who are willing to acknowledge that those instructions God has given in the Bible are eternal and unchanging.

In this article we want to talk about the institution of marriage and those instructions God has given as to when, and under what conditions a marriage may properly be dissolved. If we would learn anything about the nature of the marriage union, we must go to the Bible to learn it. **Marriage is God’s institution.** It belongs to him. He established it in the very morning of time, and he established those principles which are to govern it. Let us look, then, at what the Bible has to say.

A Lifetime Arrangement

First, marriage is a lifetime arrangement. Romans 7:2, "For the woman which hath an husband is bound by the law to her husband so long as he liveth." In this age of such moral decline in America, society has forgotten the importance, the sanctity, of the marriage union. More and more people, nowadays, have decided that marriage is not really necessary. Untold numbers of them are saying, "We will just live together for awhile, and we will decide later whether we want to get married. After six months or so, if we find that we are compatible, we just might get married."

Other people, who would never engage in such an arrangement as that, decide to get married, and then later they decide whether they want to stay married. I sold life insurance for twenty four years, and a few people have made that very statement to me. They were in a perfectly good humor with each other, but they would tell me they had married, and now they were taking their time to decide whether they were really right for each other, and if they should find that they ought not to have married, they will just divorce, and find other partners. They would make no bones about it. Really, there is a great similarity between the two arrangements. Both couples have totally lost sight of the sanctity of the marriage union.

Outside of the gift of his Son, the marriage union is the greatest benefit God has given to his creation. **Marriage is the very foundation of civilization itself.** Children must have the godly environment of a family and a home in order to grow up and learn those moral principles they will need to guide them during the remainder of their lives.

And in any nation, when families and homes fall apart to such an extent that a large segment of society does not have that godly and healthy environment in which for children to grow up and learn those necessary moral principles, that nation will never be able to build jails and prisons big enough and fast enough to house all the people who need to be there. That is the condition in America at this very moment.

The problems that exist in America will never be solved in Washington. They will never be solved in Nashville, Atlanta, Montgomery, Jackson, nor in any of the state capitals of this land. The problems that are plaguing America began in the home, and if they are not solved in the home, they will never be solved.

People need to think before they enter into a marriage. The union between a devoted husband and wife is the sweetest and most tender union on earth. It is a symbol of the union between Christ and his church. But not every marriage is all it should be. Before you marry him, you need to be very sure that you want to spend the rest of your life with him. **To look at it from the negative side, as long as he is faithful to those vows, you are stuck with him.** I am going to show you by the scriptures that as long as he is faithful to those vows, there is no way you can get a valid divorce from him.

Only One Ground

The Bible provides the one and only ground for divorce and remarriage. Matthew 5:32, "But I say unto you, that whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery, and whosoever shall marry her that is divorced committeth adultery." The Bible gives this one ground for severing a marriage. If one of them (either the husband or wife) is guilty of fornication, the innocent party has the right to a divorce, and, therefore, the right to remarry. God will recognize that divorce. God does not require the innocent party to put up with any such conduct as that.

There are sometimes situations which arise in which it is physically unsafe for a woman to continue to be married to a man. Good judgment requires her to leave for the safety of herself and her children. In such a case, she has a perfect right to leave, but the scriptures do not grant her the right to remarry.

But, if I might interject my own personal opinion in this particular situation, if a man is so abusive that his wife must

leave for her own protection, it is very likely, if she will only watch, that she will discover he is guilty of much more than abuse. It is hard to imagine that a man would be faithful to his marriage vows, when at the same time, he terrorizes his wife and children.

The Legislatures Are on Notice

This is the only ground for divorce God will recognize, but more than that, **God explicitly forbids the judicial system to grant any divorce on any other basis.** Matthew 19:5-6, "And said, For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife: and they twain shall be one flesh? Wherefore they are no more twain, but one flesh, **What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder.**" I fear that most of the time this verse is overlooked. The verse is quoted often enough. It has been quoted many times, but I fear that almost without exception people still do not realize what the verse is saying.

"Wherefore, they are no more twain, but one flesh, what therefore God hath joined together, Let not man put asunder."

Every verse in the Bible is for me, but not every verse in the Bible is to me. This verse is for me, but it is not to me. Why? Because I am not in the business of putting marriages asunder. I have never tried to do that. I have never claimed the authority to do that. Then who is this verse addressed to? This verse is directed to those people who are in the business of putting marriages asunder. Who is that? Well, in our system of government, it is the state legislatures, who make the laws, and it is the judges and lawyers, who implement the laws governing divorce.

Notice what the text says. This text is addressed to the state legislatures, which make the laws, and to the judges and lawyers, who implement those laws, and in effect it tells them, "Don't you make any law, and don't you take advantage of any law, that will sever a marriage on any other basis than the one ground provided in this text." Think about that. **God has put the various state legislatures on notice.** He strictly forbids

any legislation which will sever a marriage on any other basis than the one ground he allows. "What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder."

When God singles out any one group of people for such special instructions, it behooves them to take notice.

God is the one lawgiver. James 4:12, "There is one lawgiver, who is able to save and to destroy, who art thou that judgest another?"

Probably the greatest authority on English law who ever lived was a man by the name of William Blackstone. He died in 1780, at the time of the American Revolution. Up until Blackstone's day English legal experts generally wrote on Roman law. William Blackstone wrote a large four volume commentary on English law. Blackstone's own countrymen did not like him, but the Americans just loved him. I looked up the article on Blackstone recently in Encyclopedia Britannica, which is a British publication, and they did not have very many good things to say about him, but for the first one hundred years of American history, Blackstone's Commentaries were all most American lawyers knew about the law. The point I am getting to is this: Blackstone's most fundamental principle said, "**the law of God is the source of every valid human law.**"

Not a Valid Law

In other words, if any lawmaking body makes a law that is contrary to God's it is not a valid law. The law does not really mean anything. That is why, on the one hand, Paul could repeatedly instruct us to be subject to the laws of the land Romans 13:1-5; Titus 3:1, and how, on the other hand, the Bible could commend the three Hebrew children because they refused to obey the Babylonian law which required them to bow down and worship the graven image that was erected in the plain of Dura. Daniel 3:10-30.

We are obligated to comply with the law of the land—so long as that law does not require us to violate the law of God.

That decree of the king was the law of that land, but it was not a valid law, because it was contrary to God's law. Any time a state legislature, or the federal government, passes a law that is clearly contrary to God's law it is an invalid law.

Blackstone went on to say that the law of God is revealed in nature and in the Scriptures. But whether we discover God's law in nature or in the Bible, that law is the basis of every valid human law. In this respect there is a grand similarity between the gospel minister and the lawmakers of the land. Preachers do not have the right to conjure up their own ideas about what principles they want to advocate from the pulpit. It is our duty to study the Bible, and to find out what the Bible teaches, and to teach that.

By the same token, no lawmaking body has the right to just sit around and dream up laws. It is their duty to search for God's law—in nature or in Scriptures—and to pass laws to govern the land based on that law.

No Fault Divorce

Up until 1970, if anyone wanted to get a divorce, she (or he) had to prove grounds for divorce. She had to prove adultery, or desertion, or cruelty. But there has been a great moral decline, which began in the United States about the end of the Second World War. I think most everybody would agree that the morals of Americans have been going down since about that time. That moral decline was in full swing by the beginning of the 1960's, when we began to hear about *the new morality*. That is just another name for the old immorality. We began to hear about *the sexual revolution*. I don't even like to use that expression, and I am sure that you do not like to hear it, but nobody can deny that for the last forty years or so, a large portion of the American people have simply put their morals on the shelf. There is, indeed, a grand decline in the moral fabric of our nation.

Then in 1970, right at the height of the so-called *sexual revolution*, the state of California passed the first *no fault divorce* law in the history of the Western World. An article was

published not long ago, which said, "At one fell blow the state of California swept away every moral consideration from the institution of marriage." But that is not really right. Rather **they denied** every moral consideration with regard to the institution of marriage. Their law did not change anything. Man does not have the right, the authority, nor the ability to pass a valid law that is contrary to God's law.

Within ten years after that first *no fault divorce* law, every state in the union except two had adopted some form of *no fault divorce* law. Those two states may have done so by now. Today, as a general rule, about all you have to do is file for a divorce, and you can get it. If there are no children involved, and if there is very little money or property involved, one state will grant a divorce by mail, without even requiring a court hearing.

Our American people have never been so deceived and imposed upon as we have been deceived by our state legislatures, in this matter of *no fault divorce*. Because the laws are on the books, the American people have come to believe that once they get a divorce decree, all connection with their spouse is once and for all severed. They do not realize that the authority on which those laws were passed was a usurped authority—that the legislature had no authority to pass any such law. They do not realize that the law is an invalid law, and that no valid divorce can ever be granted on the strength of it.

At one fell blow the various lawmaking bodies endeavored to sweep away "every moral consideration from the institution of marriage," **and the silence in the pulpits of America was deafening**. Marriage is the very foundation of civilization. It is the cement that holds our society together. When marriage and the home fall apart in any nation, as it is happening in America today, that nation very soon comes to ruin. Never in the history of the Western World has the Judeo-Christian ethic been so boldly and brazenly attacked as it has been attacked by the passage of the various *no fault divorce* laws, and never has the Christian ministry been so remiss in our duty as we have been in failing to denounce those laws.

The Legislatures Have Set Us Up

Our various state legislatures have set our people up for unacceptable, adulterous marriages. They have virtually taken them by the hand, and led them into such marriages, and the ministry has stood silently by and watched it happen with hardly a protest.

In 1973, right about that same time, the Supreme Court of the United States handed down the Roe vs Wade decision, which forbade the various states to interfere with any expectant mother, if she wanted to destroy her unborn child before it ever saw the light of day. Let me ask you, do you believe it ceased to be wrong to destroy that little defenseless child, just because the Supreme Court handed down that decision? No, of course not. When an expectant mother goes to an abortion clinic and pays money to have that little baby destroyed, it is still murder, no matter what the Supreme Court may say. Those God-given principles which govern the taking of human life are the same today as they have ever been. The Roe vs Wade decision did not change that.

And those God-given principles which govern the sanctity of the marriage union are also the same as they have always been. *No fault divorce* laws have not changed that.

Blackstone was right. The Bible is right. God is the one lawgiver, and his law is the source of every valid human law. James said, "There is one lawgiver, who is able to save and to destroy," James 4:12. Isaiah said, "To the law and to the testimony, if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them," Isaiah 8:20. Any law that is contrary to God's law is not a valid law.

Suppose lawmakers go ahead and pass those laws anyway. Do you believe God will allow himself to be overridden, and overruled, and reversed? No. God's law is still in effect. **Those no fault divorce laws are invalid laws, and no valid divorce can be granted on the basis of an invalid law.** Such divorces granted on any basis other than the one ground

God allows do have the force of law, but it is an invalid law, and any divorce granted on that basis is an invalid divorce.

Let Her Remain Unmarried

Suppose two people do divorce for some other cause than the one cause God allows. The Bible deals with that, and gives instruction to the person who finds himself in that situation. I Corinthians 7:11, "But and if she depart, **Let her remain unmarried**, or be reconciled to her husband." This verse has to do with a person who divorces for some other reason. In this case it has to do with a believer and an unbeliever, but it could be for any other cause except the one cause God recognizes.

In the very morning of time God created Adam, and he said, "It is not good that the man should be alone, I will make him an help meet for him." It was so important for a man to have a wife that God created one for him. Four thousand years later Paul said to Timothy, "I will therefore that the younger women marry, bear children, guide the house, give none occasion to the adversary to speak reproachfully." Here are two texts four thousand years apart teaching us that men ought to have wives, and that women ought to have husbands. **But God singles out one class of people and instructs them not to get married.** That ought to make it clear enough. Who is this one class of people God singles out? It is anybody, who is divorced for any cause except that one cause which God recognizes. God tells her, "Don't you get married."

Notice that she is unmarried. The text says so: "Let her remain **unmarried.**" She has gotten her *no fault divorce*, so why can she not get married? Because she already has a husband. "Let her remain unmarried, or be reconciled to **her husband.**" We have Paul's word for it that he is still her husband—in spite of the divorce. The divorce did not entirely sever the marriage union. It was not a valid divorce. The only divorce God will recognize is a divorce based on the one cause he allows. She already has a husband. If she wants to be married, she will have to go back to her own husband.

Romans 7:3, "So then if while her husband liveth, she be married to another man, **she shall be called an adulteress**, but if her husband be dead, she is free from that law, so that she is no adulteress, though she be married to another man."

Is it Fornication or Adultery?

Fornication and adultery differ in this way: Fornication is the broad term, and adultery is a more narrow term. Fornication takes in every form of illicit sexual relations. Adultery always involves at least one married person. Adultery is always fornication, but fornication is not necessarily adultery.

Webster defines fornication as "voluntary sexual intercourse between an unmarried man and an unmarried woman." Two single people can commit fornication. Adultery always involves at least one person who is married to somebody else. Webster defines adultery as "voluntary sexual intercourse of a married man with a woman other than his wife, or of a married woman with a man other than her husband."

Paul says, "So then if while her husband liveth, she be married to another man, she shall be called an adulteress." If her previous husband was not actually **still her husband**, there is no way she could commit adultery. But Paul makes it very clear that he is still her husband.

Why does God caution her against getting married? Because she already has a husband. This is so simple I believe a little third grader could understand it. The Bible becomes much easier to understand, if we will just let it say what it says. "So then if while **her husband** liveth, she be **married to another man**." She already has a husband—but now she is married to another man. She got a *no fault divorce*. She got a new marriage license. She went through the ceremony. She is married to another man. But the text says that the other man is still her husband.

The Source of Every Valid Law

Blackstone said it clearly. The law of God is the source of every valid human law. The various states passed their *no fault divorce* laws, but no valid divorce has ever been granted on the strength of those laws.

“So then if, while her husband liveth, she be married to another man, she shall be called an adulteress.” It did not say, “**if she become married....**” It said, “**if she be married** to another man, she shall be called an adulteress.” **The statement does not have to do with past action; it has to do with the present condition.** Folks challenge Primitive Baptists. They want to know, “Why can this person not live in the church? He married into this situation twenty years ago?” The bottom line is simply this. **He cannot live in the church at the same time he is living with (married to) another man’s wife.**

American society has become desensitized to the sanctity of the marriage union. We use the expression, *the sexual revolution*, and we talk about the way that mind set has affected people. But it appears that the mentality which comes from that idea has affected more people than we imagine.

We probably should have made this point much sooner. But at any rate, we must take time now to point out as strongly as we can that many, perhaps most, of those who are involved in the situation we are describing are as honorable, and honest, and decent as anybody you would ever care to meet. They are truly devoted to each other. They love each other, and they love their children. They are good neighbors, and good citizens. Many of them love the Lord, and they are trying as hard as anybody to live God-honoring lives. Many of them love the church; they attend as often as any member of the church.

For that matter, very few of them realize the nature of their situation. The law of the land has deceived them, and the ministry has failed them. If the ministry had been more faithful, there probably would not be nearly as many people as there are in that condition. Some of them got in their present situation at a time, when they were younger and more reckless. Others simply did not realize the sanctity of the marriage union and the

seriousness of the matter. They had not been properly instructed. For that the ministry must take part of the blame.

No doubt, many of the people in the condition we are describing do live immoral lives, but that applies to the population as a whole. We should not get the idea that the people under consideration are necessarily bad people. Many of them are pillars of the community. We have no desire to injure the tender feelings of any little child of God who finds himself in that situation, but, by the same token, we dare not compromise the instructions God has given us with regard to the subject.

Our Changing Society

There are few questions on which the thinking of the American people has undergone such a change as it has on this question during the last forty or fifty years. During the memory of most of those reading these lines there was a time when the more conservative denominational churches were much closer to the Bible standard than they are today. When I was growing up, I knew nothing about the Primitive Baptists, and consequently knew nothing about their doctrine, but in the area where I lived the expression *living in adultery* was well known and understood. The sanctity of the marriage union was recognized, and the break up of a marriage was seen for the tragedy that it is. Divorce carried the stigma that properly belonged to it, and when anyone was said to be *living in adultery* the reproach was obvious, both in the words and in the way they were repeated. The more conservative denominational churches in our area would readily accept a person in that condition into their membership, but if a preacher was perceived to be *living in adultery*, they would generally not call him as pastor, nor invite him to hold their special meetings.

Most of you remember when Nelson Rockefeller wanted so much to be president. Do you remember the question the news media asked at that time? They wanted to know, "Will the American people accept a divorced man in the White House?" But the thinking of the American people has changed. By the time Ronald Reagan came along the question did not even come

up. In that very short time we had become desensitized to the question of divorce and remarriage.

The Law for All Mankind

Sometimes somebody says, "But, Brother Hunt, that took place before he had an experience of grace. He has been born again since that time. Does that not do away with his previous condition?" No it does not. **God provided marriage for all of mankind.** He did not just provide it for his children. Marriage is God's institution. He set it up. It belongs to him. He gave all of mankind the principles which are to govern it, and **those restrictions are binding on all of mankind.** The wicked are bound by those principles as surely as the righteous are.

There could be no doubt that question would come up, and the Holy Spirit was very careful to provide a text dealing with it. Matthew 14:3, "For Herod had laid hold on John, and bound him, and put him in prison for Herodias' sake, his brother Philip's wife, for John said unto him, It is not lawful for thee to have her." John the Baptist told Herod that it was not lawful—**not legal**—for him to have his brother's wife. Herod was as mean as a snake. He never gave any indication that he had ever been born of the Spirit of God, but he was still bound by the same principles that govern anybody else. He took his brother's Philip's wife. Bear in mind that they went through all the formalities. In the book of Mark we are told that "he had married her" Mark 6:17. She got her *no fault divorce*. They went through the formalities, but John the Baptist, that brave old preacher, challenged that wicked king, and told him the marriage was *not lawful*—not legal. John knew that wicked old king was fully capable of taking his life, and he finally did do just that, but that did not deter him from telling him the truth.

Not Lawful for Thee to Have Her

Notice that he did not tell him, "It was unlawful for thee to marry her." Most Bible students will admit that an adulterous marriage is improper at its outset. Not so many will admit that it continues to be wrong for its duration. The marriage was wrong at its inception, but John was not talking about Herod's

past sins; he was talking about his present situation. He said, "You still have her; **it is not lawful for thee to have her.**" What was John saying, when he told Herod it was not lawful for him to have his brother's wife? Just what we have been saying all along: that any divorce Herodias had gotten from Herod's brother was not a valid divorce, and therefore any subsequent marriage was *not lawful* —not legal.

There are at least two lessons to be learned from this passage. First, that it does not make any difference on which side of regeneration a person gets into that situation. John was talking to a man who never gave any indication that he had ever been born of the Spirit of God, and he held him to the same restrictions that he would anybody else.

The second lesson is probably more central to our subject. John told that wicked old king that it was not lawful for him to have his brother's wife. **Surely we ought to have at least as high a standard for members of a Primitive Baptist church as John proclaimed for that wicked king.**

And Such Were Some of You

One passage which has given people some concern on this point is in Paul's first letter to the Corinthians. I Corinthians 6:9-11, "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. 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." This passage has left some people thinking that Paul was here justifying receiving adulterers into the church. But that is not what he is saying at all. Notice the tense of the verb: "and such **were** some of you...." There is repentance available for any sin a person may repent of and turn from. **These people were no longer involved in the sinful conduct mentioned.**

Always a Point of Contention

We must acknowledge that there has always been some confusion on this point. When I joined the church more than forty years ago, there were older brethren in this area who were convinced that regeneration did, indeed, take a person out of adultery. There were members, who had been taken into the church on that basis. The cases I knew about died long ago, but for all I know, there may still be others in the churches in that condition. There are a few areas today in which many of our people are just as firmly convinced that regeneration does take a person out of a state of adultery as I am convinced that it does not.

I believe it behooves us to search the Scriptures, and to be just as faithful as God will give us the grace and determination to be in proclaiming those high moral principles God has laid down with regard to divorce and remarriage. No church can wilfully take adulterers into the church without suffering the consequences. Once we wilfully forsake the clear moral ground of the Scriptures on this point, we are not likely to escape that long slippery slide to the bottom. It will not be long until there will be very little we will not accept. We have seen what is happening in the denominational churches. There is no reason to believe our lot will be any different, if we follow the same course they have followed.

Our people are agreed that, if a member of the church is guilty either of fornication or adultery, he must be excluded. We cannot tolerate such conduct among our membership. On that point our people do not generally have any problem. No other group of people has been so faithful as our Primitive Baptist people have been in that regard. If the denominational churches of the land would take the position our Primitive Baptist churches have taken on that one point, it would make an enormous difference in the spiritual condition of this nation. **The greatest problem in the land is the silence of its spiritual leaders on basic moral issues.**

There are others of our people who believe that if a person became involved in an adulterous marriage many years ago, and later had an experience of grace, he can now be received

into the church. I am convinced that they are dead wrong. I cannot see how the Bible could be any more clear on this point.

If a marriage is adulterous at its inception; it is adulterous for its duration.

I have no doubt that those who follow such a course will one day see their error. But there are areas in which not everyone agrees with what most of us perceive the Bible to teach on this point. The difference of opinion on that point goes back for generations. Many of the previous generation in this area had that idea.

The Need to Use Judgment

While we may differ very vigorously with that notion we need to use judgment in the matter. It does not behoove us to be constantly on the alert for someone who does not agree with us, just so we can declare against them. There have been far too many declarations of non-fellowship, and too many divisions, as it is.

It is sad to say, but very often, those, who have been the quickest to break fellowship with their brethren, have also been the most careful to conceal problems, when they arise in their own church, or in their own family.

How often we have seen it happen that those ministers, who are so anxious to straighten out everybody else, themselves have the most to hide.

Problems arise in their own families, and they are unwilling to deal with the matter, or to allow the church to deal with it. We have often seen it happen that churches or ministers, who seem to have set themselves up as regulators, generally wind up with serious problems of their own, which they are unwilling to handle. Being so obviously caught in their own trap, we cannot help but wonder if God has not dealt with their arrogance by delivering them over to judgment.

We cannot straighten out every church in the land, and we should not try. If the conduct of a particular church is injuring the good name of our Primitive Baptist people, we have no choice but to disown them —to declare against them. But there is no way we will ever get every church in the land to march in lock step. The churches of the apostles' day were not perfect in every respect, and we cannot expect that we will fare any better in our day. The church at Corinth had serious problems. So did the churches of Galatia, and all but two of the seven churches of Asia. Paul and John did not declare against those churches, and they did not persuade the other churches to do so. But they did reprimand them sharply. They called on them to repent, and to turn away from their misconduct.

No Need to Apologize

Let me end where I began. Our Primitive Baptists have no need to apologize for the firm stand the majority of our people have generally taken on the subject of divorce and remarriage. If a couple is involved in an adulterous marriage, we cannot receive them into the church. We mean them no harm, but they cannot be members of the church. We cannot abandon those simple moral precepts God has provided in order to gain a few members.

It behooves us that we use all the persuasive power God will give us to persuade our various churches to stay with the high moral ground God has assigned us, but we cannot straighten out every church in the land. Sometimes the conduct of a church scandalizes the good name of our Lord, and of our Primitive Baptist people, and the other churches have no choice but to disown them, to declare against them. There is a limit to forbearance, but we ought to be as patient as the Scriptures will allow us to be, before we write off any church as a lost cause.
hlh

Agent, Free Moral

Free Moral AGENT (*See under FREE Moral Agent*)

Ahaz

AHAZ The next king [after Jotham] was Ahaz, son of Jotham, who excelled all of his predecessors in idolatry. He openly espoused it, “sacrificing and burning incense, in the high places, and on the hills, and under every green tree;” and was the first of all the kings of Judah of Israel that sacrificed human sacrifices—even his own son—to the dumb idols! He revolutionized the whole system of religious worship in Judea, completely ignored the worship of the true God, cut in pieces the vessels of the house of the Lord, caused the sacrifices of the temple to cease, turned the priests out of doors, and closed the doors of the temple, so that the worshipers of God found no entrance. Those doors which had remained open for 267 years (B.C. 1005 to 738) were now closed, and remained so for twelve years. God punished him for all this. He set the king of Assyria on him, who defeated him in battle, and carried many of his people away as captives to Damascus. Pekah, king of Israel, also slew 120,000 of his subjects, and carried away 200,000 women and children captives to Samaria.

The captives and spoil were returned, but none of the dead came back. The Edomites of the south rose up, smote Judah, and carried away captives; and the Philistines overran and retained possession of the south of Judah. Nothing seemed to touch the heart of this wicked king. He became more and more hardened, and deaf to all the appeals for reform that could be made to him. How the ways of Zion mourned during this long season of cruelty and idolatry, and how deep must have been the sorrow and mortification of all spiritual worshipers of the true God during this long night of abomination!” (*Hassell’s History* ppg 129)

Ahaziah

AHAZIAH Jehoram’s son Ahaziah, sometimes called Azariah and Jehoahaz, succeeded him and walked in his footsteps. He also married in the wicked family of Ahab. He went to war against Hazael, king of Assyria, with Joram,

king of Israel; they were defeated, and returned, and both were slain by Jehu, king of Israel, who was raised up to take vengeance on the house of Ahab. Ahaziah was slain in the first year of his reign (II Chronicles 22; II Kings 9).

Athaliah, the mother of Ahaziah, upon learning of the death of her son (and who had counseled him for evil during his life), caused all the seed royal of the house of Judah to be put to death, except one that escaped, and then usurped the throne herself. Wickedness appeared to be triumphant at this juncture, and Baal’s

worshippers were in the ascendant. The valuable and sacred things of the temple were taken and bestowed upon the worship of Baal, and this idol was set up in Judah as it had been in Israel, with its altars, images and priests.

But **Jehoiada** the priest resolutely held the temple during the six years of Athaliah's usurpation, and conducted the services in the prescribed forms (II Kings 11:1-16; II Chronicles 22; 23). He was one of the most remarkable men of the times, and seemed to stand superior to any other in his day for wisdom, prudence, and devotion to God, from first to last, without any defection or abatement of zeal for the law of the Lord. He had great influence with the people; they revered him as Israel did Samuel of old.

He was contemporary with Solomon, Rehoboam, Abijah, Asa, Jehoshaphat, Jehoram, and Ahaziah—seven kings. He secreted the escaped son of Ahaziah, Joash or Jehoash, his wife's nephew, in the temple until he could succeed in deposing Athaliah, which was done in the sixth year of her reign; and he had **Joash**, a child of seven years, proclaimed king of Judah, who for twenty-seven years did that which was right in the sight of the Lord, because his uncle counseled him.

He brought the people generally back to the worship of God, and the bright and peaceful days of Asa and Jehoshaphat seemed to be returning again. But Jehoiada died at the advanced age of one hundred and thirty years; being kingly in life, he was honored with a kingly burial at his death. "And they buried him in the city of David among the kings, because he had done good in Israel, both toward God and toward his house."

So soon as Jehoiada died, the young king fell into the hands of wicked men, who soon led him astray. "They left the house of the Lord God of their fathers and served groves and idols." "Yet the Lord sent prophets to bring them again unto the Lord, and they testified against them, but they would not give ear."

Zechariah, son of Jehoiada, became high priest, and used his utmost exertions to stay the tide of the wide-spreading idolatry; but a conspiracy was raised against him, and at the king's command he was stoned to death in the house of the Lord! Our Savior tells exactly where—"between the temple and the altar" (Matthew 23:35). Here was a priest of the Most High God slain in his sacred temple (while performing sacred rites), by order of a king whom his father secreted, protected, raised, had crowned king of Judah, and counseled for good all his life, and he a relative at that!

How could it be otherwise than that this blood should cry aloud to heaven for vengeance? It did cry aloud for vengeance, as well as that of Abel and of the

Son of God; and that divine wrath, which had been slumbering so long, fell upon an after-generation of this people, with untold misery and woe, and the remnant have been scattered to the four winds of heaven—the despised and persecuted people among the nations of the earth.

The death of Zechariah is the first recorded martyrdom of a priest of the Most High God; martyred while officiating in the holy temple service and by the professing people of the Lord! How awful and gloomy the scene, and yet how frequently has it been re-enacted since the introduction of Christianity into the world! Ministers of the gospel, pastors and elders, have been torn from their flocks and from their ministrations in holy things, hundreds and thousands of them, and cruelly slain for their faithfulness to God by those who professed to be Christians, the people of God, and the servants of Christ!

God punished Joash by the hand of Hazael, king of Assyria, and afterwards his servants slew him in his bed (II Kings 11; 12; II Chronicles 23; 24)" (*Hassell's History ppg 127,128*)

Albertus Magnus

ALBERTUS MAGNUS (*See under SCHOLASTIC THEOLOGY*)

Albigenses, The

The ALBIGENSES The Albigenses were so called from Albi or Albiga, a town in Southern France, one of their principal seats. Their history is written in fire and blood.

Their books and themselves having been destroyed, we have to glean our views of their sentiments from the distorted and unreliable statements of their Catholic enemies. *It is thus impossible for us to know what their real doctrines were.* The general account given of them by the latest and ablest historians represents that their doctrinal system was a strange compound of many gross errors with some simple and important truths; that, besides being severely moral and anti-sacerdotal, they held views that were strongly Manichean, like those of the Bogomiles in Thrace and the Cathari in Germany; maintaining that matter is essentially evil, that Satan created the world, and was the god of the Old Testament, that Christ and the Holy Spirit are only temporary emanations from the true God, and will be finally absorbed in Him, that the body of Christ was not real flesh, but only phenomenal and ethereal, that the fleshly bodies of the saints being essentially evil, will not be raised from the grave, etc.

These unscriptural errors no believer in the Bible can receive; and we do not know that the Albigenses held these views. It is said, even, by their enemies, that their speculative opinions were very diverse; and, in that age of darkness, when there were scarcely any Bibles, and exceedingly few persons who could read, it is not wonderful that errors abounded even in the minds of the real people of God. While the Albigenses are said to have received the New Testament as the oracles of God, Rome, with all her learning, substituted her own traditions for the entire scriptures, and especially antagonized the fundamental spiritual tenets of the New Testament, and thus she committed worse doctrinal errors than those she stigmatized and persecuted as heretics.” (*Hassell’s History pg 439*) (*See also WALDENSES*)

Alexander

ALEXANDER (*See under Constantine*)

Alexandria, The Academy Of

The Academy at ALEXANDRIA: *Sylvester Hassell:* The great prototype of modern Sunday Schools and Theological Seminaries was the so-called “Christian” School, or School of Catechists, of Alexandria, in Egypt, founded about A.D. 180. The first president was a “converted” heathen philosopher, **Pantaenus**, who was succeeded in 189 by **Clement**, another “converted” heathen philosopher. The great scholar and universalist, **Origen**, succeeded Clement in 202, and presided till 232, and is said to have raised the school to the summit of prosperity. Origen’s pupils, Heraclas and Dionysius succeeded him. The last teacher was Didymus, in A.D. 395.

The two chief objects of this Alexandrian school were to prepare people, especially the young, for the church, and to prepare talented young men to preach. The number of students was very great, and it is said that many eloquent preachers were sent out from this school. The doctrines inculcated here were certainly fascinating to the natural mind—traditionalism, Arminianism, rationalism and universalism. Religion was gradually blended with and superseded by philosophy. Judaism and paganism were kindly brought in; and a broad, liberal, eclectic system, adapted to accommodate and reconcile all parties was devised, and this monstrous compound of truth and falsehood, of light and darkness—being mostly falsehood and darkness—was considered the perfection of true religion.

One of the most permanent and wide-reaching results of this school was the philosophical invention and establishment of the doctrine of *free-will*, scientifically known as the Greek anthropology and soteriology—the doctrine that the *first* step in every man’s salvation must be taken by his own natural will;

that Christ's death was not an expiatory sacrifice for sin, and is not of itself sufficient to save sinners; that repentance is a purifying and expiatory principle; that no faith whatsoever can save unless it is followed by works.

The learned city of Alexandria contained the greatest library of ancient times, said to have 700,000 volumes, collected by the Ptolemies, kings of Egypt; and this city was the home of *Gnosticism* and *Neo-Platonism*, and into these fatal errors the teaching of the Catechetical School shaded off by almost imperceptible gradations. (*Hassell's History* pg 365)

Allah

ALLAH The Muslim mantra says, "There is no god but Allah, and Mohammed is his prophet." We are forever hearing about Allah, but nobody bothers to tell us who he is. Because the Muslim tells us Allah is the one and only God, there are those who seem to think Allah is simply another name for Jehovah. Nothing could be farther from the truth.

It is true there are several names for Jehovah, but Allah is not one of them. In the original Hebrew Jehovah is also called El, Elohim, Shaddai, El Shaddai, Adonai, Jah, Jehovah, and so on. But you can be very sure that, when the Muslim refers to Allah, he has no reference to Jehovah. The pagan gods had any number of names. The same god was worshiped in different countries under different names. We have the Moabites worshiping Moloch, the Ammonites worshiping Chemosh, the Phoenicians worshiping Baal, and so on.

The names were different, but the various religions were essentially the same. They were fertility cults; they worshiped fertility, and sex, and reproduction. And they rejected the notion of an absolute standard of right and wrong.

Baal was worshiped in Arabia under the name of Allah. Did you ever wonder why the crescent moon is the symbol of Islam? Allah was the name of the Arabian Moon God. That is what the crescent moon signifies. Mohammed did not come up with a new name for his god. Long before he came along, his Quraysh tribe was known as the People of Allah, or the Protected Neighbors of Allah. Three of their other gods were called the Daughters of Allah.

The Kaaba, that huge rectangular building, sacred to Islam, was a sacred shrine for generations before Mohammed's day. Before his time there were three hundred and sixty different pagan gods worshiped at the Kaaba. Mohammed changed things in that he taught them to call all three hundred and sixty gods by the same name—Allah.

The worshipers of those various pagan gods rejected the notion of an absolute standard of morality. Nothing was inherently right or wrong. An act was right or wrong only in the sense that it pleased or displeased their pagan god. That is one of the most basic doctrines of Islam to this day. No act is inherently right or wrong. That is why they can convince themselves it is right and proper to blow themselves up—and a dozen other people with them—if they do it to please Allah. We will never begin to understand Islam until we learn to better understand what Baal worship is all about. hlh

Amaziah

AMAZIAH Amaziah his [Joash's] son succeeded him, and his reign was an improvement upon that of his father, though it was far from being good. He made a successful war against the Edomites, but publicly introduced the gods of Edom into Jerusalem as his own, for which God punished him by the hand of Joash, king of Israel. Joash made war on him, defeated and took him prisoner, destroyed part of the wall of Jerusalem, seized and carried off to Samaria part of the treasures of the temple and the king's house, after which he was conspired against and murdered (II Kings 14; II Chronicles 25). While Amaziah reigned, Jonah, the first of the sixteen prophets whose writings appear in the sacred canon of Scripture, was prophesying in Israel (II Kings 14:25). (*Hassell's History pg 128*)

Ammonius Saccas

AMMONIUS SACCAS (*See under NEO-PLATONISM*)

Amon

AMON (*See under MANASSEH*)

Anabaptists

ANABAPTISTS (*See under WALDENSES*)

Anselm

ANSELM (*See under SCHOLASTIC THEOLOGY*)

Antinomianism

ANTINOMIANISM (*See under The LAW of God*)

Antiochus IV, Epiphanes

ANTIOCHUS IV, EPIPHANES: Sylvester Hassell: Antiochus IV., Epiphanes, King of Syria, B.C. 175, became one of the most cruel oppressors the Jews had ever met with. He wished to *Grecianize* everything—names, places, fashions, religion and all. He acted like a madman. He attempted to exterminate the religion of the Jews and substitute that of the Greeks. At one time he approached Jerusalem, took it without much resistance, put to death in three days' time 40,000 of the inhabitants, and seized as many more to be sold as slaves. He entered every part of the temple, pillaged the treasury, seized all the sacred utensils, the golden candlestick, the table of shew-bread, the altar of incense, and thus collected a booty to the amount of 1,800 talents (about three million dollars).

He then commanded a great sow to be sacrificed on the altar of burnt offerings, part of the flesh to be boiled, and the liquor from the unclean animal to be sprinkled over every part of the temple; and thus desecrated with the most odious defilement the sacred place, which the Jews had considered for centuries the one holy spot in all the universe.

Menelaus retained the dignity of High Priest; but two foreign officers, Philip, a Phrygian, and Andronicus, were made Governors of Jerusalem and Samaria. He designed the entire destruction of the Jewish race, when, in two years after this unhallowed course, he authorized one Apollonius to carry into execution his design with cruel dispatch. Apollonius waited until the Sabbath, when the whole people were occupied in their religious duties. He then let loose his soldiers against the unresisting multitude, slew all the men, till the streets ran with blood, and seized all the women as captives. He proceeded to pillage, and then to dismantle the city, which he set on fire in many places; he threw down the walls, and built a strong fortress on the highest part of Mount Zion, which commanded the temple and all the rest of the city. From this garrison he harassed all the people of the country, who stole in with fond attachment to visit the ruins, or offer a hasty and interrupted worship in the place of the sanctuary; for all the public services had ceased, and no voice of adoration was heard in the holy city, unless of the profane heathen calling on their idols.

The persecution did not end here. Antiochus issued an edict for uniformity of worship throughout his dominions, and dispatched officers into all parts to enforce rigid compliance with the decree. This office in the district of Judea and

Samaria was assigned to Athenaeus, an aged man, who was well versed in the ceremonies and usages of the Grecian religion.

The Samaritans, according to the Jewish account, by whom they are represented as always asserting their Jewish lineage when it seemed to their advantage, and their Median descent when they hoped thereby to escape any immediate danger, yielded at once; and the temple on Gerizim was formally consecrated to Jupiter Xenius.

Athenaeus, having been so far successful, proceeded to Jerusalem, where, with the assistance of the garrison, he prohibited and suppressed every observance of the Jewish religion, forced the people to profane the Sabbath, to eat swine's flesh and other unclean food, and expressly forbade the national rite of circumcision. The temple was dedicated to Jupiter Olympus; the statue of that deity erected on part of the altar of burnt offerings, and sacrifice duly performed. Two women, who had circumcised their children, were led round the city with the babes hanging at their breasts, and then cast headlong from the wall; and many more of those barbarities committed, which, as it were, escape the reprobation of posterity from their excessive atrocity. Cruelties too horrible to be related, sometimes for that very reason, do not meet with the detestation they deserve.

Among other martyrdoms, Jewish tradition dwells with honest pride upon that of Eleazar, an aged scribe, ninety years old, who determined to leave a notable example to such as be young to die willingly and courageously for the honorable and holy laws; and the seven brethren who, encouraged by their mother, rejected the most splendid offers, and confronted the most excruciating torments rather than infringe the law.

From Jerusalem the persecution spread throughout the country; in every city the same barbarities were executed, the same profanations introduced; and, as a last insult, the feast of Bacchanalia, the license of which, as these feasts were celebrations in the later ages of Greece shocked the severe virtue of the older Romans, was substituted for the national festival of tabernacles. The reluctant Jews were forced to join in these riotous orgies, and carry the ivy, the insignia of the god. So near was the Jewish nation, and the worship of Jehovah, to total extermination.

Many have been the scenes described in ancient and modern history, where the people of the Most High God have suffered persecution purely for conscience' sake, but we believe very few have surpassed in enormity that which they suffered under Antiochus Epiphanes about 167 years before the Christian era. There was no insubordination, no revolt, no political pretext, for this cruelty

toward his own peaceable subjects, but simply a determination to destroy the visible signs of God's worshipers or destroy the people themselves!

Antiochus Epiphanes died at Tabae, in Persia, B.C. 164, of a most horrible and loathsome disease of the bowels, it is said, eaten alive with worms, emitting an intolerable odor, acknowledging that his illness was sent upon him by the God of Israel for his cruelty and sacrilege, and becoming raving mad before he breathed his last. (*Hassell's History* ppg 162, 163)

Apocrypha, The

The APOCRYPHA *Apocrypha* means *hidden* or *spurious*. The books called the Apocrypha, in the Old Testament, are not contained in the Hebrew Bible at all, but are found in the Greek Septuagint. They were written by unknown authors from 300 to 30 B.C. They are not quoted at all by the writers of the New Testament, and they abound in fictitious stories and doctrinal errors. The Catholic Council of Trent in 1546 endorsed as canonical, or inspired, all the Apocrypha, except 1st and 2nd Esdras, and the Prayer of Manaseh. The Hebrew church, "to whom were committed the oracles of God' Romans 3:2), and all the Protestant and non-Catholic denominations reject the Apocrypha as uninspired. These writings are interesting as showing the workings of the Jewish mind in the interval between the Old and New Testaments. It is from the Apocrypha that the Roman Catholics derive the texts for proof of their unscriptural doctrines of purgatory, prayers for the dead, and their meritoriousness of good works. In the apocrypha, as derived from the Persian Zend-Avesta, two-seedism, or dualism, can find its strongest arguments." (*Hassell's History* pg 158)

Question: How should we regard the Apocrypha?

Answer: The old London Baptist Confession of Faith, of 1689, very well says in Chapter 1, Section 3: —"The books commonly called Apocrypha, not being of Divine inspiration (Luke 24:27,44; Romans 3:2) are not part of the canon (or rule) of Scripture, and therefore are of no authority to the church of God, nor to be any otherwise approved or made use of than other human writings."

And the same views of these books are held by the Jews, the Greek Catholics, and all Protestants except the Church of England (or Episcopal Church) which, in her Thirty-nine Articles of Faith mentions the Apocrypha as books "which the church doth read for examples of life and instruction of manners, but yet doth it not apply them to establish any doctrine."

The Roman Catholic Church has always highly favored these books, and in the Council of Trent (1545-1553) received them in part for edification, but not for “the establishment of doctrine;” yet the Romish Church, in its translation of the Bible, mixes these books with the books of the Old Testament, and derives from them its unscriptural doctrines of purgatory, prayers for the dead, and the meritoriousness of good works; and in the Apocrypha, as derived from the Persian Zend-Avesta, two-seedism, or dualism, finds its strongest arguments.

The Apocrypha is not in the Hebrew Old Testament, but is in the Septuagint, or Greek Version of the Old Testament. It consists of the following fourteen books:—1st, *Historical* (First Esdras, First and Second Maccabees); 2nd, *Legendary*, (Tobit, Judith, Additions to Esther, Song of Three Holy Children, Susanna, Bel and the Dragon); 3rd, *Prophetical* (Baruch, Prayer of Manassas); 4th *Apocalyptic* (Second Esdras); and 5th *Didactic* (The Wisdom of Solomon, and the Wisdom of Jesus, Son of Sirach, or Ecclesiasticus).

These books were written between 300 B.C. and 75 A.D. They are not quoted at all by the writers of the New Testament, and they abound in fictitious stories and doctrinal errors, and they show the workings of the carnal Jewish mind just before and after the coming of Christ.” (*Hassell in Questions and Answers by R.H. Pittman 1935*)

Apostolic Succession

APOSTOLIC SUCCESSION: Not proven by Ananias’s laying hands on Saul: Sylvester Hassell In regard to Ananias’s putting his hands on Saul, by the command of God, we observe the highly important fact that, not only was it done *before* Saul’s *baptism*, but it was done by a man who was *not an Apostle*, nor a successor of an Apostle, (if such a thing as succession were at all scriptural or possible), for the Apostles were all then living; and thus the case of the great Apostle of the Gentiles totally undermines the Episcopal doctrine of the necessity of the confirmation of every believer, *after* baptism, either by an Apostle or the successor of an Apostle.

Upon Cornelius and his company, it is distinctly asserted, in Acts 10, that the Holy Ghost, both in his converting and miracle-working power, was poured out, *before* they were *baptized*; and no mention is made of Peter’s putting his hands on the company at all.

The apostolic imposition of hands after baptism (except for ordination) is mentioned in only two instances in the New Testament (Acts 8:17; 19:6); and in both cases it was certainly used, as we know from the context (Acts 8:7,18; 19:6), to represent the bestowal of the miracle-working power of the Holy

Ghost. Christ put his hands upon unbaptized infants and blessed them (Matthew 19:13-15; Luke 18:15-16).

As for Hebrews 6:2, in which these six principles of the doctrine of Christ are mentioned— repentance, faith, baptism, laying on of hands, resurrection and judgment, we observe that nothing is said of an Apostle or a successor of an Apostle; it is not said upon whom or for what purpose hands are to be laid; but, if we are to infer from the order, that laying on of hands should follow every baptism, so we are compelled to infer that *every baptism must follow repentance from dead works, and faith toward God*; and this *inevitable* corollary of “confirmation,” as deduced from this passage, *utterly sweeps away the foundation of infant baptism, a chief corner-stone of hierarchism.*

The ordination of the Deaconship or Eldership by the laying on of the hands of the presbytery is scriptural (Acts 6:6; 13:3; I Timothy 4:14; II Timothy 1:6; I Peter 5:1; 2Jo 1:1). So Moses ordained Joshua by laying his hands upon him (Numbers 27:18; Deuteronomy 34:9). (*Hassell's History ppg 198, 199*)

Aquinas, Thomas

Thomas AQUINAS (*See under SCHOLASTIC THEOLOGY and The IMMACULATE CONCEPTION*)

Archaeology, Biblical

Biblical ARCHAEOLOGY: The late nineteenth century was a time of great discovery. The Industrial Revolution was in full swing. Scientific achievements were astounding the world. Old methods of industry and commerce were rapidly giving way to the new technology. Science was becoming the new god of the age. Society had never been so convinced that science could conquer the world. But as they cast aside the old ideas and the old methods, they began to cast aside the old values, and the old certainties. They began to question their religious convictions—and the Bible itself. It was a time of great discovery and great skepticism.

The nineteenth century saw the development of archaeology and the so-called Higher Criticism of the Bible. The Higher Critics insisted the Bible was no different than any other ancient book, and it ought to be studied, and dissected, in the same way. They began to apply their *scientific method* to the Bible and religion.

They questioned virtually everything about the Bible. They were sure its facts were wrong, and it was not written by the authors, nor at the time, it was supposed to have been written. Among other things, they claimed no one was

able to read and write at that time. With this new confidence in their own abilities, they insisted they had *scientific proof* the old ideas were wrong. They dared anybody to challenge their conclusions. How could they be wrong, when they had accomplished so much in the scientific realm?

But at the time the skeptics were doing their work, archaeologists were busy digging up their relics from the past. To be sure, it was a rare archaeologist who expected to confirm the facts of the Bible, but they confirmed them, nonetheless. God is able to turn the enemies' camp against itself. For over two hundred years now, the archaeologists have been digging up irrefutable proof the Higher Critics are wrong.

One of the key arguments of the skeptics was that the Bible could not possibly have been written when it was claimed, because nobody could read and write at that time. But God was about to prove beyond all doubt they were wrong. One of the first keys he provided was the *Rosetta Stone*.

The Rosetta Stone When Napoleon Bonaparte invaded Egypt in 1799, he took a small army of French scholars with him. It is not likely he was especially interested in learning about Egyptian antiquities. But those scholars would be helpful in telling him which artifacts were worth stealing. One of the artifacts they discovered was the Rosetta Stone.

The Rosetta Stone is presently in the British Museum. It was discovered M. Boussard, one of Napoleon's scholars, at Rosetta, a town near the mouth of the Nile. It provided the key to the ancient Egyptian language.

The language of ancient Egypt was a kind of picture writing called *Hieroglyphic*. About 800 B.C. Hieroglyphics gave way to *Demotic*. It was nearer the alphabetic style of writing. When Alexander the Great came along, Demotic gave way to Greek. Eventually, nobody could read Hieroglyphic or Demotic. The Rosetta Stone provided the key.

The stone is black granite. It is about 4 feet high, and 2 ½ feet wide. It has three inscriptions, one above the other, in Greek, Egyptian Demotic, and Egyptian Hieroglyphic. Greek was well known. The inscription was discovered to be a decree of Ptolemy V, Epiphanes. Scholars supposed it was made about 200 B.C.

From 1818 to 1822, a French scholar, named Champollion, compared the Greek letters with the unknown Egyptian characters. He managed to unravel the inscription and provide the key to the Hieroglyphic and the Demotic writing. It unlocked the entire world of Egyptian antiquities.

Those scholars were simply trying to make a name for themselves, but God was providing a way to decipher the old inscriptions, and demonstrate beyond all doubt that the historical facts of the Bible were true.

The Behistun Rock Sir Henry Rawlinson, an officer in the British army, provided the key to unraveling Babylonian inscriptions. In 1835 he discovered an inscription on Behistun Mountain about 200 miles Northeast of Babylon. The mountain is a huge rock, standing 1700 feet out of the plain. 400 feet above the road, on a perpendicular cliff, he found a smoothed surface with carvings. He discovered it was an inscription engraved by the order of Darius, king of Persia, who lived about 521 to 485 B.C. This was the same Darius Ezra and Daniel wrote about.

This inscription was a long account, in the Persian, Elamite, and Babylonian languages, talking about the mighty conquests of Darius. Rawlinson was acquainted with of the Persian language. Among other books he wrote *A Commentary on the Cuneiform Inscriptions of Babylonia and Assyria*, and *Notes on the Early History of Babylonia*. He assumed this was the same inscription in three languages. For 4 years, he climbed the rock, stood on a ledge about a foot wide at the bottom of the inscription, and made *squeezes* of the inscriptions. He spent another 14 years translating the material. But when he finished, he had found the key to the Babylonian language. With that discovery he provided later archaeologists access to the ancient Babylonian literature, and opened up an entire field of study, that for all these years has over and over confirmed the facts of the Bible.

Hammurabi's Code If there was ever any doubt about whether anybody could read in Abraham's day, the Hammarabi Code removed all doubt. It was one of the most important archaeological discoveries ever made. Hammurabi was the king of Babylon about 2000 B.C. That was the time of Abraham. He is usually identified by Assyriologists with *Amraphel* of Genesis 14. He was one of the four kings who invaded Canaan and carried Abraham's nephew Lot captive.

He had his code of law engraved on stones and set up in the main cities. In 1902 a French expedition under M. J. de Morgan found one of these stones in Babylon in the ruins of Susa. It is now in the Louvre Museum in Paris. It is a very smooth block of hard black stone. It is about 8 feet high, and 2 feet wide, and 1 ½ feet thick. It is oval in shape; it is beautifully cut, on all four sides. It is in cuneiform writing in the Babylonian language. It has about 4000 lines. It is the longest cuneiform tablet yet discovered.

It purports to show Hammurabi receiving laws from the sun-god Shamash. The laws deal with the worship of gods, administration of justice, taxes, wages,

interest, money lending, property, disputes, marriage, partnerships, public works, canal building, care of canals, regulations regarding passenger and freight service by canal and caravan, international commerce, etc.

This is a stone monument from Abraham's day. It is still in existence, and it proves beyond all question that the people of that day had a well-developed system of jurisprudence, and they had very well-developed literary skills. So much for our Higher Critics. Since that day, in their quest to make a name for themselves, and to outdo their colleagues, archaeologists have provided us a world of confirmation of the truth of this book of all books.

Arianism

ARIUS and **ARIANISM** (*See under Constantine*)

Arius

ARIUS and **ARIANISM** (*See under Constantine*)

Ark Of The Covenant, The

The ARK of the Covenant: Sylvester Hassell: The ark during the time of the judges remained at different places—a long time at Shiloh, a still longer time at Kirjath-Jearim, then at Jerusalem, and finally was deposited by Solomon in the magnificent temple which he had erected. When thus deposited, it contained nothing but the two tables of stone; the golden pot of manna and Aaron's Rod that budded, having been lost during its capture or frequent removals. With little exception it remained in the Holy of Holies, in the temple, from its dedication B.C. 1003, to its destruction B.C. 588—a period of four hundred and fifteen years. Moses made it B.C. 1490, and it perished in Solomon's temple B.C. 588, having been in existence nine hundred and two years! What a miraculous preservation! The second temple had no ark. (*Hassell's History pg 112*)

Arminianism

ARMINIANISM: Sylvester Hassell: The Wesleyans, while admitting the imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity, maintain that such imputation was just in God only on condition that he should give every individual of the human family sufficient grace in Christ to enable him, if he chooses, to attain salvation—thus taking back with the left hand what they give us with the right, and making themselves semi-Pelagians, and contradicting the whole tenor of the Scriptures, which everywhere affirm or imply that God's gift of Christ was an act

of pure and unmerited mercy.” (*Hassell’s History pg 51*) (*See also James ARMINIUS*)

Arminius, James

James ARMINIUS: Sylvester Hassell: James Arminius, of Holland (1560-1609), an able, learned and amiable man, was a disciple of Theodore Beza, and at first a strict Calvinist, but, through the combined influences of the rationalism of Peter Ramus, the synergism of Philip Melancthon, the Semi-Pelagianism of Robert Bellarmine, and the liberalism of Theodore Koornhert, he came to believe and advocate that the election of the sinner to eternal life is not absolute, but is conditioned on the sinner’s foreseen faith and perseverance.

Still he inconsistently maintained the total depravity of human nature since the Fall; that “man, in his natural condition, is dead in sins; that his mind is darkened, his affections depraved, and his will refractory; that the will of man, with respect to true good, is not only wounded, bruised, inferior, crooked, and attenuated, but that it is likewise captivated, destroyed and lost, and has no powers whatever, except such as are excited by grace; that the grace of Christ is simply and absolutely necessary for the illumination of the mind, the ordering of the affections, and the inclination of the will to that which is good; that it infuses good thoughts into the mind, inspires good desires into the affections, and leads the will to execute good thoughts and good desires; that it goes before, accompanies and follows; that it excites, assists, works in us to will, and works with us that we may not will in vain; that it averts temptation, stands by and aids us in temptations, supports us against the flesh, the world and Satan; and that, in conflict, it grants us to enjoy the victory; that it raises up again those who are conquered and fallen, establishes them, endues them with new strength, and renders them more cautious; that it begins, promotes, perfects and consummates salvation” (*Watson’s Theological Institutes, Vol. 2., pp. 46 and 47*).

It has been truly said that “James Arminius was much less Arminian than his followers.” The latter, after his death, being continually reproached as Pelagians, had their creed drawn up in Five Articles by one of their preachers, James Mytenbogaert, and presented, as a “Remonstrance,” to the States of Holland and West Friesland, in 1610.

This original Arminian Creed, which sets forth a carefully restricted Semi-Pelagianism, is as follows:

-
Article I. That God, by an eternal unchangeable purpose in Jesus Christ His Son, before the foundation of the world, hath determined, out of the fallen, sinful race of men, to save in Christ, for Christ’s sake, and through Christ, those who,

through the grace of the Holy Ghost, shall believe on this his Son Jesus, and shall persevere in this faith and obedience of faith, through this grace, even to the end; and, on the other hand, to leave the incorrigible and unbelieving in sin and under wrath, and to condemn them as alienate from Christ, according to the word of the gospel in John 3:36, and according to other passages of Scripture also.

Article 2., That, agreeably thereto, Jesus Christ, the Savior of the world, died for all men and for every man, so that he has obtained for them all, by his death on the cross, redemption and the forgiveness of sins; yet that no one actually enjoys this forgiveness of sins except the believer, according to the word of the gospel of John 3:36, and in I John 2:2.

Article 3. That man has not saving grace of himself, nor of the energy of his free-will, inasmuch as he, in the state of apostasy and sin, can of and by himself neither think, will nor do anything that is truly good (such as saving faith eminently is); but that it is needful that he be born again of God in Christ, through his Holy Spirit, and renewed in understanding, inclination or will, and all his power, in order that he may rightly understand, think, will and effect what is truly good, according to the word of Christ in John 15:5.

Article 4. That this grace of God is the beginning, continuance and accomplishment of all good, even to this extent, that the regenerate man himself, without prevenient or assisting, awakening, following and co-operative grace, can neither think, will nor do good, nor withstand any temptations to evil; so that all good deeds or movements, that can be conceived, must be ascribed to the grace of God in Christ. But as respects the mode of the operation of this grace, it is not irresistible, inasmuch as it is written concerning many that they have resisted the Holy Ghost, Acts 7, and elsewhere in many places.

Article 5. That those who are incorporated into Christ by a true faith, and have thereby become partakers of his life-giving Spirit, have thereby full power to strive against Satan, sin, the world, and their own flesh, and to win the victory; it being well understood that it is ever through the assisting grace of the Holy Ghost; and that Jesus Christ assists them through his Spirit in all temptations, extends to them his hand, and if only they are ready for the conflict, and desire his help, and are not inactive, keeps them from falling, so that they, by no power or craft of Satan, can be misled nor plucked out of Christ's hands, according to the word of Christ in John 10:28. But whether they are capable, through negligence, of forsaking again the first beginnings of their life in Christ, or again returning to this present evil world, of turning away from the holy doctrine which was delivered them, of losing a good conscience, of becoming devoid of grace, that must be more particularly determined out of the Holy Scripture, before we ourselves can teach it with the full persuasion of our minds.

These articles, thus set forth and taught, the Remonstrants deem agreeable to the word of God, tending to edification, and, as regards this argument, sufficient for salvation, so that it is not necessary or edifying to rise higher or descend deeper.

The question as to the possibility of finally falling from grace, left open in the Fifth Article, was decided by the Remonstrants or Arminians in the *affirmative* during the very next year (1611). And so, though having pronounced it both "unnecessary and unedifying," they continued to "descend deeper" into false doctrine, until, in the latter part of the seventeenth century, large numbers of them had logically degenerated into Pelagians and Arians; and they were but little removed from the deism of Herbert of Cherburg; the materialism of Hobbes, the pantheism of Spinoza, and the skepticism of Bayle. Thus error, instead of rectifying itself, continually tends to depart more widely from the truth."
(*Hassell's History* ppg 509-511)

Arnold of Brescia and The Arnoldists

ARNOLD of Brescia and **THE ARNOLDISTS** (*See under PETER de BRUYS*)

Asa

ASA Abijah's son, Asa, succeeded him, and proved to be one of the best kings that ever reigned over Judea. He earnestly sought to extirpate idolatry and immorality from the land, and repaired the fortified places of Judea; and, in the strength of a covenant-keeping God (see his remarkable prayer in II Chronicles 14:11), he met the mighty invading Ethiopian host of a million men, under Zerah, and utterly routed them. Encouraged by the prophet Azariah, he now became still more zealous in the destruction of idolatry. But Baasha, king of Israel, moving against him, his faith in God seemed for a time to fail him, and he, with the treasures of his palace and the temple, hired Benhadad, king of Syria, to invade Baasha's northern frontier; and, being rebuked for this by the faithful prophet of the Lord, Hanani, he cast the latter into prison. Asa was attacked with a disease in his feet; and seeking not to the Lord, but to physicians (probably foreign idolaters), he died. (*Hassell's History* pg 125)

Associations

ASSOCIATIONS These are annual meetings for the worship of God—for singing prayer, preaching, and to hear from sister churches of the same faith and order how they are getting along. We think there is scriptural authority for a meeting of this kind. It is necessary that the gospel be preached and this would be an opportune time for doing so. Besides, we are commanded not to “forsake the assembling of ourselves together, as the manner of some is; but exhort one another; and so much the more, as ye see the day approaching,” Hebrews 10:25. (*Hassell*)

Question: Has an association the authority to sit in judgment and render a decision in church differences?

Answer: Associations are not mentioned in the Scriptures. The first Baptist Association was formed in Wales A.D. 1651, more than 1500 years after the death of John the last apostle, and therefore, associations have no right over the churches; or to render decisions between churches. It would be far better to abolish all associations than to have them rule and ruin the churches, sacred to the Lord Jesus Christ her only head and master. The church is the highest, the last and the only organization on earth authorized to settle differences between its members.” (*Hassell in Questions and Answers by R.H. Pittman 1935*)

Question: Do Councils of Associations have any authority over the churches?

Answer: None whatsoever, since the death of the apostles, the last fully inspired and infallible created teachers of the human race. Any assemblies of men may advise a church of Christ, but they cannot impose their decisions upon her. But if a church, after the humble, loving, and continued labors of gospel churches, stubbornly and permanently persists in departing from the doctrine and practice of Christ and the apostles, she unchurches herself, her candlestick is removed out of its place, and she becomes a synagogue of Satan (Revelation 2:5; 3:9). (*Hassell in Questions and Answers by R.H. Pittman 1935*)

According to my reading and understanding, Baptist associations were at first simply general informal yearly meetings of the members of different churches for the worship of God, and did not have even any representation of the churches by delegates, or any so-called Constitution, or any correspondence with other similar meetings, and thus did not exercise the slightest authority over the churches whose members were at these meetings or over similar meetings of the members of other churches, and were very much like the present yearly meetings of some of our churches, leaving out all the business of such meetings; and, if associations had never been anything more than this, I can see no valid scriptural objections to them.

But these oldest Baptist associations, after a few years, adopted Constitutions, assumed to be Courts of Appeal for the difficulties arising in the churches, overseeing all the faith and practice of the churches, dropping and non-fellowshipping the churches, when the latter did not conform to their regulations, and finally took up formal correspondence with other associations, and some of them, after awhile, used this machinery to drop other associations and cut them off from their fellowship without gospel labor, and have thus erected apparently insurmountable and everlasting barriers between the churches of the saints, the members of the mystical body of Christ.

This is why it seems to me that either our associations ought to return to the original simple form of general meetings for nothing but the worship of God, or our churches ought to return to the simple form of the apostolic churches, which were bound together by nothing but the strong bond of divine truth and love. (*Sylvester Hassell, The Gospel Messenger, Nov. 1899*)

R.W. Thompson: Elder Hassell, in his church history refers to the ancient custom of the Jews, who were required to appear together before the Lord, at the Tabernacle, or temple, and make an offering with a joyful heart, and he says, “God’s object was to promote, in this way, the religious zeal and knowledge and union of his covenant people, to bring them frequently together in loving brotherly fellowship for the worship of God—the very same object that is now beautifully and pleasantly subserved by the frequent assemblies of the people of God in their quarterly, yearly, union, corresponding, and associational meetings.” (Hassell’s History, pg 94) The name by which you may call a thing in no sense changes its nature or character. Our associational meetings are for the identical purpose here assigned, and are conducted to the same end.

The first Baptist Association was formed in Wales, in 1649. —Gospel Messenger, vol. 28, p. 126, April, 1906. This date places the organization of the first Baptist association too far back by one hundred and forty-three years for it to have been of Missionary Baptist origin.

The government of our churches by associations would be wrong, hurtful, and unscriptural. Primitive Baptist churches will not submit to such an unscriptural system. A sound gospel church of good standing may or may not belong to an association without affecting her standing in the least. Any general meeting of the saints—union meetings and associations—should only be for the worship of God, mutual edification and promotion of brotherly love. There may be some things connected with the business part of our associations that could be better attended to some other way—by the church with which the association convenes. This is now practiced by some of our sound and orderly churches and

gives entire satisfaction. But to condemn the purpose of such general meeting for the worship is wrong, and only tends to engender strife, confusion, and division.

Let us stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free, and be not misled by any man in these restless times.” (R.W. Thompson in the *PRIMITIVE MONITOR*)

Athaliah

ATHALIAH (See under *Ahaziah*)

Atonement

ATONEMENT: definition: Gill defines *atonement* as “a covering to his people, from the curses of the law they have broken—from the wrath of God they have deserved—and from avenging justice their sins exposed them to.” James Oliphant defines it, “that which makes satisfaction for sin.”

The ATONEMENT: excerpts from The Daily-Throg-morton Debate: Daily: **1.** What does the death of Christ, apart from everything else, accomplish in the salvation of sinners? **2.** Did Christ die for sinners *really* and *absolutely* as a *substitute*; that is, did he take the place of sinners in dying for them? Was his death for them vicarious or not? **3.** Did Christ die for sinners in order to make the eternal salvation of all he died for possible on condition of faith?

My first argument in support of my proposition is that the death of Christ was necessary in order to the eternal salvation of sinners, and being necessary to that end, it was designed to accomplish it. For whatever is necessary to an end is designed to accomplish that end.

As God is all-wise, and as God is all-powerful, we are forced to the conclusion that whatever he designed in any undertaking of his will be accomplished; and that, therefore, to ascertain his design we have but to ascertain the final results.

If his design for sinners was not their eternal salvation, what was it? I maintain that the design was the eternal salvation of the sinners for whom he died.

When I think of God, whose name is "I am," the self-existent one, who is from everlasting to everlasting, the Almighty God, as knowing all things, I cannot associate with such an idea of God any idea of a failure upon his part.

Matthew 18:11 "For the Son of Man is come to save that which was lost."

I Thessalonians 5:9-10 "For God hath not appointed us to wrath, but to obtain salvation by our Lord Jesus Christ, who died for us, that, whether we wake or sleep, we should live together with him."

Galatians 1:3-4 "Grace be to you and peace from God the Father, and from our Lord Jesus Christ, who gave himself for our sins that he might deliver us from this present evil world, according to the will of God our Father."

God's design in Christ's dying for sinners was their eternal salvation from sin and their deliverance according to his will. His design is to be measured by its final results. Therefore, all for whom Christ died will be eternally saved.

My second argument is founded upon the annunciation of the coming birth of Christ by the angel to Joseph:

Matthew 1:21 "Thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he shall save his people from their sins."

Since he will save his people from their sins, he will not save more than his people; he will not save fewer than his people. He will save just that many.

All whom he will save are reckoned as his people before they are saved, before he died for them, even before he came into the world.

It was not his mission to try to save them, or to give them a chance to save themselves, or to enable someone else to save them, but to *save them himself*.

A priest in making his priestly offering could not sit down until the offering was accomplished. Jesus Christ could not have sat down on the right of the Majesty on high if he had not purged the sins of those for whom he died.

As Aaron bore the names of the twelve tribes of Israel, those he represented, making sacrifice for them and acting as their intercessor, thus purging them typically, so Christ, the glorious anti-type, bears the names of all for whom he died as a sacrifice, on the breastplate of his love.

Christ and the Holy Spirit act with one consent together, the work of one being the complement to that of the other. Christ intercedes for those for whom he died, as an advocate in heaven, and the Holy Spirit quickens them and becomes an advocate within to bear witness with their spirits that they are the children of God. The Atonement and intercession of Christ and the work of the Holy Spirit cannot fail. Therefore, all for whom Christ died will be eternally saved.

My sixth argument is that the death of Christ was a ransom paid for sinners intended to redeem them. That ransom price was God's own provision for the redemption of the sinners for whom Christ died, and therefore it cannot fail.

The death of Christ for sinners, the shedding of his blood, is the ransom price paid, by which those for whom he died are said to be purchased or redeemed.

I Corinthians 6:20 "For ye are bought with a price; therefore glorify God in your body, and in your spirit, which are God's.

What is the price? It is the priceless shed blood of the blessed Jesus. That is the full price. That is God's accepted price, to which there needs be no addition, to which there can be made no addition, which satisfies God in behalf of those for whom Christ die.

Acts 20:28 "Feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood."

I Peter 1:18-19 "Forasmuch as ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from your vain conversation received by tradition from your fathers; but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot."

Revelation 5:9 "And they sung a new song, saying, Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof; for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every kindred and tongue, and people, and nation."

If the payment of such a price should fail to secure the everlasting salvation of any for whom it was paid, the failure would be to the everlasting shame and disgrace of the omnipotent one who proposed to accept the price and of the obedient one, the suffering one who paid it.

There can be no more God dishonoring doctrine than that which teaches that some for whom Christ died will be eternally lost. It says his blood was spilt in vain. It charges him and the everlasting Father with both failure and falsehood. It says the law demands two payments for the same offense.

Titus 2:13-14 "Looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the Great God and our Savior Jesus Christ; Who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works."

Can redemption be for any one who is never redeemed? Can a price be paid as a ransom, and the ransom not be consummated? Can the judge be satisfied, justice be met, and the prisoners, any of them, remain forever enthralled?

My seventh argument in support of my proposition is: That salvation by the life of Christ is sure to follow reconciliation by his death.

Romans 5:6-10 "For when we were yet without strength, in due time Christ died for the ungodly. For scarcely for a righteous man will one die; yet peradventure for a good man some would even dare to die. But God commendeth his love toward us, in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us. Much more then, being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him. For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life."

The act of reconciling is here ascribed to the death of Christ. It was declared to be done when the sinners for whom he died were enemies, ungodly ones, and sinners without strength. It does not say they were reconciled when they became God's friends, when they repented and believed on Christ, but when they were enemies. All for whom Christ died were reckoned sinners, they were reckoned ungodly, and enemies to God. These enemies were all for whom Christ died, who lived in the ages before he lived, at that time, and who would live in subsequent ages.

All who were reconciled to God by the death of his Son will be eternally saved by his life. Therefore, all for whom Christ died will be eternally saved.

Throgmorton: It is true that God takes no pleasure in the death of any of them: Ezekiel 18:32 "For I have no pleasure in the death of him that dieth, saith the Lord God; wherefore turn yourselves and live."

Daily: God is here addressing National Israel and speaking of the disobedient ones among National Israel. As his promises to that nation were conditional promises, if they obeyed God under that national law, God preserved them; if they did not, God afflicted them. He had no pleasure in such affliction in case of disobedience under national law.

Throgmorton: God is not willing that any should perish. II Peter 3:9 The Lord is not slack concerning his promise, as some

men count slackness; but is long suffering to usward, *not willing that any should perish*, but that all should come to repentance."

Daily: It is God's work to save sinners, and since he doeth according to his will as the Bible declares, he will save all he wills to save. Therefore if this passage means all mankind, all will be saved. To come to repentance is to come to Christ. Christ says no one can come to him except the Father draws him. Then all the Father wills to come to Christ will be drawn. If this passage means all mankind, all will repent and be saved.

Throgmorton: I Timothy 4:10 "For therefore we both labor and suffer reproach, because we trust in the living God, who is the Savior of *all men*, specially those who believe." What about the living God, Paul? "*He is the Savior of all men.*" Of how many men? *All men*. What else have you to say? "Specially of those that believe." You see Paul makes a distinction. And all men that believe are the elect. And unless *all men* be saved eternally there will be some for whom he died that will not be eternally saved.

Daily: This passage was I Timothy 2:6, where he said he gave himself a ransom for all. Ransom is here translated from **antilutron** (antilutron). The preposition *anti* is here joined to the verb. **Antilutron** is a strong word translated *ransom* in this text. **Anti** means over against, corresponding to in place of, in retribution or return for. **Lutron** (lutron) is from the verb **luo** (luo) which means to loosen, unbind, set at liberty. So the word *anti-lutron* means the payment of such a price as retribution or return for as results in loosing or setting at liberty all for whom the ransom is paid. This fact is strengthened still by the phrase **uper pantwn** (huper panton) "for all." **Huper** (for) means in the attitude of protection, so that the idea of protection over all for whom the ransom was paid is *definitely expressed*. This makes it infallibly certain that all for whom this ransom was paid, for whom this blessed Mediator gave himself as a ransom, will be eternally saved. So when he says he gave himself a ransom for all he did not mean the whole human race. If he did, the whole race is going to heaven.

Throgmorton: The book plainly says in so many words that he tasted death for every man. Hebrews 2:9 "That he by the grace of God should taste death for every man."

Daily: Speaking of Christ tasting death for every man, in Hebrews 2:9, he claims "every man" means the entire human race. Let's see. The phrase "for every man," is translated from the Greek phrase, **uper pantos** (huper pantos). It is not **uper pantos antropos** "for every man," but **uper pantos** "for every." The word "man" is not in the original. This might be translated "for every one," if taken distributively, which means every one of the many brethren mentioned in the context, for whose salvation Jesus was made a perfect captain. Through suffering he was made the perfect captain of the salvation of all finally brought to glory by him, and not of all the human race. If he tasted death for every one of the human race, and thus became the captain of their salvation through suffering for them, they will all be saved and be brought to glory. So he tasted death for those only for whom he was made a perfect captain.

Throgmorton: We read of one weak brother for whom Christ died that *perished*. I Corinthians 8:10-11 "For if any man see thee which hast knowledge, sit at meat in the idol's temple, shall not the conscience of him which is weak be emboldened to eat those things which are offered to idols? And through thy knowledge shall the weak brother *perish, for whom Christ died?*" In the Revised Version, American, it reads: For through thy knowledge he that is weak *perisheth, the brother for whom Christ died.*" It doesn't mean a brother in Christ, because we have seen that those in Christ will never perish, but here is a brother in *Adam* for whom Christ die, who *perishes*. The Greek word *apoleitai* (*apoleitai*) is the same as in John 3:16, where the word *perish* occurs.

Daily: He speaks about the weak brother perishing: I Corinthians 8:11. Now the Apostle is there writing to brethren in the church, and speaks of a weak brother in the church perishing. The argument of my friend is, that one who belongs to the church, is a brother in the church, might eternally perish. Do you believe in apostasy? If not, why did you call

attention to that? Did that mean a brother in Adam? How do you know it did? The Apostle is not writing to the Adamic family, but to the Church of God. He means a brother in Christ. There might be many ways in which a person can perish and then not go to hell. There are different ways in which a person may perish.

Throgmorton: I Timothy 4:10 "For therefore we both labor and suffer reproach, because we trust in the living God, who is the savior of *all men*, specially those who believe." What about the living God, Paul? "*He is the Savior of all men.*" Of how many men? *All men*. What else have you to say? "Specially of those that believe." You see Paul makes a distinction. And all men that believe are the elect. And unless *all* men be saved eternally, there will be some for whom he died that will not be eternally saved. So my opponent's proposition is gone. He is the Savior of all men in that he has saved all men from the guilt of Adam's transgression. He is the special Savior of those that believe, because *when* they believe, he pardons all their actual transgressions. Many for whom he died, and whom he saved from Adam's guilt, become actual transgressors and never believe and so are lost forever.

Daily: In reference to I Timothy 4:10, Christ is referred to there. God the Father is referred to, and in saying he is the Savior of all men and especially those that believe, he teaches that he is the *preserver* of all men by his *protection over them*, particularly and especially them that believe. The word Savior here in the Emphatic Diaglott is translated *preserver*. In Hind's Interlinear Greek Testament it is also translated *preserver*, so that the literal rendering would be *preserver* of all men, and especially those that believe. Now if he is the Savior of all men, he will save all, because it takes that to be a Savior.

Throgmorton: Romans 5:18 "Therefore as by the offense of *one*, judgment came upon *all men* to condemnation." Whose was the one offense? Adam's. Who were the "all men" upon whom the condemnation came by Adam's disobedience? What does Paul say? As by the offense of *one* judgment came upon *all men* to condemnation." Not by their own transgression, but because of Adam's transgression. "Even so by the

righteousness of one," that is, the righteousness of Jesus Christ wrought out and finished on the cross, "Even so by the righteousness of *one*, the free gift came upon"—how many? "Upon all men," the same "all men" mentioned in the first part of the verse. My opponent says if that means all men, all men will be eternally saved, and told me "good bye." It does mean *universal* salvation from *Adam's* transgression, but not from *actual* transgression. There will never be a man in hell at last on account of Adam's transgression, unless it is Adam himself.

Daily: In reference to the 5th chapter of Romans (Romans 5), "Therefore, as by the offense of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life." Does that justification of life mean eternal life? Does it mean they all received eternal life, when it speaks of the free gift coming to all? If justification of life doesn't mean eternal life, what kind of life does it mean? If it does mean eternal life, how can any fail to be saved forever? Answer that, and we will have more on that subject.

Throgmorton: Brother Daily refers to Ephesians 1:7 and to Colossians 1:14, "In whom we have redemption." This redemption is not something that we obtained on the cross when Christ died. Redemption is forgiveness! When did *you* get forgiveness, Brother Daily? Back there? Or in the hour in which you first believed? Tell us! Colossians 1:14 "In whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins." When were *you* forgiven? When Christ suffered on the cross? Or when he met you in faith?

Daily: In the way of redemption through his blood, in quoting that, he says we do not have redemption until we have forgiveness, because redemption is forgiveness. Now Christ obtained eternal redemption for us before he entered the Holy Place, did he not? If Christ obtained eternal redemption before he entered the Holy Place, then will we not get the redemption that Christ obtained for us? If not, why? Is Christ's work a failure? Will Christ obtain eternal redemption for a sinner when he died on the cross, and then that sinner fail to receive that redemption that Christ had obtained for him? I proved that

ransom signified a loosing, that it was to redeem that which was ransomed, and he hasn't answered the argument, and he will not do it.

Throgmorton: The blood of Christ purges our conscience from dead works. When? Back there when the blood was shed? Tell us. Is that what you mean—that your conscience was purged from sin when Christ died on the cross? *Mine* was purged in *my lifetime* by the application of that blood. And Christ's blood when shed on the cross per se, cleanses no one. That only the application of the blood can do. It is the blood *applied* that does this thing. Let me read you Acts 15:7-9. It will show you *when* the purification takes place: "God made choice among us, that the Gentiles by my mouth should hear the word of the gospel, and believe. And God, which knoweth the hearts, bare them witness, giving them the Holy Ghost, even as he did unto us;"—now listen!—"and put no difference between us and them, *purifying their hearts by faith.*" Not without faith—not yet when the blood was *shed*; but *by* faith when the blood was *applied*. That is when the *purging* takes place as to the actual transgressor.

Daily: Speaking of the conscience being purged from sin, that is not the purging of the sins mentioned in Hebrews 1st chapter. He purged our sins in a different sense when he died on the Roman cross. There was a sense in which he purged our sins, when he died on the cross, was there not? So there was a sense in which he purged sins. The Apostle says he purged our sins before he sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high.

Daily: What does the death of Christ, apart from everything else, accomplish in the salvation of sinners? For instance, in the case of those who die without hearing the gospel, what does the gospel accomplish in their eternal salvation? You deny that all for whom Christ died will be eternally saved. You contend that some will be eternally damned. Now what does Christ's death accomplish in the case of those who never hear the gospel preached?

Let us illustrate the gentleman's theory. Let this represent those that are lost, and this those who are saved (using two books). That Christ died for these he admits, but also argues that he died for these just the same. No difference in the death. What does the death of Christ do for these? They go to endless ruin. They suffer in an endless hell, though Christ died for them. What makes the difference between the two? The death of Christ? No, sir. Anything Christ did? No, sir. He did just as much for these as these. Nothing that Christ did makes the difference. My Friend's position is that what these did, and not what Christ did, is what made the difference between the classes. So that those in heaven are there for what *they* did, and *not* by reason of what Christ did for them!

Daily: Galatians 3:13 "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us; for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree." When was that redemption accomplished? When he was made a curse for us. When was he made a curse for us? When he died on the Roman cross. That agrees with the other text, that he entered heaven, having obtained eternal redemption for us. So Christ has redeemed us, for it is written, "Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree." The meaning is: he was made a curse over us, in the sense of protection. This represents him as being a curse in an attitude of protection over them for whom he died. The Greek work **uper** (huper) means over, so that the curse due to them fell upon him. They were shielded by him.

As surety of the covenant he stood to his engagement and made full reparation for the sins of those for whom he died. Because of his being made sin and a curse, the supporting and comforting presence of his father was withdrawn from him, so that he cried out, "My God, My God, why hast thou forsaken me:?" It was for no sin of his own, but because he became sin for those for whom he died, and because he died a curse for them.

Christ, in being made sin for those for whom he died, was their substitute, as the word **uper** (huper) positively declares. Every sinner for whom he died must be absolved or the substitution of Christ is a failure. Did Christ die for sinners as an absolute

substitute? He has not said yes, or no, to that question. He has not even given an *evasive* answer to that question. He has paid no attention to it. He has said that Christ died to make the salvation to all possible, when he knows that he cannot stand upon that through this debate to save his life. He is gone if I were to stop here and give him the rest of the time. His position is that God has not made provision for the salvation of all. He will never get out of that hole. It will go down in the book with him in it, covered up with no possibility to escape.

Now all secured by Christ as their substitute, as their surety, will be eternally saved, because they are secured and redeemed from the curse of the law. Therefore all for whom Christ died will be eternally saved. He will not answer that question; he will not answer that argument. He will treat it as he has all the rest.

Daily: My tenth argument is founded on the unity of the Trinity. The three Persons in the Trinity co-operate, the work of each being a complement to the work of the others. God, and Christ, and the Spirit form a Divine Trinity—God the Father, Christ the Son, and the Holy Spirit. And these three operate in harmony, one being harmonious with the others in the accomplishment of the work.

Christ comes and acts as the representative and surety. He gives his very life for them, and purifies them to himself, a peculiar people, and finally ascends to his Father, having purged their sins by his death. The Holy Spirit, being one with the Father and Son, cannot fail to perform the important work assigned in the great economy of their salvation.

If the co-operation of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost is a harmonious work, then all for whom Christ died will be eternally saved. But the co-operation of these divine persons is a harmonious work, for these three are one. Therefore all for whom Christ died will be eternally saved.

Daily: My Eleventh argument is that positive fact stated by Paul, that just as certainly as God delivered up Christ to die for sinners, he will as surely and freely give them all things else

necessary for their salvation. Romans 8:32 "He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things?" The argument of the Apostle is this: If God gave the best gift he could in giving Christ for those for whom he died, he will not fail to give any other gift necessary to their eternal salvation. If he will not fail in giving any other gift necessary for their eternal salvation, then all for whom Christ died will be eternally saved. Your friends are wondering what you are going to do with that.

I Thessalonians 5:9: "For God hath not appointed us to wrath, but to obtain salvation by our Lord Jesus Christ, who died for us, that whether we wake or sleep, we should live together with him." The great purpose for which Christ died for sinners is that they should live together with him. God spared him not. He will also give all things necessary to that end. The Holy Spirit which quickens them is a gift to them.

Romans 5:5: "And hope maketh not ashamed; because the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us." Then if God gave Christ to die for a sinner, he will give the Holy Ghost as well.

Romans 6:23: "The gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord." He gave Christ to die for the sinner. He will give everything else necessary. Eternal life is necessary, therefore he will give eternal life.

To offset that conclusion my friend must show that God will not give all things to those for whom he gave Christ to die. When he proves that, he will prove the Apostle told a falsehood when he declared that God would give all things necessary, when he declared that God gave Christ, the greatest gift that could be given for sinners.

Daily: My next argument is based upon the plain statement of Peter, that the object of Christ's suffering for sinners is that he might bring them to God. I Peter 3:18: "For Christ also once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God." In the phrase, "the just for the unjust," the preposition here is **uper** (huper), and is translated "for," signifying protection

over the unjust, a substitute for the sins for those for whom Christ died. My opponent does not say whether Christ died as a substitute or not. He has not said yet. I have proved that. He knows that he has not.

Daily: It is just as he illustrated his idea of salvation yesterday by reference to a man who had been put in jail under a fine of \$1,000.00, who was entirely unable to escape from the jail unless the \$1,000.00 should be paid. When the \$1,000.00 was paid, and the court dockets were cleared on account of the payment being made, the man was still in jail, he said. His idea seems to be, however, in regard to the salvation of the sinner, that after all the provision has been made, the payment and all preparation made, the sinner must then believe that it is made.

It seems to me to be ridiculous to suppose that the man in jail must believe that his fine has been paid or he will never get any benefit out of the payment. He will never be benefitted unless he believes. I desire not only to show the ridiculousness of my opponent's position here, but to show just how this matter is, by calling your attention to Isaiah 49:8-10: "Thus saith the Lord, in an acceptable time have I heard thee, and in a day of salvation have I helped thee." The Lord is here speaking to Christ. God the Father is addressing the Savior. "And in a day of salvation have I helped thee." Still addressing the Savior, And I will preserve thee, and give thee for a covenant of the people, to establish the earth, to cause to inherit the desolate heritage." Still addressing the Savior, "That thou mayest say to the prisoners, Go forth."

He makes the payment, this Savior does, after which he is able to say to the prisoner, "Go forth, because I have made the payment." If he should require them to believe in order that the payment be made, then the payment couldn't be made until they believed, which is ridiculous, and any one with any degree of intelligence can see the ridiculousness of it. The idea of believing a thing to be true in order to make it true, is too absurd for an intelligent mind to accept.

In addition to that I want to say this: That if the ransom is paid for sinners, if the fine is liquidated and the docket is cleared on

that account for sinners, and those sinners remain in jail forever, it would be to the everlasting disgrace of the law of the country under which they are held as prisoners, the debt being paid. Answer it if you dare. You *may* try.

Daily: I want to call your attention to another predicament into which my worthy opponent plunged yesterday, and from which he will never be able to extricate himself. A corrupt tree, an alien sinner, cannot bring forth good fruit. Matthew 7:18 Faith is a good fruit, for the Apostle says it is a fruit of the Spirit. Therefore the alien sinner cannot bring forth faith. The conclusion of this syllogism will stand, because neither premise can be destroyed. It follows, therefore, that the alien sinner cannot bring forth the good fruit of faith. His theory requires him to do what he cannot do in order that the death of Christ be effectual in his salvation.

Daily: Now, Brother Throgmorton has been repeating [himself] a great deal. I will not have to repeat a great deal, because I have so much to bring forward, as you will see as this debate progresses.

But I have some more here that I want to give you on the term "the whole world," as found in I John 2:2. According to his position, Christ died for all the sins of all the human family just alike. Then he died for those who were in hell when he died, who had died and were lost before he died, and he now stands as the propitiation for their sins. The passage says he is *now* the propitiation for the sins of the whole world, and so if Brother Throgmorton is right, he is the propitiation for the sins of all the host of the lost, those who had died before his death, and those who have died since. He is *now* their propitiation, being their advocate in heaven!

The term "whole world" is *assumed* to mean the entire human family. It is an *assumption* without *proof*. But his position on Romans 3:25, where God is said to have set Christ forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, is that faith is a condition in order for Christ's being a propitiation for sins. That is a positive contradiction of his position on this text, for all have not faith. Since all have not faith, and since faith, according to his

view, is a condition of Christ's being the propitiation for sins, it follows as an unavoidable conclusion that the whole world, in I John 2:2, does not mean the entire human family.

The key to this passage is in Isaiah 49:6: "And he said, It is a light thing," addressing Christ, "that thou shouldest be my servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and restore the preserved of Israel; I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that thou mayest be my salvation unto the end of the earth."

This key shows the "world" means Gentiles. The salvation which God has prepared unto the end of the earth. Wherever this salvation which God has provided reaches, whoever are saved by it, are included in the propitiation and advocacy of Christ. This includes all the world—that is, the Gentiles as well as the Jews; in fact, some of every kindred and tongue and people and nation. Revelation 5:9 Christ's propitiation and advocacy propitiates the Father, conciliates, brings peace and secures his mercy. This is the design of his glorious work, and in this he cannot fail. So all for whom he is the propitiation and advocate, the world of Gentiles as well as Jews, will be eternally saved.

Daily: He says the death of Christ would have amounted to nothing had he not risen. His resurrection is not what made his death really effective, for his death was virtuous. I mean had virtue in it, as soon as he died. His resurrection showed his death to be effectual. Had he not been resurrected from the dead, it would have been demonstrated that his death was not satisfactory. it was necessary to show that his death had virtue in it.

Daily: He speaks of the light that lighteth every man that comes into the world, and I asked him how millions upon millions that go down to endless hell without having heard the gospel preached were enlightened. He hasn't told me, and he will not dare to during this debate. Were the millions that go down to an endless hell without hearing the gospel ever enlightened by this true light, and if so, how were they enlightened by it?

Daily: I want to call your attention to another thing that was brought up yesterday by my opponent. In speaking of Jesus weeping over the condition of Jerusalem, because as he supposed, Jesus was not able to save them, not able to save, wanted to do it, gave his life to do it, and absolutely could not. Jesus weeping, because he couldn't do what he wanted to do in the work of the salvation of these people!

Now listen: If Jesus wept on that account, may we not conclude that God the Father in heaven, Jesus Christ, the Divine advocate there, and the Holy Spirit, are now weeping over countless millions that have gone down to endless hell, whom they could not save! And as they might be supposed to be weeping in heaven, and as the children of God, in love with the Father, are in sympathy, they would join in the wailing, and all heaven would ring with wailings!! God the Father, the Holy Spirit, and all who are saved in heaven, weeping, because God could not save the countless millions that went to hell!! Draw down the curtains!!

Daily: My brother is repeating. He will continue to repeat. He will hammer upon I John 2:2, and some other things; but, my friends, I have enough to just keep on. I promise to bring up something every time, which he cannot answer, and that this day's debate will close with still plenty on hand that I could have used, that would have been to his ruin as he stands upon the opposite side of this question. I respect my brother. When we parted the last time before we met here, I remarked to him, "I think we will meet again." He said: "We will, but we will meet as friends." Thank you for your attention.

Throgmorton: And now my opponent wants me to explain how it is that God has given light to all men. I take the fact as God states it. What is the fact? "He (Christ) was the true light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world." If I wanted to designate every member of the human race, could I do it in stronger language? I don't have to explain *how* it is done, but it is done. God says it is done, and that is enough for me. It ought to be for you, Brother Daily.

Daily: How does God give light to all men? He said he didn't have to take time to tell how. God gives light to all men. He doesn't dare to say that God gave light to millions that go down without ever hearing the gospel preached.

Throgmorton: Christ's mission and death were for the world in general. You see I am repeating. It is line upon line. John 3:16 "God so loved the world." God's love was for the world in general. When the term world refers to mankind, unless there is some modification it means all Adam's posterity, not just two or three "ends of the earth." Sometimes when modified it means all living at the time, except these that have been chosen of God and separated into another family. Sometimes it means all the race then living. Sometimes it means all the race for all time, except God's people. *It never means God's people only.*

Put that down. Christ was sent to save the world. I John 4:14 "And we have seen and do testify that the Father sent the Son to be the Savior of the world." Hear that same John in that same I John 5:19 "And we know that we (the elect) are of God, and the whole world lieth in wickedness." But John says we have seen it and we testify to it "that the Father sent the Son to be the Savior of the world." And Jesus says, "If any man hear my words and believeth not, I judge him not, for I came not to judge the world, but to save the world." John 12:47

Who are the world? Those that believe not. Jesus says he doesn't judge them; he didn't come to judge but to save them. It is to save them all. My friend says not. Jesus says he came to save them. Why doesn't he save them? They don't believe on him. Don't forget Jesus said that, concerning those that believe not. "If any man hear my words and believe not, I judge him not, for I came not to judge the world, but to save the world." That is in John 12:47.

Before men believe they are of the world; when they believe they are counted no more of the world. Jesus said of his apostles, "They are not of the world, even as I am not of the world," John 17:16. He said, "I have chosen you out of the world," John 15:19. Before they were separated from the

world, they were part of it even as others. Ephesians 2:1-3
"And you hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins; wherein ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience; among whom also we all had our conversation in times past in the lusts of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind; and were by nature the children of wrath, even as others"

God loved the world before his people were separated from it, and he loved it afterwards. Between those separated from the world and those left John distinguishes thus. I John 5:19 "And we know that we are of God, and the whole world lieth in wickedness." Speaking of those now separated from the world, Paul described them thus: Ephesians 3:11-12 "Wherefore remember, that ye being in time past Gentiles in the flesh, who are called uncircumcision by that which is called the circumcision in the flesh made by hands; that at that time ye were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope and without God in the world." And yet my opponent says that they were then members of the bride of Christ!

Daily: In the negative argument he calls attention to John 3:16 "God so loved the world." The Jewish idea was the Messiah was to come exclusively to the Jews, that he was to come to save them; but Christ tells them that he came in love to the *Gentiles* as well as the *Jews*. Love, in its very nature, is particular, definite and special. It must center upon some *particular* and *special* object of its exercise, and cannot go to everybody in general. When God says, "I have loved thee with an everlasting love," he addresses not persons in *general*, but persons in *particular*. That the nations of the world meant the Gentiles is seen by a comparison of Luke 12:30 with Matthew 6:32, "For all these things do the nations of the world seek after; and your Father knoweth that ye have need of these things." The Gentiles are here called the nations of the world, in conformity with the Jewish manner of speaking. Again, the Gentiles are denominated "the world" by Paul in Romans 11:15, "For if the casting away of them be the reconciling of the world,

what shall the receiving of them be, but life from the dead?" So Paul calls the Gentiles "the world."

That Christ did not mean the entire human family when he said, "God so loved the world," is proved conclusively beyond successful dispute by Paul's quotation, when he says, "Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated," Romans 9:11-13. If he loved some and hated some at the same time, he did not love all alike; in fact, he did not love them *at all*.

The learned Moses Stuart, though he believed in a general atonement as a theologian, was too candid as a scholar to build an argument or found his faith on such passages as John 3:16. He says, "The sacred writers mean to declare by such expressions that Christ died really and truly as well and as much for the Gentiles as for the Jews."

Subjunctive mode means doubt, he says. Not always, Brother Throgmorton, you assume the role of teacher. I am going to accord you that place. However, I want to correct you. Subjunctive mode doesn't always mean doubt. It only just occasionally means doubt in English, and as used in the Greek, you know, after the conjunction *hena* it means a certain purpose, being properly translated, "in order that." So he gave himself in order that he might bring us to God, the purpose being to *bring* us, not to *try* to bring us, or give us a *chance* to come, or enable somebody *else* to bring us, or place us where we *have no chance* to come, but to *bring* us.

Daily: I Peter 2:24 "Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree, that we, being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness; by whose stripes ye were healed." The fact that he actually bore the sins of all for whom he died in his body on the tree is emphasized by the appositive phrase "his own self," and by the additional use of the word "own" to the pronoun "his" in its limitation or modification of the word "body." "Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree." These adjectives are used to make the declaration emphatic. This cannot be successfully denied. Then it is proved that God laid on his Son the sins of those for whom he died, and that the Son, his own self, bore these very sins in his own body on the

cross. I inquire as to the result. What became of those sins which the Father laid on his Son, which he bore in his body on the tree? Let the word of God answer, and let us all bow to the answer, and forever keep silent rather than deny the answer so plainly given.

Daily: My next argument is that the justification of sinners is necessarily connected with the death of Christ for them as the procuring cause of their justification. As the cause of the justification is the bearing of the sins of those for whom Christ died, all for whom Christ died will be justified.

Isaiah 53:11: "By his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many, for he shall bear their iniquities." If the mere results had been borne and not the iniquities themselves, then justification would have been impossible. Pardon there might have been, but justification there never could have been. The word of God, by one sweeping declaration, settles this matter forever. Listen: "By his knowledge (mark you, it is Jehovah speaking of his Son), "By his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many, for he shall bear their iniquities." If we ask why any sinner is justified, what is the cause of his justification, we find the answer in our text: Because Christ bore his iniquities.

As the iniquities of sinners being borne by Christ in his death on the cross is the cause of their being justified, as the text declares, then if he bore the sins of all the race, they will all be justified.

Daily: I attend first to the questions which my brother handed me.

The first is: "Does God require all men, elect and non-elect to seek him?" None are commanded to seek God except his children.

The second is: "Can a man be blamed for not accepting a gift which is not offered to him?" A man is not blamed for not accepting Christ. He is blamed for violating God's law.

I have a question now for him. Can a man be blamed for not accepting Christ who never hears of him? Are heathens, who never hear of Christ, sent to hell for not accepting him?

"Is Christ offered to men, elect and non-elect, in the gospel?"
Not *offered* to anybody.

"Does God command every sinner, elect and non-elect, to repent?" A man cannot repent without life, whatever kind of repentance it be, natural or spiritual.

"Does God censure sinners, elect and non-elect, for not believing on his Son?" Not believing is not the *cause* of condemnation. It is the *evidence* of it.

"What is the penalty due to sin?" Death.

"Where do you learn that only elect persons die in infancy?" All that die in infancy are saved in Heaven. I believe that. Those that are saved in Heaven are elect. Therefore only elect persons die in infancy.

"Can a man believe in Christ without believing that Christ died for him?" The devils did.

Throgmorton: Did they believe that Christ died for them?

Daily: Devils believe.

Throgmorton: On Christ, is what my question said.

Daily: Don't interrupt, please.

"Is there any way for a sinner to repent or seek God except through the crucified Christ?" None repent or seek after God in a state of unregeneracy.

"Why does God favor a non-elect person with long life, and deny the same blessing to the elect?" Because it seems good in his sight.

"Would Christ have suffered any more in dying for all of Adam's race than in dying for just one sinner?" No way of knowing.

"When Paul says, Christ loved me and gave himself for me, does he mean that Christ loved no one else and gave himself for nobody else?" No, he gave himself for *all* the elect.

"Can you name a passage in the New Testament where the word "world" means only the elect?" Yes, sir: I John 2:2. The "whole world means *only* the elect among the Jews and among the Gentiles.

Daily: He says his duty is to examine the proof text. His duty is to examine the *arguments* and *proof text* that I submit. He examines the proof texts, but the *arguments* he passes by. He quotes John 3:16. "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life." His position is that he believes to *get* everlasting life. My position is that he believes because he *has* everlasting life. If his position were true, it would not be true that he that believeth hath everlasting life. It ought to be stated that he that believeth will get it.

Throgmorton: [I asked] "Where do you learn that only elect persons die in infancy?" He says he believes that all that die in infancy are saved. That is about like I thought you'd answer. Because you *think* it. I don't want to find out what you *think*, but where you get the *authority* for your thought. His answer is he believes that all who die in infancy shall be saved!

Daily: He wants to know where I get my authority for saying that all infants that die in infancy are saved. That sounds like he disputes it. When a man calls for my authority, the inference, of course, would be that he rather doubts it. If not, why should he call for my authority? Now if I were to take the time, I think I could prove that infants that die in infancy are saved. I will just make this general statement, however, without entering further into proof, that everything that is said of that class in God's word is favorable to it. David wept and fasted while his child was sick. He was glad in his heart, and so quit weeping when he learned that his child was dead, because he had the assurance that he could go to the child. All infants

that die in infancy are saved with an everlasting salvation, and, therefore, they belong to the elect, since the elect are saved. That is plain.

Throgmorton: He wants to know, "if Christ is the savior of the damned in hell?" Yes, sir; he saved every one of them from the guilt of Adam's transgression. I have proved that by Romans 5:18. Christ took Adam's sin away.

Daily: He says that Christ is the Savior of the damned in hell by saving all of them from the guilt of Adam's transgression. He has not proved, neither can he prove, that Christ by his death atoned for the entire human race by satisfying for Adam's transgression. There is not a text in the Bible from the beginning of Genesis to the end of Revelation that says or intimates that Christ by his death on the cross atoned for Adam's transgression for all the human race. If Christ could pay the debt on the cross for the Adamic transgression, I ask why could he not pay the debt of actual sins for sinners on the cross? You say he did pay the debt of the Adamic transgression on the cross. Do you have any proof that he atoned for the entire race? In Romans 5, the reference to which you called attention does not prove that, but to the contrary, for it has reference to those "who receive abundance of grace and the gift of righteousness," and not the entire Adamic family. He says that is the work of God that the sinner believes on Christ. Well, if that is God's work, and the sinner believes because God works in him to believe, why then cannot God reach them in unbelief and cause them to believe? You said he had to believe before God could reach him. There you are in the hole. If God works the belief in the sinner causing the sinner to believe, then cannot God reach him in unbelief, and cause him to believe? Yet you take the position that God could not save a sinner until that sinner believed! Draw down the curtains!!

Throgmorton: He thinks I ought to get up and acknowledge that the weak brother in I Corinthians 8:11, was one of God's saints who had sinned and perished. I guess that would look well to him! But how does it look for you, Brother Daily, to get up here and say that a brother for whom Christ died may perish? How does it look for you to say that a true saint may

perish? I will turn you over to the Methodists. I didn't know you believed in the possibility of final apostasy! This brother in I Corinthians 8:11, you say was one of the elect, a brother *in Christ*. So, if you are right a child of God may perish—does perish. To escape this, he must show that to perish does not mean to be finally lost.

Daily: What does perish mean? It doesn't always mean to perish in hell. I proved to you by the context that the brother for whom Christ died was the brother in the church, and he cannot answer it if he lived until dooms-day and tried all the time. The perishing in that case is in a different sense from perishing eternally. We perish in the sense of losing our religious enjoyment in the service of the Lord, by disobeying his commands. There is a perishing by losing your enjoyment. It is not perishing in hell, and he cannot prove that it is. He takes an affirmative, and if he could prove it he would prove apostasy.

But he says we can resist the Spirit by sinning, therefore all can resist in the call. How about that? When God calls us from death to life, can we, being dead, resist the call? We might, after he had called us to life, resist in the sense of disobeying the commands, but could we resist the call from death to life? The idea of a dead person resisting the call! The Apostle says, 2nd chapter of Ephesians (Ephesians 2), "You hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins." The idea of the sinner resisting that call, because we may disobey God's commands is too light to weigh anything. He is making out God trying and failing, and Christ trying and failing, and the Holy Spirit trying and failing. I do not believe in a Triune God that fails.

Daily: II Corinthians 5:15 "For the love of Christ constraineth us; because we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead; and that he died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him which died for them, and rose again." This cannot mean that he died for all who are dead in sins, for that would make his dying for them the *cause* of their being dead in sins.

Were they not dead in trespasses and in sins independent of his death for them? His dying for them didn't cause them to be dead in trespasses and sins!

It did cause them to be dead in some sense. In what sense? If "one died for all, then were all dead," means that he died for all that were dead in sins—then his dying for them is the cause.

No, it doesn't mean that at all. All were dead in sins, and the death of Christ has nothing to do with that. All would have been dead in sins, and would have forever continued in that state if Christ had not died. So his dying for sinners did not *cause* them to be dead in sins.

The Greek shows that all died for whom Christ died. "If one for all died, then they all died," is the literal rendering. I want to repeat that. "If one for all died, then they all died." They died because he died. How? His dying for them was the cause of their dying, but in what sense are they dead, because he died for them? He died as their substitute, as the preposition **uper** (huper) shows, and they died because of his death.

As he, their substitute died for them, he died just as the substitute going to the war. If one takes the place of one in the army, then his death is the death of the one for whom he goes as a substitute. Christ died as their substitute, and for that reason we are dead because Christ died for us. All for whom Christ died are dead in that sense, therefore all are going to be finally saved.

Daily: All for whom Christ died shall be eternally saved, because the eternal perfection of all for whom Christ died is necessarily connected with his death for them.

Christ by the offering of his body once for all did perfect forever those for whom he died, by accepting their sins or by bearing their sins in his own body on the cross. Not one shall ever be lost whom Christ has forever perfected by this offering made for them. In him they have a perfect sacrifice for their sins, a perfect righteousness for their covering, a perfect advocate with the Father continually—the perfection of all they need to bring

them home to glory and present them faultless and spotless before the throne of God. Therefore all for whom Christ died will be eternally saved.

Daily: My 18th argument is that all for whom Christ died are declared to be dead, because he died for them. They are dead in him as their substitute. It is said that they that are dead are freed from sin. Romans 6:7. Those who are freed from sin shall be eternally saved, therefore, all for whom Christ died shall be eternally saved.

II Corinthians 5:14-15 "For the love of Christ constraineth us; because we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead; and that he died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him which died for them, and rose again." This text declares that the reason for all being dead is that Christ died for them. Their death in sin cannot be meant, for that is not caused by Christ's dying for them.

No other death can be meant than their death in him as their substitute, for no other death could be caused by his dying for them. Those for whom he died are dead, all of them, because he died for them. If he had not died for them, they would have died the eternal death. His death being accepted as their death, they are dead, because he died for them. So Paul says, "I am crucified with Christ." Romans 6:8 "Now if we be dead with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with him." All for whom Christ died are dead, because he died for them. All who are dead in this sense are freed from sin, shall live with him, and shall be eternally saved. Therefore all for whom Christ died will be eternally saved.

Daily: My next argument is founded on the covenant relation between Christ and the people he came to save, and for whom he died, represented as Shepherd and sheep. They are declared in the scriptures to have been his sheep before receiving eternal life, and before being brought to God by him.

Jesus said, "I give unto them eternal life." John 10:28 And "Other sheep I have, which are not of this fold, them also I

must bring." This shows they were his sheep before receiving eternal life, or before being brought to the Father by him. This relation, therefore, is not a *vital*, but a *covenant* relation.

The sword of divine justice, that would otherwise have found its satisfaction in the everlasting destruction of the sheep, was called forth by Jehovah and required to strike his own Son with the death blow. Zechariah 13:7 "Awake, O sword, against my Shepherd, and against the man that is my fellow, saith the Lord of hosts; smite the Shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered; and I will turn mine hand upon the little ones."

Jesus says, "I am the good shepherd; the good shepherd giveth his life for the sheep," John 10:11, and "I lay down my life for the sheep," John 10:15.

There will be a final separation as taught in Matthew 25:31-34, "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory; 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, and he shall set the sheep on his right hand; but the goats on the left. Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." Those who shall be eternally saved are the sheep; the others are the goats. It is not said Christ gave his life for the goats. He did not lay down his life for the goats. Christ died for the sheep. His sheep shall be eternally saved. Therefore all for whom Christ died shall be eternally saved.

The ATONEMENT: J.H. Oliphant: The atonement is that which makes satisfaction for sin. We must discriminate between the atonement and its effects. "And to make an atonement for the children of Israel, that there be no plague among the children of Israel when they come nigh unto the sanctuary," Numbers 8:19. **In this place the atonement removed the wrath of God, and the consequence was that they were secured from the plague.**

Also, Numbers 1:46, "And Moses said unto Aaron, take a censor and put fire therein from off the altar, and put in incense, and go quickly unto the congregation and make an atonement for them."

This atonement was intended to make satisfaction to God for the sin of the people, and when it was made, "the plague was stayed," Numbers 1:48.

[Christ's Atonement for Our Sins]

The great atonement for sin was made by Christ. Our sin and rebellion against God constituted a permanent bar against all hope of mercy. God's mercy is only exercised in the way of justice. Hence the need of a mediator, one who could satisfy the claims of justice and make a full and complete atonement for all our sins, and give us just reasons to hope for a full deliverance from sin and all its terrible consequences.

The great work of opening the book and loosening the seals Revelation 5:1-5 was performed by Christ. His relation to us, and interest in us, his own purity, and influence in heaven, his wisdom, and worth, all fitted him to undertake the work of our redemption. He is related to us as a brother. Hebrews 2:11, "He is not ashamed to call them brethren." Also, Hebrews 2:14, "He took our nature, our flesh and blood;" in all things he was made like us, "that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest."

[The Son of Man: the Son of God]

In a great many places he is called the "Son of man"—Psalms 8:4, and Psalms 80:17; Daniel 7:13. He was evidently a man, and one of our number. The Bible shows that he was born of a woman—Mary. He was nursed and cared for as other babes. The account given of his birth and conception in Luke 1, is simple and impressive.

And while he was man, he was God. Paul, in Hebrews 1, speaks of him as "Upholding all things by the word of his power," "Being made so much better than the angels, as he hath by

inheritance (or birth as the word implies) obtained a more excellent name than they." In this whole chapter he labors to teach that he is the very God. I know this is a mystery. That he is God I know the Bible teaches, and I know too, that it teaches that he is man.

It also teaches that his death is the only source of eternal life; it is an interesting task to study the cross of Christ, to ascertain and understand the reason why his death is of value to us. I shall try to open up this subject, and shall insist all the way that **the atonement and salvation are of equal extent, the latter secured by the former.**

[Atonement and Salvation Equal in Extent]

1st. In his work as a redeemer he sustained a representative relation to us, and consequently his death was vicarious, or substitutive. **I know that saints are vitally united to him, which union is secured by regeneration,** but the relation I wish here to speak of was not vital, but legal, and is the real ground upon which his work as a mediator is of value to any one.

The legal relation is the cause, and vital union in regeneration is the effect. It is of no note to me if there be a great sum in the bank, if I am in no way connected with it. There is a legal relation between the heir and the estate left it in will, which will ultimately enrich the heir; and so Christ did bear a legal relation to his people in all his work as a mediator, which secures to them the full benefits of all he did or shall do as a mediator.

Paul has his mind on this doctrine when he writes, "Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church and gave himself for it." "That he might sanctify and cleanse *it*," etc. Ephesians 4:25-26. **The husband is the legal representative of his wife,** and so Christ as our faithful and true lover gave himself for *it*, the *church*; he did not die for it, considered as *sanctified* and *cleansed*, but in its *unholy* and *unsanctified* state. Certainly the doctrine of relationship prior to

regeneration is maintained, and upon this relationship he dies for us with the design of sanctifying and cleansing us.

In John 10, Christ is frequently presented under the idea of a shepherd, The good shepherd giveth his life for the sheep."

There is a relationship between the shepherd and his flock, though not a vital one, yet it is such a one that he is legally bound for all their misdemeanors. **The shepherd is always looked to for injuries done by his flock;** when he makes payment the flock is given up; and so we were transgressors, and under the curse for our transgression, but the great and ever blessed Shepherd has died for us.

Our transgression was such that death only would remove it, therefore he died as a shepherd for us, and his death is supposed to equal all the claims against us.

[Christ Our Representative]

Truly in him, as our representative, we have all died and paid the utmost claims against us. This is taught in II Corinthians 5:14, "If one died for all, then were all dead." If the shepherd paid the debt, then in him, as a head, all the flock paid it. If Christ died for or *in the room of* all, then were all, representatively, dead, and all *in Christ* met the claims of law.

The Socinians denied the divinity of Christ, and also denied that his death was expiatory; they claimed that it was not intended to meet the claims of broken law, but was a mere example of heroic virtue; they claimed that his death was not substitutive, and consequently salvation could not result from the atonement as they viewed it.

[Andrew Fuller's Strange View]

I have not the works of Mr. Andrew Fuller at hand, but have recently read one volume of his works. I understand him to deny the substitutive character of Christ's death. He seems to hold that his death is sufficient for the whole world, or for many worlds equally sinful. It is true that Mr. Fuller held the doctrine of unconditional election, and that the Holy Spirit would

regenerate the elect. He also held the doctrine of *total depravity*, and claimed to be a Calvinist.

He held that the power of the atonement was determined by the worth or merit of him who died, which is infinite; therefore, the atonement is of sufficient value to save the universe, if necessary. Upon this he held that salvation was offered in the gospel to every one of the race, although none of the race would receive it unless enabled so to do by the Spirit, and that none but the elect would be enabled to receive it.

Mr. Fuller is an excellent writer, but it is clear that his position would contradict the doctrine of the transfer of sin to Christ, for **if our sins were transferred to Christ and by him put away, then salvation is not merely a possible thing, but a certain one.** Therefore, the power of the atonement is not determined by the mere value of his blood, but by the extent of his representation.

If he represented the race on the cross, universal salvation will ensue; and if he bore the sins of no one particularly, then no one will be saved; but if he died as a shepherd for his flock, representing his flock, then his flock will be saved. **I say the positions of Mr. Fuller deny that sin was actually transferred to Christ.**

[Our Sins Laid on Christ]

It is difficult for us to see how that *sin was laid* on Christ. We can see easily how a debt may be laid on the security, or pass from the wife to the husband, or from the flock to the shepherd, but how is it that our sins (not the mere deserts of sins) were laid on Christ? Some have held that he bore the mere deservings of sin, but we insist that he bore the *sins*, and *consequently* their deservings, for how could he bear the deserts of sin without the sin itself?

If he did not bear our sins, then the sins of those who were saved never were punished, for they were not on Christ, hence not punished in him; therefore, we are not freed from sin. We may be delivered from the deserts of sin, but

never from the sin itself; we may be pardoned, but on the Fuller plan we never can be justified, for if Christ only bears the deservings of our sins, and leaves the sins upon us, we are not in a justified state.

The doctrine of justification has given trouble to all clear minds that deny the real and actual imputation of sin to Christ; they see and know that if sin is really imputed to Christ, that it will *certainly* result in salvation, and hence the Arminian and conditional systems have to go to ruin. They also know that if sin is not transferred to Christ, then no sinner can be really and actually justified; he may be pardoned, but *never* justified.

[Alexander Campbell's Peculiar View]

I have been pained and amused to read Mr. Campbell's peculiar views of justification. On page 276 of his work on baptism, **he, speaking of justification, says it is "really no more than pardon."** He knew that to admit that the sinner is really justified would also admit the real transfer of sin to Christ, and that sin by him was put away, and the next result would be, the eternal overthrow of his whole system; and, rather than give his own system up, he will virtually strike justification and such words out of his Bible, for **if justification means "pardon" only, we have no need of the word at all.**

On page 277 Mr. Campbell says, "Evangelical justification is the justification of one that has been convicted as guilty before God, the supreme and ultimate judge of the universe. * * * It is utterly impossible that any sinner can be forensically or legally justified before God by a law which he has in any one instance violated." Here he denies the doctrine of justification entirely, which of course he must do to save his beloved *Diana*.

For if justification is a Bible doctrine, the gospel is not a mere proclamation of terms and conditions of salvation, as he explains it, but it is proclaiming *liberty* to the *captive*, and the LAWFUL captive at that.

On the same page he says, "If the sinner is justified, it must be on some other principle than law; he must be justified by favor

and not by right." If the sinner's sins were laid on Christ, and the law received its claims in Christ, then the very law demands the liberty of the sinner, and his justification is a matter of right, Mr. Campbell to the contrary, notwithstanding.

Again, on the next page, he says, "Still, it must be regarded as not a real or legal justification, it is, as respects man, only pardon or forgiveness of the past, but the pardoned sinner being ever after treated and regarded as though he were righteous—he is constituted and treated as righteous before God." **In this he would teach that God treats as just one who is not just, which is a reflection on the sincerity of God.**

[It is God that Justifieth]

The question is asked, Romans 8:33, "Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth." In this the apostle challenges the universe to lay anything to the charge of God's elect, and **Mr. Campbell comes up with his charge, that they are only treated as if they were just**, "If he is justified it must be on some other principle than law." Thus Mr. Campbell arrays himself against Paul, Paul advocating the *actual and real* justification of the elect, and **Mr. Campbell affirming it impossible, and declaring that though they are justified, it "is not by right."**

But the Bible abundantly teaches that God's people are *justified*. The word justifieth, Romans 8:33, is from the Greek *Dikaioo*, to claim as right. Webster says justify is to prove or show one to be right, just and conformable to law. This conformableness to law is the result of our sins being laid on Christ, and this righteousness being imputed to us. We before remarked that it is difficult to see how our sins could be transferred to Christ, but it is certain the Bible teaches that our sins were laid on him. In order to do this he must bear a relation to us as a shepherd, in which our trespasses as straying sheep are laid on him and he pays the debt for us.

[The Husband Responsible for the Debts of the Wife]

As the debts of the wife pass to the husband, so our sins were set to his account and he bore them, and their due, on the cross. “All we, like sheep, have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way, and **the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all,” Isaiah 53:6.** Here the flock is in trespass and its sins are laid on Jesus; he pays with his own life the price of our redemption; he has a right to redeem because he bears the relation of a shepherd. Again, He shall see of the travail of his soul, and shall be satisfied; by his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many; for he shall bear their iniquities.”

In this we are plainly informed that he “bears their iniquities.” If so, they were transferred to him, and this lays the sure ground of justification. No one can assign a good reason why the *many* justified in this text are not the same whose iniquities were borne. He had no sin of his own. Peter says, Who his own self bore our sins in his own body on the tree, etc.

The passages that teach this doctrine are numerous. Read Leviticus 16th chapter, where you will find the offering of **the scape-goat** described, “And Aaron shall lay both his hands on the head of the live goat, and confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions in all their sins, putting them on the head of the goat, and shall send him away by the hand of a fit man into the wilderness,” **“and the goat shall bear upon him all their iniquities into a land not inhabited,”** etc.

[The Doctrine of Substitution]

In these typical services we learn that the sins of God’s chosen people, Israel, were laid on the scape-goat, **and so in the Lord Jesus, our sins were laid on him, and he suffered in our room and stead.** “He was taken from prison and from judgment, and who shall declare his generation, for he was cut off out of the land of the living, for the transgression of my people was he stricken.”

The doctrine of substitution is taught here—he takes our sins and our place, and stands between us and the wrath of God. He becomes “a covert from the tempest,” a “hiding place from the wind, the shadow of a great rock in a weary land.” **He receives in his body the full penalty due for all our sins,** and now, in his name, we are set at liberty. Paul in Acts 17:3, alleged “that Christ must needs have suffered.”

Luke 24:46, “Thus it is written and thus it behooved Christ to suffer and to rise from the dead,” etc. Luke 24:26, “Ought not Christ to have suffered these things and to enter into his glory?” These places show that there was a necessity for his death; that he ought to die, because he occupied our law place; our sins were made his by imputation, and he must die. And this he did as a substitute. **If he died as a substitute for us, as a matter of necessary consequence we shall be set at liberty.**

Many who now live have not forgotten the nature of substitution as they learned it during the late war. When the substitute takes his place, it is a permanent release to the person he represents; the law will not ask for more, it is satisfied.

[A Ransom for Many]

Matthew 20:28, “Even as the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many.” **Here we are informed that Christ gave his life a ransom.** The word ransom is from the Greek *antilutron*, and it is a reference to the exchange of captives, in which head is given for head, man for man.

Our Savior is a ransom for each of us—gives his own life for our redemption. Such is the perfection of his offering, that it will certainly accomplish the end desired. “He that spared not his own son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not also with him freely give us all things.”

There may be passages that seem to favor universal redemption, but I feel sure that there are no passages that indicate that any of the redeemed shall finally be lost. If we are

redeemed, then our redemption is eternal; and if we are ransomed, then we shall "return and come to Zion with songs and everlasting joys upon our heads," etc.

1st. The scriptures teach that Christ, as our Redeemer, sustained a federal or representative relation to his people. So his death was vicarious, or substitutive.

2nd. Our sins were transferred to Christ.

3rd. His righteousness is transferred to us.

4th. We are said to be justified.

5th. The Bible teaches that there is an inseparable connection between the atonement and the salvation of those for whom it was made.

6th. To affirm universal redemption is attended with many inconsistencies, and is not in harmony with the perfections of God.

[Not to Justify Himself but to Justify His People]

Mr. Fuller urges that the atonement is sufficient for all, though only designed for the elect; *i.e.*, that God is sovereign, and discriminating in his application, though general and universal in his provisions. This seems to me to array one part of his works against another. It is upon this, he lays the justice of God in the final condemnation of the wicked; but **if the justice of God is not clear in the condemnation of sinners, without the atonement, then the atonement is not needed;** but if we would know what are God's rights with sinners, let us mark what he does with his own Son, when his Son takes their place.

If the life of his *Son* must go, when he takes the place of sinners, would not those same sinners be exposed to death had he not taken their place? Most assuredly they would. **It is great folly to urge that Christ's death for the finally impenitent is necessary to justify God in their condemnation;** his right to do this existed before, and this is why his Son came.

Christ did not come to make it right to curse any one finally, but to secure the salvation of his people. "He shall save his people from their sins." We never can rightly

appreciate the grace of God in giving his own Son for us, unless we can admit and understand that our sins were of sufficient magnitude to render our case justly hopeless without a Redeemer.

To say that Christ, in his death, did as much for the lost as the saved, is equal to saying that his death does not secure any one's salvation, for if it saves one, why not all? If I am saved by it and my neighbor not, why the difference? Evidently the difference would grow out of my own action; that I am more easily touched by it; I was disposed to do my *part*, or in some way I was *more in harmony* with the divine arrangement; but this disagrees with fact.

We often see the hardest of men touched and changed by grace, while others remain in indifference. We dare not trace this difference to the natural goodness of some and the innate evil of others; nor dare we trace it to the obedience of some and the disobedience of others. As to our nature, God declares us all alike to be the children of wrath, and he also abundantly teaches that it is not by works of any kind, but that it is of his own grace, "by the grace of God I am what I am." It is God that has made me to differ both from others and my former self.

God said to Moses, "I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I will have compassion." This sort of language is very humbling to our proud nature. Christ on the cross is the great fountain from which flows the great river of mercy to us. The repentance of every poor sinner who has or will repent, may be traced to Calvary. All our hopes, all our joys, and all our bright prospects come to us from the cross. "I determined not to know anything among you save Christ and him crucified."

(J.H. Oliphant in Principles and Practices of the Regular Baptists 1885—subheads added)

Augustine, St. of Hippo

St. AUGUSTINE of Hippo Augustine, though he saw so clearly the Bible doctrine of God's free redeeming grace, yet greatly and sadly erred in accepting also, and very inconsistently, the doctrine of sacramentalism (or salvation only through the ordinances administered by the Catholic "Church"—the Old Catholic, not Roman Catholic), and also in inconsistently persecuting the Donatists for their religion. Augustine's ability and sacramentalism caused the Catholics at first to accept his doctrine of grace; but, soon after his death, the Catholics became Semi-Augustinian; and, at the councils of Orange and Valence, A.D. 529, Semi-Augustinianism was formally adopted as Catholic doctrine.

Augustine's theory of the right of a State to persecute its citizens to make them conform to a national religion involved the germs of absolute spiritual despotism, and of even the horrors of the **Inquisition**; but in practice he is said to have urged clemency and humanity upon the magistrates. Sacramentalism and religious persecution are as diverse from predestination as night is from day; and, as Augustine held all these three principles, we learn that even God's regenerated people may be in great darkness on some important points, while they have light on other points still more important—in other words, that we are utterly dependent on the Holy Spirit to open our understandings and hearts, and to enlighten and animate us on all spiritual subjects. (*Hassell's History* ppg 406, 407)

Augustinianism

AUGUSTINIANISM (*See under PELAGIANISM and under John CALVIN*)

Azariah

AZARIAH (*See under UZZIAH*)

Babylonian Captivity (of the Popes)

The BABYLONIAN CAPTIVITY (of the Popes) (*See under The GREAT WESTERN SCHISM*)

Baptism

BAPTISM: Harold Hunt: Baptism by immersion in water, upon a profession of faith in Christ Jesus, is the manner God requires in which for his obedient children to publicly profess

their faith in him. He created us, chose us to salvation by his own amazing grace, prepared a home for us in eternal heaven, and quickened us by his Spirit, and he has a right to expect us to profess faith in him publicly. **Baptism by immersion in water is the manner he requires for that public profession.**

Not only does he require baptism of his children; **he has set baptism as the boundary line between gospel obedience and disobedience.** When Peter says, "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ," Acts 2:38, he was not giving an invitation; and we make a mistake when call it an invitation. He was telling them what they must do in order to follow Christ in gospel obedience. **The call to be baptized is not an invitation; it is a commandment.**

A person may be baptized and still not be obedient to God's commandments; but nobody can be obedient to his commandments without being baptized.

Nothing to do with eternal salvation

Water baptism has nothing to do with eternal salvation; the failure to be baptized will not interfere with God's purpose to save his redeemed, and to house them with him in eternal heaven; but it has everything to do with our gospel obedience, and our enjoyment of the blessings of God in this life. In order to enjoy those benefits that are available to the child of God in gospel obedience a person must be baptized in water. Once a person is taught his duty with regard to baptism, his failure to be baptized is simply rebellion against God's command, and no one can expect to enjoy the blessings of God while he is in a state of rebellion.

The language is clear and to the point: we are commanded to be baptized. Notice that when Christ referred to the baptism of John he uses John's baptism to draw a clear and distinct boundary line between those who *justified God*, and those who *rejected the counsel of God against themselves*, and he shows that boundary line to be water baptism.

Luke 7:29-30, "And all the people that heard him, and the publicans, justified God, **being baptized** with the baptism of John. But the Pharisees and lawyers rejected the counsel of God against themselves, **being not baptized** of him." He does not leave us an option; we are commanded to be baptized.

They justified God

Notice that they "justified God" by being baptized. To *justify* signifies to *declare to be just*; that is, by being baptized, they declared that God is just in all he says and does. He is just in delivering us from our sins, and he is just in requiring us to indicate our hope in him by being baptized.

The opposite of *justify* is *condemn*. If we justify God by being baptized, it follows that we condemn him by refusing to be baptized. You cannot acknowledge the one without the other.

By being baptized we declare that God is just in all he says and does; he is just in what he requires of us. By refusing to be baptized we declare that he is unjust; especially, we indicate that he is unjust in requiring us to be baptized. We indicate that he has no right to make such a demand.

Indeed, baptism in water has nothing to do with our eternal salvation, but it is, nonetheless, a serious matter for any person who has a hope of heaven to refuse to be baptized.

Qualifications for Baptism

On the one hand, the commandment is "Repent and be baptized every one of you." On the other hand, **there are some qualifications for baptism**. Not everybody is a proper subject for baptism.

Unbelievers are not to be baptized. The Ethiopian eunuch asked Philip, "What doth hinder me to be baptized?" Acts 8:36. There are some things that do hinder baptism, and **when those hindrances are in the way, the minister cannot proceed with the baptism**. Philip answered, "If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest," (Acts 8:37). If a person clearly does

not have faith in Christ and his redemptive work on behalf of his people, he is not to be baptized. It is by baptism that a person publicly professes faith in Christ, and gains membership in the church. The church is *an assembly of baptized believers*. It is not an assembly of unbelievers. No assembly could claim to be a church if it was made up of unbelievers. It might be a social club; but it is not a church.

Infants are not to be baptized. This same text is the death knell to infant baptism. Philip says clearly enough, "If thou believest with all thine heart thou mayest." In other words, one who does not believe cannot be baptized, and little babies are not capable of believing. They may come to believe later, and that will be soon enough to baptize them, but until that day the Bible is clear enough; they cannot be baptized.

Those who show no signs of repentance are not to be baptized. Or to put it another way, those who have too high an opinion of themselves cannot be baptized. That may sound like a harsh statement to make, but again, that is the Bible pattern. When those proud, arrogant Pharisees and Sadducees came to John the Baptist to be baptized, John refused, and he refused in no uncertain terms. He called them a *generation of vipers*, a family of snakes Matthew 3:7, and told them that in order for him to baptize them they must *bring forth fruits meet for repentance* (Matthew 3:8). It is penitent believers who are to be baptized; and proud, arrogant, self-righteous individuals are not really believers, no matter how much they may protest to the contrary. A self-righteous attitude indicates that one has not seen himself for the sinner he is, nor the Lord for the Savior he is. One who has seen something of his own unworthiness is filled with self-loathing, and he falls humbly before the feet of Jesus. He presents himself for baptism in humble submission to the command of his Lord. He does not request baptism as something he has the right to demand.

Again, there are those whose lives, or whose living conditions, prevent them from being baptized. I Corinthians 6:9-10, "Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Be not deceived: neither fornicators, nor idolaters, no 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.”

It is by being baptized upon a public profession of faith in Christ that a person gains membership in the Lord’s church. **In this passage Paul provides a list of those who cannot have membership in the Lord’s church—those who cannot be baptized.**

There is repentance available for any sin a person can repent of and turn from, and Paul shows in the next verse that some of the members of the church at Corinth had, indeed, been guilty of some of those sins, and had turned from them; but so long as they were in those conditions, or were involved in those kinds of conduct, they could not *inherit the kingdom of God*. “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” (I Corinthians 6:11)

We have no right to complain about those requirements the Lord has laid down for membership in the church. **It is his church and he has the right to say who will be its members.**

The Mode of Baptism

Baptize is a transliteration of the Greek word *Baptizo* (baptizo). By *transliterate* we mean the word was not translated; it was simply transposed into the English language by putting English letters in place of their Greek equivalents. The final *o* (omicron) in the Greek was exchanged for the English letter *e*. The Greek word is *baptizo* and that word came from *bapto* (bapto). It means to plunge, to dip, to immerse.

Baptism is a symbol of the death, burial, and resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ. It is also a symbol of the death to sin—and to the law—of the child of God, and of his resurrection to walk in newness of life with his Lord. If to baptize means to plunge, dip, or immerse, then baptism must be a plunging, dipping, or

immersing. Baptism symbolizes the death, burial, and resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ, and in order to be a clear symbol it must involve a symbolic burial. Romans 6:4, “Therefore we are **buried** (literally, completely buried) with him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life.” Any form that does not involve the complete immersing of the body in water does not constitute a burying; it does not constitute baptism.

A very clear symbol

Baptism by immersion in water is a very clear symbol. When a person is baptized, he closes his eyes, folds his hands over his chest, momentarily ceases to breathe, becomes completely passive, yields himself into the hands of the minister, is lowered beneath the surface of the water, is then raised up from the water, usually shakes his head, opens his eyes, and again begins to breathe and manifest signs of life. It is impossible for human ingenuity to devise a clearer symbol of death, burial, and resurrection than God has provided for us in baptism by immersion in water.

John the Baptist was the first to baptize, and he baptized by immersion in water. John 3:23, “And John also was baptizing in Enon near to Salim, because there was **much water** there.” It does not take much water to sprinkle a few drops on somebody’s head, but it takes a lot of water to immerse him. John baptized in the river of Jordan, because it takes a lot of water to baptize somebody. It takes a lot of water to bury them. Mark 1:4-5, “John did baptize in the wilderness, and preach the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins. And there went out unto him all the land of Judea, and they of Jerusalem, and were all **baptized** of him **in the river** of Jordan, confessing their sins.” He baptized them in the river, that is, **he plunged them in the river**—he immersed them.

Authority to Baptize

Baptism is Christ’s ordinance. It belongs to him, and he calls, appoints, and sends out those whom he will have to administer

it. They were first, baptized, and ordained, and then sent out. John 15:16, "Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you, and ordained you, that ye should go and bring forth fruit, and that your fruit should remain: that whatsoever ye shall ask of the Father in my name, he may give it you." That was the pattern when the Lord called his own disciples, and the pattern is the same today. In order for any minister to have authority to baptize he must be (1) called by the Lord to preach, and (2) ordained under the authority of the church. Acts 13:2-3, "As they ministered to the Lord, and fasted, the Holy Ghost said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them. And when they had fasted and prayed, and laid their hands on them, they sent them away." Notice that the Holy Ghost says *I have called them*. The ordination was performed by the presbytery, under the authority of the church, and by the direction of the Holy Spirit, but the calling was from God. If a man has not been called of God to preach the gospel, he is not to be ordained, and he has no authority to baptize.

The Symbolism of Marriage in Baptism

Baptism is the ceremony by which the Lord's people, the bride of Christ, are **married to the Lord**. We were by nature married to the Law, but Christ has fulfilled every requirement of the law on our behalf, and the law cannot require anything more of us.

The law required perfect obedience, and on our behalf he provided perfect obedience. **The Law called for the death of sinners**, and in our room and stead he died. When Christ died and went to the grave on our behalf, every requirement of the law went there with him.

By his suffering and death we are dead to the Law, and the Law is dead to us. Romans 7:4, "Wherefore, my brethren, ye also are become **dead to the Law** by the body of Christ; that ye should be **married to another**, even to him that is raised from the dead, that we should bring forth fruit unto God."

The marriage ceremony states that the union is binding *until death do us part*. Now that Christ has suffered and died in order to satisfy every demand of the law, our first husband, the Law, is now dead. **Our first husband being now dead, we are free to be married to another—to Christ.**

Question: In baptism, does the subject become married to Christ, or does he actually become married to the church.

Answer: Both. The Bible expresses it both ways.

Isaiah 62:5, "For as a young man marrieth a virgin, so shall thy sons marry thee: and as the bridegroom rejoiceth over the bride, so shall thy God rejoice over thee."

The text in Romans talks about our being married "to him that is raised from the dead," in other words **married to Christ**. The text in Isaiah talks about our being **married to the virgin bride of Christ**, the church. Christ is the bridegroom; the church is his bride. As the *young man*, the subject of baptism, is married to the church, he becomes a part of the bride of Christ—hence married to him.

Alien Baptism and Rebaptism

The question is often asked, "If I have been baptized before, why must I be baptized again in order to join your church?"

Answer: If your husband dies and you take a new husband, you need a new marriage ceremony. If you have become dead to the law as it is taught by the denominational churches, and made alive to the gospel as it is taught by the true church, it is your place to be married to Christ in baptism.

Matthew 20:19-20, "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world."

The only people who are authorized to baptize are those whom God has first called to preach, and who are teaching what he

taught. **The baptism any man administers is only as good as the doctrine he teaches.** If any person whom God has not called to preach, or who does not preach what Christ preached, does go about to administer baptism, he has no authority to do so. **He is a free lance operator**— he is operating on his own. He, and perhaps his church, have simply set up for themselves. No church can claim to be Christ's church which does not teach as he taught, and no minister can claim to be administering Christ's baptism at the same time he opposes Christ's doctrine. **He may get people wet, but he cannot baptize them.** He is somewhat akin to the printer, who decides to begin printing one hundred dollar bills. The product may look very much like the real thing, but the man had no authority to print them: they are counterfeit.

An assembly may look very much like a New Testament church, but if it does not advocate those principles taught in the Scriptures, it is not the Lord's church, and any baptism administered under its authority is invalid baptism—alien baptism—and no New Testament Church can honor that baptism. hlh

Baptism, Authority to

Authority to BAPTIZE: C. H. Cayce: Baptism must be administered by one who has been set apart by the church to the work whereunto God has called him, if it be gospel baptism. "As they ministered to the Lord, and fasted, the Holy Ghost said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them. And when they had fasted and prayed, and laid their hands on them, they sent them away. So they, being sent forth by the Holy Ghost, departed unto Seleucia; and from thence they sailed to Cyprus."—Acts 13:2-4. Here we have the called ministers of Christ set apart by the church for the work whereunto the Lord had called them.

It is a part of the work of the ministry to administer the ordinances. Those who are commanded to teach, as ministers of the gospel, are the same who are to baptize. "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and, lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world."—Matthew 28:19-20. In this text the same persons who are commanded to go teach are also commanded to baptize.

It is the work of the ministry to go teach the things concerning the kingdom of Christ, and it is the work of those who teach these things to baptize those who are taught. The Primitive Baptists are the only people, in our judgment, who are teaching as Christ commanded. They are teaching the true doctrine of God our Savior. Hence, the Primitive Baptist ministers are the persons who are authorized by the Savior to administer baptism.

Others are not teaching the doctrine of God our Savior, are not teaching the things commanded by the Savior, so are not authorized by him to administer baptism. If they baptize, it is without the authority of Christ. Baptism administered without the authority is not gospel baptism. This is a good reason why Primitive Baptists do not receive the baptism administered by Methodists, Missionary Baptists, or other people. We do not think the doctrine or principles they hold to and teach are true, and the baptism they administer is no better than the doctrine they teach.

“And I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me; that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, and sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel.”— Luke 22:29-30. The Savior has appointed a kingdom for his people here in the world, that they may have a blessed home here on earth, that they may eat and drink at his table in his kingdom— only one.

“There are threescore queens, and fourscore concubines, and virgins without number. My dove, my undefiled is but one; she is the only one of her mother, she is the choice one of her that bare her.”— Song of Solomon 6:8-9. The church of Christ is but one. There are many institutions, but of all the institutions of the world, only one is the church of Christ. The Savior has never authorized the queens nor concubines nor the virgins to administer the ordinances of his house. These queens, concubines, and virgins represent the many institutions that are in the world. Jesus has never commanded that his ordinances be administered in these institutions. His love, his dove, his undefiled, is but one. That is his church or kingdom, which is but one. He has authorized and commanded that his ordinances be administered in this one kingdom. They cannot be administered elsewhere so that they will be recognized or approved by him. He does not approve of anything being done in a place where he has not commanded. We think the Primitive Baptist Church is the true church of Christ, the kingdom he set up while he was on earth. If it is, then that is the place where the ordinances are to be administered. This is another reason why we do not accept the baptism administered by other people. If the Primitive Baptist Church is the church of Christ, the others are not. If any of the others are the church of Christ, then the Primitive Baptist Church is not the church of Christ.

“Wherefore, my brethren, ye are also become dead to the law by the body of Christ; that ye should be married to another, even to him who is raised from the dead, that we should be married to another, even to him who is raised from the dead, that we should bring forth fruit unto God.”—Romans 7:4. Those who are dead to the law are those who have been born again. They are dead to the law, and they should now be married to Christ. In order that they be married to Christ the marriage ceremony must be performed by one who has the proper authority to perform it. If two people desire to marry, in order that they carry out the desire, they must have the ceremony performed by one who is authorized to do so. They may get a good man to pronounce the ceremony for them, but unless he has the proper authority, the marriage would not be legal. It would make no difference how good the man may be who pronounces the ceremony, his goodness and honesty, or sincerity, would not make the marriage legal. To be married to Christ, the rite must be performed by one authorized to perform it.

Baptism is the ceremony, or the rite, by which God’s people are married to Christ. It is the work of the ministry who are set apart by his church to administer baptism, they are the persons who are authorized to administer the ordinance. They are the only ones who can perform the marriage ceremony. Others may go through the form, but it is not recognized by the Savior. The form may be alright, but a form without reality or authority is without value. So the baptism administered by others is without authority, hence without value, so far as the true church of Christ is concerned.” (*C.H. Cayce vol. 1 ppg 53-55*).

Baptism, Burial in

Burial in BAPTISM: C. H. Cayce: We do no violence to language if we take a word out of a sentence and put another word in its place that means the same thing as the word taken out. If we do this we are doing no violence, and are not changing the meaning of the sentence. The word sprinkle means “to scatter in drops or small particles.” Now try the language, “And were all baptized of him in the river of Jordan.” The sentence reads alright that way, and is found in Mark 1:5. Remember, we do no violence by removing or taking a word out, and placing the true meaning of the word in the place of it. So, “and were all dipped of him in the river of Jordan.” The sentence still reads all right. “And were all immersed of him in the river of Jordan.” It is alright yet. “And were all scattered in drops or small particles of him in the river of Jordan.” The sentence

is all wrong now. Why? Because baptism is not sprinkling; it is dipping, immersing.

Read the account of the baptism of the eunuch in the eighth chapter of Acts and apply the same rule, and you will have it that Philip scattered the eunuch about in drops or small particles. He did not do this, but “they both went down into the water, both Philip and the eunuch,” and Philip “baptized him,” dipped him, immersed him.”

Suppose some of your dear friends or near relatives were to die, and some person should carry their body to the cemetery and pour or sprinkle a little dirt on their head, and then say we have buried your relative or friend. Would you consider the people to be your friends who would do this? No; you would consider them as your enemies.

Now read Romans 6:4, “Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death.” The apostle here plainly says we are “buried with him by baptism.” If we are buried by baptism, then baptism must be a burial—it must be an immersion. Anything short of a burial, therefore, is not baptism, for we are buried by it. Then as baptism is a burial, how can we claim to be Christ’s friends when we say we baptize his friends who are dead to sin by sprinkling or pouring a little water on their heads?

Let us prove our faith by our works. We have faith that Christ died, was buried, and rose again. Let us show that faith by being buried with him by baptism, and arise to walk in newness of life. (*C.H. Cayce vol. 1 pg. 46*)

Baptism, Infant

Infant BAPTISM: G.H. Orchard: During the first three centuries Christian congregations all over the East continued separate independent bodies, unsupported by government, and consequently without any secular power over one another. All this time they were Baptist churches; and though all the *fathers* of the first four ages down to Jerome were of Greece, Syria, and Africa, and though they give great numbers of histories of the baptism of adults, yet there is not (if we except the case referred by Fidus to Cyprian, 256 A.D.) one record of the baptism of a child till the year 370, when Galetes, the dying son of the Emperor Valens, was baptized by order of a monarch, who swore he would not be contradicted (see *Rob. Res.*, p.55). (*G.H. Orchard*)

Infant Baptism: Sylvester Hassell: It is claimed that Irenaeus was born A.D. 97, and that he makes one allusion to infant baptism. The fact is that both the

date and place of Irenaeus's birth and death are unknown. The ablest scholars believe that he was born between A.D. 120 and 140; and some suppose that he died A.D. 202. His book against Heresies was composed, says Mr. Schaff, between the years 177 and 192. In that book he says that "our Lord came in order that through himself he might save all men, infants, and little ones, and children and youths and elders, even all who through him are born again unto God."

The expression '*born again*' is said, in the early so-called *Father*, *habitually* to mean *baptized*; but it remains to be proved that it *always* has that meaning, and that it has that meaning in the sentence just quoted from Irenaeus. The phrase *through him*, instead of *through water*, militates emphatically against the idea of baptism regeneration in this passage—so admit the German scholars.

The earliest *undoubted* reference to child baptism is by Tertullian of North Africa (born 160 A.D., died between 220 and 240—converted about A.D. 190), and he earnestly opposes it. Certainly then, child baptism must have been, not of apostolic, but of recent origin, when Tertullian wrote. Bunsen shows that Tertullian was not arguing against *infant baptism* at all, then unknown, but against the baptism of little growing children from six years old who could go down with the other catechumens into the baptismal bath, but were not yet in a state to make the proper responses.

This custom was coming into fashion, but Tertullian rejects it. From boys of ten, who might possibly sometimes give evidence of sincere piety, the clergy advanced to take in those of six or seven responded for by others, though able to descend into the water, unaided with the adult catechumens. Then those of three or four, when just able to repeat a few of the sacred words, as Gregory Nazianzen recommends, were, by a further corruption, brought by baptism into the fold of the *church*.

From this very circumstance would arise the strongest argument for going a step further. For since in these very young children baptism could not be a profession of personal faith, it could only lead the masses to suppose that it acted as a charm, and that the child was *more safe* in case of death, a view carefully cherished by the clergy. Thus arose the belief that *all*, even infants, dying without baptism, would be lost; and hence followed the baptism of babes eight days old, and even those of a day.

The first *known* instance of this last was A.D. 256, in North Africa, and these ideas slowly and gradually pervaded the *church* as Neander has shown. A host of authorities fully sustain this view of the origin of infant baptism. "The Catholic practice of pretending to make even infants catechumens, or

rudimentally instructed in Christianity, before baptism, is an undesigned proof of the correctness of the above explanation, and of the truth of Baptist principles.”—*T.F. Curtis*. Dean Stanley says that there is but one known instance of infant baptism in the third century, though he defends the practice as being “a standing testimony to the truth, value, and eternal significance of natural religion,” and as showing that, “in every child of Adam, whilst there is much evil, there is more good.” (*Hassell’s History pg 271*)

“The baptism of youth, it is maintained by many, began in this [fourth] Century. In the year 370 the Emperor Valens sent for Basil to baptize his dying son Galetes; the ground of the request was the illness of the youth. Basil refused to do it, and it was eventually done by an Arian bishop. If an emperor’s son must be baptized before he died, although destitute of faith, of course the next highest in authority must have the same privilege accorded him, and so on down to the lowest officer and the poorest and most obscure man in the empire. And upon similar grounds it came to be urged that if young men and youths, who were taught to ask for baptism, could receive it and thus escape eternal punishment, the same blessing ought to be conferred on poor helpless infants, who could not even speak for themselves and knew not anything. So that it was agreed eventually that they should also be baptized as soon as born or soon thereafter, so that they also, by this means, in case of death, might escape the flames of hell! And either about 256 A.D. in Africa or 370 A.D. in Rome, is where youths’ and children’s baptism, without faith, came from; not from Christ or his apostles. Be it remembered, then, that *370 years after the birth of our Savior*, and emperor’s child was baptized by an Arian Bishop—having been refused by one of the Athanasian or orthodox party!” (*Hassell’s History pg 386*)

Baptism, John's

John’s BAPTISM: Sylvester Hassell: Question: Was John’s baptism Christian baptism, and were the baptisms practiced by the disciples of Christ previous to his crucifixion identical with those practiced by his apostles after his ascension? And did John baptize in any name, and, if in the name of Christ, was Christ baptized in his own name?’

Answer: John's baptism was from heaven, and he therefore baptized by the authority or in the name of God. He baptized Christ, although Christ was sinless, to fulfill all righteousness; that is, to do the righteous will of God, to point forward to Christ's atoning death for our sins and his resurrection for our justification, and to show the example we are to follow.

Though Christ had no sin of his own, he was the representative of his sinful people. He was a real man, as well as the real God, and he was baptized and labored and suffered and bled and died and rose as a man.

Some of John's disciples whom he had baptized followed Christ, and were not baptized in water again, so far as we are told in the Scriptures. The baptisms performed by Christ's disciples before his crucifixion were undoubtedly in the name or by the authority of God (Christ is God), and did not have to be repeated, and were therefore substantially the same as those performed by his apostles after his ascension, though the form of words used was not probably the same; the Scriptures do not tell us the form of words used in the baptisms performed by John or in those performed by the disciples of Christ before his crucifixion, and it is, therefore, not necessary for us to know that form of words. An attempt to be wise above what is written, and speculation upon things that the Lord has not revealed to us, are not only unprofitable, but injurious to the people of God, tending, not to edify and unite, but to confuse and divide them." (*Hassell in Questions and Answers by R..H. Pittman 1935*)

Baptism, Two Kinds of

Two kinds of BAPTISM: T.S. Dalton: Romans 6:3-4, 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 newness of life.

“Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death,” etc., which shows very clearly that Paul had under consideration two baptisms, of spirit and water, and in the 3rd and 4th verses Paul clearly shows that the baptism of the Holy Spirit precedes water baptism, and is preparatory to it, hence he says, “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, (not into him) by baptism into death,” etc., which shows very clearly to every unprejudiced mind that one of these

baptisms is in the past tense, and the other in the present tense; one of them is **baptism into Christ** and the other a **burial with Christ**.” (*Zion’s Advocate* May 1893).

Baptism: Believers the Proper Subjects

BAPTISM: Believers the Proper Subjects: J.H. Oliphant:

It is universally agreed that adult believers are proper subjects of baptism. The Pedobaptists insist that infants should be baptized. Mr. Porter, in his history of Methodism, p. 286, says that infant baptism “takes the place of circumcision.” On page 287 he says: “The Abrahamic and Christian covenants are one in their nature and object. Under the first, children were brought into covenant with God by circumcision, the baptism of that dispensation, * * and why should they be left out under the second?”

It is well known that this is the foundation of infant baptism as practiced by Methodists, Presbyterians, etc. That as circumcision was a *seal* of the interest the children of Abraham had in the covenant made with Abraham, so baptism is to be administered to infants as a seal of their interest in the covenant of grace. Therefore it is common for them to observe that “baptism came in the room of circumcision.” Buck, in his Dictionary, gives this as their argument. They think that if baptism under the gospel is what circumcision was under the law, that the point is clearly made that infants should be baptized. That as God is unchangeable, and did direct that infants should be circumcised, which was the sealing ordinance, so he now requires that infants shall receive the sealing ordinance.

Baptism did not take the place of circumcision

I will now try to answer this argument. Buck invites our attention to Genesis 17:12, where circumcision is enjoined. By reading the first twelve verses of that chapter you will see that God made a covenant with Abraham in which he promised to him and his seed the land that he was then in, and he required Abraham to maintain circumcision as a *token* (Genesis 17:11) of that covenant.

It was not circumcision that gave the land to Abraham and his seed, but it was a token to them of their interest in the promise. This land was not given to the children of Abraham "by faith," but to his seed according to the flesh. The promise did not embrace spiritual things, but natural. There is a great difference between this covenant and that of grace, as much as there is between things "temporal" and things "eternal," or between a shadow and its substance.

Here God made a promise to Abraham that his seed should have the land which he was then in, which the subsequent history of his children shows to have been fulfilled, when they were brought out of Egypt and led to that promised land." But the fact that his seed was interested in that promise does not show that they were interested in the "promise of eternal life."—Hebrews 9:12. In speaking of the *true Israel*, Paul says, "They which are the children of the flesh, these are not the children of God."—Romans 9:8; *i.e.*, although one may be the seed of Abraham according to the flesh, and interested in the covenant sealed by circumcision, yet he may not be interested in the second.

Jews outwardly and Jews inwardly

Agreeably to this we read, "He is not a Jew which is one outwardly," etc.—Romans 2:28-29. So we see that there were some who were not entitled to the promise of eternal life who *were* interested in the Abrahamic covenant, and others of the gentiles who had no interest in the first who *were interested in the second*.

The seed of Abraham, according to the flesh, were embraced in the one; these are Jews outwardly, and these have an outward circumcision in the flesh; but they who are Jews inwardly and who are circumcised in heart, both of the Jews and gentiles, are embraced in the second.

In determining who should be circumcised, they looked to the seed of Abraham according to the flesh, for to them was the promise made; but in determining who are embraced in the

covenant of grace, we look to those who are Jews inwardly. Now, as circumcision belonged to every one interested in the covenant made with Abraham, so baptism belongs to every one who is embraced in spiritual Israel; circumcision to those who are Jews outwardly, as a token of their interest in the promise of God to Abraham, and baptism to those who are Jews inwardly, as a token of their interest in the promise of eternal life.

It was a natural birth (of the flesh) that entitled a Jew to the promise of God to Abraham, and to circumcision; but the birth of the spirit alone fits us to lay claim to the promise of eternal life.

The difference between the two covenants

We must mark the difference between the two covenants. The one confers temporal blessings to a nation of people, the other eternal life to the great family of God spiritually. With the one, circumcision is an outward sign of an interest in the promise of *temporal blessings*, and with the other, baptism (I grant) is an outward sign of an interest in the promise of eternal things.

With regard to infants, all parties agree that they are saved that die in infancy. We deny, however, that they are saved because of their natural goodness. We deny that they are by the natural birth fitted for heaven. We believe (or I do) that they who die in infancy are born of the spirit of God, and thus made spiritual, incorruptible, and prepared to enjoy the company of God. Their happy death, or happiness after death, is not the result of anything they *received* in their natural birth, or for anything they *are* by nature, but of God's divine power in regeneration.

Generation and regeneration

It is a great mistake that regenerated parents will produce regenerated children. In our first birth we are but *generated*, and while, among the Jews, this would entitle one to God's promise to Abraham, it does not entitle us to the promise of eternal life. Paul, in Romans 6:3-4, puts regeneration before

baptism, and it is upon this promise that baptism is an intelligent service.

Also Colossians 2:11-12, he makes the same point, that the *body* of our sins is taken away by the circumcision of heart, and as a consequence we are buried in baptism. Circumcision belongs to the *generated* Jew, and baptism to the *regenerated*, who are Jews inwardly.

The evidence that infants are *regenerated* is entirely wanting, and as they grow up we are confronted with clear evidences that they are not regenerated. So if it be true that baptism in the gospel takes the place of circumcision under the law, it is not true that a flesh birth gives one the blessings of the gospel, although it did give him an interest in the Abrahamic covenant; and while we grant that circumcision did belong to those who were "*Jews outwardly*," yet we insist that baptism belongs to those who are "*Jews inwardly*."

A mighty poor argument

2d. There were whole households baptized, and from this it is argued that there must have been infants baptized. This is a very common argument, which seems to me to be of very little value to their cause. In Acts 16:33, we read that the jailer and all his were baptized. Now, if we had any way of proving that there were any babes in his household, this would be an argument, but in Acts 16:34 we learn that he "rejoiced, believing in God with all his house," so those who were baptized were capable of rejoicing and believing in God.

From this we are sure there were no babes there, and the fact that men like Wesley, Porter, Buck, and many others, resort to this argument betrays the weakness of their cause, and so the case of Lydia, Acts 16:15. She was far from home on business of a mercantile kind, and it is by no means safe to build the practice of infant sprinkling on the bare supposition that there was an infant in her house. The business she was engaged in and the distance she was from home, would tend to raise the presumption that she had no helpless babes with her.

Cornelius feared God

with all his house

Also, the house of Cornelius, Acts 10: He is declared to have been a "devout man, and one that feared God with all his house." The angel told him to send for Peter, "who shall tell thee words whereby thou and all thy house shall be saved," and "the Holy Ghost fell on them. Those baptized here feared God, Acts 18:8.

"Crispus believed on the Lord with all his house." Here those baptized "believed on God," which contradicts the idea that there were any infants there. "And I baptized also the household of Stephanus,"—I Corinthians 1:16. Here is another household baptized, but in I Corinthians 16:15, we read of this same household that they "addicted themselves to the ministry of the saints."

I have now mentioned all the places where there were households baptized, and we find something said of each one that forbids the idea that there were infants, except that of Lydia. In every other case they were said to "fear God" or "believe God" or "minister to the saints," showing that every member of each household was of sufficient age to have understanding.

And in the case of Lydia, her business and distance from home would rather raise the inference that there were no babes in her house. Besides this, it is not an uncommon thing to see whole families with no babes in their midst. Reader, let your mind run over your own acquaintances and think how many families there are without infants. I know of several whole households that belong to the Baptist church.

Now, I repeat that the fact that the wisest advocates of infant baptism have used this as an argument in its favor, justly raises the suspicion that it is a practice without divine authority.

He blessed them; he did not baptize them

In Matthew 19:13, we read, "Then were there brought unto him little children that he should put his hands on them and pray." Also Mark 10:16, "And he took them up in his arms, puts his hands on them, and blessed them." These passages are frequently quoted to sustain the practice, but unfortunately for the practice, the passages say nothing about baptism. We learn that "he put his hands on them and prayed," but nothing is said about baptizing them.

All parties admit that there is no plain example in the New Testament for it; that it is nowhere commanded by the Savior. It seems to me that if the Savior and the disciples had practiced it, that there would have been much of their time spent in administering the ordinance, and the fact that there is nothing said about it in all their letters, nor in the Acts of the Apostles, is pretty clear evidence that it was not done.

Baptizing babies cannot secure their regeneration

A careful reading of the Methodist Discipline will lead you to the conclusion that it is practiced by them with the understanding that it secures regeneration to the child, and not only the Methodists, but the Catholics; and, I may say, all who practice it do it with the impression that it is a saving ordinance, which, if true, it involves the possibility of *infant damnation*.

It has been common for our people to be charged with preaching that infants go to hell; but if I had time and space I could show that the advocates of infant baptism have virtually taught the doctrine themselves. We love our children as dearly as others, and feel anxious about them, but we have never believed that the Lord requires us to *join them to our church without their knowledge or consent*.

We have not been able to see that the children who were baptized in infancy are any better by practice than others. We know that it is not required by the Bible, and therefore we do not practice it. Its tendency is to unite the church and the world. It is a sort of feeder of formalism in the church. It tends to destroy all distinction between the Church of Christ and the world, and therefore we have ever opposed it.

Believe first, then be baptized

The believer in Christ is the only character who is entitled to baptism. "And Philip said, if thou believest with all thy heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God,"—Acts 8:37. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved,"—Mark 16:16. These passages show that none but believers were considered suitable subjects for baptism. A believer is one who has been born of God. He is spiritual, and therefore can understand the things of the Spirit. He is a Jew inwardly, has been "circumcised without hands," and "passed from death unto life." I John 5:1, "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God." Also I John 4:2, "Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God."

These passages prove that the believer is born of God, and is in possession of his Spirit. "Whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God dwelleth in him and he in God," I John 4:5. The believer dwells in God, and God dwells in him. "Where the Spirit of the Lord is there is liberty." The man in whom God dwells is "free from sin;" he is born again, and therefore should be baptized. John 5:24, "He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life."

Baptism does not pass him from death unto life, but he "is passed from death unto life." So the believer is born of God; God dwells in him and he in God. "He that acknowledgeth the Son hath the Father." This man has been born again, not of corruptible, but of incorruptible seed, even by the word (*Logos*) of God, which liveth and abideth forever. "Born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." Such a person should be baptized; he should receive the "outward sign of an inward work." He is now "dead to sin" and should be "Buried with Christ by baptism."

Fruits meet for repentance

John denied baptism to the multitude for the lack of this inward grace; he demanded fruits meet for repentance. Baptism to an impenitent person is of no value to him. Baptism is not a part of the remedial system by which the new birth is effected; it is the peculiar privilege of the believer who is already "passed from death unto life," and "is born of God." It is the act of the obedient child of God in which he puts on Christ before the world and vows to live in his service.

Peter, at the house of Cornelius, recognized that they had received the Holy Ghost, and upon this fact he baptized them. The Holy Spirit owned our Savior in the ordinance. He owned Philip when he was baptized, "and he went on his way rejoicing."

The great Savior has promised that all who take his yoke upon them shall find rest. There is a rest to the saint in following Christ. He is made to rejoice in the Lord. In receiving members into the church we want evidence that they have been born of God. "The sow that was washed returned to her wallow in the mire."

Outward reformation will not qualify one for the service of God. The new birth will produce a suitable reformation, and hence we want an evidence that the applicant has been born again. To tell a long experience is not essential, but to give evidence that you have repented of your sins is necessary; it is necessary that you love the brethren, and that in heart you love the Savior. "If ye love me, keep my commandments," says the Redeemer. We want evidence that you love the Lord Jesus, for if you do, his service will not be a task to you. Every person contemplating baptism should seriously examine his own heart.

Dear reader, do you love the Savior? If so, he commands you to observe his ordinances; and if you look rightly at his service, you feel that it is a solemn engagement to enter into his service. "Amos I prepared in heart?" is a suitable question for you to ponder well. "It is said that if any man be in Christ he is a new creature, old things have passed away, and all things are become new." Do you know anything of such an experience? Is your heart set as much on this world as formerly?

Do you delight in sin as much as ever? If you are prepared in heart for God's service, sin to you has "become exceeding sinful." "You are dead to sin," and can not, with delight, "live any longer therein." God's people are allied to Christ and his cause. You will, if you are a Christian, find that you have undergone a change in your thoughts of God and his Word.

Paul experienced a conviction for his sin, and that before baptism; and you, if you are a fit subject for baptism, have had deep trouble about sin, and even now you understand the words, "*when I would do good, evil is present with me,*" in a way you did not formerly. You are a weak thing. You once felt strong and able to keep your heart when you got ready; but now you sensibly feel that your sin is more than a match for your strength.

Although you have vowed, and vowed again, to do better, yet you feel the force of the words, "Oh, wretched man that I am." When you compare yourself as you are, with what you are sure that you should be, you think it can hardly be that you are a Christian. You are not fit for baptism. The service is too holy for so unholy a being as you are. The church is composed of good people, and you are not good. You would be a spot in their feasts, and you feel unfit for God's notice. You can understand how God can notice others; how he can care for the hosts of heaven and the saints on earth, but you can't understand how he can care for you as the very apple of his eye. You crave such care, but feel that it is too much to claim. You think, "Oh, how can the great Eternal One, who knows my every imperfection, love me as a tender parent, and delight in me as a bride. How can it be that I, so like a sinner, should be beloved so."

Your heart's desire is to do right, and if you felt sure that you were prepared for a place in his house, you would at once go into his service. You are interested in the church, you rejoice to see others follow the Savior, you would be glad to see whole nations fall at his feet "and crown him Lord of all," you *would* adore and exalt the name of Jesus if you could. Oh, how

encouraging to many of us that God's people are not described as a strong people.

Our Savior said, "Blessed are the poor in spirit; for theirs is the kingdom of heaven." This kind of preaching gets down to you. Oh, think you, does he bless the poor in spirit? Then I am that; he has come to me with his blessing; I am poor in spirit, I am bankrupt and penniless, I am naked and starving; if I can't claim the good things of the gospel, I can claim that I need them, and am ruined without them.

The centurion felt unworthy that Christ should come under his roof, and you feel unworthy to go into his service, or claim a place among his people. Christ said of the centurion, "I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel." It is faith that fills us with low opinions of self and high ones of God. Oh, dear reader, have you thus discovered the corruption of your own nature and the great worth of Christ? Have you been made to love him and his precious cause? If so, you should keep his commandments. Unite with his people in their efforts to maintain his cause in the world. I would exhort you by the mercies of God, that you present your body a living sacrifice, holy and acceptable in his sight, which is your reasonable service. The low opinion you have of self prepares you to walk humbly in his sight you ought not to confer with self, but by an obedient life prove your love to Christ.

Alien Baptism

Note.—The subject of re-baptism, or alien baptism, has been one of deep interest among us. Persons join other churches and then become dissatisfied and wish to unite with us. Whether we should receive them on their baptism, has been a question of serious inquiry. It is well known that Baptists believe the doctrine of church succession; that the church first organized by Christ has existed in all ages of the world to the present, and we claim to be in that succession. The various churches around us are of recent and *human* origin. Most of them originally came out of the Catholics. Whatever authority they have to administer the ordinances of God's house, they received from Catholicism. Our people hold that these are institutions of men,

and are unauthorized to administer the ordinances of the Lord's house.

What is known as the "branch system," we oppose. Those who hold it, say that "the general church is made up of the various denominations; each one is a branch of the church, and all together make the true church." If Baptists believed this theory they could consistently receive baptism from other orders, but as long as we hold the doctrine of Church Succession we cannot consistently receive baptism from any save our own people. Let us examine these branches that are supposed to make up the general church. One immerses and others pour or sprinkle; some teach the doctrine of apostasy, and all teach that salvation is conditional. No two agree in all things, and all of them agree in opposing the doctrine of grace. Does one branch of a tree bear gourds, and another apples, another potatoes, and so on? No; this is confusion, or *Babylon*.

We do not belong to that tree; we are no part of it; and never were connected with it, and we cannot receive its work without virtually accepting the "branch system." Those who believe the "branch system" can afford to receive each other's work and commune with each other, but we cannot afford to do it. If we lay claim to the doctrine of Church Succession we must be a separate people and administer our own ordinances.

It is well known that the Campbellite Church sprang from A. Campbell, and that he was excluded from the Old Baptists in Virginia. Is there any reason in excluding a man from our church and still allow him to administer our ordinances? We think not. We think it very inconsistent to exclude a minister and deny communion with him and still receive his work. It is often the case that preachers are excluded from our body, who step off and set up for themselves, and we think that to receive their work is very inconsistent. The fact that the Campbellite Church has become strong and numerous is no reason why we should receive their work.

Besides, they administer the right *in order* to the forgiveness of sins, as a condition of salvation, and we have ever regarded this as a gross heresy. To receive baptism from their hands is to

recognize their authority, and in a degree to tolerate their false views of baptism. If a person is satisfied with their baptism we think he ought to be satisfied with them. If he has become dissatisfied with them as a church, and believes their preaching to be generally false, he should not desire to bring to us the baptism he has received from those people he now renounces. If he renounces them, he should also renounce their work. Other orders, that practice sprinkling and pouring, sometimes immerse persons when it is contrary to their own faith. "Whatsoever is not of faith is sin." We think it inconsistent to receive their work when they performed it without faith. It is very unwise for any person who desires to be immersed to go to those who practice sprinkling for it. They should go to one who believes that God requires it, and when he lifts up his hand towards heaven and says, "I baptize thee in the name of the Father," etc, he will be sincere, and it will be a work of faith with him.

It is argued that if the person's conscience is satisfied, we ought to be. To this we reply, if their conscience is satisfied with the baptism, they ought to remain with the people who baptized them; besides, the proper administration of the laws of the Lord, does not depend on men's consciences altogether.

Does the Bible teach that the church of Christ has existed in all ages? And are we that church? This is the foundation of our course in this matter. If we are the church, then those institutions organized by Calvin, Luther, Wesley, Campbell and others, are not the church, but *rival institutions*, and we can no more receive their work than our fathers could the baptism of Catholics. As before said, if we *lay down* the claim of succession we can receive *alien* baptism. The question of communion and baptism seem to be bounded by the same line.

If we can receive baptism from other orders, why not commune with them? There is no more sacredness in the ordinance of baptism than there is in the communion, and when we become willing to receive baptism from other orders we should be willing to commune with them. If we would preserve our history as a church we must be a separate people. And where persons ask for membership on their baptism received from other orders, it

is better to reject them, reason with them, show them the inconsistency of such a thing, and if they are reasonable and sincere they will see the point that it is reasonable. They will be glad afterwards, and love you for your faithfulness.

I have had persons urge upon me that they were satisfied with their baptism, and wished to unite with us. In such cases I have urged them to stay where they were until they were convinced that our course was right. I urged that we wanted to be a separate people, and that we could not give up our practice in this matter without surrendering a vital principle of our faith. The intelligent reader will readily see that we cannot receive baptism from any other order without sacrificing our claim to Church Succession. Reasonable people will respect us for having sincerity enough to dare to be consistent.

We know that it tends to make our members few, but we are anxious to pursue a consistent course. We are trying to maintain the order of the house of God. We are more anxious to do this than to have the applause of men. It is the only safe course we can pursue.

Baptism: Christ's Marriage to the Church

BAPTISM: Christ's marriage to the church: S. A. Paine: In Malachi 3:1, same verse referred to, it is said, "And the Lord whom ye seek shall suddenly come to his temple, even the messenger of the covenant, whom ye delight in; behold he shall come, saith the Lord of hosts."

Who is this but the Savior coming to John on the bank of Jordan? And in coming to him he comes to, or confronts those whom John has made ready. He calls this coming to his temple. **Here is where the marriage occurs.**

We hear John exclaiming, "**Behold the Lamb of God** which taketh away the sin of the world." Here is the midnight cry, "**Behold the Bridegroom cometh, go ye out to meet him.**" Those who were ready, who were prepared in heart, and had obeyed the teaching of John, were admitted to the marriage. Hence Christ suddenly came to his temple, "even the messenger of the covenant whom ye delight in." This was fulfilled in Jesus's approach to John, and those whom he had baptized, **here the union of the Bride and Bridegroom was effected**, and the church, there began in its incipency—began to be builded. (*Writings of S.A. Paine*)

Baptism: Immersion the Mode

BAPTISM: Immersion the Mode: J.H. Oliphant: Subheads added: Volumes have been written on this subject, and I have no thought that I shall be able to present anything new in the way of argument. I only propose to give the reasons and arguments that satisfy me, and upon which I act. The design of this work forbids that I should attempt to write at length. I would first say that we should be sincere and candid in our investigation; we should not act in this matter to please men, nor upon the opinions of men, but, if possible, find what the Savior and apostles practiced, and do likewise.

Baptize: to DIP

The meaning of the word used to express the action of baptism has very much, if not everything, to do with the subject at hand. Not what it *now* means, but what it meant at *the time* the Savior and apostles used it.

1st. Webster in his definition says the word "baptize" is from a Greek word which signified "to dip." Of course he gives its present meaning in harmony with the practice of the various churches. Yet the question with us is "not what does it *now* mean" and how is it *now* understood, but "what did it mean in our *Savior's* day?" Webster says the original word "signified to *dip*." So our practice is in harmony with his definition.

Bapto, Baptizo, Baptizma

2nd. The Greek words *Bapto, Baptizo, Baptizma,* and *Baptizmos,* are never rendered *sprinkle* or *pour,* that is, the Savior never used a word that expressed the action of pour or sprinkle to express baptism. Now, if the Savior and apostles never used a word to express baptism, that they in other places used to express sprinkling or pouring, we think it clear that they did not intend to teach that baptism should be performed by sprinkling or pouring. In Luke 16:24, we read, "Send Lazarus that he may dip the tip of his finger in water and cool my tongue," etc.

Bapto

The word *dip* in this text is from the word *Bapto*. Here the meaning is clearly expressed by the scripture itself. The water was not *sprinkled* on his finger, nor *poured* on his finger, but the finger was *dipped* in the water. I regard this as a clear argument in favor of immersion. Also John 13:26, "Jesus answered, he it is to whom I shall give a sop when I have *dipped* it." Here the word *dipped* is from *Bapto*. The Savior fixes the meaning of the word, and illustrates it by *dipping*.

Also, Revelation 19:13, "And he was clothed in a vesture *dipped* in blood." His word *dipped* is also from the word *Bapto*. The blood was not sprinkled nor poured on the garment, but it had been baptized (or dipped) in the blood, so that his garments were *dyed*, or he was "red in his apparel." The use of the word in these places fixes its meaning as that of immerse or dip.

Baptizo

The Greek word *Baptizo* is never rendered pour or sprinkle. It is twice rendered *wash*, Mark 7:4; and Luke 11:38. The word *Baptismos* is rendered twice *wash*, Mark 7:4,8; and once *washings*, Hebrews 9:10. In these places it would be very unreasonable and unnatural, I think, to conclude that the washing was performed by sprinkling or pouring; possibly it could have been done by pouring, but the plainest sense of the connection is in favor of immersion.

The first mentioned is Mark 7:4, "Except they wash they eat not." The washing of *hands* is here referred to, as shown by the previous verse. The usual method of washing hands is by *dipping* them in the water; also, the "*washing* of cups, and pots, and brazen vessels, and tables," etc. The usual method of washing cups is by immersing them in the water. The word *pots* is from *Sextarios*, *about a pint and one-half*." So there is no difficulty in understanding the washing of *pots* to be in strict harmony with the views I am presenting.

The word *tables* in the same connection may present some difficulty to the mind of some. The original for *table* is *Klinel*. It occurs ten times in the New testament, and is rendered *bed* in every place except the one above named, Matthew 9:2,6; Mark 4:21; and Mark 7:4,30; Luke 5:18; and Luke 8:16; and Luke 17:34; Acts 5:15; and Revelation 2:22. Also, I may add that the meaning of the word *Klinel* is given by Greek lexicographers as follows, "That on which one lies, a bed, a couch, a bier." So the question is not how or what be the most natural way of washing a *table* but a *bed*, a *couch*, and every washer-woman in the land would say the best and easiest way is by immersion or dipping.

Baptize: a Greek word transliterated

We have noticed every passage in the New testament where the word has been translated from Greek to English. Of course the words baptize, baptism, etc., are not translations, but the Greek word itself with a English termination. We have found it three times rendered sprinkle or pour. We have found it twice rendered *wash*, and three times *washing*, but we have found the plain meaning of the texts in which wash and washing occur, to be very much in favor of immersion.

3rd. The first and principal meaning of the word, as given by Liddel and Scott gives it *Bapto*, to dip repeatedly, dip under, to bathe; *Baptismos*, a dipping in water; *Baptistus*, one who dips, a dyer; *ho Baptistus*, the Baptist; *Baptos*, dipped, dyed; *Bapto*, Greek, and *Immergere*, Latin, to dip, to sink. For a lengthy and general reference to Greek lexicons showing that the meaning of the word is dip or immerse, see "Theodosia Earnest," 1st Vol.; "Campbell on Baptism;" "Grace Trueman;" "Conversations on Baptism." The subject has, by these authors, been exhausted.

All admit the word means to dip

4th. The most learned men of the world have admitted the meaning of the word to be dip or immerse. John Wesley, in his notes on Romans 6:4, "We are buried with him by baptism," etc., says, "Alluding to the ancient manner of baptizing by immersion." Here the eminent founder of Methodism admits

the position we take, and although we would not regard him and such men as *infallible*; yet we regard it as evidence that we are right for those who practice sprinkling and pouring to confess that "the ancient mode" of baptism was by *burying*.

McKnight, an eminent Presbyterian, says, "In baptism the baptized person is buried under water." On Epistles, vol. 1,4, "Therefore, we are buried with him by baptism," says, "It is altogether probable that the apostle in this place had allusion to the custom of baptizing by immersion. This can not be proved so as to be liable to no objection, but I presume that this is the idea that would strike the great mass of unprejudiced readers." Certainly Barnes is correct in saying that the *great mass* would get the idea of immersion from this text. Luther, "Baptism is a sign of death and resurrection. Being moved by this reason, I would have those that are baptized to be wholly dipped into the water as the *word imports* and the mystery doth signify." "On this account I could wish that such as are to be baptized should be completely immersed into the water according to the meaning of the word," etc.

John Calvin's Institutes, vol. 2, p. 491, "The very word *baptize*, however, signifies to immerse, and it is certain that immersion was the practice of the ancient church." Again on John 3:23, and Acts 8:38, "From these words it may be inferred that baptism was administered by John and Christ by plunging the whole body under water. Here we perceive how baptism was administered among the ancients, for they immersed the whole body under water."

These quotations show that the great founders of the Methodist, Presbyterian and Lutheran churches have borne testimony that the meaning of the word is dip or immerse. We might add a host of other names of prominent men who themselves practiced sprinkling and pouring, who, nevertheless, admitted that the word signified *dip* or *immerse*, and that the ancient practice was by "immersing the whole body in the water." Mosheim, Neander, Beza, Dr. Chalmers, George Campbell, and many others.

How dare anyone change the rite

Now, reader, I ask you if our practice of immersion is not sustained by the meaning of the word, and if so, how dare we change the rite? Who has a right to repeal or amend the laws of Christ? His law was given in words that signify *immersion*? How dare we substitute sprinkling? How others have managed to keep a good conscience, declaring the meaning of the word in the Savior's example to be immersion and yet practicing sprinkling and pouring, is to me a mystery.

2nd. We argue that immersion was the apostolic mode of baptism, from the places selected to administer the ordinance. Matthew 3:5-6, "Then went out to him Jerusalem and all Judea and all the region round about Jordan, and were baptized of him *in* Jordan, confessing their sins." They were not baptized *near* Jordan, nor was Jordan baptized upon them, but they were baptized *in* Jordan. This circumstance plainly shows that John's baptism was by immersion.

The Greek word *en* is here rendered *in*, and is the same word the Savior uses in speaking of Jonah being three days and nights *in* the whale's belly Verse 13 (Matthew 3:13), "Then cometh Jesus from Galilee to Jordan to be baptized of him," and Matthew 3:16, "And Jesus when he was baptized went up straightway out of the water." Here our Savior was in the water and "went up straightway out of it." These narratives do not agree with the practice of sprinkling, nor pouring, for in neither case is there a good reason why they should be in the water.

Jordan: a good place for baptizing

It is sometimes argued that immersion in Jordan was impossible from the swiftness of the stream. The Bible dictionary published by the Presbyterians, by A.W. Mitchell, gives the length at 180 miles. "The waters are cool and wholesome; the breadth and depth vary at different places." He speaks of "frequent rapids," twenty-seven threatening ones, besides many of less importance. He mentions one place where the water is eighty feet wide and four feet deep, which would be an excellent place for immersion.

Where there are so many "fords" and rapids along a river, there are certainly some places where the water is still, else it is one continuous rapid, which disagrees with our Presbyterian's account of it. The case of Phillip and the eunuch, who went down into the water, also, John baptized in Enon, near to Salem, "because there was much water there."

It is argued he baptized in these places, because much water was needed to quench the thirst of the camels, asses, etc, that the people rode to the place. We regard all such arguments as a mere dodge to evade the plain force of truth, and we think that a plain, honest man will gather the doctrine of immersion from these places.

They went down into the water

It is argued that the words "down into the water" mean down *to* the water, and *up out of* the water, means up *from* the water. If we are to suffer the plain teaching of the Bible to be thus explained away we would soon have to give the whole thing up. We are satisfied that a plain man who will take his Bible and read the account of every baptism in the New Testament will be led to the opinion that immersion was the mode practiced.

The Roman brethren were "buried with him by baptism," and were "planted together in the likeness of his death." Planting is performed by a burial. "Buried with him by baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him," etc, Colossians 2:12. These references show at least that baptism effects a *burial*. Luke 3:16, "I indeed baptize you *with* water." The word *with* is here supposed to teach that the water is applied to the candidate and not the person to the water. In reply to this, I say the word *with* in this text is the same word that is rendered *in* in Matthew 3:6, "Baptized of him in Jordan," Matthew 3:11, "I indeed baptize you *with* water," Matthew 3:15, "unto all that are *in* the house." "*In* the whale's belly." "*In* the heart of the earth." The italicized words in these passages are all from the same Greek word. A careful examination of the New Testament will show that the word here rendered *with* is, in four out of every five places it occurs in the New Testament rendered *in*.

Immersion is regarded as valid and scriptural baptism, I believe, by all denominations. The leading men of past ages have declared it to have been the original practice. Every case of baptism in the New Testament justifies the conclusion that it was performed by immersion, and many cases force that conclusion. The places selected to administer the ordinance, with every reference in the New Testament, tend to fix in our minds that immersion was the ancient mode. That it is too cold, or indecent for ladies, or unsafe for weakly persons, we regard as an argument being unworthy of candid consideration.

We have demonstrated many times over that "ice and snow can do no harm," that the most delicate females can, with safety, go into the ordinance, even when the ice must be cut, that persons sick can with safety be taken from their beds and baptized. Hundreds of young ladies of taste and refinement, have like the dear Redeemer, gone down into the water and been "buried in baptism," and if it looked *indecent* to some, they felt happy in the ordinance. In baptism we are not so much concerned about what the people would call *decent*, but what God would approbate.

No sight is more blessed than to see a man or woman of our poor, dying race go down into the water and submit to the holy rite. There is something in it that reminds us of Jesus in Jordan, and the same blessed Spirit that crowned our blessed Lord owns us poor mortals in the service. Oh! how often have we seen the brethren gather at the water's edge and join in a song of praise to God, followed by an humble prayer to God for his blessing upon the poor, unworthy servants, after which the humble followers of Jesus go down into the water.

How solemn a sight

Oh! how solemn. What solemn thoughts crowd the mind of that beautiful young lady as she takes the minister's hand. Her prayer is that God will own her service. She mentally exclaims, Lord be *with* and own me now. She mentally, and sometimes vocally, says, "Farewell, vain world," "I leave this world of sin behind my back." Oh! reader, will God own this service? Do you not believe this is from heaven? The ordinance is

administered; the candidate comes from the water happy. The congregation rejoices in the Lord together. Saints of all denominations, as they witness the same, are forcibly reminded of Christ's baptism, and the eunuch's, and John's baptism in Jordan

Pure minded persons see nothing *indecent* in it. Sickly and feeble, old and decrepit persons experience no injury from it. It is an humble service that the proud and high minded will shun. It offers no encouragements to the proud, nor to hypocrites. There is enough sacrifice about it to be a test of sincerity. Our gay clothing for once is laid aside—ribbons, laces, silks, and costly clothing are forgot or left off. We feel for once free from pride, while we enter this solemn ordinance.

Reader, what think ye of this matter? Are you not convinced that Jesus, our Savior, was immersed in the river of Jordan? Have you followed him in this service? Baptists feel it their duty to maintain this service in the world. God owns it among us to our great comfort. We regard nothing else as baptism, and we believe the scripture and all reason sustain us. And above all, we believe that God, by his Holy Spirit, owns our service and us in it.

The Savior gave the example

Note.—If it be argued that we should in charity allow the person baptized to choose the *mode* by which he will be baptized, we reply, that if the Savior gave us the example by immersion, and enjoined it upon us in terms that clearly indicate immersion, then neither the person to be baptized nor the administrator has a right to change the ordinance.

We deny there being any *charity* in such a course. If it be said the person *ought* to have a *right* to choose for himself respecting the mode, we would say, he has an equal right to choose the *element*, whether he will be sprinkled with *sand* or *water*, or whether we shall use *wine* or *water* in the sacrament. But the Savior used *wine* and not *water* in the sacrament, and he used bread and not fruit. He selected the element himself and we have no right to change it.

If one would say, it is more *charitable* to allow the people to select their own manner of commemorating his death, that there is nothing in the bread, the real importance is in the thing *signified*. It can as well be signified with *fruit* as *bread*, that it is too rigid and uncharitable to contend that nothing but bread will do. To all this, we would reply, that the Savior selected *bread*. He made the selection for us, and therefore we are not at liberty to select fruit instead of bread nor *water* instead of *wine*. The Savior used wine—gave us the example in that way, and as we wish to follow him and imitate his example, we do not feel at liberty to say to the people that we want to be charitable above our neighbors, therefore we will let them choose between water and wine in the communion, and that if they prefer, they can have sand sprinkled on them for baptism.

This would be charitable, indeed, and some people, no doubt, would admire us for such liberality; but Christ gave us no such example. We only wish to know the way in which he performed these ordinances. As he used wine and bread we use these elements in showing his death till he come.

We have no right to allow our communicants to select some other way. And for the same reason we practice immersion; we find that Christ was immersed, and in this way he gave us the example. We have no right to say that some other way will do as well. The Savior never said the person should select his own mode. "Follow me," is his command, which we think can only be done by imitating his examples.

There are others who will sprinkle you

If the Redeemer was immersed, shall we substitute a service that escapes the cross in its room? We have no right to change the ordinance, and we deny that any other denomination under heaven has such a right. If our members are fewer by it, we will nevertheless seek to imitate the great exemplar, and those who are unwilling to aid us in preserving his examples pure in the world may go elsewhere.

We do not wish to fetter men's consciences, and if after a careful and prayerful reading of the New Testament, you are convinced that Jesus and the apostles were sprinkled, that Philip sprinkled the eunuch, that John's *reason* for selecting a place where there was much water to baptize, was because he wanted to have plenty of water for the camels and asses that the people rode there; I say, if you come to these conclusions, we will not ask you to go into our church, we will not fetter your conscience.

And if you should decide that all these cases and circumstances point to immersion, and yet you feel like you prefer to imitate some one beside the great Savior, that although he was immersed, you prefer to be sprinkled, we will not bind your conscience; we will very willingly allow you to go to those who are more charitable. If it is uncharitable to maintain the ordinances as they were delivered to us, we glory in being uncharitable; and if charity and liberality consist in asking the people to choose between the commandments of man and the ordinances as God gave them to us, we have no desire to be liberal or charitable.

Baptism: The Purpose

BAPTISM: The Purpose: J.H. Oliphant: In olden times the true gospel was set forth in types and shadows. Abel's sacrifice set forth in a figure our Savior; every animal that was slain under the direction of God, in its way, pointed the mind to the Lord Jesus on the cross. The Paschal lamb pointed to the Redeemer as the great deliverer from sin. I have no doubt but that Bunyan was right when he makes the temple, with all its services, a type of something better.

From the shadow to the substance

Hebrews 9:1-11. In this place we learn from the apostle that all things connected with the temple were "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 the conscience." "Which stood only in meats and drinks and

divers washing and carnal rites," etc. "But Christ being come....by a greater and more perfect tabernacle," etc.

In this place he calls our minds away from the shadow to the true Savior. The Jews were prone to look to and depend on the shadow. These shadows were very useful, if used aright by the Jews, for they carried the mind to the Lord Jesus; but when they were used unlawfully there were a curse to Israel, and instead of carrying the mind of the people to the only Savior of sinners, they served rather as a blind to hide the only hope of a sinner. "But even unto this day when Moses is read the veil is upon their hearts," and they "could not look steadfastly to the end of that which is abolished,"— II Corinthians 3:13 to last.

The service of the law was not given as a part of the *remedial system* by which sinners are justified before God, but as a shadow of it. In their bleeding victims they had a picture of Christ on the cross. Their incense, ark, mercy-seat, and every part of their service was significant, but their own blindness, and proneness to legalize everything, led them to "rest in the law." "And David saith, Let their table be made a snare, and a trap, and a stumbling block, and a recompense unto them,"— Romans 11:9-10.

Their table of service which was instituted to point the mind to the Savior, had served them as a stumbling block; it had become a snare, a trap to their feet, so that their service became a curse to them. Their natural tendency was to legalize the whole service and make a Savior of it, and thus shut their eyes to the only Savior.

They turned the symbol into a stumbling stone

The natural, unregenerate man will turn the very gospel of grace into one of works. The ceremonial law was to the Jews a real gospel, but they made a legal trap and stumbling stone out of it, that denied the real need of that inward change which alone fits us for heaven. And they contended for the law in such a way as to reject him to whom it was intended to direct them.

Circumcision was a type of the circumcision made without hands, and it distinguished them as the peculiar people of God as a nation, and in all this it tended to lead the mind to look for that inward circumcision which was performed without hands, and by which we are in heart separated from this world, and have the "body of our sins cut off." But the Jews were prone to regard this circumcision made by hands as sufficient, and thus trust in the shadow or pattern instead of the substance. In Romans 3:1-10, the apostle labors to deliver the brethren from this snare or trap, and reminds them that Abraham's justification before God was *not secured* by it.

The Savior taught the Jews to search the scripture, "for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they that testify of me." These poor depraved Jews believed that eternal life was in these ordinances, and carnal rites, but Jesus said, "They are they that testify of me;" "the great blessing of eternal life is in me; you will not find it in the ordinances of the law or the gospel either, *it is in me.*"

They put circumcision in the place of Christ

This *legal taint* was found among the early Christians—Acts 15:1.—There were certain persons who taught that "except ye be circumcised, ye cannot be saved." Thus seeking to bring the saints into bondage, and assigning a place for circumcision in the remedial system equal to that of Christ.

The Galatian brethren were troubled with the same thing. Paul tells them, "Ye observe days, and months, and times, and years,—Galatians 4:10. He then adds, "I am afraid of you, lest I have bestowed upon you labor in vain." This same legal bias was plainly observable among them, in which they were legalizing the gospel, and betraying a disposition to trust in part to the performance of ordinances.

This is the natural tendency of men in all ages of the world. The gospel is often explained as a bundle of contradictions, upon which life and immortality is suspended, thus making "a snare and a trap, and a stumbling block" out of the pure gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ.

In Romans 1:16, we read, "For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ, for it is the power (authority) of God unto salvation," etc.; "for therein is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith." The gospel, then, *reveals* a righteousness which is suited to our need. The tendency of man is to "go about to establish his own righteousness," and in order to do it he generally legalizes gospel services, such as observing days, and years, baptism, the Lord's Supper, etc., and when I see this tendency in men, I become afraid of them, as Paul was of the Galatians.

Campbell legalized baptism

The doctrine of transubstantiation among the Catholics has its foundation in this error. The followers of Mr. Campbell have legalized baptism as certain teachers of old did circumcision, saying, except ye be circumcised, ye cannot be saved. It is not a part of the remedial system by which men are justified before God. The imputed righteousness of Christ is the ground upon which we are justified.

We have shown in the previous chapter that baptism is the peculiar privilege of the believer. We have shown that the believer is "born of God" "is passed from death unto life," and that he "shall not come into condemnation." The design of baptism is not to bring about a new birth, or save him from condemnation. In a word, it is not a part of that system by which sinners are justified before God. I know that many have labored hard to give it as much importance as those false teachers did circumcision.

Campbell put baptism in the place of circumcision

Mr. Campbell, in his work on baptism, page 255: "We must give to grace, to faith, to repentance, to baptism, to the purpose of God the Father, to the blood of Christ, to the sanctification of the Holy Spirit, to each of these, severally, its proper place and importance in redemption and salvation, and to all of them a concurrent efficacy in the rescue and delivery of man from sin, misery and ruin."

He here gives to baptism the same prominence that those false teachers did to circumcision, thus suspending all on its performance. It is a link in his chain of salvation, which, if it is lacking, there is no salvation. This is the result of that tendency in all nations and ages, to make a stumbling block of the ordinances of God.

I think I have shown that the believer alone is entitled to the ordinance of baptism, and I have also shown the believer to be in a saved state, "born of God," etc. Baptism is therefore not a part of the remedial system, but it is confined entirely to the family of God. It should not be performed with a legal bias in mind; it becomes a curse instead of a blessing when it is attended to as a passport to heaven.

By regeneration made one with Christ

In Romans 6:3-4, we have baptism as a burial; we are, Romans 6:3, baptized into Christ; as the wife is one, essentially, with her husband, we are, by regeneration, made one with Christ; he is our life and head, the fountain of all our hopes. Romans 6:4, "Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death." From the fact that by regeneration we are one with him, we have, in the act of baptism, publicly owned him, whereby we have also solemnly pledged ourselves to walk in newness of life.

Raised to walk a new life

When Christ was raised from the dead, he was not simply restored to life, but was raised into a higher life. So we are in this ordinance raised to walk a new life, not after the manner of this world or our former lusts, but after the example of our Master; as we by natural death are separated from our worldly pursuits of life, so by regeneration we die to sin—see Romans 6:2. And our burial in baptism is a showing to the world that we are dead to sin, and our raising from the water of baptism is with a view to live a new life.

Persons who have been baptized should feel themselves solemnly bound, as if by an oath, to walk according to the commandments of God. In Galatians 3:27, it is called putting on Christ, or acting in our outward life what has been wrought within; it is confessing him before men, or a public marriage to Christ wherein we bind ourselves to live for him who has died for us. The marriage ceremony does not unite persons in heart, but it publicly and practically unites those who have been one in heart. So baptism does not, in heart, unite men to Christ, but is the appointed manner in which we should acknowledge him. It is like an oath of allegiance, which binds us as long as we live to obey him. It is a picture that shows:

Symbolizes death to sin

1st. Our death to sin. We confess in it that we are dead to sin; in it we teach others the great necessity of dying to sin. By a picture, when we stand at a grave, we see the dead buried; they are never, in civil countries buried until dead. So we should not bury in baptism until there is a death to sin. How beautiful to see one in deep humility confess himself dead to sin; and

2nd. It is a picture of our being raised up by the Holy Spirit to walk in newness of life. The baptized should feel himself under the most binding obligations to live a holy life. The true wife feels bound to pursue a course of life that will honor her husband, and it is greatly to her disgrace to betray a spirit of disobedience at any time in her future life; and so it is very wrong and disgraceful for a baptized person to practice sin as formerly.

This obligation is as lasting as life. We put on Christ to wear him through life and death. Putting on Christ may include, as some think, the imitation of Christ in our lives, a seeking of the same temper that he had; the same course of life among our fellow creatures. The disciples were known to have been with Christ by their conduct, and we, by carefully obeying him in all things, will be clothed with his spirit of love, forbearance, and tenderness, that would make us delightful companions for each other, and greatly prepare us to bear hardness, which we will,

more or less, through life have opportunity to do. How careful should we be in our lives to fill our solemn pledge to God, taken in baptism.

Also symbolizes the resurrection

It is also emblematic of the great resurrection. In I Corinthians 15:29, "Else what shall they do who are baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not at all? Why are they then baptized for the dead?" He shows that if there is no resurrection of the dead that our baptism was an unnecessary thing. In this solemn service we are constantly teaching the resurrection of our bodies. We shall by and by go down to the grave and be buried out of the sight of men, and this is shown by our burial in baptism. But we will not forever remain in the grave. The time will come when the grave shall be robbed of its spoil. This will be a glorious and triumphant day to the dear saints who now go sorrowing here; and this great privilege of saints is shown in picture, by his being raised from the water.

Oh! dear reader, have you a hope of being raised to life eternal? If so, in this rite you may show forth that hope. Whom do you love best, this vain world or the dear Redeemer? If your heart is set on Christ, confess him. Go to his people who are endeavoring to maintain his service, and tell them the "reason of the hope that is within you with meekness and fear," and publicly put him on as your great exemplar.

Bear in mind his people are a poor people in spirit; they feel and complain of their imperfections, but they love the great Redeemer and desire to manifest it to the world. They are trying to maintain his ordinances pure in the world. Their ministers are trying to maintain a pure gospel. Are you concerned for these precious things? If so, go to these people, ask for a place among them, never halting to inquire whether it will increase or lessen your popularity in the world. Your time for this service may be very short, and we know it cannot be very long. You do not want to meet the enemy, death, without having publicly owned him as your Master to love and obey.

You may urge that your hope is not clear enough, that you are unworthy, etc., but all this does not satisfy you; your sense of unperformed duty remains. You go away from the house of the Lord with a burdened mind on account of your neglect of duty. If you would be freed from a heavy heart, and receive the Savior's promised rest, deny yourself and take up your cross and follow the great Redeemer through the grave of baptism.

You shall one day follow him through death, the grave and the resurrection. Oh! blessed hope, that we shall all be raised immortal in the sweet society of the great family of God, when we shall with joy sing; "O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?" How ardent ought our love to be to him whose sweet employ it is to prepare us all for this bright destiny. Let us devote the remainder of our lives to his service in sincerity and truth.

God Almighty grant that it may be our sweet privilege to meet in that blessed day, and be allowed to unite to all eternity in the praise of our dear Lord Jesus Christ.

Note:—In the translation of the New Testament, called, "The Living Oracles," approved by A. Campbell, the 19th verse of the last chapter of Matthew (Matthew 28:19) reads, "Go, convert all nations, immersing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit." The common version reads, "baptizing them in the name," etc. Mr. Campbell so renders this as to teach that men are BAPTIZED into Christ. We have ever understood this verse to teach that the disciples were to perform that rite by his authority; "In his name," as agents do business in the name of another, so we perform this rite as the appointed servants of God. It is true, that if the word rendered *into* must mean *into*, we would have to yield this point and agree that baptism is a part of the remedial system. The Greek word rendered *into* here is *Eis*. But these translators do not always render it *into*, which leaves room to suspicion that they were biased in favor of baptismal regeneration, and that it was their *theology*, and not their *scholarship*, that led them to make this translation.

In Matthew 10:41-42, the common version reads, "He that receiveth a righteous man *in* the name of a righteous man;" and again, "And whosoever shall give to drink unto one of these little ones a cup of cold water only *in* the name of a disciple," etc. The word *in* in these places is from *Eis*, and Mr. Campbell does not render them *into*. Also, Matthew 18:20, "Where two or three are gathered together *in* my name," etc. Here the word, *in* is from *Eis*. Mr. Campbell gives it the same reading, "Wherever two or three are assembled *in* my name, etc. Now, why, unless it be to favor his peculiar views of baptism, should he render the word *in* in this passage and *into* in Matthew 28:19.

By comparing this translation with the Greek concordance, we find that great pains were taken to render this Greek word *Eis* as *into* wherever it would favor Campbell's notion of the design of baptism, but in a great number, and I believe, a majority of cases, he has rendered it by some other word plainly showing that his *legal* notion of baptism, decided him to render the word *into* wherever it would help to support his pet notion of baptism.

Baptist Church, First in America

First BAPTIST church in America: Sylvester Hassell: From the most recent and thorough investigation, it is believed that Dr. John Clark (a physician and eleven other persons formed, at Newport, Rhode Island, in 1638, the first Baptist Church in America; Clark resigning the proposed care of the church in 1651, in order to return to England, was succeeded by Obadiah Holmes. The pastors and members of this oldest Baptist Church in America remained strongly Calvinistic or predestinarian until about the year 1820.

In 1636 the town, and in 1639 the Baptist Church, of Providence, Rhode Island, were founded by Roger Williams (1599-1683). He was a Welshman by birth, an Episcopalian by training, and had been a Congregationalist by choice, and he was a graduate of the University of Cambridge. He came to Massachusetts in 1631, and was for a few years assistant minister of the Congregational Church at Salem; but, denying the right of the magistrates to punish offenses of a purely religious character, he was banished, and, leaving his wife and children at Salem, he fled, in the depth of winter, to the Narragansett Indians, and, in gratitude to God for his preservation during fourteen weeks of bitter wilderness wandering,

he called the town that he founded Providence, and he made it a shelter for persons distressed for the sake of conscience.

He established the colony of Rhode Island upon principles of entire religious liberty—principles which have since been adopted in all the States of the American Union, but upon which no State before Rhode Island had ever been founded. In March, 1639, Roger Williams, Ezekiel Holliman and ten others constituted the Baptist Church at Providence. Holliman baptized Williams, and then Williams immersed Holliman and the others. Four months afterwards, doubting the validity of this procedure, Williams withdrew from the church, and seems never again to have united with any religious organization, but remained a *Seeker*, seeking but never finding a church of pure apostolic faith and practice.

For one hundred and thirty years the ministers of the Providence Church were natives, bred on the spot, generally advanced in years, worked for their daily bread, and had no special training.” For a long time it was thought that this church was the first Baptist organization in America; but the best evidence seems to show that the Newport Church was the first.

John Miles formed a Baptist Church at Swansea in Wales in 1649; and removing, with a few of his members and a copy of the old church records, to America, he founded in 1663 the first Baptist Church in Massachusetts at Swansea or Swanzy.” (*Hassell’s History* pg 526)

Baptist: Origin of the Name

BAPTIST: Origin of the name: C. H. Cayce: As to the name, will say that John was called a Baptist, and the Lord gave him that name. He baptized the persons who first composed the church. The church was composed of baptized believers. Jesus organized His church and the first members, those whom He first placed in the church, were baptized persons who had been baptized by John. We would call them Baptists, then. Hence what is known as the Baptist Church is the church of God. They have been called by different names in the different ages and countries since the days of the apostles.

But the name of a thing does not change its nature. The identity of the church of God has remained with those who contended for Scriptural doctrine and practice in all the ages since the church was established by the Savior while on earth.” (*Cayce’s Editorials* vol. 2, ppg 362)

Baptists, Strict

Strict BAPTISTS: Sylvester Hassell There are three classes of Strict Baptists in England, represented respectively by the “Gospel Herald,” established in 1833; the “Gospel Standard,” established in 1835; and the “Earthen Vessel,” established in 1843. They are all Calvinists and Close Communionists; they do not exact rebaptism on the part of members that join them from other “churches,” though they require a relation of Christian experience; they do not practice footwashing as a literal observance in the churches; they all have Sunday Schools, in which they teach how to read, and explain the Scriptures, but they reject the idea that the Sunday School is “a nursery of the church,” or a substitute for the Holy Spirit; they all have Relief Societies for the Christian poor; and all contribute to the “Trinitarian Bible Society.” The “Gospel Herald” class of Strict Baptists also have Associations, and Tract and Missionary Societies.

The “Gospel Standard” Strict Baptists most nearly of all the people in England resemble the Old School or Primitive Baptists in the United States. Their Articles of Faith are substantially the same as ours—are thoroughly sound, spiritual, and experimental, insisting, in the strongest language, upon the doctrine of salvation by sovereign, discriminating and almighty grace from beginning to end, and upon the necessity of adorning the doctrine of God our Savior with a godly walk and conversation, humility and brotherly love, and closing with these words: “And for every blessing and favor, both temporal and spiritual, we, who are as deserving of hell as the vilest of the vile, desire to ascribe all the praise to the glory of the grace of a Triune God.”

They open their pulpits to all who subscribe to all their Articles of Faith, whether they are Baptists or not. They utterly condemn Theological Seminaries. They have, and sustain by voluntary contributions, the “Gospel Standard Aid Society” for the relief of aged and infirm Strict Baptist ministers and their widows; and the “Gospel Standard Poor Relief Society,” for the relief of afflicted and needy Strict Baptist ministers of any age, and of needy Strict Baptist members over sixty years of age.

One of their leading members writes me: “We do not profess to have religious Associations, as the Duty-Faith Baptists have. Neither do we send out missionaries, as we cannot afford to do so; and we do not unite with the Baptist Missionary Society, as the ministers Duty-Faith men (that is, such as declare faith to be a duty, instead of a gift). We have no Society for the distribution of tracts, though individuals amongst us often issue tracts or leaflets in our letters.”

Among the leading ministers of the Gospel Standard Strict Baptist have been William Gadsby, John Warburton, John Kershaw, John M'Kensie and J.C. Philpot." (*Hassell's History* ppg 616, 617)

Baptists, The: Their Origin

The BAPTISTS: Their origin: Sylvester Hassell: It is exceedingly interesting to notice the candid admission of the careful Lutheran historian, J. L. Mosheim, in reference to the origin of the Baptists. "The true origin of the Anabaptists or Mennonites (or Baptists)," says this learned and impartial writer, "*is hidden in the depths of antiquity*, and is, of consequence, extremely difficult to be ascertained. They are not entirely in an error when they boast of their descent from the Waldenses, Petrobrusians and other ancient sects, who are usually considered as witnesses of the truth in the times of general darkness and superstition. *Before the rise of Luther and Calvin*, there lay concealed in almost all the countries of Europe, particularly in Bohemia, Moravia, Switzerland and Germany, many persons who adhered tenaciously to the following doctrine, which the Waldenses, Wycliffites and Hussites had maintained, some in a more disguised, and others in a more open and public manner, viz.: "That the kingdom of Christ, or the visible church which he established upon earth, was an assembly of true and real saints, and ought, therefore, to be inaccessible to the wicked and unrighteous, and also exempt from all those institutions which human prudence suggests, to oppose the progress of iniquity, or to correct and reform transgressors."

I know of no people who are, by their principles, so closely identified as Old School or Bible Baptists with this *primitive, spiritual, truly apostolical succession*.

Again: Two learned members of the Dutch reformed Church, Ypieg and Dermont, the first a professor of theology at Groningnen, and the second the Royal Chaplain, appointed by the King of Holland to examine into the origin and history of the Dutch Baptists, made a careful investigation of the facts, and in their book, published in 1819, made the following important declaration as the result of their careful and impartial researches: "The Baptists may be considered as the only Christian society which has stood since the days of the Apostles, and as a Christian society which has preserved pure the doctrine of the gospel through all ages. The notion of the Catholics that their communion is the most ancient is erroneous." The doctrine of the gospel is, I believe, nowhere else maintained in such purity as among Bible Baptists." (*Hassell's History* ppg 470,471)

BERNARD of France

BERNARD of France (*See under the CRUSADES and The IMMACULATE CONCEPTION*)

Beza, Theodore

Theodore BEZA: Sylvester Hassell The able and scholarly Theodore Beza (1519-1605), the friend, biographer and successor of Calvin, the surviving patriarch of the Reformation, was pastor of the Genevan Church for nearly forty years. While increasing the doctrinal, he relaxed the governmental rigor of Calvin. He was a Professor of Greek and Theology, and Rector of the University of Geneva. In 1556 he published a faithful and elegant Latin translation of the New Testament; and afterwards four excellent editions of the Greek Testament, which were the main basis of the Authorized (King James) English Version of 1611. Upon the English Geneva Bible of 1560 (translated by William Whittingham, Thomas Sampson and Anthony Gilby, English exiles at Geneva) “a noble, scholarly production,” says the Schaff-herzog Encyclopedia. Beza exerted a marked influence by his Latin version and his exegetical notes. The famous notes of the Geneva Testament are mostly original, or selected from Calvin and Beza, both of whom were profound critical scholars. (*Hassell’s History pg 499*)

Bible, The

The BIBLE: Abridged from Gill’s Divinity: As what I shall say hereafter concerning God, his essence, perfections, persons, works, and worship, and everything relative to him, will be taken out of the sacred scriptures, and proved by them; it will be necessary, before I proceed any further, to secure the ground I go upon; and establish the divine authority of them; and show that they are a perfect, plain, and sure rule to go by; and are the standard of faith and practice. I shall,

I. Observe the divine authority of the Scriptures, or show, that they are from God, or inspired by him; they lay in a claim to a divine original; and the claim is just, as will be seen.

They are called the law, or doctrine of the Lord; the testimony of the Lord; the statutes of the Lord; the commandment of the

Lord; the fear of the Lord; and the judgments of the Lord; by the Psalmist David.

Psalms 19:7-9 The law of the LORD *is* perfect, converting the soul: the testimony of the LORD *is* sure, making wise the simple. The statutes of the LORD *are* right, rejoicing the heart: the commandment of the LORD *is* pure, enlightening the eyes. The fear of the LORD *is* clean, enduring for ever: the judgments of the LORD *are* true *and* righteous altogether.

And the prophets frequently introduce their prophecies and discourses, by saying, "the word of the Lord came" to them; and with a, "thus saith the Lord."

Isaiah 1:10 Hear *the word of the LORD*, ye rulers of Sodom; give ear unto the law of our God, ye people of Gomorrah.

Jeremiah 2:1-2 Moreover *the word of the LORD* came to me, saying, Go and cry in the ears of Jerusalem, saying, Thus saith the LORD;

And our Lord expressly calls the scripture the word of God,

John 10:35 If he called them gods, unto whom *the word of God* came, and the scripture cannot be broken;

Hebrews 1:1-2 God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, Hath in these last days spoken unto us by *his* Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds;

And is represented as the oracles of God, and may be safely consulted and depended on; and according to which men are to speak,

Romans 3:2 Much every way: chiefly, because that unto them were committed *the oracles of God*.

I Peter 1:11 Searching what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow.

But before I proceed any further, in the proof of the divinity of the sacred Scriptures, I shall premise the following things.

First, That when we say that the Scriptures are the word of God, or that this word is of God; we do not mean that it was spoken with an articulate voice by him; or written immediately by the finger of God.

The law of the Decalogue, or the Ten Commands, indeed, were articulately spoken by him, and the writing of them was the writing of God.

Exodus 20:1 And God spake all these words, saying,

Exodus 31:18 And he gave unto Moses, when he had made an end of communing with him upon mount Sinai, two tables of testimony, tables of stone, written with the finger of God.

Exodus 32:15 And Moses turned, and went down from the mount, and the two tables of the testimony *were* in his hand: the tables *were* written on both their sides; on the one side and on the other *were* they written.

It is enough, that they were bid to write what he delivered to them, as Moses and others were ordered to do.

Deuteronomy 31:19 Now therefore *write ye this song* for you, and teach it the children of Israel: put it in their mouths, that this song may be a witness for me against the children of Israel.

Jeremiah 30:2 Thus speaketh the LORD God of Israel, saying, *Write thee all the words* that I have spoken unto thee in a book.

Habakkuk 2:2 And the LORD answered me, and said, *Write the vision*, and make *it* plain upon tables, that he may run that readeth it.

Revelation 1:11 Saying, I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last: and, *What thou seest, write in a book*, and send *it* unto the seven churches which are in Asia; unto Ephesus, and unto Smyrna, and unto Pergamos, and unto Thyatira, and unto Sardis, and unto Philadelphia, and unto Laodicea.

Revelation 1:19 *Write the things* which thou hast seen, and the things which are, and the things which shall be hereafter.

And what was ordered by the Lord to be written, it is the same as if it was written by himself; and especially since the penmen wrote as they were directed, dictated and inspired by him, and “spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.”

II Peter 1:21 For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake *as they were* moved by the Holy Ghost.

Secondly, Not all that is contained in the scriptures is of God. Some are the words of others; yea, some are the speeches of Satan, and very bad ones too

Job 1:9-11 Then Satan answered the LORD, and said, Doth Job fear God for nought? Hast not thou made an hedge about him, and about his house, and about all that he hath on every side? thou hast blessed the work of his hands, and his substance is increased in the land. But put forth thine hand now, and touch all that he hath, and he will curse thee to thy face.

Job 2:4-6 And Satan answered the LORD, and said, Skin for skin, yea, all that a man hath will he give for his life. But put forth thine hand now, and touch his bone and his flesh, and he will curse thee to thy face. And the LORD said unto Satan, Behold, he *is* in thine hand; but save his life.

So when he tempted our Lord, and moved him to cast himself down from the pinnacle of the temple, and destroy himself; and not succeeding in that, urged him to fall down and worship him.

Matthew 4:5 Then the devil taketh him up into the holy city, and setteth him on a pinnacle of the temple,

Matthew 4:9 And saith unto him, All these things will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me.

But the penmen of these books, in which these speeches are, were moved and directed by the Lord to commit them to writing; so that though they themselves are not the word of God; yet that they are written, and are on record, is of God.

In the writings and discourses of the apostle Paul, are several quotations out of heathen authors.

Acts 17:28 For in him we live, and move, and have our being; as certain also of your own poets have said, For we are also his offspring.

I Corinthians 15:33 Be not deceived: evil communications corrupt good manners.

Titus 1:12 One of themselves, even a prophet of their own, said, The Cretians are always liars, evil beasts, slow bellies.

Thirdly, Let it be observed, that not the matter of the Scriptures only, but the very words in which they are written are of God.

Some who are not for organic inspiration, as they call it, think that the sacred writers were only furnished of God with matter, and had general ideas of things given them, and were left to clothe them with their own words, and to use their own style; which they suppose accounts for the difference of style to be observed in them.

But if this was the case, as it sometimes is with men, that they have clear and satisfactory ideas of things in their own minds, and yet are at a loss for proper words to express and convey the sense of them to others; so it might be with the sacred writers, if words were not suggested to them, as well as matter.

It seems, therefore, most agreeable, that words also, as well as matter, were given by divine inspiration; and as for difference of style, as it was easy with God to direct to the use of proper words, so he could accommodate himself to the style such persons were wont to use, and which was natural to them.

II Samuel 23:2 The Spirit of the LORD spake by me, and his word *was* in my tongue.

I Corinthians 2:13 Which things also we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth; comparing spiritual things with spiritual.

1d. Fourthly, This is to be understood of the Scriptures, as in the original languages in which they were written, and not of translations; unless it could be thought, that the translators of the Bible into each of the languages of the nations into which it has been translated, were under the divine inspiration also in translating.

To the Bible, in its original languages, is every translation to be brought, and by it to be examined, tried and judged, and to be corrected and amended.

Let not now any be uneasy in their minds about translations on this account, because they are not upon an equality with the original text, and especially about our own. It has been the will of God, and appears absolutely necessary that so it should be, that the Bible should be translated into different languages, that all may read it, and some particularly may receive benefit by it. He has taken care, in his providence, to raise up men capable of such a performance, in various nations, and particularly in ours; for whenever a set of men have been engaged in this work, as were in our nation, men well skilled in the languages, and partakers of the grace of God; of sound principles, and of

integrity and faithfulness, having the fear of God before their eyes; they have never failed of producing a translation worthy of acceptance.

Bless God, therefore, and be thankful that God has, in his providence, raised up such men to translate the Bible into the mother tongue of every nation, and particularly into ours.

Having premised these things, I now proceed to prove the claim of the Scriptures to a divine authority, which may be evinced from the following things.

First, From the subject matter of them.

1. In general there is nothing in them unworthy of God; nothing contrary to his truth and faithfulness, to his purity and holiness, to his wisdom and goodness, or to any of the perfections of his nature; there is no falsehood nor contradiction in them.

Daniel 10:21 But I will shew thee that which is noted in the scripture of truth.

Ephesians 1:13 In whom ye also *trusted*, after that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation.

There is nothing impious or impure, absurd or ridiculous in them; as in the Al-koran of Mahomet; which is stuffed with impurities and impieties, as well as with things foolish and absurd: or as in the Pagan treatises of their gods; which abound with tales of their murders, adulteries, and thefts; and the impure rites and ceremonies, and in human sacrifices used in the worship of them.

2. The things contained in the Scriptures are pure and holy; the Holy Spirit dictated them, holy men spoke and wrote them, and they are justly called "holy Scriptures," and plainly show they came from the holy God.

—
Romans 1:2 (Which he had promised afore by his prophets in the holy scriptures.)

The doctrines of them are holy; they are doctrines according to godliness, and tend to promote it; they teach and influence men to deny ungodliness and worldly lusts, and to live soberly, righteously, and godly:

They are indeed, by some ignorant persons, charged with licentiousness; but the charge, as it is false, it is easily removed, by observing the nature of the doctrines, and the effects of them.

Romans 7:12 Wherefore the law *is* holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good.

It is holy in its own nature, and requires nothing but what is for the good of men, what is but a reasonable service to God, and what is just between man and man.

The style of the Scriptures is pure and holy, chaste and clean, free from all levity and obscenity, and from everything that might be offensive to the ear of the chaste and pious.

3. There are some things recorded in the Scriptures, which could never have been known but by revelation from God himself; as particularly, with respect to the creation of the world, and the original of mankind; that the world was made out of nothing; when made, how, and in what form and order, and how long it was in making.

Yea, the Scriptures inform us what was done in eternity, which none but God himself could reveal.

Ephesians 1:4 According as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love:

And also the council held between the divine Persons, concerning the salvation of man.

Zechariah 6:13 Even he shall build the temple of the LORD; and he shall bear the glory, and shall sit and rule upon his

throne; and he shall be a priest upon his throne: and the counsel of peace shall be between them both.

Proverbs 8:22 The LORD possessed me in the beginning of his way, before his works of old. Proverbs 8:23 I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was.

Micah 5:2 But thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, *though* thou be little among the thousands of Judah, *yet* out of thee shall he come forth unto me *that is* to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth *have been* from of old, from everlasting.

II Timothy 1:9 Who hath saved us, and called *us* with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began,

Ephesians 1:3-4 Blessed *be* the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly *places* in Christ: According as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love. All which could never have been known unless God himself had revealed them.

4. There are some things recorded in the Scriptures as to the future, which God only could foreknow would be.

Some of them relate to particular persons, and contingent events; as Josiah, who was prophesied of by name, as to be born to the house of David, three or four hundred years before his birth, and what he should do; "offer up the idolatrous priests on Jeroboam's altar, and burn mens' bones on it," all which exactly came to pass.

I Kings 13:2 And he cried against the altar in the word of the LORD, and said, O altar, altar, thus saith the LORD; Behold, a child shall be born unto the house of David, Josiah by name; and upon thee shall he offer the priests of the high places that burn incense upon thee, and men's bones shall be burnt upon thee.

II Kings 23:17,20 Then he said, What title *is* that that I see? And the men of the city told him, *It is* the sepulchre of the man of God, which came from Judah, and proclaimed these things that thou hast done against the altar of Bethel....And he slew all the priests of the high places that *were* there upon the altars, and burned men's bones upon them, and returned to Jerusalem.

Cyrus, king of Persia, also was prophesied of by name, more than two hundred years before his birth, and what he should do.

Isaiah 44:28 That saith of Cyrus, *He is* my shepherd, and shall perform all my pleasure: even saying to Jerusalem, Thou shalt be built; and to the temple, Thy foundation shall be laid.

Isaiah 45:1,13 Thus saith the LORD to his anointed, to Cyrus, whose right hand I have holden, to subdue nations before him; and I will loose the loins of kings, to open before him the two leaved gates; and the gates shall not be shut....I have raised him up in righteousness, and I will direct all his ways: he shall build my city, and he shall let go my captives, not for price nor reward, saith the LORD of hosts.

Ezra 1:1-3 Now in the first year of Cyrus king of Persia, that the word of the LORD by the mouth of Jeremiah might be fulfilled, the LORD stirred up the spirit of Cyrus king of Persia, that he made a proclamation throughout all his kingdom, and *put it* also in writing, saying, Thus saith Cyrus king of Persia, The LORD God of heaven hath given me all the kingdoms of the earth; and he hath charged me to build him an house at Jerusalem, which *is* in Judah. Who *is there* among you of all his people? his God be with him, and let him go up to Jerusalem, which *is* in Judah, and build the house of the LORD God of Israel, (he *is* the God,) which *is* in Jerusalem.

Others relate to kingdoms and states, and what should befall them; as the Egyptians, Moabites, Ammonites, Edomites, Assyrians, Babylonians, and others; of whose destruction Isaiah and Jeremiah prophesied, and who now are no more, have not so much as a name on earth.

Particularly many things are foretold concerning the Jews; as their descent into Egypt, abode and bondage there, and coming from thence with great riches; which was made known to their great ancestor Abraham.

Genesis 15:14 And also that nation, whom they shall serve, will I judge: and afterward shall they come out with great substance.

Exodus 12:40-41 Now the sojourning of the children of Israel, who dwelt in Egypt, was four hundred and thirty years. And it came to pass at the end of the four hundred and thirty years, even the selfsame day it came to pass, that all the hosts of the LORD went out from the land of Egypt.

Their captivity in Babylon, and return from thence after seventy years,

Jeremiah 29:10-11 For thus saith the LORD, That after seventy years be accomplished at Babylon I will visit you, and perform my good word toward you, in causing you to return to this place. For I know the thoughts that I think toward you, saith the LORD, thoughts of peace, and not of evil, to give you an expected end.

Having premised these things, I now proceed to prove the claim of the Scriptures to a divine authority, which may be evinced from the following things.

First, From the subject matter of them.

1. In general there is nothing in them unworthy of God; nothing contrary to his truth and faithfulness, to his purity and holiness, to his wisdom and goodness, or to any of the perfections of his nature; there is no falsehood nor contradiction in them.

Daniel 10:21 But I will shew thee that which is noted in *the scripture of truth.*

Ephesians 1:13 In whom ye also *trusted*, after that ye heard *the word of truth*, the gospel of your salvation.

There is nothing impious or impure, absurd or ridiculous in them; as in the Al-koran of Mahomet; which is stuffed with impurities and impieties, as well as with things foolish and absurd: or as in the Pagan treatises of their gods; which abound with tales of their murders, adulteries, and thefts; and the impure rites and ceremonies, and in human sacrifices used in the worship of them.

2. The things contained in the Scriptures are pure and holy; the Holy Spirit dictated them, holy men spoke and wrote them, and they are justly called "holy Scriptures," and plainly show they came from the holy God.

Romans 1:2 (Which he had promised afore by his prophets in *the holy scriptures*.)

The doctrines of them are holy; they are doctrines according to godliness, and tend to promote it; they teach and influence men to deny ungodliness and worldly lusts, and to live soberly, righteously, and godly. They are indeed, by some ignorant persons, charged with licentiousness; but the charge, as it is false, it is easily removed, by observing the nature of the doctrines, and the effects of them.

Romans 7:12 Wherefore *the law is holy*, and the commandment holy, and just, and good.

It is holy in its own nature, and requires nothing but what is for the good of men, what is but a reasonable service to God, and what is just between man and man.

The style of the Scriptures is pure and holy, chaste and clean, free from all levity and obscenity, and from everything that might be offensive to the ear of the chaste and pious.

3. There are some things recorded in the Scriptures, which could never have been known but by revelation from God himself; as particularly, with respect to the creation

of the world, and the original of mankind; that the world was made out of nothing; when made, how, and in what form and order, and how long it was in making.

Yea, the Scriptures inform us what was done in eternity, which none but God himself could reveal.

Ephesians 1:4 According as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love:

And also the council held between the divine Persons, concerning the salvation of man.

Zechariah 6:13 Even he shall build the temple of the LORD; and he shall bear the glory, and shall sit and rule upon his throne; and he shall be a priest upon his throne: and the counsel of peace shall be between them both.

Proverbs 8:22-23 The LORD possessed me in the beginning of his way, before his works of old. I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was.

Micah 5:2 But thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, *though* thou be little among the thousands of Judah, *yet* out of thee shall he come forth unto me *that is* to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth *have been* from of old, from everlasting.

II Timothy 1:9 Who hath saved us, and called *us* with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began.

Ephesians 1:3-4 Blessed *be* the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly *places* in Christ: According as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love.

4. There are some things recorded in the Scriptures as to the future, which God only could foreknow would be.

Some of them relate to particular persons, and contingent events; as Josiah, who was prophesied of by name, as to be born to the house of David, three or four hundred years before his birth, and what he should do; "offer up the idolatrous priests on Jeroboam's altar, and burn mens' bones on it," all which exactly came to pass.

I Kings 13:2 And he cried against the altar in the word of the LORD, and said, O altar, altar, thus saith the LORD; Behold, a child shall be born unto the house of David, Josiah by name; and upon thee shall he offer the priests of the high places that burn incense upon thee, and men's bones shall be burnt upon thee.

II Kings 23:17,20 Then he said, What title *is* that that I see? And the men of the city told him, *It is* the sepulchre of the man of God, which came from Judah, and proclaimed these things that thou hast done against the altar of Bethel....And he slew all the priests of the high places that *were* there upon the altars, and burned men's bones upon them, and returned to Jerusalem.

Daniel 9:2 In the first year of his reign I Daniel understood by books the number of the years, whereof the word of the LORD came to Jeremiah the prophet, that he would accomplish seventy years in the desolations of Jerusalem.

And all their miseries and afflictions in their last destruction, and present state, are prophetically described in Deuteronomy 28. And their exact case, for about nineteen hundred years, is expressed in a few words; as well as their future conversion is prophesied of,

Hosea 3:4-5 For the children of Israel shall abide many days without a king, and without a prince, and without a sacrifice, and without an image, and without an ephod, and *without* teraphim: Afterward shall the children of Israel return, and seek the LORD their God, and David their king; and shall fear the LORD and his goodness in the latter days.

But especially the prophecies concerning Christ, are worthy of notice; his incarnation and birth of a virgin; the place where he should be born; of what nation, tribe, and family; his sufferings and death, his burial, resurrection, ascension to heaven, and session at the right hand of God: All which are plainly pointed out in prophecy; and which, with many other things relating to him, have had their exact accomplishment in him.

To which might be added, predictions of the calling of the Gentiles, by many of the prophets; and the abolition of paganism in the Roman empire; the rise, power, and ruin of antichrist; which are particularly spoken of in the book of the Revelation; great part of which prophetic book has been already fulfilled.

5. There are some things in the Scriptures, which, though not contrary to reason, yet are above the capacity of men ever to have made a discovery of; as the Trinity of persons in the Godhead; the eternal, generation of the Son of God; his incarnation and birth of a virgin; the union of the human nature to his divine person; which is, "without controversy, the great mystery of godliness," the regeneration of men by the Spirit of God; and the resurrection of the same body at the last day.

6. The things contained in the Scriptures, whether doctrines or facts, are harmonious; the doctrines, though delivered at sundry times, and in divers manners, are all of a piece; no yea and nay, no discord and disagreement among them. The two Testaments "are like two young roes that are twins."

Song of Solomon 4:5 Thy two breasts *are* like two young roes that are twins, which feed among the lilies.

Song of Solomon 7:3 Thy two breasts *are* like two young roes *that are* twins.

And to the Cherubim over the mercy seat, which were of one beaten piece, were exactly alike, and looked to one another, and both to the mercy seat; a type of Christ.

And as to historical facts, what seeming contradictions may be observed in any of them, are easily reconciled, with a little care, diligence, and study.

Secondly, The style and manner in which the Scriptures are written, is a further evidence of their divine original.

The majesty in which they appear, the authoritative manner in which they are delivered; not asking, but demanding, attention and assent unto them; and which commands reverence and acceptance of them; the figures used to engage hereunto are inimitable by creatures; and such as would be daring and presumptuous for any but God to use.

Deuteronomy 32:1 Give ear, O ye heavens, and I will speak; and hear, O earth, the words of my mouth.

Isaiah 1:2 Hear, O heavens, and give ear, O earth: for the LORD hath spoken.

The sublimity of the style is such as exceeds all other writings:

That early composition, the book of Job, abounds with such strong and lofty expressions as are not to be found in human writings, especially the speeches Jehovah himself delivered out of the whirlwind, Job 38-41.

The book of Psalms is full of bright figures and inimitable language, particularly see Psalms 18:7-15; 29:3-10; 113:3-8; 139:7-12. The prophecies of Isaiah are fraught with a rich treasure of divine elocution, which surpasses all that is to be met with in the writings of men.

And it is remarkable, that in some of the inspired writers, who have been bred up in a rustic manner, are found some of the most grand images, and lively picturesque, and highest flights of language, as in Amos the herdman,

Amos 4:13 For, lo, he that formeth the mountains, and createth the wind, and declareth unto man what *is* his thought, that maketh the morning darkness, and treadeth upon the high places of the earth, The LORD, The God of hosts, *is* his name.

Amos 9:2 Though they dig into hell, thence shall mine hand take them; though they climb up to heaven, thence will I bring them down:

Amos 9:6 *It is* he that buildeth his stories in the heaven, and hath founded his troop in the earth; he that calleth for the waters of the sea, and poureth them out upon the face of the earth: The LORD *is* his name.

Thirdly, Another argument for the divine authority of the Scriptures may be taken from the penmen and writers of them.

1. Many of these were men of no education, in a low station of life, and were taken from the flock, or from the herd, or from their nets, or other mean employments; and what they wrote, both as to matter and manner, were above and beyond their ordinary capacities, and therefore must be of God. What they wrote could not be of themselves; but they "spake and wrote as they were moved by the Holy Ghost."

2. They lived in different times and places, and were of different interests and capacities, and in different conditions and circumstances; and yet they were all of the same sentiment.

They speak and write the same things, deliver out the same truths and doctrines, and enjoin the same moral duties of religion, and the same positive precepts, according to the different dispensations under which they were; and this shows that they were dictated, and influenced in all, by the same Spirit of God.

3. They were holy and good men, partakers of the grace of God; and therefore could never give into an imposture,

nor deliver out a known lie, nor obtrude a falsehood upon the world.

4. They appear to be plain, honest, and faithful men; they conceal not their own failings and infirmities.

So Moses published his own weaknesses and mistakes, and spared not the blemishes of his family; not of his more remote ancestor Levi, in the case of the Shechemites; nor of his immediate parents, their illegal marriage; nor of his favorite people the Israelites, their rebellion and obstinacy, and idolatry.

5. They were disinterested men; they sought not popular applause, nor worldly wealth, nor to aggrandize themselves and their families.

Moses, when it was offered to him, by the Lord, to make of him a great nation, and cut off the people of Israel for their sins, refused it more than once, preferring the public good of that people to his own advantage. And though he was king in Jeshurun, he was not careful to have any of his posterity to succeed him in his office. Though the priesthood was conferred on Aaron his brother, and his sons, yet no other provision was made for his own family, than to attend the lower services of the tabernacle in common with the rest of his tribe.

And of this disposition were the apostles of Christ, who left all, and followed him; and sought not the wealth of men, nor honour from them. On the contrary, [they] exposed themselves to reproach, poverty, vexation, and trouble; yea, to persecution, and death itself; which they would never have done, had they not been fully satisfied of their mission of God, and of their message from him. And therefore [they] could not be deterred from speaking and writing in his name, by the terrors and menaces of men, and by all the afflictions, bonds, and persecution, and death in every shape, which awaited them. In short, the writers of the Scriptures seem to be men that neither could be imposed upon themselves, nor sought to impose on others.

Fifthly, The testimony bore to the Scriptures by miracles, abundantly confirm the genuineness of them, and that they are of God.

Mark 16:20 And they went forth, and preached every where, the Lord working with *them*, and confirming the word with signs following. Amen.

Hebrews 2:3 How shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation; which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard *him*; Hebrews 2:4 God also bearing *them* witness, both with signs and wonders, and with divers miracles, and gifts of the Holy Ghost, according to his own will?

Sixthly, The hatred and opposition of men, and the enmity of devils, to them, afford no inconsiderable argument in favour of the divinity of them;

For were they of men, they would not have such a disgust at them, and disapprobation of them, and make such opposition to them.

John 4:5-6 They are of the world: therefore speak they of the world, and the world heareth them. We are of God: he that knoweth God heareth us; he that is not of God heareth not us. Hereby know we the spirit of truth, and the spirit of error.

And if these writings were of Satan, and the work of forgery, imposture, and deceit, that wicked spirit would never have shown such despite unto them, nor have taken such pains to tempt men, and prevail upon them not to read them; and to persuade others to use their utmost efforts to corrupt or destroy them, and root them out of the world.

Seventhly, The awful judgments of God on such who have despised them, and have endeavoured to destroy them, are no mean evidence that they are of God.

[He] hereby has shown his resentment of such conduct and behaviour; which might be illustrated by the instances of

Antiochus Epiphanes, king of Syria, who cut to pieces the copies of the book of the law wherever he found them, and burnt them, and put to death all with whom they were.

"Now the five and twentieth day of the month they did sacrifice upon the idol altar, which was upon the altar of God. At which time according to the commandment they put to death certain women, that had caused their children to be circumcised." (1 Maccabees 1:59,60)

This man died of a violent disorder in his bowels, his body was covered with worms, his flesh flaked off, and was attended with an intolerable stench, "But the Lord Almighty, the God of Israel, smote him with an incurable and invisible plague: or as soon as he had spoken these words, a pain of the bowels that was remediless came upon him, and sore torments of the inner parts." (2 Maccabees 9:5)

"So that the worms rose up out of the body of this wicked man, and whiles he lived in sorrow and pain, his flesh fell away, and the filthiness of his smell was noisome to all his army." (2 Maccabees 9:9)

And of Dioclesian, the Roman emperor, who by an edict ordered all the sacred books to be burnt, that, if possible, he might root Christianity out of the world; and once fancied that he had done it. But when he found he had not accomplished his design, through madness and despair, in the height of his imperial glory, abdicated the empire, and retired to a private life, and at last poisoned himself.

The one showed a despite to the books of the Old Testament, the other more especially to the books of the New Testament; and both were highly resented by the divine Being, who hereby showed himself the author of both. Many more instances might be produced, but these may suffice.

Eighthly, The antiquity and continuance of these writings may be improved into an argument in favor of them:

Tertullian says, "That which is most ancient is most true." Men from the beginning had knowledge of God, and of the way of salvation, and in what manner God was to be worshiped; which could not be without a revelation; though for some time it was not delivered in writing.

The antediluvian patriarchs had it, and so the postdiluvian ones, to the times of Moses; whose writings are the first, and are more ancient than any profane writings, by many hundreds of years. The most early of that sort extant, are the poems of Homer and Hesiod, who flourished about the times of Isaiah.

And the divine writings have been preserved notwithstanding the malice of men and devils, some of them some thousands of years, when other writings are lost and perished.

To which may be added, that the Scriptures receive no small evidence of the authority of them, from the testimonies of many heathen writers agreeing with them, with respect to the chronology, geography, and history of them; as concerning the creation of the world, Noah's flood, the tower of Babel, the confusion of languages, the peopling the earth by the sons of Noah, the burning of Sodom and Gomorrah; with many other things respecting the people of Israel, their origin, laws, etc.

II. The Perfection of the Scriptures.

When we assert the perfection of them, we do not mean that they contain a perfect account of all that God has done from the beginning of time, in the dispensations of his providence in the world, and in the distributions of his grace to the sons of men. They relate much of the state and condition of the church of God in all ages, and as it will be to the end of time. Nor that they contain all the discourses, exhortations, admonitions, cautions, and counsels of the prophets, delivered to the people of Israel, in each of the ages of time. Nor all the sermons of the apostles, which they preached to the Jews, and among the Gentiles: nor are all that were said and done by our Lord Jesus Christ recorded in them. There were many signs done by him which are not written, which if they should be written, as the

evangelist observes, "even the world itself could not contain the books that should be written."

John 20:30 And many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book:

John 21:25 And there are also many other things which Jesus did, the which, if they should be written every one, I suppose that even the world itself could not contain the books that should be written. Amen.

But then they relate all things necessary to salvation, everything that ought to be believed and done; and are a complete, perfect standard of faith and practice.

Which may be proved,

First, From the Author of them, who is God; they are the word of God, and are "given by inspiration of God."

[This is] asserted in them, and has been clearly shown. Now since God is the author of them, who is a perfect Being, in whom is "no darkness at all;" not of ignorance, error, and imperfection. They coming from him, must be free from everything of that kind; "he is a rock," and "his work is perfect;" as his works of creation, providence, and redemption; so this work of the Scriptures.

Secondly, From the name they go by, a Testament.

We commonly divide the Scriptures into the Books of the Old Testament, and the Books of the New Testament; and that there was a First and a Second Testament, an Old and a New one, is plainly intimated.

Hebrews 9:15 And for this cause he is the mediator of *the new testament*, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions *that were under the first testament*, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance.

Now a man's testament, or will, contains the whole of his will and pleasure, concerning the disposition of his estate to whomsoever he pleases, or it is not properly his will and testament.

Galatians 3:15 Brethren, I speak after the manner of men; Though *it be* but a man's covenant, yet *if it be* confirmed, no man disannulleth, or addeth thereto.

Such the Scriptures are; they contain the whole will of God, about the disposition of the blessings of grace, and of the heavenly inheritance, to those who are appointed by him heirs. And being ratified and confirmed by the blood of Christ, are so sure and firm as not to be disannulled, and so perfect that nothing can be added thereunto.

Thirdly, From the epithet of perfect being expressly given unto them.

Psalms 19:7 The law of the LORD *is* perfect, converting the soul: the testimony of the LORD *is* sure, making wise the simple.

[This] is to be understood, not of the Decalogue, or Ten Commands, but of the doctrine of the Lord, as the phrase signifies; even what was delivered in the sacred writings extant in the times of David. And if it was perfect then as to the substance of it, then much more must it appear so by the accession of the prophets, and the books of the New Testament since, in which there are plainer and clearer discoveries of the mind and will of God.

Fourthly, From the essential parts of them, the Law and Gospel; to which two heads the substance of them may be reduced.

The Law is a perfect rule of duty; it contains what is the "good, acceptable, and perfect will of God,"

Romans 12:2 And be not conformed to this world: but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what *is* that good, and acceptable, and perfect, will of God.

What he would have done, or not done; the whole duty of man, both towards God and man; all is comprehended in these two commands, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, etc. and thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

Matthew 22:37-40 Jesus said unto him, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment. And the second *is* like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets.

The Gospel is the *perfect law*, or *doctrine of liberty*, the apostle James speaks of.

James 1:25 But whoso looketh into *the perfect law of liberty*, and continueth therein, he being not a forgetful hearer, but a doer of the work, this man shall be blessed in his deed.

[This] proclaims the glorious liberty of the children of God by Christ; and it is perfect, it treats of perfect things; of perfect justification by Christ; of full pardon of sin through his blood, and complete salvation in him; and contains a perfect plan of truth. Every truth, "as it is in Jesus," all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge: it is the whole, or all the counsel of God, concerning the spiritual and eternal salvation of men.

Acts 20:27 For I have not shunned to declare unto you all the counsel of God.

Fifthly, From the integral parts of them; the Scriptures, containing all the books that were written by divine inspiration.

The books of the Old Testament were complete and perfect in the times of Christ; not one was wanting, nor any mutilated and corrupted. The Jews, he says, "have Moses and the prophets;"

and he himself, "beginning at Moses and all the prophets, expounded in all the scriptures, the things concerning himself."

Luke 16:31 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 24:27 And beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself.

So that they had not only the five books of Moses, but *all* the prophets, and *all* the scriptures of the Old Testament: nay, he affirms, that *till heaven and earth pass, one jot, or one tittle, shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled.*

Matthew 5:18 For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled.

The Jews had the oracles of God committed to their care.

—
Romans 3:2 Much every way: chiefly, because that unto them were committed the oracles of God.

And they have been faithful keepers of them, even some of them to superstition and scrupulous nicety, numbering not only the books and sections, but also the verses, and even the words and letters. And there never was nor now is, any reason to be given why they had corrupted, or would corrupt, any part of the Old Testament. On the coming of Christ it was not their interest to do it; and even before that it was translated into the Greek tongue, by which they would have been detected. And after the coming of Christ they could not do it if they would, copies of it being in the hands of Christians; who were able to correct what they should corrupt, had they done it. And whatever attempts may have been made by any under the Christian name, to corrupt some copies of either Testament, they may be, and have been detected. Or whatever mistakes may be made, through the carelessness of transcribers of copies, they are to be corrected by other copies, which God, in

his providence, has preserved. And, as it seems, for such purposes: so that we have a perfect canon, or rule of faith and practice.

It is objected to the perfection of the books of the Old Testament, that the books of Nathan, Gad, and Iddo, the prophets mentioned therein, are lost; but then it should be proved that these were inspired writings, and, indeed, that they are lost; they may be the same, as some think, with the books of Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles. And it is also objected to those of the New Testament, that there was an epistle from Laodicea.

Colossians 4:16 And when this epistle is read among you, cause that it be read also in the church of the Laodiceans; and that ye likewise read the *epistle* from Laodicea.

And another to the Corinthians, distinct from those we have,

I Corinthians 5:9 I wrote unto you in an epistle not to company with fornicators:

Neither of them now extant. As to the first, that is not an epistle *to* Laodicea, but *from* it; and may refer to one of the epistles, we have, written by the apostle Paul, when at that place. And as to that to the Corinthians, it does not appear to be another and distinct, but the same he was then writing.

But admitting, for argument sake, though it is not to be granted, that some book, or part of the inspired writings is lost; let it be proved, if it can, that any essential article of faith is lost with it, or that there is any such article of faith wanting in the books we have.

If this cannot be proved, then, notwithstanding the pretended defect, we have still a perfect rule of faith; which is what is contended for.

Sixthly, This may be further evinced from the charge that is given, "not to add unto, nor diminish from, any part of the sacred writings, law or gospel."

This is strictly enjoined the Israelites to observe, with respect to the law, and the commandments of it, given them by Moses,

Deuteronomy 4:2 Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish *ought* from it, that ye may keep the commandments of the LORD your God which I command you.

Deuteronomy 12:32 What thing soever I command you, observe to do it: thou shalt not add thereto, nor diminish from it.

And with respect to the Gospel, the apostle Paul says,

Galatians 1:8-9 But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed. As we said before, so say I now again, If any *man* preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed.

And the wise man, or Agur, says of the Scriptures in his time, *Every word of God is pure—add thou not unto his words.* And the apostle and evangelist John, closes the canon of the Scripture with these remarkable words:

Revelation 22:18-19 For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book: And if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and *from* the things which are written in this book.

Now if there is nothing superfluous in the Scriptures, to be taken from them; and nothing defective in them, which requires any addition to them; then they must be perfect.

Seventhly, This may be argued from the sufficiency of them to answer the ends and purposes for which they are

written; as, for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, and for instruction in righteousness.

II Timothy 3:16 All scripture *is* given by inspiration of God, and *is* profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness.

They are sufficiently profitable and useful for doctrine; there is no spiritual truth, nor evangelical doctrine, but what they contain; they are called *the Scriptures of truth*; not only because they come from the God of truth, and whatsoever is in them is truth; but they contain *all truth*; which the Spirit of God, the dictator of them, guides into, and that by means of them.

Daniel 10:21 But I will shew thee that which is noted in the scripture of truth: and *there is* none that holdeth with me in these things, but Michael your prince.

John 16:13 Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth: for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, *that* shall he speak: and he will shew you things to come.

Every doctrine is to be confirmed and established by them. Our Lord proved the things concerning himself, his person, office, sufferings, and death, by them.

Luke 24:25-27 Then he said unto them, O fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken: Ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory? And beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself.

The apostle Paul reasoned out of the Scriptures, in confirmation and defense of the doctrines he taught; *opening and alleging*, that is, from the Scriptures, *that Christ must needs have suffered and risen again from the dead; and that this Jesus is Christ*, whom he preached. And, indeed, he

said *none other things than what Moses and the prophets did say* should be, and which he was able to prove from thence.

Acts 17:2-3 And Paul, as his manner was, went in unto them, and three sabbath days reasoned with them out of the scriptures, Opening and alleging, that Christ must needs have suffered, and risen again from the dead; and that this Jesus, whom I preach unto you, is Christ.

Acts 26:22 Having therefore obtained help of God, I continue unto this day, witnessing both to small and great, saying none other things than those which the prophets and Moses did say should come: That Christ should suffer, *and* that he should be the first that should rise from the dead, and should shew light unto the people, and to the Gentiles.

Every doctrine proposed by men, to the assent of others, is not immediately to be credited; but to be tried and proved, and judged of by the holy Scriptures, which are to be searched, as they were by the Bereans, to see whether those things be so or not. And being found agreeable to them, they are to be believed, and held fast.

Isaiah 8:20 To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, *it is* because *there is* no light in them.

I John 4:1 Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God: because many false prophets are gone out into the world.

I Timothy 5:21 I charge *thee* before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, and the elect angels, that thou observe these things without preferring one before another, doing nothing by partiality.

Acts 17:11 These were more noble than those in Thessalonica, in that they received the word with all readiness of mind, and searched the scriptures daily, whether those things were so.

Matthew 22:37-40 Jesus said unto him, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with

all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment. And the second *is* like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets.

The Gospel is the *perfect law*, or doctrine of *liberty*, the apostle James speaks of.

James 1:25 But whoso looketh into *the perfect law of liberty*, and continueth therein, he being not a forgetful hearer, but a doer of the work, this man shall be blessed in his deed.

[This] proclaims the glorious liberty of the children of God by Christ; and it is perfect, it treats of perfect things; of perfect justification by Christ; of full pardon of sin through his blood, and complete salvation in him; and contains a perfect plan of truth. Every truth, "as it is in Jesus," all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge: it is the whole, or all the counsel of God, concerning the spiritual and eternal salvation of men.

Acts 20:27 For I have not shunned to declare unto you all the counsel of God.

Fifthly, From the integral parts of them; the Scriptures, containing all the books that were written by divine inspiration.

I John 4:1 Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God: because many false prophets are gone out into the world.

I Thessalonians 5:21 Prove all things; hold fast that which is good.

Acts 17:11 These were more noble than those in Thessalonica, in that they received the word with all readiness of mind, and searched the scriptures daily, whether those things were so.

And these are serviceable *for reproof*, for the detection, confutation, and conviction of error. Thus Christ confuted the error of the Sadducees by the Scriptures.

Matthew 22:29-30 Jesus answered and said unto them, Ye do err, not knowing the scriptures, nor the power of God. For in the resurrection they neither marry, nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God in heaven.

And the apostles, with these, warred a good warfare; these were their spiritual weapons. The word of God is the sword of the Spirit, they used in fighting the good fight of faith, against false teachers; by sound doctrine, fetched from thence, they were able to convince and stop the mouths of gainsayers. There never was an error, or heresy, broached in the world yet, but what has been confuted by the Scriptures; and it is not possible that anyone can arise in opposition to "the faith once delivered," but what may receive its refutation from them.

They are also of use for correction of every sin, internal or external; of heart, lip, and life, secret or open; sins of omission or commission; all are forbidden, reprov'd, and condemned by the law of God; which says, *Thou shalt not covet*, nor do this, and that, and the other iniquity.

Romans 7:7 What shall we say then? *Is* the law sin? God forbid. Nay, I had not known sin, but by the law: for I had not known lust, except the law had said, *Thou shalt not covet*.

Romans 13:9 For this, *Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Thou shalt not covet;* and if *there be* any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, *Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself*.

And the Gospel agrees with the law herein; and what is contrary to the law, is to sound doctrine; the Gospel of the grace of God, teaches to "deny ungodliness and worldly lusts."

I Timothy 1:9-11 Knowing this, that the law is not made for a righteous man, but for the lawless and disobedient, for the ungodly and for sinners, for unholy and profane, for murderers of fathers and murderers of mothers, for manslayers, For whoremongers, for them that defile themselves with mankind,

for menstealers, for liars, for perjured persons, and if there be any other thing that is contrary to sound doctrine; According to the glorious gospel of the blessed God, which was committed to my trust.

Titus 2:11-12 For the grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men, Teaching us that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly, in this present world.

There is not a sin that can be named, but what the Scriptures inveigh against, forbid, and correct. And another end answered by them is, that they are *for instruction in righteousness*, in every moral duty of religion, and in every positive precept of God, according to the different dispensations. They instruct in everything of a moral or positive nature, and direct to observe all that is commanded of God and Christ. And now writings by which all such ends are answered, must needs be perfect and complete.

II Timothy 3:17 That the man of God may be perfect, throughly furnished unto all good works.

Not a private good man only, but one in a public character and office; a prophet, a preacher, and minister of the word; in which sense the phrase is used both in the Old and New Testament.

I Samuel 9:6-7 And he said unto him, Behold now, *there is* in this city *a man of God*, and *he is* an honorable man; all that he saith cometh surely to pass: now let us go thither; peradventure he can shew us our way that we should go.

Then said Saul to his servant, But, behold, *if* we go, what shall we bring the man? for the bread is spent in our vessels, and *there is* not a present to bring to the man of God: what have we?

I Timothy 6:11 But thou, *O man of God*, flee these things; and follow after righteousness, godliness, faith, love, patience, meekness.

An acquaintance with these fits him for the work of the ministry, and furnishes him with sound doctrine, to deliver out to the edification of others; by means of these he becomes "a scribe well instructed in the kingdom of God; and to be able to bring out of his treasure things new and old." And if they are able to make such a man perfect, they must be perfect themselves.

Another use of the Scriptures, and an end to be, and which is, answered by them, is not only the learning and instruction of private men, as well as those of a public character, but to make them patient under afflictions, and comfort them in them, and give hope of deliverance out of them, as well as of eternal salvation hereafter.

Romans 15:4 For whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the scriptures might have hope.

Nor is there any afflictive circumstance a good man can come into, but there is a promise in the word of God suitable to him in it; and which may be a means of enlivening, cheering, and comforting him.

Psalms 119:49-50 Remember the word unto thy servant, upon which thou hast caused me to hope. This *is* my comfort in my affliction: for thy word hath quickened me.

Yea, the Scriptures are written to promote and increase the spiritual joy of God's people, and that that joy might be full, and therefore must be full and perfect themselves.

I John 1:3-4 That which we have seen and heard declare we unto you, that ye also may have fellowship with us: and truly our fellowship *is* with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ. And these things write we unto you, that your joy may be full.

III. I proceed, to prove the perspicuity of the Scriptures; for since they are a rule of faith and practice, they should be clear and plain, as they are:

Not that they are all equally clear and plain; some parts of them, and some things in them, are dark and obscure. But then by comparing spiritual things with spiritual, or those more dark passages with those that are clearer, they may be plainly understood. Moreover, the light of the Scriptures has been a growing one; it was but dim under the dispensation of the law of Moses; it became more clear through the writings of the prophets; but most clear under the gospel dispensation; where, "as in a glass, we behold, with open face, the glory of the Lord," and of divine things.

Though in the gospel dispensation, and in such clear writings and epistles as those of the apostle Paul, who used *great plainness of speech*, there are some things *hard to be understood*.

II Corinthians 3:12-18 Seeing then that we have such hope, we use great plainness of speech: And not as Moses, *which* put a vail over his face, that the children of Israel could not stedfastly look to the end of that which is abolished: But their minds were blinded: for until this day remaineth the same vail untaken away in the reading of the old testament; which *vail* is done away in Christ. But even unto this day, when Moses is read, the vail is upon their heart. Nevertheless when it shall turn to the Lord, the vail shall be taken away. Now the Lord is that Spirit: and where the Spirit of the Lord *is*, there *is* liberty. But we all, with open face beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image from glory to glory, *even* as by the Spirit of the Lord.

II Peter 3:16 As also in all *his* epistles, speaking in them of these things; in which are some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as *they do* also the other scriptures, unto their own destruction.

And this is so ordered on purpose to remove all contempt and loathing of the Scriptures, and to humble the arrogance and pride of men, to engage reverence of them, and to excite attention to them, and to put men on searching them with close study, application, and prayer.

Nor is every doctrine of the Scriptures expressed in so many words; as the doctrine of the Trinity of persons in the Godhead; the eternal generation of the Son of God, his incarnation and satisfaction, etc. But then the things themselves signified by them are clear and plain; and there are terms and phrases answerable to them; or they are to be deduced from thence by just and necessary consequences.

Nor are the Scriptures clear and plain to everyone that reads them; they are a sealed book, which neither learned nor unlearned men can understand and interpret without the Spirit of God, the dictator of them. The natural man, by the mere light of nature, and dint of reason, though he may understand the grammatical sense of words; yet he does not understand the meaning of them, at least in a spiritual way, with application to himself. And so far as he has any notion of them, he has a disgust and contempt of them, for the most part; yet they are so fully expressed and clearly revealed, that if the gospel is hid to any, it is to those that perish, who are left to the native darkness of their minds, and to be "blinded by the god of this world," that the glorious light of the gospel might not shine into them.

Isaiah 29:11-12 And the vision of all is become unto you as the words of a book that is sealed, which *men* deliver to one that is learned, saying, Read this, I pray thee: and he saith, I cannot; for it *is* sealed: And the book is delivered to him that is not learned, saying, Read this, I pray thee: and he saith, I am not learned.

I Corinthians 2:14 But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know *them*, because they are spiritually discerned.

II Corinthians 4:3-4 But if our gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost: In whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them.

But then the Scriptures are plain to them that have a spiritual understanding; who are spiritual men, and judge all things; "to whom it is given to know the mysteries of the kingdom." What are more clear and plain than the precepts of the law, commanding one thing to be done, and forbidding the doing of another? in what plain language are they expressed, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me, etc," "Thou shalt not kill, etc.?" And how clearly is asserted the great and fundamental doctrine of the gospel, "That salvation is alone by Jesus Christ, through the free grace of God; and not of the works of men?" And so everything necessary of belief unto salvation.

In short, as Gregory says, they are like a full and deep river, in which the lamb may walk, and the elephant swim, in different places.

The perspicuity [clarity] of the Scriptures may be argued,

I. From the author of them, God, as has been proved, who is the Father of lights, and therefore what comes from him must be light and clear, in whom is *no darkness at all*.

2. From the several parts of them, and what they are compared unto.

The law, or legal part of them, is represented by things which are light, and give it; *The commandment is a lamp, and the law is light.*

Proverbs 6:23 For the commandment *is* a lamp; and the law *is* light; and reproofs of instruction *are* the way of life.

The commandments of the law, as before observed, are clearly expressed; and are a plain direction to men what to do, or shun.

Psalms 119:105 Thy word *is* a lamp unto my feet, and a light unto my path.

The evangelical part of the Scriptures, or the gospel, is compared to a glass, in which may be clearly beheld, *the glory of the Lord*, of his person, offices, grace, and righteousness; and everyone of the glorious truths and doctrines of it,

II Corinthians 3:18 But we all, with open face beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image from glory to glory, *even* as by the Spirit of the Lord.

Hence the ministers of the word are called the light of the world; because by opening and explaining the Scriptures, they are instruments of enlightening men into the will of God, and the mysteries of his grace.

Matthew 5:14 Ye are the light of the world. A city that is set on an hill cannot be hid.

And the whole of Scripture is the sure word of prophecy, whereunto men do well to take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, and so the means of dispelling the darkness of ignorance, error, and unbelief.

4. From exhortations to all sorts of people to read them, and who are commended for so doing.

Not only the kings of Israel were to read the law of the Lord, but all that people in general; and there was a certain time of the year for them to assemble together to hear it read, men, women, children, and strangers.

But if it was not plain and clear, and easy to be understood, it would have been to no purpose for them to attend it.

Deuteronomy 17:19 And it shall be with him, and he shall read therein all the days of his life: that he may learn to fear the LORD his God, to keep all the words of this law and these statutes, to do them.

Deuteronomy 31:11-13 When all Israel is come to appear before the LORD thy God in the place which he shall choose, thou shalt read this law before all Israel in their hearing. Gather the people together, men, and women, and children, and thy stranger that *is* within thy gates, that they may hear, and that they may learn, and fear the LORD your God, and observe to do all the words of this law: And *that* their children, which have not known *any thing*, may hear, and learn to fear the LORD your God, as long as ye live in the land whither ye go over Jordan to possess it.

Our Lord advises to search the Scriptures, which supposes them legible and intelligible,

John 5:39 Search the scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life: and they are they which testify of me.

Acts 17:11 These were more noble than those in Thessalonica, in that they received the word with all readiness of mind, and searched the scriptures daily, whether those things were so.

Revelation 1:3 Blessed *is* he that readeth, and they that hear the words of this prophecy, and keep those things which are written therein: for the time *is* at hand.

5. From all sorts of persons being capable of reading them, and hearing them read, so as to understand them.

Thus in the times of Nehemiah and Ezra, persons of every sex and age, who were at years of maturity, and had the exercise of their rational faculties, had the law read unto them.

Nehemiah 8:3 And he read therein before the street that was before the water gate from the morning until midday, before the men and the women, and those that could understand; and the ears of all the people *were attentive* unto the book of the law.

Timothy, from a child, knew the holy Scriptures,

II Timothy 3:15 And that from a child thou hast known the holy scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus.

Believers, and regenerate persons of every rank and degree, have knowledge of them, whether fathers, young men, or little children,

I John 2:12-14 I write unto you, little children, because your sins are forgiven you for his name's sake. I write unto you, fathers, because ye have known him *that is* from the beginning. I write unto you, young men, because ye have overcome the wicked one. I write unto you, little children, because ye have known the Father. I have written unto you, fathers, because ye have known him *that is* from the beginning. I have written unto you, young men, because ye are strong, and the word of God abideth in you, and ye have overcome the wicked one.

Nor is the public preaching of the word, and the necessity of it, to be objected to all this; since that is, as for conversion, so for greater edification and comfort, and for establishment in the truth.

I Corinthians 14:3 But he that prophesieth speaketh unto men *to* edification, and exhortation, and comfort.

II Peter 1:12 Wherefore I will not be negligent to put you always in remembrance of these things, though ye know *them*, and be established in the present truth.

Acts 8:30-31 And Philip ran thither to *him*, and heard him read the prophet Esaias, and said, Understandest thou what thou readest? And he said, How can I, except some man should guide me? And he desired Philip that he would come up and sit with him.

Ephesians 4:11-13 And he gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; For the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ: Till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of

God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ.

So that it may be concluded, upon the whole, that the Scriptures are a sure, certain, and infallible rule to go by, with respect to things both to be believed and done.

4. And there seems to be a real necessity of such a rule in the present state of things; and, indeed, a divine revelation was necessary to Adam, in a state of innocence.

How, otherwise, should he have known anything of the manner of his creation; of the state and condition in which he was created, after the image and in the likeness of God; the extent of his power and authority over the creation; by what means his animal life was to be supported; in what manner God was to be served and worshiped by him, especially the parts of positive and instituted worship, both as to matter, time, and place; and particularly the will of God, as to abstinence from eating of the fruit of the tree of knowledge of good and evil?

And if our first parents stood in need of a divine revelation, as a rule and guide to them in their state of integrity; then much more we in our present state of ignorance and depravity. And after the fall, it was owing to divine revelation, that man had any knowledge of the way of his salvation, by the woman's seed; and of the appointment, nature, import, use, and end of sacrifices. And though this revelation was for a time unwritten, and was handed down by tradition to the patriarchs before the flood, and for some time after, while the lives of men were of a long continuance, and it required but few hands to transmit it from one to another; but when mens' lives were shortened, and it was the pleasure of God to make further and clearer discoveries of his mind and will, and to frame new laws and rules of worship, in different dispensations; it seemed proper and necessary to commit them to writing, both that they might remain, and that they might be referred to in case of any doubt or difficulty about them. And particularly that the ends before mentioned might be answered by them, which it was intended should be; namely, the learning and instruction of men in

matters of faith and practice, their peace, comfort, and edification.

Romans 15:4 For whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the scriptures might have hope.

II Timothy 3:15-17 And that from a child thou hast known the holy scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus. All scripture *is* given by inspiration of God, and *is* profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: That the man of God may be perfect, throughly furnished unto all good works.

And the rather, since nothing else was, and nothing less than the Scriptures are, a sufficient rule and guide in matters of religion; even not the light of nature and reason, so much talked of, and so highly exalted; and since it has been set up as such against divine revelation, it may be proper to show the insufficiency of it.

Now the light of nature or reason, is not to be taken in an abstract sense, or considered only in theory, what it has been, may be, or should be, but not subsisting in men or books; as such it can be no rule or guide at all to have recourse unto. And besides, reason in such sense is not opposed to revelation; there is nothing in revelation contrary to reason, though there are things above it, and of which it is not a competent judge, and therefore can be no guide in such matters.

But it must be considered as it is in fact, and as it subsists, either in single individuals, or in whole bodies of men, and these unacquainted with, and unassisted by divine revelation; and then its sufficiency, or rather insufficiency, will soon appear. If it is considered as in individuals, it may easily be observed it is not alike in all, but differs, according to the circumstances of men, climate, constitution, education, etc. Some have a greater share of it than others; and what is agreeable to the reason of one man, is not so to another; and therefore unless it was alike and equal in all, it can be no sure rule or guide to go by.

Let one of the most exalted genius, be chosen, one of the wisest and sagest philosophers of the Gentiles, that has studied nature most, and arrived to the highest degree of reason and good sense. For instance, let Socrates be the man, who is sometimes magnified as *divine*, and in whom the light of nature and reason may be thought to be sublimated and raised to its highest degree, in the Gentile world, without the help of revelation.

And yet, as it was in him, it must be a very deficient rule of faith and practice; for though he asserted the unity of the divine Being, and is said to die a martyr for it; yet he was not clear of the heathenish notions of inferior deities, and of worship to be given them. One of the last things spoken by him was, to desire his friends to fulfil a vow of his, to offer a cock to *Esculapius*, the god of health. And he is most grievously slandered, if he was not guilty of the love of boys in an unnatural way. And besides, he himself bewails the weakness and darkness of human nature, and confessed the want of a guide.

If the light of nature and reason be considered in large bodies of men, in whole nations, it will appear not to be the same in all. Some under the guidance of it have worshiped one sort of deities, and some others; have gone into different modes of worship, and devised different rites and ceremonies, and followed different customs and usages, and even differed in things of a moral nature.

And as their forefathers, guided by this light, introduced and established the said things; they, with all their observations, reflections, and reasonings on them, or increase of light, supposing they had any, were never able, by the light of nature and reason in them, to prevail over, and demolish such idolatry, and such profane and wicked practices that obtained among them.

The insufficiency thereof, as a rule and guide in religion, will further appear by considering the following particulars.

1. That there is a God may be known by the light of nature; but who and what he is, men, destitute of a divine revelation, have been at a loss about.

Multitudes have gone into polytheism, and have embraced for gods almost everything in and under the heavens; not only the sun, moon, and stars, and mortal men, they have deified; but various sorts of beasts, fishes, fowl, creeping things, and even forms of such that never existed. And some that have received the notion of a supreme Being, yet have also acknowledged a numerous train of inferior deities, and have worshiped the creature besides the Creator; whose folly is represented in a true and full light by the apostle.

Romans 1:19-25 Because that which may be known of God is manifest in them; for God hath shewed *it* unto them. For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, *even* his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse: Because that, when they knew God, they glorified *him* not as God, neither were 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 beasts, and creeping things. Wherefore God also gave them up to uncleanness through the lusts of their own hearts, to dishonor 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.

Though the unity of the divine Being, is the voice of reason as well as of revelation; yet by the former, without the latter, we could have had no certain notion, if any at all, of three divine persons subsisting in the unity of the divine essence; and especially of each of the parts they have taken in the economy of man's salvation. As for what Plato and others have been supposed to say concerning a Trinity, it is very lame and imperfect, and what was borrowed from eastern tradition.

2. Though the light of nature may teach men that God, their Creator and Benefactor, is to be worshiped by them; and may direct them to some parts of worship, as to pray unto him for what they want, and praise him for what they have received; yet a perfect plan of worship, acceptable to God, could never have been formed according to that.

Especially that part of it could not have been known which depends upon the arbitrary will of God, and consists of positive precepts and institutions. Hence the Gentiles, left to that, and without a divine revelation, have introduced modes of worship the most absurd and ridiculous, as well as cruel and bloody, even human sacrifices, and the slaughter of their own children, as well as the most shocking scenes of debauchery and uncleanness.

3. By the light of nature men may know that they are not in the same condition and circumstances they originally were.

When they consider things, they cannot imagine that they were made by a holy Being subject to such irregular passions and unruly lusts which now prevail in them; but in what state they were made, and how they fell from that estate, and came into the present depraved one, they know not.

Still less how to get out of it, and to be cured of their irregularities; but divine revelation informs us how man was made upright, and like unto God; and by what means he fell from his uprightness into the sinful state he is in; and how he may be recovered from it, and brought out of it by the regenerating and sanctifying grace of the Spirit of God, and not otherwise.

4. Though, as the apostle says, the Gentiles without the law, "do by nature the things contained in the law; and are a law unto themselves, which show the work of the law written on their hearts; their consciences also bearing witness, and their thoughts the meanwhile accusing, or else excusing one another."

Romans 2:14-15 For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these having not the law, are a law unto themselves; Which shew the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the meanwhile accusing or else excusing one another.

And so have some notion of the difference between moral good and evil; yet this is not so clear and extensive, but that some of the greatest moralists among them gave into the most notorious vices, and allowed of them, and recommended them. Chrysippus allowed of incest; Plato commended community of wives; Socrates a plurality of wives, and which he enforced by his own example; Cicero pleaded for fornication; the Stoics, a grave set of moralists, for the use of obscene words, and recommended suicide as becoming a wise man, and as his duty to commit in some cases. So dim was the light of nature in things of a moral kind!

5. Though in many cases reason taught them that certain vices were disagreeable to God, and resented by him, and he was displeased with them, and would punish for the; and they were very desirous of appeasing him; but then how to reconcile him to them, and recommend themselves to his favor, they were quite ignorant, and therefore took the most shocking and detestable methods for it, as human sacrifices, and particularly burning their innocent infants. But revelation shows us the more excellent way.

6. Men may, by the light of nature, have some notion of sin as an offence to God, and of their need of forgiveness from him; and from a general notion of his mercy, and of some instances of kindness to them, may entertain some faint hope of the pardon of it.

But then they cannot be certain of it from thence, or that even God will pardon sin at all, the sins of any man; and still less how this can be done consistent with his holiness and justice. But through divine revelation we come at a clear and certain

knowledge of this doctrine, and of its consistence with the divine perfections.

7. The light of nature leaves men entirely without the knowledge of the way of salvation by the Son of God. And even without revelation, angels of themselves would not be able to know the way of saving sinful men, or how sinful men can be justified before God; wherefore, in order to know this; they “desire to look into it.”

I Peter 1:12. Unto whom it was revealed, that not unto themselves, but unto us they did minister the things, which are now reported unto you by them that have preached the gospel unto you with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven; *which things the angels desire to look into.*

Some have thought that Socrates had some notion of it; who is made to say, “It is necessary to wait till some one teaches how to behave towards God and men;” but then this respects only a man's outward conduct, and not his salvation. Nor does the philosopher seem to have any clear notion of the instructor, and of the means he should use to instruct, and still less of the certainty of his coming. And besides, the relator of this, Plato, might receive this as a tradition in the East, where it is well known he traveled for knowledge.

But the divine revelation gives an account of this glorious person, not merely as an instructor of men in the way of their duty, but as a Savior of them from their sins; and in what way he has wrought out salvation, by his sacrifice, blood, and righteousness.

8. The light of nature is far from giving any clear and certain account of the immortality of the soul, the resurrection of the body, and a future state of happiness and misery. As for the immortality of the soul, the heathens rather wished it to be true than were fully satisfied of it; they that were for it made use of but mean arguments to prove it; and they themselves believed it only “fide dimidiata, as Minutius Felix expresses it, with a divided faith; they did, as it were, but half believe it.

As for the resurrection of the body, that was denied, as Tertullian says, by every sect of the philosophers: and in what a low manner do they represent the happiness of the future state; by walking in pleasant fields, by sitting under fragrant arbours or bowers, and cooling shades, and by shelter from inclement weather; by viewing flowing fountains and purling and babbling streams; by carnal mirth, feasting, music, and dancing: and the misery of it, by being bound neck and heels together, or in chains, or fastened to rocks, and whipped by furies, with a scourge of serpents, or doomed to some laborious service.

But not the least hint is given of the presence of God with the one, nor of his absence from the other; nor of any sensation of his love or wrath. Let us therefore bless God that we have a better rule and guide to go by; "a more sure word of prophecy to take heed unto." Let us have constant recourse unto it, as the standard of faith and practice; and try every doctrine and practice by it, and believe and act as that directs us, and fetch everything from it that may be for our good, and the glory of God. *Gill's Divinity ppg 8-18*

The Literary Style of the BIBLE: Taken purely for its literary style, the Bible is different than any other book that has ever been written. Especially in its historical portions, the Bible allows its characters to simply stand forth and speak for themselves. It records what they said, what they did, and what were the consequences. It puts the reader in a position as if he were standing off to the side observing and listening to what was going on. That is the next best thing to being there. The characters are so true to life; their strengths and weaknesses are so common to all of us; and their experiences are so believable, so very similar to our own, that we feel to be acquainted with them. Their speeches sound as if they were coming from our own heart rather from words in a book. hlh

Higher Criticism of the BIBLE: Sylvester Hassell: More than two thousand mistakes have been proved to be in the writings of Herodotus, "the Father of Profane History," but not one single mistake has been proven to be in the writings of Moses, or the other inspired authors of the Holy Scriptures. The

few slight apparent discrepancies and errors, paraded and magnified by the so-called "higher critics," who occupy the professorships in the theological seminaries of Europe and America were satisfactorily explained to men of common sense and common honesty hundreds of years ago.

The wild, vague, pretentious ignorant speculation of these disguised infidels in regard to the authorship and dates of the books and the different parts of the books of the Bible are not only self-contradictory, but are opposed to the teachings of all true history and archaeology, as well as of all common sense; and a hundred of their eight hundred theories die every year; and the most radical of these destructives admit that every particle of the Old Testament was written at least a hundred years before the beginning of the Christian Era.

Satan in the subtle serpent, in the Garden of Eden, was the first "higher critic," when he said to Eve, "Yea, hath God said, Ye shall not eat of every tree in the garden?" thus casting doubt upon the word of God. The Highest Critics, Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit, put the stamp of their divine authority on the Scriptures of eternal truth. The Old Testament was "Our Savior's Bible," and was always referred to by him, with the greatest reverence, as the infallible, the literally and perfectly true testimony of God; and more than two thousand times in the Scriptures did the Holy Spirit move the writers to say that not only their thoughts, but their words, were God-breathed or inspired of God. (*Hassell*)

Christ in his sayings recorded in the New Testament, alludes to every period of the Old Dispensation. He speaks of the creation of man, the institution of marriage, the death of Abel, the flood in the days of Noah, the destruction of Sodom, the history of Abraham, the appearance of God in the burning bush, the manna in the wilderness, the miracles of the brazen serpent, the wanderings of David, the glory of Solomon, the ministry of Elijah and Elisha, the sign of Jonah, and the martyrdom of Zechariah—events which embrace the whole range of the Jewish record. Whatever, therefore, may be said by the self-constituted, pretentious, ungodly critics in regard to what they presume to call the incredible myths of the Bible, the children of

God may be a perfectly assured of the literal truth of every word of the Old Testament, as well as of the New Testament, as if every word had been written by the Lord Jesus Christ himself. (*Hassell*)

The Sufficiency of the BIBLE: Lemuel Potter: It is even charged that we do not believe in good works. I stand here to speak for my people. I am going to make a proposition now, and we will have opportunity perhaps to be corrected in this matter. I claim that our people do every good work, as a people, that is enjoined upon the people in the New Testament. If we do not, if there is anything we have overlooked, we will do it if it is pointed out to us.....That is this, our faith is, that if the church and minister will teach exclusively what the Bible teaches, and practice just precisely what it requires, that all the good results that God intended to accomplish by the means will be brought about. That is our position. We are not uneasy for fear that the Lord will leave something back that is essential to the salvation of the people or the glory of his name." (*Lemuel Potter*)

Black Death, The

The BLACK DEATH (Bubonic Plague): Sylvester Hassell The most general and fatal epidemic that ever desolated the world was the Black Death of the fourteenth century. Originating in China, preceded by dreadful droughts, famine, floods, earthquakes and volcanic eruptions, and swarms of locusts, characterized by black carbuncles and buboes all over the body, terminating fatally in two or three days, sometimes announced by dense and awful clouds coming from the east, poisoning the water and the air, maddening some and demoralizing others, the horrible pestilence ravaged the entire Eastern Hemisphere, scattering death everywhere on land and sea. It is believed to be a moderate estimate that fifty millions of human beings perished. The plague prevailed in Europe from 1348 to 1351. **Flagellation** was revived by armies of tens of thousands of people marching from city to city, chanting mournful ditties, and, at stated times, lacerating their bodies with triple scourges armed with points of iron—thus blindly seeking to extirpate their sins and avert the pestilence.

The Jews, so often treated by professed Christians as scape-goats, were tortured and murdered by thousands on the charge of poisoning the wells. The Jews were also repeatedly persecuted, during this century, in France and Spain, for their

wealth and their religion; hundreds of thousands are said to have submitted to compulsory *baptism*; those who refused thus to submit were either banished or massacred, and their property confiscated.” (*Hassell’s History* pg 454)

Black Rock Address, The

The BLACK ROCK ADDRESS: During the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century , the doctrines of Andrew Fuller were spreading among the Baptists in America. More and more people were becoming convinced that millions of souls were perishing eternally for the lack of the gospel. They began to organize Tract Societies, Sunday Schools, and theological seminaries, and like endeavors in order to save men from eternal damnation. On September 28, 1832, an assembly of ministers and others met at the Black Rock Meeting House at Baltimore, Maryland to protest against the innovations. The Black Rock Address was the result of their endeavors.

The Address

To the Particular Baptist Churches of the “Old School” in the United States.

BRETHREN:—It constitutes a new era in the history of the Baptists, when those who would follow the Lord fully, and who therefore manifest a solicitude to be, in all things pertaining to religion conformed to the Pattern showed in the mount, are by Baptists charged with antinomianism, inertness, stupidity, etc., for refusing to go beyond the word of God; but such is the case with us.

Brethren, we would not shun reproach, nor seek an exemption from persecution; but we would affectionately entreat those Baptists who revile us themselves, or who side with such as do, to pause and consider how far they have departed from the ancient principle of the Baptists, and how that in reproaching us they stigmatize the memory of those whom they have been used to honor as eminent and useful servants of Christ; and of those who have borne the brunt of the persecutions leveled against the Baptists in former ages.

For it is a well-known fact that it was in ages past a uniform and distinguishing trait in the character of the Baptists, that they required a "Thus saith the Lord," that is, direct authority from the word of God for the order and practice, as well as the doctrine, they received in religion.

It is true that many things to which we object as departures from the order established by the great head of the church, through the ministry of his apostles, are by others considered to be connected with the very essence of religion, and absolutely necessary to the prosperity of Christ's kingdom. They attach great value to them, because human wisdom suggests their importance. We allow the Head of the church alone to judge for us; we therefore esteem those things to be of no use to the cause of Christ, which he has not himself instituted.

We will notice severally the claims of the principal of these modern inventions, and state some of our objections to them for your candid consideration.

[Tract Societies]

We commence with the Tract Societies. These claim to be extensively useful. Tracts claim their thousands converted. They claim the prerogative of carrying the news of salvation into holes and comers, where the gospel would otherwise never come; of going as on the wings of the wind, carrying salvation in their train; and they claim each to contain gospel enough, should it go where the Bible has never come, to lead a soul to the knowledge of Christ. The nature and extent of these and the like claims, made in favor of tracts by their advocates, constitute a good reason why we should reject them. These claims represent tracts as possessing in these respects a superiority over the Bible, and over the institution of the gospel ministry, which is charging the Great I Amos with a deficiency of wisdom. Yea, they charge God with folly; for why has he given us the extensive revelation contained in the Bible, and given the Holy Spirit to take the things of Christ and show them to us, if a little tract of four pages can lead a soul to the knowledge of Christ? But let us consider the more rational

claims presented by others in favor of tracts, as that they constitute a convenient way of disseminating religious instruction among the more indigent and thoughtless classes of society. Admitting the propriety of this claim, could it be kept separated from other pretensions, still can we submit to the distribution of tracts becoming an order of our churches or our associations, without countenancing the prevalent idea that tracts have become an instituted means approved of God for the conversion of sinners, and hence that the distribution of them is a religious act, and on a footing with supporting the gospel ministry.

If we were to admit that tracts have occasionally been made instrumental by the Holy Ghost for imparting instruction or comfort to inquiring minds, it would by no means imply that tracts are an instituted means of salvation, to speak after the manner of the popular religionists, nor that they should be placed on a footing with the Bible and the preached gospel, in respect to imparting the knowledge of salvation.

Again, we readily admit the propriety of an individual's publishing and distributing, or of several individuals uniting to publish and distribute, what they wish circulated, whether in the form of tracts, or otherwise; but still we cannot admit the propriety of uniting with or upon the plans of existing tract Societies, even laying aside the idea of their being attempted to be palmed upon us as religious institutions, because that upon the plan of these societies, those who unite with them pay their money for publishing and distributing they know not what, under the name of religious truth; and what is worse, they submit to have sent into their families weekly or monthly, and to circulate among their neighbors, anything and everything for religious reading, which the agent or publishing committee may see fit to publish. They thus become accustomed to receive everything as good which comes under the name of religion, whether it be according to the word of God or not; and are trained to the habit of letting others judge for them in matters of religion, and are therefore fast preparing to become the dupes of priestcraft. Can any conscientious follower of the Lamb submit to such plans? If others can, we cannot.

[Sunday Schools]

Sunday Schools come next under consideration. These assume the same high stand as do Tract Societies. They claim the honor of converting their tens of thousands; of leading the tender minds of children to the knowledge of Jesus; of being as properly the instituted means of bringing children to the knowledge of salvation, as the preaching of the gospel that of bringing adults to the same knowledge etc. Such arrogant pretensions we feel bound to oppose. First, because these as well as the pretensions of the Tract Societies are grounded upon the notion that conversion or regeneration is produced by impressions made upon the natural mind by means of religious sentiments instilled into it; and if the Holy Ghost is allowed to be at all concerned in the thing, it is in a way which implies his being somehow blended with the instruction, or necessarily attendant upon it; all of which we know to be wrong.

Secondly, because such schools were never established by the apostles, nor commanded by Christ. There were children in the days of the apostles. The apostles possessed as great a desire for the salvation of souls, as much love to the cause of Christ, and knew as well what God would own for bringing persons to the knowledge of salvation, as any do at this day. We therefore must believe that if these schools were of God, we should find some account of them in the New Testament.

Thirdly, we have exemplified, in the case of the Pharisees, the evil consequences of instructing children in the letter of the Scripture, under the notion that this instruction constitutes a saving acquaintance with the word of God. We see in that instance it only made hypocrites of the Jews; and as the Scriptures declare that Christ's words are spirit and life, and that the natural man receiveth not the things of the spirit of God, we cannot believe it will have any better effect on the children in our day.

The Scriptures enjoin upon parents to bring up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord; but this, instead of countenancing, forbids the idea of parents intrusting the religious education of their children to giddy, unregenerated

young persons, who know no better than to build them up in the belief that they are learning the religion of Christ, and to confirm them in their natural notions of their own goodness.

But while we thus stand opposed to the plan and use of these Sunday schools, and the S.S. Union, in every point, we wish to be distinctly understood that we consider Sunday Schools for the purpose of teaching poor children to read, whereby they may be enabled to read the Scriptures for themselves, in neighborhoods where there is occasion for them, and when properly conducted, without that ostentation so commonly connected with them, to be useful and benevolent institutions, worthy of the patronage of all friends of civil liberty.

[The Bible Society]

We pass to the consideration of the Bible Society. We are aware, brethren, that this institution presents itself to the mind of the Christian as supported by the most plausible pretext. The idea of giving the Bible, without note or comment, to those who are unable to procure it for themselves is, in itself considered, calculated to meet the approbation of all who know the importance of the sacred Scriptures. But under this auspicious guise, we see reared in the case of the American Bible Society, an institution as foreign from anything which the gospel of Christ calls for, as are the kingdoms of this world from the kingdom of Christ. We see a combination formed, in which are united the man of the world, the vaunted professor, and the humble follower of Jesus; the leading characters in politics, the dignitaries in the church, and from them some of every grade, down to the poor servant girl, who can snatch from her hard-earned wages fifty cents a year for the privilege of being a member. We see united in this combination all parties in politics, and all sects in religion; and the distinctive differences of the one, and the sectarian barriers of the other, in part thrown aside to form the union. At the head of this vast body we see placed a few leading characters, who have in their hands the management of its enormous printing establishment, and its immense funds; and the control of its powerful influence, extended by means of agents and auxiliaries to every part of the United States a great religious parade, and forming a theater for the orator, who is ambitious of preferment, either in the pulpit, in the legislative hall, or at the bar, to display his eloquence, and elicit the cheers of the grave assemblage. Now, brethren, to justify our opposition to the Bible Society, it is not necessary for us to say that any of its members have manifested a disposition to employ its power for the subversion of our liberties. It is enough for us to say.

1st, That such a monstrous combination, concentrating so much power in the hands of a few individuals, could never be necessary for supplying the destitute with Bibles. Individual printing establishments would readily be extended so as to supply Bibles to any amount, and in any language that might be called for, and at as cheap a rate as they have ever been sold by the Bible Society.

2nd, That the humble followers of Jesus could accomplish their benevolent wishes for supplying the needy with Bibles, with more effect, and more to their satisfaction, by managing the purchase of them for themselves; and such will never seek popular applause by having their liberality trumpeted abroad through the medium of the Bible Society.

3rd, That the Bible Society, whether we consider it in its monied foundation for membership and directorship, in its hoarding up of funds, in its blending together all distinctions between the church and the world, or in its concentration of power, is an institution never contemplated by the Lord Jesus as connected with his kingdom; therefore not a command concerning it is given in the decree published, nor a sketch of it drawn in the pattern showed.

4th, That its vast combination of worldly power and influence lodged in the hands of a few renders it a dangerous engine against the liberties, both civil and religious, of our country, should it come under control of those disposed so to employ it. The above remarks apply with equal force to the other great national institutions, as the American Tract Society, and Sunday School Union, etc.

[Missions]

We will now call your attention to the subject of Missions. Previous to stating our objections to the mission plans, we will meet some of the false charges brought against us relative to this subject, by a simple and unequivocal declaration, that we do regard as of the first importance the command given of Christ, primarily to his apostles, and through them to his ministers in every age, to "Go into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature," and do feel an earnest desire to be found acting in obedience thereunto, as the providence of God directs our way, and opens a door of utterance for us. We also believe it to be the duty of individuals and churches to contribute according to their abilities, for the support, not only of their pastors, but also of those who go preaching the gospel of Christ among the destitute. But we at the same time contend, that we have no right to depart from the order which

the Master himself has seen fit to lay down, relative to the ministration of the word. We therefore cannot fellowship the plans for spreading the gospel, generally adopted at this day, under the name of Missions; because we consider those plans throughout a subversion of the order marked out in the New Testament.

1st. In reference to the medium by which the gospel minister is to be sent forth to labor in the field. Agreeable to the prophecy going before, that out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem, the Lord has manifestly established the order, that his ministers should be sent forth by the churches. But the mission plan is to send them out by a Mission Society. The gospel society or church is to be composed of baptized believers; the poor are placed on an equal footing with the rich, and money is no consideration, with regard to membership, or church privileges. Not so with Mission Societies; they are so organized that the unregenerate, the enemies of the Cross of Christ, have equal privileges as to membership, etc., with the people of God, and money is the principal consideration; a certain sum entitles to membership, a larger sum to life membership, a still larger to directorship, etc., so that their constitutions, contrary to the direction of James, are partial, saying to the rich man, sit thou here, and to the poor, stand thou there. In Christ's kingdom, all his subjects are sons, and have equal rights, and an equal voice, as well in calling persons into the ministry, as in other things. But the mission administration is all lodged in the hands of a few, who are distinguished from the rest, by great swelling titles, as Presidents, Vice Presidents, etc.

Again, each gospel church acts as the independent kingdom of Christ in calling and sending forth its members into the ministry. Very different from this is the mission order. The mission community being so arranged that from the little Mite Society, to the State Conventions, and from them to the Triennial Convention, and General Board, there is formed a general amalgamation, and a concentration of power in the hands of a dozen dignitaries, who with some exceptions have the control of all the funds designed for supporting ministers among the destitute, at home and abroad, and the sovereign authority to

designate who from among the professed ministers of Christ, shall be supported from those funds, and also to assign them the field of their labors. Yea, the authority to appoint females, and schoolmasters, and printers, and farmers, as such, to be solemnly set apart by prayer, and imposition of hands, as missionaries of the cross, and to be supported from these funds. Whereas in ancient times the preachers of the gospel [were called] by the Holy Ghost, Acts 13:1,4.

2nd. In reference to ministerial support.—the gospel order is to extend support to them who preach the gospel; but the mission plan is to hire persons to preach. The gospel order is not to prefer one before another, and do nothing by partiality. See I Timothy 5:17,21. But the Mission Boards exclude from participation in the benefits of their funds, who do not come under their direction and own their authority, however regularly they may have been set apart according to gospel order, to the work of the ministry, and however zealously they may be laboring to preach the gospel among the destitute.

And what is more, these Boards by their auxiliaries and agents, so scour every hole and corner to scrape up money for their funds that the people think they have nothing left to give a preacher who may come among them alone upon the authority of Christ, and by the fellowship of the church.

Formerly not only did preachers generally feel themselves bound to devote a part of their time to traveling and preaching among the destitute, but the people also among who they came dispensing the word of life, felt themselves bound to contribute something to meet their expenses. These were the days when Christian affections flowed freely. Then the hearts of preachers flowed out toward the people, and the affections of the people were manifested toward the preachers who visited them. There was then more preaching of the gospel among the people at large, according to the number of Baptists, than has ever been since the rage of missions commenced. How different are things now from what they were in those by-gone days. Now, generally speaking, persons who are novices in the gospel, however learned they may profess to be in the sciences, have taken the field in the place of those who, have been taught in

the school of Christ, were capacitated to administer consolation to God's afflicted people.

The missionary, instead of going into such neighborhoods as Christ's ministers used to visit, where they would be most likely to have an opportunity of administering food to the poor of the flock, seeks the more populous villages and towns, where he can attract the most attention, and do the most to promote the cause of missions and other popular institutions. His leading motive, judging from his movements, is not love to souls, but love of fame; hence his anxiety to have something to publish of what he has done, and hence his anxiety to constitute churches, even taking disaffected, disorderly, and as has been the case, excluded persons, to form a church, in the absence of better materials. And the people, instead of glowing with the affection for the preacher as such, feel burdened with the whole system of modern mendicancy, but have no resolution to shake off their oppression, because it is represented so deistical to withhold and so popular to give.

Brethren, we cheerfully acknowledge that there have been some honorable exceptions to the character we have here drawn of the modern missionary, and some societies have existed under the name of Mission Societies which were in some important exceptions from the above drawn sketch; but on a general scale we believe we have given a correct view of the mission plans and operations, and of the effects which have resulted from them, and our hearts really sicken at this state of things. How can we therefore forbear to express our disapprobation of the system that has produced it?

[Colleges and theological schools]

Colleges and Theological Schools next claim our attention. In speaking of colleges, we wish to be distinctly understood that it is not to colleges, collegial education, as such, that we have objection. We would cheerfully afford our own children such an education, did circumstances warrant the measure. But we object, in the first place, to sectarian colleges, as such. The idea of a Baptist College, and of a Presbyterian College, etc., necessarily implies that our distinct views of church

government, of gospel doctrine, of gospel ordinances, are connected with human sciences, a principle which we cannot admit; we believe the kingdom of Christ to be altogether a kingdom not of this world. In the second place, we object to the notion of attaching professorships of divinity to colleges; because this evidently implies that the revelation which God has made of himself is a human science, on a footing with mathematics, philosophy, law, etc., which is contrary to the general tenor of revelation, and indeed to the very idea of a revelation. We perhaps need not add that we have for the same reason strong objection to colleges conferring the degree of Doctor of Divinity, and to preachers receiving it.

Thirdly, we decidedly object to persons, after professing to have been called of the Lord to preach his gospel, going to a college or academy to fit themselves for that service. 1st. Because we believe that Christ possesses perfect knowledge of his own purposes, and of the proper instruments by which to accomplish them. If he has occasion for a man of science, he having power over all flesh, will so order it that the individual shall obtain the requisite learning before he calls him to his service, as was the case with Saul of Tarsus, and others since; and thus avoid subjecting himself to the imputation of weakness. For should Christ call a person to labor in the gospel field, who was unqualified for the work assigned him, it would manifest him to be deficient in knowledge relative to the proper instruments to employ, or defective in power to provide them. 2nd. Because we believe the Lord calls no man to preach his gospel, till he has made him experimentally acquainted with that gospel, and endowed him with the proper measure of gifts, suiting the field he designs him to occupy; and the person giving himself up in obedience to the voice of Christ will find himself learning in Christ's own school. But when a person professedly called of Christ to the gospel ministry, concludes, that, in order to be useful, he must first go and obtain an academical education, he must judge that human science is of more importance in the ministry, than that knowledge and those gifts which Christ imparts to his servants. To act consistently then with his own principles, he will place his chief dependence for usefulness on his scientific knowledge, and aim mostly to display this in his preaching. This person, therefore, will pursue a very different

course in his preaching, from that marked out by the great apostle of the Gentiles, who determined to know nothing among the people save Jesus Christ and him crucified.

As to Theological Schools, we shall at present content ourselves with saying that they are a reflection upon the faithfulness of the Holy Ghost, who is engaged according to the promise of the great Head of the church to lead the disciples into all truth. See John 16:13. Also, that in every age, from the school of Alexandria down to this day, they have been a real pest to the church of Christ. Of this we could produce abundant proof, did the limits of our address admit their insertion.

[Protracted meetings]

We now pass to the last item which we think it necessary particularly to notice, viz.: four days or protracted meetings. Before stating our objections to these, however, we would observe that we consider the example worthy to be imitated which the apostles set of embracing every opportunity, consistently with propriety, for preaching the gospel, wherever they met with an assembly, whether in a Jew's synagogue on the seventh day, or in a Christian assembly on the first day of the week; and the exhortation to be instant in season and out of season, we would gladly accept.

Therefore, whenever circumstances call a congregation together from day to day, as at an association or the like, we would embrace the opportunity of preaching the gospel to them from time to time, so often as they shall come together; but to the principles and plans of protracted meetings, distinguishingly so called, we do decidedly object. The principle of these meetings we cannot fellowship. Regeneration, we believe, is exclusively the work of the Holy Ghost, performed by his divine power, at his own sovereign pleasure, according to the provisions of the everlasting covenant; but these meetings are got up either for the purpose of inducing the Holy Spirit to regenerate multitudes who would otherwise not be converted, or to convert them themselves by the machinery of these meetings, or rather to bring them into their churches by means of exciting their animal feelings, without any regard to their being born again.

Whichever of these may be considered the true ground upon which these meetings are founded, we are at a loss to know how any person who has known what it is to be born again can countenance them.

The plans of these meetings are equally as objectionable; for, in the first place, all doctrinal preaching, or in other words, all illustrations of God's plan of salvation, are excluded professedly from these meetings. Hence they would make believers of their converts without presenting any fixed truths to their minds to believe. Whereas God has chosen his people to salvation through sanctification of the spirit and belief of the truth, II Thessalonians 2:13.

Secondly. The leaders of these meetings fix standards by which to decide of persons' repentance and desire of salvation, which the word of God nowhere warrants, such as rising off their seats, coming to anxious seats, or going to a certain place, etc., whereas the New Testament has given us a standard from which we have no right to depart, viz: that of bringing forth fruits meet for repentance.

Thirdly. They lead the people to depend on mediators other than the Lord Jesus Christ to obtain peace for them, by offering themselves as intercessors for them with God—whereas the Scriptures acknowledge but the one God and one Mediator.

Some may be ready to inquire whether protracted meetings, as such, may not with propriety be held, providing they be held without excluding doctrinal preaching, or introducing any of these new plans. However others may judge and act, we cannot approve of such meetings for the following reason:

1st. Because by appointing and holding a protracted meeting, as such, although we may not carry it to the same excesses to which others do, yet as most people will make no distinction between it and those meetings where all the borrowed machinery from Methodist campmeetings is introduced, we shall generally be considered as countenancing those meetings.

2nd. Because the motives we could have for conforming to the custom of holding these newly invented meetings are such as we think cannot bear the test. For we must be induced thus to conform to the reigning custom either in order to shun the reproach generally attached to those who will not conform to what is popular, or to try the experiment whether our holding a four days' meeting will not induce the Holy Ghost to produce a revival among us commensurate with the strange fire enkindled by others; or else we must be led to this plan from having imbibed the notion that the Holy Ghost is somehow so the creature of human feelings that he is led to regenerate persons by our getting their animal feelings excited; and therefore that in the same proportion as we can by any measure get the feelings of the people aroused, there will be a revival of religion. This latter motive can scarcely be supposed to have place with any who would not go the whole length of every popular measure.—But 1st. We do not believe it becoming a follower of Jesus to seek an exemption from reproach by conforming to the schemes of men. 2nd. We believe the Holy Ghost to be too sacred a being to be trifled with by trying experiments upon him. And 3rd. We believe the Holy Ghost to be God. We would as soon expect that the Father would be induced to predestinate persons to the adoption of children by their feelings being excited, and the Son be induced to redeem them, as that the Holy Ghost would be thus induced to quicken them. These three are one. The purpose of the Father, the redemption of the Son, and the regenerating power of the Holy Ghost, must run in perfect accordance, and commensurate one with the other.

Brethren, we have thus laid before you some of our objections to the popular schemes in religion, and the reasons why we cannot fellowship them. Ponder these things well. Weigh them in the balances of the sanctuary; and then say if they are not such as justify us in standing aloof from those plans of men, and those would-be religious societies, which are bound together, not by the fellowship of the gospel, but by certain money payments. If you cannot for yourselves meet the reproach by separating yourselves from those things which the word of God does not warrant, still allow us the privilege to obey God rather than man.

There is, brethren, one radical difference between us and those who advocate these various institutions which we have noticed to which we wish to call your attention. It is this: they declare the gospel to be a system of means; these means it appears they believe to be of human contrivance; and they act accordingly. But we believe the gospel dispensation to embrace a system of faith and obedience, and we would act according to our belief. We believe, for instance, that the seasons of declension, of darkness, of persecutions, etc., to which the church of Christ is at times subject, are designed by the wise Disposer of all events; not for calling forth the inventive geniuses of men to remove the difficulties, but for trying the faith of God's people in this wisdom, power and faithfulness to sustain his church.

On him, therefore, would we repose our trust, and wait his hour of deliverance, rather than rely upon an arm of flesh. Are we called to the ministry, although we may feel our own insufficiency for the work as sensibly as so others, yet we would go forward in the path of duty marked out, believing that God is able to accomplish his purpose by such instruments as he chooses; that he hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise, and the weak things of the world to confound the things that are mighty; and base things, etc., hath God chosen, that no flesh should glory in his presence.

Though we may not enjoy the satisfaction of seeing multitudes flocking to Jesus under our ministry, yet instead of going in to Hagar to accomplish the promises of God, or of resorting to any of the contrivances of men to make up the deficiency, we would still be content to preach the word, and would be instant in season and out of season; knowing it has pleased God, not by the wisdom of men, but by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe. And this word will not return unto him void, but it shall accomplish that which he please, and prosper in the thing whereunto he sends it.

Faith in God, instead of leading us to contrive ways to help him accomplish his purposes, leads us to inquire what he hath required at our hands, and to be satisfied with doing that as we

find it pointed out in his word; for we know that his purposes shall stand, and he will do all his pleasure. Jesus says, ye believe in God, believe also in me. Ye believe in the power of God to accomplish his purposes, however contrary things may appear to work to your expectations. So believe in my power to accomplish the great work of saving my people. In a word, as the dispensation of God by the hand of Moses, in bringing Israel out of Egypt, and leading them through the wilderness, was from first to last calculated to try Israel's faith in God—so is the dispensation of God by his Son, in bringing his spiritual Israel to be a people to himself.

There being, then, this radical difference between us and the patrons of these modern institutions, the question which has long since been put forth, presents itself afresh for our consideration in all its force. "Can two walk together except they be agreed?" We believe that many who love our Lord Jesus Christ, are engaged in promoting those institutions which they acknowledge to be of modern origin; and they are promoting them too as religious institutions; whereas if they would reflect a little on the origin and nature of the Christian religion, they must be, like us, convinced that this religion must remain unchangeably the same at this day, as we find it delivered in the New Testament. Hence that anything, however highly esteemed it may be among men, which is not found in the New Testament, has no just claim to be acknowledged as belonging to the religion of the religious institutions of Christ.

With all who love our Lord Jesus Christ, in truth, and walk according to apostolic traditions, to gospel order, we would gladly meet in church relation and engage with them in the worship and service of God, as he himself has ordered them. But if they will persist in bringing those institutions for which they can show us no example in the New Testament into the churches or associations, and in making them the order thereof, we shall for conscience sake, be compelled to withdraw from the disorderly walk of such churches, associations, or individuals, that we may not suffer our names to pass as sanctioning those things for which we have no fellowship. And if persons who would pass for preachers, will come to us, bringing the messages of men, etc., a gospel which they have learned in the

schools, instead of that gospel which Christ himself commits unto his servants, and which is not learned of men, they must not be surprised that we cannot acknowledge them as ministers of Christ.

Now, brethren, addressing ourselves to you who profess to be in principle, Particular Baptists, of the "Old School," but who are practicing such things as you have learned only from a New School, it is for you to say, not us, whether we can longer walk in union with you. We regret, as so do you, to see brethren professing the same faith, serving apart. But if you will compel us, either to sanction the traditions and inventions of men, as of religious obligation, or to separate from you, the sin lieth at your door. If you meet us in church to attend only to the order of Christ's house as laid down by himself; and in associations, upon the ancient principles of Baptist Association, i.e. as an associating of churches for keeping up a brotherly correspondence one with another, that they may strengthen each other in the good ways of the Lord; instead of turning the associations into a kind of legislative body, formed for the purpose of contriving plans to help along the work of Christ, and for imposing those contrivances as burdens upon the churches, by resolutions, etc., as is the manner of some, we can still go on with you in peace and fellowship.

Thus, brethren, our appeal is before you. Treat it with contempt if you can despise the cause for which we contend, i.e., conformity to the word of God. But indulge us, we beseech you, so far at least, as at our request to sit down and carefully count the cost on both sides; and see whether this shunning reproach by conforming to men's notions will not in the end be a much more expensive course than to meet reproach at once, by honoring Jesus as your only King, choosing rather to suffer affliction with the people of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season. And rebellion, you know, is as the sin of witchcraft. May the Lord lead you to judge and act upon this subject as you will wish you had done when you come to see the mass of human inventions in connection with the Man of Sin, driven away like the chaff of the summer threshing floor, and that stone which was cut out without hands alone filling the

earth. We subscribe ourselves your servants for Jesus sake.—
COMMITTEE

We, the undersigned, do hereunto set our names, as cordially uniting in all the proceedings of this meeting.

Elders: John Healy, Will. Gilmore, Edward Choat, Samuel Trott, Thomas Poteet, Thomas Barton, Edward J. Rees, Gilbert Beebe, Gabriel Conklin, Henry Moon, William Wilson, James B. Bowen.

Brethren: Abraham Cole, Sen. Lewis R. Cole, Samuel Shawl, Luke Enson, Shadrack Bond, John Ensor, Richard English, Edward Norwood, Joseph Terigoy, Joseph Matten.

Boleyn, Anne

Anne BOLEYN (*See under the CHURCH OF ENGLAND*)

Boniface

BONIFACE: Sylvester Hassell For a hundred years Irish and Frankish monks had been laboring as *missionaries* in Germany; but he who is known in history as “the Apostle of Germany,” and of whom even Smith’s recent and elaborate “Dictionary of Christian Biography” remarks that, “since the days of the great Apostle of the Gentiles no missionary of the gospel has been more eminent in labors, in perils, in self-devotion, in tenacity and elasticity of purpose,” as the English Saxon, Winfried, who, after having been made a *Bishop* by the pope, assumed the name of Boniface, by which he is generally known.

He resolved to preach among his Saxon kindred in Germany, whom he could address in his and their mother tongue, and to convert them from paganism to Roman Catholicism. In 718 he went to Rome and took “a stringent oath of fealty to the pope;” and, “with undoubting faith in the Roman Pontiff,” “with a large stock of relics,” with the powerful protection of Charles Martel, and with a considerable “retinue of monks and nuns,” he set out on his missionary tour through Germany.

He had great apparent success. He baptized thousands, and destroyed great numbers of heathen temples, and erected so-called *church* buildings in their stead; but when he visited his converts again he found them about as Pagan as

ever. The well-informed and candid Lutheran historian, Mosheim, remarks:
“This eminent prelate was an apostle of modern fashion, and had, in many respects, departed from the excellent model exhibited in the conduct and ministry of the primitive and true apostles.

Besides his zeal for the glory and authority of the Roman Pontiff, which equaled, if it did not surpass, his zeal for the service of Christ and the propagation of his religion, many other things, unworthy of a true Christian minister, are laid to his charge. In combating the Pagan superstitions he did not always use those arms with which the ancient heralds of the gospel gained such victories in behalf of the truth; but often employed violence and terror, and sometimes artifice and fraud, in order to multiply the number of Christians.

His epistles, moreover, discover an imperious and arrogant temper, a cunning and insidious turn of mind, an excessive zeal for increasing the honors and pretensions of the sacerdotal order, and a profound ignorance of many things of which the knowledge was absolutely necessary in an apostle, and particularly of the true nature and genius of the Christian religion.” He bound the new German *Church* to Rome more firmly, says Giesler, than the English was.

“During the eighth century,” says Mr. H.B. Smith, “Rome, France, Germany and England came into an alliance which determined the course and progress of history for another seven hundred and fifty years, to the era of the Reformation.”

It is related of Boniface that when, in 755, he was assailed by a band of Pagan Saxons, he forbade his few attendants from fighting: “He betook himself to the refuge of spiritual defense, taking (that is) the relics of saints which he always had with him;” and as this last refuge, of course, failed him, he and his company were slain. Such was the mournful end of one considered by many the greatest missionary since the days of the Apostles. (*Hassell’s History ppg 420, 421*)

Boniface VIII, Pope

Pope BONIFACE VIII: Sylvester Hassell: “The quarrel between Boniface VIII. and **Philip the Fair**,” says Milman, “is one of the great epochs in the papal history, the turning point after which, for a time at least, the papacy sank with a swift and precipitate descent, and from which it never rose again to the same commanding height. It led rapidly to that debasing period which has been called the **Babylonian captivity of the popes** in Avignon, during which they became not much more than the slaves of the kings of France.” (*Hassell’s History pg 452*)

Boniface VIII., who occupied the papal chair from 1294 to 1303, was the most ambitious, arrogant, avaricious, crafty, unscrupulous, revengeful and cruel of all

the popes of Rome; and he was believed by his contemporaries to be exceedingly immoral. The unexampled loftiness of his pretensions shook the papal throne to its base, and led to his own most ignominious fall and end.

Soon after his death his ineffaceable epitaph was announced to an unprotesting world; "He came in like a fox, he ruled like a lion, and he died like a dog." He craftily procured the abdication of his predecessor, Celestine V., whom he imprisoned, and, it is thought poisoned. His inauguration was the most magnificent that Rome had ever seen. The kings of Naples and Hungary held the bridle of his noble, richly caparisoned, white horse on either side. He had a crown on his head, and was followed by the nobility of Rome, and could hardly make his way through the masses of the kneeling people. In the midst of the inauguration a furious storm burst over the city, and extinguished every lamp and torch in the building. A riot broke out among the populace, in which forty lives were lost.

The next day, while the pope dined in public, the two kings waited behind his chair. In 1296 he published his bull *Clericis Laicos*, declaring himself the one exclusive trustee of all the property held throughout *Christendom* by the clergy, the monasteries and the universities, and that no authority should, on any plea, levy any tax on that property without his distinct permission. This bull was received with indignant resistance in England and France.

To aggrandize his power and enrich his treasury Boniface, by way of a Catholic revival and combination of the old Pagan Roman Secular or Centennial Games and the Mosaic Jubilee, decreed that the last year of the thirteenth century, the year 1300, should be a year of Jubilee, in which all should make a pilgrimage, not to Jerusalem, but to Rome, and visit for fifteen days, "the churches of St. Peter and St. Paul, the tombs of the chief Apostles," and repent and confess, should receive full absolution of all their sins.

It was much easier to go to Rome than to Jerusalem. All Europe, we are told, was thrown into a frenzy of religious zeal. The roads everywhere were crowded with pilgrims of all ages, of both sexes. Thirty thousand entered and left Rome in a single day; two hundred thousand strangers were in the city at one time; and it is thought that millions visited it during the year. The offerings were incalculable. An eyewitness reports that two priests stood with rakes in their hands, sweeping the uncounted gold and silver from the altars.

The entire treasure was at the free and irresponsible disposal of the pope, who professed to give in return pardon of all sin and everlasting life. During the Jubilee Boniface assumed alternately the splendid habiliments of pope and

emperor, with the crown on his head, the sceptre in his hand, and the imperial sandals on his feet; and he had two swords, symbolical of temporal and spiritual power, borne before him, thus openly assuming the unlimited sovereignty of the world.

By his bull *Unam Sanctam*, issued in 1302, he declared that *strict submission to the Pope of Rome was absolutely essential to salvation for every individual of the human race.*

From this high and golden zenith of pretension he soon had a miserable and fatal fall. He had a long and hot quarrel with **King Philip the Fair, of France**, who was his equal in avarice, ambition, and unscrupulousness, and he was just on the point of excommunicating Philip when the envoy of the latter, William of Nogaret, a stern and bold lawyer, whose grandfather had perished, on the side of the *heretics*, in the Albigensian war, attacked with three hundred horsemen and seized the pope in his castle at Anagni, and imprisoned him.

Thirty-four days afterwards the proud-hearted old man of eighty-two died a raving maniac, either beating out his brains against the wall or smothering himself with his own pillows. The history of the world affords no more striking instance of the truth of the scriptural declaration that "Pride goeth before destruction, and a haughty spirit before a fall" (Proverbs 16:18)." (*Hassell's History ppg 448, 449*)

Browne, Robert and the Brownists

Robert BROWNE and the BROWNISTS (*See under The INDEPENDENTS*)

Bullinger, Henry

Henry BULLINGER (*See under Ulrich ZWINGLI*)

Burning Bush, The

The BURNING BUSH The burning bush, which was not consumed, gave him [Moses] a striking figure of the afflictions of the Israelites in Egypt, and also was a forcible type of God's people in all ages of the world. Like the thorn-bush of the desert, they are lowly and poor and naturally unattractive (Zephaniah 3:12; Isaiah 53:2; Romans 8:29; I Corinthians 1:27-28); and they have been burning, and burning, and burning, under the cruel hand of oppression, throughout every

dispensation to the present time, and are even yet not consumed. The promise of Christ has hitherto been fulfilled, and will be to the end of the world: "Upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it" (Matthew 16:18). The flame in the bush also represents that God dwells in his people (Exodus 3:2; Zechariah 2:5; Isaiah 4:4; 57:15; Malachi 3:2; Matthew 3:11; Acts 2:3-4)." (*Hassell's History pg 81*)

Cain

CAIN Cain brought an offering to God, but even so, his offering indicated a kind of insubordination to God. His offering was "of the fruit of the ground" (Genesis 4:3) which the Lord had cursed (Genesis 3:17). It was a bloodless offering; it did not prefigure the shedding of the blood of Christ on behalf of his people.

Hebrews 9:22, "And almost all things are by the law purged with blood, and without shedding of blood is no remission."

"And Cain was very wroth, and his countenance fell" (Genesis 4:5). It obviously angered Cain, that God would not allow him to devise a form of worship according to the dictate of his own fancy. His sin was the same as that of Nadab and Abihu, the sons of Aaron, who offered "offered strange fire before the Lord" (Leviticus 10:1), and lost their lives as the consequence.

In bringing a bloodless sacrifice Cain denied the need for a blood atonement; he denied the need for Christ's sacrificial death; he denied his own sinful nature. He represented both the unregenerate, who are sometimes very religious in spite of their unregenerate condition, and the self-righteous Pharisee, who may or may not have been born of the Spirit of God. hlh

"It is remarkable that corruption of religion and morals advanced most rapidly in the line of Cain, where the greatest progress had been made in art and science; thus showing that knowledge and civilization, apart from religion, have no power to purify the heart, or to preserve society from corruption."— (*W.G. Blaike.*)
From Hassell)

Symbolism "Cain now stands as a representative of that portion of the human race who persecute the children of God, and Abel represents that portion who are persecuted by wicked men, often unto death. Figuratively speaking, Cain has

always been killing Abel, and Abel has all along fallen by the hands of Cain.”
(*Hassell*)

Question: Who was Cain’s wife (Genesis 4:16-17) Answer: *Hassell*: A daughter of Adam, who lived 930 years, and who had sons and daughters (Genesis 5:4-5). The very word Adam means *man* or *human being*, and is so rendered 362 times in the Old Testament. If there had been men before Adam, God would not have said, “Let us make man in our image (Genesis 1:26); and it would not have been true that, before he made Adam, ““there was not a man to till the ground” (Genesis 2:5). Paul says that Adam was “the first man” (I Corinthians 15:45,47); and that in Adam all men sinned and died (Romans 5:12-21). Even Abraham’s wife Sarah was his half-sister, the daughter of his father, though not of his mother (Genesis 20:12).

Afterwards, when the human race was more numerous, the marriage of near relations was forbidden by God (Leviticus 18). Nothing is known of the land of Nod, where Cain settled, except that it was east of Eden. It may have been only a few miles from Eden. (*Hassell*) (*See article on ABEL*)

Calvin, John

John CALVIN: Sylvester Hassell: Checked in German Switzerland by the battle of Cappel, the Reformation made a more important conquest in western or French Switzerland, from which it was to move westward, with the course of empire, to France, Holland, England, Scotland, and North America.

William Farel (1489-1565), one of the first and boldest of the French Reformers, preached from 1526 in the French parts of the cantons of Berne and Biel, in Neufchatel, in 1530, and in Geneva in 1532.

The Reformation had reached Geneva in 1528, and was adopted by the Council of this free city in 1535. In 1536 the city gained its most distinguished teacher, John Calvin (1509-1564), a native of Noyon, in Picardy, seventy miles northeast of Paris. He became the ablest theologian and disciplinarian of the Protestant Reformation; and his work, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, has been well called “the masterpiece of Protestantism.”

For commanding intellect, lofty character, and far-reaching influence, Calvin was one of the foremost leaders in the history of Christianity. He was always poor and sickly, severely moral and censorious (even in childhood being called by his companions "the Accusative Case"). He was educated by his father, first for the Catholic priesthood and then for the law. He injured his health by studying nearly all night; and attained such proficiency in the law as to be called to lecture to his fellow-students in the absence of the professor.

But Providence called him to a higher work. Deeply convicted of sin, he sought inward peace by the Roman Catholic methods, and found it not. Miserable and abject, with tears and cries, he was enabled to flee to God, and throw himself upon his free mercy in Christ, and thus he entered into rest, and joyfully testified, "We are saved by grace, not by our merits, not by our works. Only one haven of salvation is left for our souls, and that is the mercy of God in Christ."

He renounced Romanism, joined the persecuted Protestants, and had to flee Paris (in 1533), in which city, during the next two years, "twenty-four Protestants were burned alive, while many more were condemned to less cruel sufferings. For more than two years he wandered a fugitive evangelist, under assumed names, from place to place."

In 1534 at Orleans he published his first theological work (*Psycho-pannychia*), a treatise against the Anabaptist doctrine of the sleep of the soul between death and the resurrection. In 1536 at Basel he published the first edition of his *Institutes*—his sole motive in issuing this work being, he says, "to remove the impression that his persecuted brethren in France were fanatical Anabaptists, seeking the overthrow of civil order, which their oppressors, in order to pacify the displeasure of German Lutherans, industriously propagated." The eloquent and powerful preface was addressed to Francis I., the King of France.

"The *Institutes*," says Prof. Schaff, "are by far the clearest and ablest systematic and scientific exposition and vindication of the

ideas of the Reformation in their vernal freshness and pentecostal fire. The book is inspired by a heroic faith ready for the stake, and a glowing enthusiasm for the saving truth of the gospel, raised to a new life from beneath the rubbish of human additions. Though freely using reason and the fathers, especially Augustine, it always appeals to the supreme tribunal of the word of God, to which all human wisdom must bow in reverent obedience. It abounds in Scripture learning thoroughly digested, and wrought up into a consecutive chain of exposition and argument. It is severely logical, but perfectly free from the dryness and pedantry of a scholastic treatise, and flows on, like a Swiss river, through green meadows and sublime mountain scenery.

Greeted with enthusiasm by Protestants, the Institutes created dismay among Romanists, were burned at Paris by order of the Sorbonne (Theological College), and hated and feared as the very "Talmud" and "Koran of heresy."

In 1536 Calvin settled at Geneva, and lived there the remainder of his life, with the exception of three years (1538-1541), when he was banished from the city on account of his severe discipline (during which period he lived at Strasburg). In 1540 he married Idelette van Buren, "the widow of an Anabaptist preacher whom he had converted," as the historians tell us. Their three children died in infancy. Otherwise their married life was very happy, but short, lasting only nine years, when his wife died. He deeply lamented her, and never married again.

Calvin desired to make his church at Geneva the model, mother, and seminary of all the Reformed (or Presbyterian or Calvinistic) Churches. The Presbyterian polity, or church government, is imaginarily derived, primarily from the old Jewish Sanhedrims, and secondarily from the Greek, Roman and Anglo-Saxon Senates; but the best authorities declare that the gradation of Session, Presbytery, Synod and General Assembly was an invention of Calvin himself (his doctrine of the organization of the church and of its relation to the State being the only original feature of his system, says J.R. Green).

And the civil government already existing in Geneva and other cities (consisting of *four* Councils, rising in power one above the other) seems to have suggested the idea to him. In Geneva were the Little Council (or Council of 25), the Council of 60, the Council of 200, and the General Council or General Assembly of Citizens. As for the *two* permanent Jewish courts called the Lesser and the Greater Sanhedrim, the first of inferior and the second of appellate jurisdiction, they are nowhere mentioned in the Old Testament, but are believed by most critical scholars to have been derived by the Jews from the Macedonians (or Greeks) about 300 B.C.—the very name, Sanhedrim, being, not a Hebrew, but a Greek word. Calvin's Consistory (or Presbytery), composed of six preachers and twelve "laymen," of which body he was President, exercised a most stringent, vigilant, inquisitorial supervision, in respect to doctrine, morals and manners, over the entire life of every inhabitant of Geneva; not only excommunicating persons of every age and sex, but handing them over to the civil authorities to be imprisoned, tortured or put to death for heresies, improprieties and immoralities.

The proceedings of the Consistory were filled, and the executioner was kept busy. A child was beheaded for striking its father and mother. Another child, sixteen years old, for attempting to strike his mother, was sentenced to death, but, on account of its youth, the sentence was commuted; and having been publicly whipped, with a cord about its neck, it was banished from the city. A woman was chastised with rods for singing secular songs to the melody of the Psalms. A man was imprisoned and banished for reading the writings of the Italian humanist Poggio.

Profanity and drunkenness were severely punished; dancing, and the manufacture or use of cards, or nine-pins, and even looking upon a dance, and giving children the names of Catholic saints, and extravagance or eccentricity of dress, and the dissemination of divergent theological doctrines, brought down upon the delinquent the vengeance of the laws.

No historical student needs to be told what an incalculable amount of evil has been wrought by Catholics and by

Protestants from a mistaken belief in the perpetual validity of the Mosaic civil legislation, and from a confounding of the spirit of the old dispensation with that of the new—an overlooking of the progressive character of Divine revelation.'---George P. Fisher's *History of Reformation*. Christ and his Apostles did not persecute; neither does the true church of Christ. The Protestant persecutions of each other, and of Catholics, and of *Anabaptists*, were derived from Rome, and were in direct and horrid contradiction of the Protestant principle of freedom of conscience.

Calvin's condemnation and execution of the almost *Anabaptist* and the Anti-Trinitarian, Michael Servetus (1553), though then approved by his brother Protestants, is a sad and ineffaceable blot upon his character—the bloody deed producing only evil, utterly condemned by the entire spirit of the New Testament, and by every person (not a Roman Catholic) of today.

It is noteworthy that in 1537 Peter Caroli accused Calvin and Farel of Anti-Trinitarianism (or Arianism and Sabellianism), because they would not enforce the Athanasian Creed, and had not used the words *Trinity* and *Person* in the Confession that they had drawn up. In his first residence at Geneva, Calvin had avoided using these terms, although having no particular objection to them; as he was very indifferent to the terminology of theology, so long as the truth was expressed. Jerome Bolsec was imprisoned and banished from Geneva in 1551 for denying the doctrine of predestination.

Like Luther, Calvin was, in general, unselfish and unworldly, honest and conscientious, doing what he believed to be right, and not seeking human applause or temporal riches. His disciplinarian severity was induced, not by personal animosity, but by his views of the Scriptures and of what was required for the honor of God. Under his iron and bloody discipline (the result of a combination of "Church and State"), Geneva, from being one of the most licentious places, became the most moral town in Europe.

But some of the profligate people, hating him with a perfect hatred, would sometimes fire off fifty or sixty shots before his

door in the night, and would set upon him their dogs, which would tear his clothes and flesh.

He received from the city a small house and garden, with about five hundred dollars per year, and was very generous to the needy. In the latter part of his life he ate but one meal a day, and sometimes went without that. He would not draw his salary when he was too sick to work, and he refused an increase in salary and all kinds of presents except for the poor. Besides his library, he left only about two hundred dollars, which he gave to his younger brother and his children. When Pope Pius IV. heard of his death, he paid him this high compliment: "The strength of that heretic consisted in this, that money never had the slightest charm for him. If I had such servants, my dominions would extend from sea to sea."

Like Luther, he had a fiery temper, which was the propelling power in his extraordinary life-work. He was a walking hospital, and the wonder is that he showed so patient a spirit as he did. In his fifty-fifth year, overcome with headache, asthma, fever and gravel, he yielded to his complication of bodily infirmities. He never complained of as utterly feeble, and reduced almost to a shadow, his mind retained its clearness and energy. Assembling the city councillors, and then the ministers around his bed, he declared that he had lived, acted and taught honestly and sincerely, according to his views of the word of God, never knowingly perverting the Scriptures, and never laboring for any personal end, but only to promote the glory of God.

He thanked them for their kindness, and craved their forgiveness for his occasional outbursts of anger. He exhorted them to humility and to a faithful observance of the pure doctrine and discipline of Christ. Sitting up in bed, he offered a fervent prayer for them, and took each one by the hand, and bade him a solemn and affectionate farewell; and they parted from him, with their eyes bathed in tears, and their hearts full of unspeakable grief.

According to his express injunction, no monument was erected over his grave, so that the exact spot, in the cemetery of

Geneva, is unknown. "Like Moses, he was buried out of the reach of idolatry." Ernest Renan, the French rationalist, finds the key to Calvin's wonderful influence in the fact that he was "the most Christian man of his generation." As Prof. Schaff says: "Calvin's spirit resembled that of a Hebrew prophet. Soaring high above the earth, he was absorbed in God—who alone is great—and he looked down upon man as a fleeting shadow.

Though his system was Pauline, and though he strongly sympathized with Paul's sense of the freedom of the gospel salvation, yet he looked more to the holiness than to the love of God. His piety bears more of the stamp of the Old Testament than that of the New. He represents the majesty and severity of the law rather than the sweetness and loveliness of the gospel, the obedience of a servant of Jehovah rather than the joyfulness of a child of our heavenly Father.

On account of his logical and systematic mind and *Institutes*, he has been called the Aristotle of the Protestant Reformation. "The striking, the peculiar feature of his system," says Fisher, "is the doctrine of predestination." This doctrine, at the outset, indeed, was common to all the Reformers. They were united in receiving the Augustinian theology, in opposition to the Pelagian doctrine, which affected, in a greater or less degree, all the schools of Catholic theology.

It is very important to understand the motives of the Reformers in this proceeding. Calvin was not a speculative philosopher who thought out a necessitarian theory and defended it for the reason that he considered it capable of being logically established. It is true that the key-note in his system was a profound sense of the exaltation of God. Nothing could be admitted that seemed to clash in the least with his universal control, or to cast a shade upon his omniscience and omnipotence.

But the direct grounds of his doctrine were practical. Predestination is, to him, the correlate of human dependence; the counterpart of the doctrine of grace; the antithesis to salvation by merit; the implied consequence of man's complete

bondage to sin. In election, it is involved that man's salvation is not his own work, but wholly the work of the grace of God; and in election, also, there is laid a sure foundation for the believer's security under all the assaults of temptation.

It is practical interests which Calvin is sedulous to guard; he clings to the doctrine for what he considers its religious value; and it is no more than justice to him to remember that he habitually styles the tenet, which proved to be so obnoxious, an unfathomable mystery, an abyss into which no mortal mind can descend. And, whether consistently or not, there is the most earnest assertion of the moral and responsible nature of man. Augustine had held that in the fall of Adam the entire race were involved in a common act and a common catastrophe. The will is not destroyed; it is still free to sin, but is utterly disabled as regards holiness. Out of the mass of mankind, all of whom are alike guilty, God chooses a part to be the recipients of his mercy, whom he purifies by an irresistible influence, but leaves the rest to suffer the penalty which they have justly brought upon themselves.

In the *Institutes* Calvin does what Luther had done in his book against Erasmus; he makes the Fall itself the primal transgression, the object of an efficient decree. In this particular he goes beyond Augustine, and apparently affords a sanction to the extreme or supralapsarian type of theology, which afterwards found numerous defenders—which traces sin to the direct agency of God, and even found the distinction of right and wrong ultimately on his omnipotent will.

[Editor's Note: Notice that on this point Calvin does what every consistent Calvinist, every consistent Absoluter, must do—he traces sin to the *efficient decree*, the *direct agency* of God. He makes God to be the source of man's sin. He later backtracks, but it is clear that, even in the hand of its master, Calvinism can never entirely clear itself of this problem. hlh]

But when Calvin was called upon to define his doctrine more carefully, as in the *Consensus Genevensis*, he confines himself to the assertion of a permissive decree—a volitive permission—in the case of the first sin. In other words, he does not

overstep the Augustinian position. He explicitly avers that every decree of the Almighty springs from reasons which, though hidden from us, are good and sufficient. That is to say, he founds will upon right, and not right upon will.

The main peculiarity of Calvin's treatment of this subject, as compared with the course pursued by the other Reformers, is the greater prominence which he gives to predestination. It stands in the foreground; it is never left out of sight. Luther's practical handling of this dogma was quite different. Under his influence it retreated more and more into the background, until not only in Melancthon's system, but also in the later Lutheran theology, unconditional predestination disappeared altogether.

"The characteristic principles of the system now called **Calvinism**," says Prof. A.A. Hodge, "were first fully developed by Augustine, Bishop of Hippo (324-430), whose great opponent was Pelagius (Morgan), a British monk, a student of the Greek fathers. *The opinions of Pelagius were unanimously condemned by the whole church, Eastern and Western, at the Councils of Carthage (407-416), Mileve (416) and Ephesus (431), and by Popes Innocent and Zosimus (417 and 418)—a sure proof that they were not in accordance with the original faith of the church. And up to the present time Pelagianism has never been adopted into the public creed of any ecclesiastical body except that of the Socinians (Unitarians) of Poland (Racovian Catechism, 1605).*"

Afterwards the doctrines of Augustine triumphed, in their conflict with Semi-Pelagianism, at the Synods of Orange and Valence (529), and by the decrees of Popes Gelasius (496) and Boniface (530). Henceforth a moderate Augustinianism became the legally recognized orthodoxy of Western Europe, and actually tinted the leading minds and events of that great community for several centuries. Bede, Alcuin and Claudius of Turin, and afterwards the best and greatest of the schoolmen—Anselm (910), Bernard of Clairvaux (1140), Hugo St. Victor, Thomas Aquinas (1247) and Thomas Bradwardine (1348)—were all of the school of Augustine.

The same is true of all the Reformers before the Reformation, — Wycliffe (1324-1384), John Huss (1369-1415), the Waldenses of Piedmont, John Wessel (1419-1489), John of Goch (1475), Savonarola (1493), John Reuchlin and Staupitz, the spiritual father of Luther. The Reformation was a reaction from the growing Semi-Pelagianism, as well as from the idolatry and tyranny of the papal church. It was in all its leaders, Luther as decidedly as Calvin, and in all its centers, England and Germany, as well as Scotland, Holland or Geneva, *an Augustinian movement*.

Although Calvin was not the first to formulate the system which goes by his name (and which he himself professes to have borrowed from Augustine), he presented to the world the first and grandest work of systematic divinity, recast Augustinianism in its Protestant form, and handed it to the modern world stamped with his own name. From him his doctrines passed to that *apostolic succession* of Bullinger, Turretin, Witsius, John Owen and Jonathan Edwards; to the Synod of Dort (1618-1619) and the Westminster Assembly (1638); and so to the Independents (Congregationalists), the Baptists, and to the Presbyterians in all lands.

The Episcopal Church of England and America, whatever may be the teachings of its different leaders, was, beyond all controversy, in the intention of its founders, and in the first century of its history, and is yet in its doctrinal articles, essentially Augustinian.

“Every people of Europe,” says Prof Schaff, “was represented among Calvin’s disciples. He helped to shape the religious character of churches, and the political, moral, and social life of nations yet unborn. The Huguenots of France, the Protestants of Holland and Belgium, the Puritans and Independents of England and New England, the Presbyterians of Scotland and throughout the world, yea, we may say, the whole of the Anglo-Saxon race, in its prevailing religious character and institutions, bear the impress of his genius, and show the power and tenacity of his doctrines and principles of government.

The doctrine of predestination, in its milder infralapsarian (or sublapsarian) form, was incorporated into the Geneva Consensus, the Second Helvetic, the French, Belgic, and Scotch Confessions, the Lambeth Articles, the Irish Articles, the Canons of Dort, and the Westminster Standards (from which latter documents the same doctrine was incorporated into the English Congregational and Baptist Confessions of Faith of the seventeenth century); while the Thirty-nine (Episcopalian) Articles, the Heidelberg Catechism, and other German Reformed Confessions, endorse merely the positive, humbling, comforting part of the free election of believers (as also the Kehukee Baptist Association of North Carolina did in 1777 in a Confession which today constitutes the Articles of Faith of the churches of that Association, and which is given in the latter part of this work), and are wisely silent concerning the decree of reprobation, leaving that to theological science and private opinion.

Supralapsarian, which makes unfallen man, or man before his creation, a mere abstraction of thought, the object of God's double foreordination for the manifestation of his mercy in the elect and his justice in the reprobate, was ably advocated by Beza in Geneva, Gomarus in Holland, Twisse (the Prolocutor of the Westminster Assembly) in England, and Nathaniel Emmons (1745-1840) in New England, but it never received symbolical authority, and was virtually or expressly excluded (though not exactly condemned) by the Synod of Dort, the Westminster Assembly, and even by the Formula Consensus Helvetica (1675).

*All Calvinistic Confessions, without exception, trace the fall to a permissive decree, make man responsible and justly punishable for sin, and reject, as a blasphemous slander, the charge that God is the author of sin. And this is the case with all the Calvinistic divines of the present day. Prof. Charles Hodge, who best represents the Old School Calvinism in America, rejects **supralapsarianism**, and defends **infralapsarianism**, which he defines thus: "According to the infralapsarian doctrine, God, with the design to reveal his own glory—that, the perfections of his own nature—determined to create the world; secondly, to *permit* the fall of man; thirdly, to elect from the mass of fallen*

men a multitude whom no man could number as "vessels of mercy;" fourthly, to send his Son for their redemption; and, fifthly, to *leave* the residue of mankind, as he left the fallen angels, to suffer the just punishment of their sins." (*Hassell's History* ppg 490-496)

Sylvester Hassell "Over against the mock sovereignty of the pope," says Prof. Schaff, "Calvin set the absolute sovereignty of God, and he made this the chief article in his system; while Luther gave the greatest prominence to justification by faith alone; but the central place in the Christian system belongs only to the person and work of Christ—the incarnation and the atonement."

Calvin had extraordinary light on the doctrine of grace and the holy effects of that doctrine in the heart and life; but he was in great and lamentable darkness in regard to infant baptism, indifference of the *form* of baptism, a modified sacramentalism, alliance of *Church and State* the civil punishment of excommunicated persons, the subjection of the individual church to a gradation of higher bodies, and the fellowshiping of Catholics and all the members of every so-called Christian 'Church. (*Hassell's History* pg 499)

Ten Reasons Primitive Baptists are not Calvinists: Lonnie Mozingo Jr., with Michael Gowens:

1. Baptists are not Protestants. Calvin, the Protestant Reformer and founder of Presbyterianism, seceded from Roman Catholicism. **Baptists** derive their existence from Christ and the Apostles, and as such, pre-date Catholics and have maintained a separate existence from them even through the Dark Ages. Hence the name *Primitive* Baptists. Matthew 16:16-19; Ephesians 2:20.

2. The Means of Grace. The Reformers continued the Roman Catholic idea that salvation is mediated by the *church*. Though they largely discarded Roman Catholic sacramentalism (i.e. the notion that participation in baptism and the Eucharist are saving acts), they still maintained the same emphasis, namely, that redemption is applied to the individual by external means. In

most Calvinistic camps, the word is the *means of grace* (*media gratiae*). **Primitive Baptists**, on the contrary, insist that the only mediator of saving grace is Christ, and that the media of word or ordinances are applicable to discipleship, not sonship. II Timothy 1:9-10, Compare John 6:38-45 to Matthew 11:28-30.

3. Saving Faith. Calvinism's primary slogan is *sola fide*—faith alone. The doctrine of "justification by faith *alone* is the bedrock of Reformed Theology. By that phrase, they mean that sinners are justified in the sight of God only by the act of believing the gospel, not by their works. **Primitive Baptists** believe Scripture teaches that the subject of justification has various phases—by grace, by blood, by faith, and by work—hence, the word *alone* is misleading. If we were forced to employ the word *alone*, we would rather speak of "justification by grace alone" or "justification by blood alone." We believe that the Calvinists err by assuming the noun *faith* always means "the act of believing the gospel." Further, we interpret justification by faith in terms of the assurance of salvation, not the application of redemption. Romans 3:24; 5:9,1; James 2:24.

4. Perseverance. Calvinism asserts that all the elect will persevere in faith and holiness. If an individual does not persevere, then he proves by his apostasy that he was merely a professor, not a possessor, of eternal life **Primitive Baptists** insist that Divine Preservation, rather than human perseverance, is the Biblical emphasis (Jude 1:1; I Thessalonians 5:23-24; II Timothy 4:18; John 10:27-30; Romans 8:38-39). A child of God may indeed fall from his own steadfastness in the faith, but will not fall from God's covenant favor. The chastisements upon God's children in disobedience are parental and remedial, not punitive. All of God's people will be preserved for they are "kept by His power," but they are responsible for "keeping the faith," "keeping their hearts with all diligence," and "keeping themselves in the love of God" (that is, behaving in such a way that He will manifest His blessing upon them and adorn rather than bring reproach upon the doctrine they believe. Their perseverance is not guaranteed by covenant

decree. Their preservation is. II Samuel 23:5; II Peter 2:7; II Timothy 2:18-19; Hebrews 12:6-7; Titus 2:10; Jude 1:20.

5. Double Predestination. Calvinism, or Reformed Theology, affirms *double predestination*, i.e. that God has decreed the salvation of some through election and the damnation of others through reprobation. It's supralapsarianism makes God the first cause of sin. **Primitive Baptists** believe that predestination concerns only the salvation of the elect, and that the non-elect are simply left in their fallen state to be punished for their wicked works. (Note that the word *predestinate* appears in its various forms four times in the Bible, and always refers to people, and not to events of time.) Romans 8:29-30; Ephesians 1:5,11; Matthew 7:23; Revelation 20:13,

6. Absolute Predestination. Calvinism espouses the idea that "God has from all eternity past, unchangeably and unalterably fixed whatsoever comes to pass..." **Primitive Baptists** believe that predestination has reference only to the final destiny of God's people, not to the events of daily life. Yes, God is a God of providence, but providence and predestination are not synonymous. Romans 8:29-30; Ephesians 1:5,11; II Thessalonians 2:7; Psalms 76:10; John 8:4; Jeremiah 19:5; 7:9-11; Isaiah 5:20; I John 2:16; Matthew 12:24-32.

7. Covenant theology. Reformed Theology asserts a view known as *covenant theology*. This is the view that the Covenant of Grace is administered through covenants mad with men in time. Under the Law, it was administered by promises, prophecies, sacrifices, circumcision, and under the Gospel, it is administered by means of the word and sacraments. **Primitive Baptists** believe that the covenants made with men in time *revealed*, not *administered*, the Covenant o Redemption. (i.e. the types and shadows of the law covenant only revealed their need for the Christ) Galatians 3:24; 4:24-26; Hebrews 8:6-13.

8. Infant Baptism. As a part of their view of the *covenant family*, Presbyterianism, Calvin's legacy, practices infant baptism. The sprinkling of infants of a believing parent purportedly "seals the benefits of the covenant" to the child, thus insuring his salvation, until he/she is sufficiently mature to

understand and embrace the gospel personally. **Primitive Baptists** reject the notion that baptism is the NT equivalent of OT circumcision. Practicing Believer's Baptism instead of pedobaptism. Matthew 28:19-20; Acts 8:2,36-37.

9. Separation of Church/State. Calvin governed Geneva as a theocracy, confounding the separate roles of Church and State. To defy the church was to be politically seditious. **Primitive Baptists** have always insisted on a distinction between Church/State. John 18:36; II Corinthians 10:4; Mark 12:17; Romans 13:7.

10. Persecution of Detractors. Calvin's involvement in the trial and burning of Michael Servetus for heresy on Oct. 27, 1553, is incriminating. Though Severtus had asked permission to come to Geneva, Calvin threatened, "If I consent, he will come here, but I will not give my word, for should he come, I will not suffer him to get out alive." And he didn't. In contrast to Calvin's tactics, **Primitive Baptists** are distinguished for their refusal to persecute detractors. They are known as the sufferers of, not the perpetrators of persecution. Matthew 10:16; Philippians 2:15; II Corinthians 11:23-33; I Peter 4:12-16; Matthew 5:10-12.

A New Form of CALVINISM: Harold Hunt: Calvinism has always been able to evolve into a multitude of shapes and forms, depending on who its advocates, and its targets, happen to be.

Frank Mead's *Handbook of Denominations* has been a recognized authority for the last fifty years. To give just one illustration, Mead describes Southern Baptists as being "more definitely Calvinistic" than some other Baptists. Most of us would insist that Southern Baptists are totally Arminian in their doctrine, and yet Mr. Mead insists that, by some standards, they are Calvinistic. This only points up the flexibility of the doctrine, and its ability to modify itself in order to appeal to the present audience.

It should be no surprise that Calvinism sometimes fades into various forms of Arminianism. Even though they differ in

insignificant ways, **in their most basic precepts Calvinism and Arminianism are very similar.** Their greatest similarity has to do with their attitude toward the preached gospel.

The Arminian says, "If you are saved, you must hear the gospel and believe it, and it is up to you whether you do."

The Calvinist says, "If you are saved, you must hear the gospel and believe it, and God will see to it that you do.

Regardless of the ways in which they are very different, both insist eternal salvation is limited to those who hear and believe the preached gospel. **If that is true, the grace of God reaches no farther than the preacher does.** That enormously limits the grace of God, to say the least.

In recent years we have been hearing about **a new form of Calvinism**, which has been considerably modified in order to appeal to a Primitive Baptist mindset. This new form of Calvinism denies the Arminian notion that hearing and believing the preached gospel is a *condition* one must meet in order to be born again. It admits the sinner must be born again *before* he is able to hear and believe the gospel. So far, so good.

By admitting the sinner must be born again before he can hear and believe the gospel, this doctrine also denies the old style Calvinistic notion that hearing and believing the gospel is the *means* by which a person is born again. Again, so far, so good. That is one of the main differences between Arminianism and Calvinism. Arminianism insists the gospel provides the *condition*, and Calvinism insists the gospel provides the *means* by which the sinner is born again.

But having said all that, this new form of Calvinism insists that if one has been born again, it is *inevitable* that someday —after he is born again—he will hear and believe the gospel. In other words, if he never hears the preached gospel and believes it, it is proof positive he was never truly born again.

This doctrine places **the same unbreakable bond** between the preached gospel and salvation as Arminianism and old style

Calvinism do. Arminianism says believing the gospel is a *necessary condition* to being born again; this new form of Calvinism says believing the gospel is an *inevitable consequence* of being born again. Both teach that if you never hear the gospel and believe it, you will burn in the flames of eternal damnation. **On that point there is not the slightest difference between this doctrine and Arminianism.**

I would hate to believe the family of God is limited to the little number we preachers can reach. But that is clearly not what the Bible teaches. **God will have the victory, even in numbers.**

Revelation 7:9-10, "After this I beheld, and lo, **a great multitude**, such as no man could number, of all nations, and kindreds, and people, and tongues, stood before the throne, and before the lamb, clothed in white robes, and palms in their hands; And cried with a loud voice, saying, Salvation to our God, which sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb." hlh

Calvinism Makes Men to be Puppets: Guy Hunt: There are some points Calvin believed that the church has always stood for. But, Calvinism will actually have men as puppets. In their doctrine the reasoning power that God has given us had just as well not been given, for God is the cause of every deed or action we do. We refer to this doctrine as *absolutism*.

They assert that Romans 8:28 refers, not just to the carrying out of the five principles mentioned following this verse, but to wicked and sinful acts that may invade our lives. Some, recently, have asserted that the holocaust worked together for good to those who love God. I am afraid such could spread like fire blight. We may think it is so repulsive that it could gain no ground. Remember, it is very easy to work in a few of these repulsive assertions among those of us who believe in the providential work of God in the lives of his children. We need to pray that God will give us wisdom to maintain sound doctrine in the churches where he has sent us. Brethren, no matter how much we love those who become unsound, they should not be invited to preach to our lambs. It may look to be a small matter, but it can infect good people overnight.

There is a treatment for fire blight before infection begins. There is an antibiotic that can be sprayed in the trees in the spring, that is said to be helpful in preventing fire blight. In like manner, we who believe in the good old way once delivered to the saints need to be vigilant. There is no antibiotic like clear and fervent teaching of the whole truth. It sort of inoculates us against unsound doctrine.

But, what if my minister becomes infected? You have to cut him off, just like I cut a limb from a tree. Not because you wanted to, but because you do not want the entire church infected.

Something similar to fire blight has broken out in the church in years past, because people failed to follow the pattern Paul gave to the Galatians. "I marvel that ye are so soon removed from him that called you into the grace of Christ unto another gospel. Which is not another; but there be some that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ. But though we or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed," Galatians 1:6-8.

Always before, when a perverted gospel began to be preached, it was preached by brethren who once spoke from their lips the sweet pure doctrine of my Lord and Savior. *Guy Hunt: The Pathway of Truth, June 2003*

DON'T ACCUSE GOD: Guy Hunt: When I served as Probate Judge, I was probating a will one day for a young man, who had been killed in an automobile accident. The lawyer, whose father was a Calvinist, told me he was this much like a Primitive Baptist; it was just his time to go. I told him Primitive Baptists had never believed that kind of doctrine. I explained to him that for that theory to work, you would take down all the red light, remove the speed limit, cross at railroad crossings without looking for trains, and just floor board it, for you could not go before your time. He looked at me and said, "That would not work, would it?"

To apply the *all things* in Romans 8:28 to drunks getting drunk and pulling into the path of a sweet mother with her car full of kids and killing them all, would be accusing God of causing wickedness. I can still see the fire in the eyes of the late Elder C.M. Mills of the Bear Creek Association, when fighting such heresy. He would say, "Don't accuse my God of such wickedness." *Guy Hunt: Pathway of Truth: January, 2003*

CALVINISTS and Arminians: are there only two choices?

Harold Hunt As a general rule, the professional theologians provide two neat little boxes, and they insist that, doctrinally, all Christians must fit into one of the other of those boxes. If you are not an Arminian, you must be a Calvinist; those are the only choices—or so we are told.

It was no different in the Lord's day. The Jewish people were divided into two warring camps; the Pharisees and the Sadducees. If you were not one, you must be the other. [Acts 23:8](#), "For the Sadducees say that there is no resurrection, neither angel, nor spirit; but the Pharisees confess both." Those two points of view pretty well covered the range of Jewish thought at that time.

But the Primitive Baptists have not generally allowed themselves to be packaged by the professional theologians. We insist we are different. We are neither Pharisees nor Sadducees; we are neither Arminians nor Calvinists. Far better than to talk of just two broad camps, we would do well to speak of the Arminians, the Calvinists, and the *Church of God*

Paul used similar language. [I Corinthians 10:32](#), "Giving no offense, neither to the Jews, nor to the Gentiles, nor to the *church of God*." Notice that he made three distinctions. Lest anybody might protest that this text divides the people on racial lines, we should point out that it is fairly certain there were both Jews and Gentiles in the church of that day. (A Gentile is anybody who is not a Jew.)

But there are a few who place too much weight on the professional theologians. With them the opinions of the theologians carry more weight than that of their brethren, or of

the Bible itself. They insist that we must submit to the professionals, and accept one or the other of their labels. But even if we remove the Lord's church, and his doctrine, from consideration, it is still not possible to fit all of established religion into those two boxes. With regard to the doctrine of how people are saved, there are, at least three other major doctrines.

Pelagianism

Most religious people would not recognize the term *Pelagianism* if they heard it, but it is a system totally different from Arminianism or Calvinism. And it is just as fundamental, and fully as widespread.

Pelagianism teaches that man is not really depraved. Adam did not stand as our federal head. His sin only affected himself. Man is fully able to save himself. He does not need a Redeemer, and he does not need a revelation from God. Or so they say.

If you would judge what people believe by listening to what they say, you would think there very well may be as many *Pelagians* as there are *Arminians* or *Calvinists*. You can often learn more about what a person believes by listening to what he does not say, than you can by listening to what he does say. For instance, most *no-hellers* do not preach against the existence of hell; they just do not bring up the subject.

By the same token, there is very little said in established religion about depravity, or redemption, or revelation. Preaching on such subjects has long since given way to a *social gospel*. Most of their preaching would give you the idea that your prospect of heaven lies in how *nice* you are to other people. There is no way you can make the *Pelagian* fit into either the *Arminian* or the *Calvinist* box.

Semi- Pelagianism

Then there is *Semi-Pelagianism*. Again, most people never heard the term, but its adherents are different from the

Arminians or the *Pelagians*. The *Arminian* acknowledges that man is by nature totally depraved, but he still believes the sinner has sufficient ability to choose between heaven and hell. That is different from either *Pelagianism* or *Semi-Pelagianism*.

The *Pelagian* denies that man is depraved. The *semi-Pelagian* acknowledges that man is depraved—but not totally. The expression *a little good in every man* is classic *Semi-Pelagianism*, and that expression typifies much of today's religious thought.

Semi-Pelagianism resembles Arminianism, but by its firm denial of total depravity it sets itself apart from that doctrine. There are probably about as many *Semi-Pelagians* as there are *Arminians*.

Sacerdotalism

And then there is *Sacerdotalism*. That is the doctrine that salvation comes by observing the (so-called) *sacraments of the church*. That is the doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church, the Greek Orthodox Church, and the various other *liturgical churches*. It is a system of doctrine distinct to itself, and it will not fit in any of the other four boxes. It resembles *Pelagianism*, as *Semi-Pelagianism* resembles *Arminianism*, but they are all separate and distinct systems.

Lack of precision in labels

It has been pointed out many times that, over the years, some of our best informed, and most highly respected ministers have referred to Primitive Baptists as *Calvinists*. But it is also true that those same writers, just as often, referred to every form of conditional salvation as *Arminianism*.

They regularly used the term *Arminianism*, when sometimes the doctrine was not *Arminian* at all; it was *Pelagianism* (works salvation), or *Semi-Pelagianism*.

Those writers did not need to be as precise in their use of labels as our generation has become. Their readers knew exactly what

they meant, and it was not necessary for them to spell it out on every line.

That is one of the problems with labels. Labels can be dangerous if the reader does not understand what is meant by the label. If we are going to quote those writers, we need to be aware of how they used a word.

Our people in this day are faced with problems that were not so obvious in that day. That has made us more restrictive and more precise, in using the term *Calvinist* than those writers were.

The notion that God uses *means* in the eternal salvation of the elect is *pure Calvinism*, and that is what our people generally mean today when we use the term. Our people have become quite adamant in this clear, and more restrictive use of the term.

That is not what a few of our people mean by the term, but if anyone wants to be identified as a *Calvinist*, he should expect that those who hear him will—rightly or wrongly—reach the conclusion that he believes God uses the gospel in the eternal salvation of his elect. If anybody is so in love with the term, that he insists on being called a *Calvinist*, he should be ready to accept the consequences. hlh

CALVINISM: Believing in Christ: Harold Hunt: John tells us, "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him," John 3:36.

This is a favorite text, with our Calvinist friends. They are sure it teaches that if one does not hear and believe *the preached gospel* he has no hope of eternal heaven. The simple problem is that they cannot tell the difference between believing Christ, and believing the preacher—when he tells them about Christ.

Believing Christ or Believing the Preacher

It is that distinction—believing Christ and believing the preacher—that makes all the difference. And make no mistake; that is the subject under consideration. John says it in no uncertain language. He talks about *he that believeth on the Son*, and he talks about *he that believeth not the Son*. **Not one word about believing the preacher.** Not one word about believing the *soul-winner*.

The carnal nature of men—even very spiritual men—is such that **they cannot resist slipping man and his work into the formula.** Man wants his recognition. But you can push and tug all you want to; it will not work. This text does not provide the slightest crack to squeeze man and his work into the operation. Jesus Christ is the one and only Savior, and he will not share his honor with any other.

Isaiah 42:8, “I am the Lord; that is my name: and **my glory will I not give to another**, neither my praise to graven images.”

The One and Only Savior

God is the one and only Savior; he does not need any help. **But the pride of man bristles at the thought that God saves his people without any help from man.** He just cannot bear the thought of being left out of the process.

There are some very real differences between Arminianism and Calvinism; but on this point they are identical.

To be sure, they approach the question from different directions. The Arminian is convinced *God cannot* save the sinner without his help. The Calvinist is sure that he could save the sinner all by himself; but *he will not*; he always calls on man to do his part. But different though they are, both are convinced that man has his part to play in the salvation of sinners. **The one says God cannot, and the other says he will not, save the sinner unless he participates in the matter.**

On this most fundamental level they both teach the same thing as regards the preached gospel. The Arminian says that, in order to be saved, the sinner must hear the gospel and believe it, and *it is up to him* whether he does. The Calvinist says that in order to be saved the sinner must hear the gospel and believe it, and *God will see to it* that he does.

The one teaches that believing the gospel is the *condition* to eternal life; the other teaches that it is the *means*. **Both teach that there is an unbreakable bond between salvation and the preached gospel.** On that level they are identical.

Both insist on inserting man and his work into the formula, and **they bristle at the thought that God saves sinners without their help.** It is unthinkable that God would engage in such an important work without involving them. It wounds their pride. But unthinkable though it may be, that is what the Bible teaches.

Isaiah 63:5, "And I looked, and **there was none to help**, and I wondered that there was none to uphold; therefore mine own arm brought salvation unto me, and my fury, it upheld me."

The prophet tells us the *arm* of God brings salvation, and he does it without any *help*. It is human pride that imagines God needs our help in anything he does. If he cannot do it without our help; he could not do it with our help.

One Way of Saving Sinners

Keep it always in mind that God only has one way of saving sinners. He says, "Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be born again. The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell from whence it cometh or whither it goeth, **so is everyone that is born of the Spirit**," John 3:7-8.

Notice four things: First: everybody is born of the Spirit in the same way. God does not have one plan for the adult, another plan for the dying infant, another for the idiot, and another for the man who is never reached by the preacher.

If he saves the dying infant without the help of the preacher, he saves the adult the same way. The text does not allow for the slightest variation—"So is *everyone* that is born of the Spirit."

If God's word is true—and who would dare deny it—we are all born again in exactly the same way. With such clear evidence it is foolish for anybody to imagine different plans for the idiot, for the dying infant, and for the person who never hears the gospel message.

Second: the wind is sovereign; it blows *where it listeth*, where it chooses. Keep in mind that this wind is the Holy Spirit. It is hard to imagine a more graphic metaphor than the wind representing the Spirit of God. The wind blows in places where the foot of man never treads. It goes where the preacher never goes. God is not limited by man's puny efforts.

Third: wherever it goes, it makes its presence, and its effects, known. Can you imagine a mighty hurricane passing through unnoticed? We all remember Hurricane Andrew. Can you imagine Andrew passing through—and nobody noticing?

The wind of God's Spirit is no less powerful than the mightiest hurricane. Hurricane Andrew did not have any greater effect on the landscape, than God's Spirit has on the heart of the sinner, when it does its mighty work.

That is why God uses the wind to represent his Spirit. When God's Spirit does its work in the heart of a sinner, it turns his world upside down. He comes to love the things he once had no use for; and he hates things that were once the delight of his life. Once God's Spirit comes into his heart, he can never again be happy in sin. If he finds contentment, he will find it in Christ Jesus—or else he will never find happiness.

And fourth: you cannot tell whence it cometh and whither it goeth. The preacher does not carry the Spirit with him, and it is not at his beck and call. God sovereignly and irresistibly sends his Spirit into the heart, and he does not call for an audience to watch him do his mighty work.

Isaiah 45:15, "Verily thou art a God that hidest thyself, O God of Israel, thy Savior."

The Saved are the Believers

But our friends have a literal arsenal of proof texts which they think prove that the preacher—the *soul winner*—is involved in the process. They point to all those texts which identify the saved as *those who know God*. In other words, the saved are those who know God, **and they are sure it is their role to provide the proper introductions**, as if God could not introduce himself to his own child.

They point to those texts that identify the saved as *those who believe in Christ*, and they are sure the sinner could not possibly believe until they talk to him—and tell him what to believe—as if the Spirit of God is unable to witness in the heart of the sinner.

They point to those texts that talk about the personal relationship between the sinner and his Savior. It seems never to have occurred to them that the Lord Jesus Christ—living in the heart of his child—is a deeper, and more personal, relationship than the mind of any man can imagine.

It is hard to imagine that any person could believe he is able—by his preaching—to provide the sinner with a more personal relationship with his Maker, than God himself can provide by dwelling and witnessing in the heart of his child. **To imagine such superiority of the work of the preacher over the work of the Spirit of God is arrogance in the extreme.**

Christ in the Heart of the Sinner

To cast a little more light on the subject, consider, if you will, what happens when a person is quickened by the Spirit. **When he is born again; the Lord Jesus Christ—in the person of his Spirit—comes into his heart.** There are not many things the Bible tells us more often than it tells us that. Romans 8:9, "...if so be that the Spirit of God dwell **in you**...." Romans 8:10, "And if Christ be **in you**...." Colossians 1:27, "....which is

Christ **in you**, the hope of glory." Galatians 2:20, "I am crucified with Christ; nevertheless I live; yet not I, but **Christ liveth in me....**"

In regeneration Jesus Christ, personally and vitally takes up residence in the heart of his child.

The very heaven of heavens cannot contain him, but he lives in the hearts of his redeemed, born again children. If the universe cannot contain him, how could he possibly live in the heart of one person? **He can do anything he wants to do; he is God.**

A New Life Within

When a person is born again, a new life enters his life.

Jesus Christ himself tells us he is life itself.

John 14:6, "I am the way, the truth, and **the life.**"

He is life itself, and when he comes into our hearts in regeneration, a new life comes into our life.

Colossians 1:27, "Which is **Christ in you**, the hope of glory."

When we receive this new life within, we may not understand what is going on, but we cannot help but know that everything is different than it once was. Whether he ever hears a gospel sermon or not, once Jesus Christ comes into his heart, he can never again enjoy sin the way he once did. He now has an appetite for better things, and that hunger will never be satisfied until it is satisfied in Christ.

If he has a hunger for righteousness, he is a blessed character; Christ lives in his heart.

Matthew 5:6, "Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness, for they shall be filled."

He will never respond to the gospel message unless he has a hunger for the righteousness that is revealed in the gospel. And

if he has that hunger, he is already a *blessed* character; the Spirit of God already lives in his heart.

Coming to Know Christ

But somebody objects, "All you have said is well and good; but you have still not shown me that the Spirit teaches the sinner to believe in Jesus Christ the Son of God as a person; and that is what the Bible teaches; it teaches that those who are saved believe in the person of Jesus Christ.

Well, let us see if the Holy Spirit teaches us to know Jesus Christ, and to believe in him—as a person—or not. First, let us look at what the Bible spells out, and then look at how he demonstrates that very fact in nature.

First off, the Bible teaches in the clearest language that the Holy Spirit teaches us to know Jesus Christ—as a person.

John 15:26, "But when the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, **he shall testify of me.**"

That sounds plain enough to me; the Holy Spirit testifies of Jesus Christ as a person. But there is more.

John 15:13-15, "Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth: for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak: and he will show you things to come. **He shall glorify me:** for he shall receive of mine, and shall shew it unto you. All things that the Father hath are mine: therefore said I, that **he shall take of mine, and shall shew it unto you.**"

That ought to make it plain enough. It is the special work of the Spirit—not to glorify himself—but to glorify the Son. This is the province of the Holy Spirit, **and there is nary a word about the preacher.**

It Wounds Their Pride

This is the reason our Calvinist friends get so hysterical.

They are confronted with the Bible doctrine of the Holy Spirit and its mighty work. They are told God can do his work without depending on them to help, and they are offended that they are left out of the process.

They are very much like the *men of Ephraim*, who became so enraged at Gideon, when he went to war with the Midianites without asking them to help. They wanted the recognition that comes from victory in battle, and they felt cheated.

Because they are left out of the work of quickening sinners from death in sin to life in Christ, they are convinced they are out of a job. But Bible doctrine does not leave the preacher out of a job; it leaves him with more to do than he will ever accomplish. It just shows that he cannot do God's work—and that upsets him to no end.

A New Life in His Life

God gives us in nature a good illustration of this new life we receive in regeneration, and the evidence that new life brings with it. Bear in mind that this new life is "Christ in you the hope of glory" (Colossians 1:27). It is Christ himself living in your heart.

For nine months an expectant mother carries her child in her womb. There is a beautiful parallel to that in regeneration.

Like the born again child of God, she has a new life within. In being born again, Jesus Christ—who is life itself—comes into the life of his child, and when that happens, that new life will make itself known.

Let me ask you. When that child begins to kick and squirm, do you think its mother needs a gynecologist to convince her of the life and existence of the child? A gynecologist can teach her ever so much about her condition. He can tell her things she needs to know, things she needs to do, but there are some things she will know without any instruction from the gynecologist. There is much the preacher can teach us about

the Lord, and what he has done in our hearts and lives, but you can be sure that if a life so vast the universe cannot contain him has come into your heart, **there is some things you are going to learn directly from him without any input from the preacher, or anybody else.**

Again, do you think that mother requires the assistance of her friends and neighbors to teach her to have a personal relationship with that child. Do you think she needs them to assist her in learning to love it, and to look forward to the day when she can see its face, when she can hold it in her arms, and hug, and squeeze it.

Or do you think there is going to be a love—a bonding if you will—between the mother and child, whether anybody else has any input or not. Do you think that maybe—just maybe—that relationship between the mother and her child is the sweetest and the most tender of all relationships. And do you not think her relationship with that new life within is a faint reflection of the relationship between the saved sinner and the Lord Jesus Christ living in his heart?

The Fruit of the Spirit

We cannot explain how Christ can live in the heart of the sinner. God takes care of that, and it is not our responsibility to figure out how he does all he does. But you can be sure that if one so vast the universe cannot contain him does come into the heart of the sinner, **he will make it manifest that he is there.**

How will he do that? The Spirit of God is like a tree; it bears fruit. “But **the fruit of the Spirit** is love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance, against such there is not law,” Galatians 5:22-23. **That is not the work of the preacher; that is the fruit of the Spirit.**

Those who would have us believe there is an unbreakable bond between the preached gospel and the salvation of sinners would also have us believe that those who live in remote areas never

reached by the gospel—who never hear the preached gospel and so never have the opportunity to believe it—are doomed to eternal damnation.

They assure us that if we would only respond to their pleas for money, and help send the gospel to them, there are many who would live in heaven, who otherwise would burn in the flames of eternal damnation.

But the Bible teaches no such thing. Read the text again. Galatians 5:22-23, “But *the fruit of the Spirit* is love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance: against such there is no law.” **Those are the fruit of the Spirit, and no person ever produced the fruit of the Spirit unless he was in possession of the Spirit.** If any person has those characteristics—if he behaves in that way— it is an indication that God’s Spirit lives in his heart. It is evidence that he is heaven-bought, heaven-born, and heaven-bound.

The preacher may not have done his work; the soul-winner may not have reached him. But God’s Spirit has reached him, and done his work. **God’s Spirit will do his work, whether the preacher does his work or not.**

He is Truth Incarnate

When one is born again, Jesus Christ—who is truth incarnate—comes into his heart. He will spend the rest of his life sorting it all out, **but as surely as Jesus Christ lives in his heart, truth lives in his heart.**

John 14:6, “I am the way, **the truth**, and the life.”

Keep in mind that the very universe cannot contain him, and **truth is one of his attributes.** That truth is as vast, and as powerful, and as all pervasive, as he is. If he is the very embodiment of truth, and if he lives in the heart of the sinner, is there any way you can deny that **truth lives in the heart of the sinner?** How can you deny it without either denying that

he is what he says he is, or else denying that he can dwell in the heart of the sinner?

The Benefit of the Gospel

Unless, and until, the gospel comes to him in power, his mind will be in a state of confusion. He may not know much, if anything, about the doctrine of the Bible. He may not understand the doctrine of the incarnation, and depravity, and redemption.

Truth lives in his heart, but he still needs the gospel, and the gospel preacher, to help his mind to understand what his heart already knows.

Much of what the sinner knows in his heart is in "groanings which cannot be uttered" (Romans 8:26). He needs the preacher, and the gospel, to help him find words to express what he has been taught in his heart; but he would not be groaning and agonizing over sin, and his need of a Savior, if the Spirit had not already done its mighty work. There is no way to calculate the benefit of the gospel in helping him to understand what God has done in his heart.

But the preacher takes far too much credit, when he thinks his preaching helps God in bringing the Spirit of God into his heart in the first place.

It Wounds Their Pride

It is at this point that the Calvinist—no less than the Arminian—becomes hysterical, when you tell him God can, and does, save sinners without assistance on the part of the preacher. It wounds his pride when you tell him God does not need his help.

The majority of the religious world errs in their disparaging of the Spirit of God, and its ability to do its work without the assistance of man. They err in their notion that the Spirit cannot go, unless they go along and help in the work. **They err in their notion that they can do by their preaching what**

the Spirit cannot do by its power—quicken and teaching the heart of the sinner.

The Calvinist—no less than the Arminian—would have us believe the Spirit will not do its work, unless the preacher pitches in and helps out. They are sure the Spirit never exercises its quickening and teaching power in those regions where the preacher never goes. But the Spirit is not limited by the going and witnessing of the preacher.

The Spirit is no less powerful than the Father and the Son, and he will be no less successful in doing his work. God created worlds without number in places where the foot of man will never tread, and his Spirit is able to quicken sinners in those regions the preacher never reaches.

The Spirit of Truth

Not only are we told the Son is truth itself (John 14:6), we are also told the Spirit is “the Spirit of truth.”

John 14:17, “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 15:25, “But when the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even **the Spirit of truth**, which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me.”

The Spirit of God is *the Spirit of truth*, and when that Spirit sovereignly, irresistibly, comes into the heart of the sinner in the work of regeneration, **truth comes into his heart**. There is no way you can deny that fact without denying the Spirit of God is what God says it is.

All Taught of the Lord

Most of the confusion in religion would be cleared up if we would acknowledge the office and work of God’s Spirit in the salvation of his people. It is placing the gospel and the gospel preacher in the office of the Holy Spirit that has

produced most of the confusion. The preacher has his work to do—and it is the most important work any man ever engaged in—but it is not the preacher’s place to do that work that can only be done by the Spirit of God.

After its work in regeneration, the work of the Spirit is one of teaching.

Isaiah 53:12 “And **all thy children** shall be **taught of the Lord**; and great shall be the peace of thy children.”

Notice that God promises he will teach *all* his children. **It does not say anything about every child of God being taught by the preacher.** The preacher may be lazy, or incompetent, or rebellious, but God will do his work, whether the preacher does his work or not.

Who Can Imagine Such Folly

We are told it is the responsibility of the preacher to warn people, and to assist them in escaping hell, and making sure they will live in heaven after awhile.

What a terrifying thought it is to think that God would suspend the eternal destiny of millions of poor sinners on the faithfulness of preachers. That would be folly in the highest degree. Who would dare accuse God of such poor judgment. Who could believe that God—who has all the power there is—would place such responsibility in such irresponsible hands.

The notion that the eternal destiny of sinners depends on the faithfulness—and the effectiveness—of other sinners to teach them can lead to some of the strangest conclusions.

Over fifty years ago I attended a seminar on *soul-winning*. One of the points the instructor impressed on us was the importance of personal grooming. She stressed that we should wear clean clothes; our shoes should be shined; our hair should be well combed; we should brush our teeth, and we should be sure to use a mouth wash. Wouldn’t it be terrible if our bad breath might offend the person we were witnessing to, and he would

not listen. This might be the only chance he would ever have to hear and believe the gospel. He might turn away and never again have a chance to be saved.

I was just a boy, and I had a lot to learn, but it seemed a little harsh to think that somebody might burn forever because of bad breath. And it certainly seemed unfair that one person might burn in the flames of eternal hell, because somebody else had bad breath.

There is no end to the strange conclusions you will face, when you insist the eternal destiny of sinners depends on the work and faithfulness of other sinners.

He Guides Into All Truth

Not only does the truth of God come into the heart of the sinner, when Christ comes into his heart, he promises to guide his people into *all truth*.

John 16:13, "Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, **he will guide you into all truth.**"

The Holy Spirit is a far more effective teacher than our friends are willing to admit. **Inspiration places no limits on the ability of the Holy Spirit to teach God's people.** Again, we need the preacher, and the gospel to help us sort it all out. Our carnal nature is such that it will twist and distort anything that does not suit its prejudices; and the witness of the Spirit does not suit the prejudice of the flesh. Even after one is born again, he still needs the gospel to deliver him from his own strange ideas.

But the ultimate teacher of every child of God is, and has always been, the Spirit of God himself. It is that Spirit that shines the light on the Bible, and on our own experience.

John 14:26, "But 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."

There is no need to comment. If anybody will not admit what that verse says without comment, he would probably not admit it with comment. The Spirit is not limited in its ability to teach his people.

Conviction for Sin

Second, it is the work of the Spirit to convict the sinner of his sinful condition, and his need for a Savior.

II Corinthians 7:10, "Godly sorrow worketh repentance to salvation not to be repented of, but the sorrow of the world worketh death."

Matthew 5:4, "Blessed are they that mourn; for they shall be comforted."

If one mourns because of sin, it is evidence the Spirit of God lives in his heart. The sinner, dead in trespasses and sins, does not mourn over sin. **He is a sinner and glad of it; he loves to sin.** He is convinced that nothing is very much fun, if it is not at least, a little bit *naughty*, a little bit sinful.

That is the reason places like Las Vegas, and Bourbon Street in New Orleans. and X-Rated movies, and risqué pictures, make so much money. The sinner loves to sin, and if you tell him what he is doing is sinful, you only whet his appetite for more of the same. He is as much at home in sin as a fish is at home in the water. It is his natural habitat; he would not consider being any other way.

If you find one who mourns because of sin, you have found one who has already been quickened by the Spirit. The Spirit of God has come into his heart. It has taught him he is a sinner, and he needs a Savior.

The wicked often mourn over the consequences of sin; he may even tremble at the thought of eternal damnation, but if one mourns because of sin—because his ways displease his Maker—he is already born of the spirit of God. The wicked man does

not care whether his ways please God or not, and if he does show a preference, he is happy to show his disdain for God and godliness.

If he can no longer enjoy those kinds of conduct that once gave him the greatest satisfaction, and he now hungers for something better, **how can he help but believe** something has happened in his life. If one so vast and so magnificent that the very universe cannot contain him has just taken up residence in his heart, how can he help but believe that something is very different.

Assurance of Salvation

The question is asked, "How can you know you are a child of God." Again, the Bible provides an adequate answer.

Romans 8:16, "The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God."

It is the Spirit that gives us assurance of salvation. The Calvinist is sure the Spirit is unable—all by itself—to give us that assurance. The preacher needs to do his part. He needs to explain that we have heard, and believed, and repented of sin; we have met the prescribed conditions; **so we should take his word for it**—we are now the children of God.

That is another of those differences between the doctrine of the Bible and the doctrine of most of religion. Most of religion assures its people they are the children of God, because they have done what is required, and **they should take the preacher's word for it** that they are now children of God.

The Bible teaches that if one is born again, "The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit that we are the children of God." The one says we should take the word of the preacher; **the other says we have the witness of the Spirit.** If I must say so, that sounds like a big difference.

If I might digress for a moment, that is one of the reasons for the multitude of psychologists, psychiatrists, and therapists in

our day. We have such a multitude of advisers who try to help people without first pointing them to that one *Comforter*, who has already taught them in their hearts. Instead of pointing them to a multitude of *authorities* who can never agree among themselves, if these advisers would rather point their people to that one Comforter, who is never wrong, who is always available, and who has the solution to every problem, how very much more they could help their people.

But do we not need the preacher to teach us? Yes, we need the preacher. The Holy Spirit is infallible, he is never wrong. But we are not infallible. We make terrible mistakes, and reach ridiculous conclusions. We need the preacher, and access to the Bible, to help us sort it all out. **But you can be sure the preacher will never be able to teach our heads, unless the Lord has already taught our hearts.** There can be no doubt that, especially in this work, God uses the preacher to confirm, and reinforce, that assurance. But the preacher cannot reinforce the assurance of salvation, unless the Spirit has already done its work.

Bringing Life and Immortality to Light

So what benefit is the preacher? The sinner needs the gospel preached in power to help his mind sort out what his heart already knows. He needs the gospel to bring life and immortality to light—to cast the light on what has happened in his heart.

II Timothy 1:10, "But is now made manifest by the appearing of our Savior Jesus Christ, who hath abolished death, and **hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel.**

The gospel does not bring life and immortality; it brings life and immortality to light. It casts the light on what has already taken place. It explains to the sinner what has happened in his heart.

From Faith to Faith

Paul tells us that by the gospel “the righteousness of God is revealed **from faith to faith**,” Romans 1:17.

That vital (living) faith, that comes with regeneration, responds to the evangelical faith, that comes with the gospel, and he is able to understand with his mind what he has believed in his heart all along. The gospel enables him to sort it all out. **He is able to know with his mind the Christ whom he already knows in his heart.**

And is there anybody who dares deny that the Christ revealed in the gospel is **the same Christ who has lived—and witnessed—in his heart all along?**

Not only is Jesus Christ truth, and life; he is love; he is the very essence of love.

I John 4:8, "He that loveth not knoweth not God; for **God is love.**"

When this love—a love bigger and more powerful than the universe itself—comes into the heart of the sinner, you can be sure it will have its effect. God himself, living in the heart of his child, will teach that child to love him, and to love his fellow man. Just as surely as that expectant mother believes in, and enjoys, and loves the child in her womb, the heaven-born soul believes in, and enjoys, and loves the Lord Jesus Christ, living in his heart and soul.

The gospel preacher can teach us to know more about the Lord, and the more we learn about him, the more we learn to love him. But the preacher has far too high an opinion of himself, when he thinks the sinner cannot love the Lord until the preacher teaches him how.

It was jealousy of God that brought sin into the world in the first place. The serpent taught our first parents to be jealous of God, and to aspire to occupy the throne with him. Most of modern religion springs from this same jealousy of God—this unwillingness to admit that God can do his work whether the preacher does his work or not.

Evidence of the Love of God

If you will, consider a couple of illustrations. During the conflict we call *Desert Storm*, the first war in Iraq, Saddam Hussein closed the Baghdad airport. Hundreds of Westerners were trapped; they could not get out of the country. It had not been long since the Iranians had held more than fifty of our people hostage. It was a time of national grief, and national outrage. It looked like the same thing was about to happen all over again.

A young lady was interviewed one evening on the six o'clock news. She told how she had escaped from Baghdad. An Iraqi citizen had loaded as many people as he could get on a *Land Rover*, and started across the desert for the Jordanian border. She said he drove ninety miles an hour. I really doubt that; it is

hard to imagine going ninety miles an hour over the desert. But, no doubt, it seemed like he was going ninety miles an hour.

She said from time to time he would be stopped by Iraqi soldiers. They would turn him back. He would start back toward Baghdad until he was well out of sight of the soldiers, and then he would make a wide swing, and head out toward Jordan. When he unloaded his passengers, they tried to pay him. He would not take any pay; he did not want their money. He was just trying to save the lives of people who might otherwise die in Iraq.

Since Islam is the established religion of Iraq, and it is dangerous for anyone to embrace any other religion, and since the man probably grew up in Iraq, it is likely he is a Muslim. He may never have heard a Christian sermon in his life. He may never have had the opportunity, as our friends express it, to *accept Christ as his Savior*. According to the most of our friends, since he never made that all important public profession, if he died in that heroic effort, he is today burning in the flames of eternal damnation.

But that man has more evidence that the Spirit of God lives in his heart than most of the church members I know. The wicked do not behave the way that man did. You can be sure he would never have behaved the way he did if God's Spirit had not been in his heart, motivating and strengthening him.

The Works of the Flesh

The majority of the religious world has far too high an opinion of man in his unregenerate state. They are sure the wicked often produce the same righteous works as the born again child of God, or at least, that they often produce works so similar to those of the righteous that nobody can tell the difference. But the Bible teaches that is not the case at all; it describes the conduct of the wicked in very clear language.

In Galatians, chapter five, Paul tells us the kind of conduct the sinner engages in before the Spirit does its work. "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, revelings, and such like....," Galatians 5:19-21. The human mind cannot imagine a change so profound as the change that takes place when the Lord Jesus Christ, in the person of his Spirit, comes into the heart of a sinner.

Before he is born again, he is flesh, all flesh, and nothing but flesh, and the works of the flesh are manifest in everything he does.

After he is born again, he still has the flesh, that old nature, to contend with, and so long as he lives, that old nature will manifest itself in a variety of ways. But now he has Christ dwelling in his heart, aiding him and prompting him to do better. And this man proved by his conduct that Christ Jesus lived in his heart, and motivated him, and strengthened him to do what he did. But our friends tell us that, because he was born in a land where the gospel is never preached, and he would never hear a gospel sermon, he will one day burn in eternal damnation. **Such a cruel doctrine shames the name of our Lord.**

The Power of God to Save Sinners

God has all the power there is; he can do anything he wants to do. Who could believe he would make hearing and believing the one critical condition to salvation, and not see to it that every individual had ample, and equal, opportunity to hear the gospel and respond to it?

Who could believe that God would so mock his creatures as to withhold the very means that could save them from eternal misery? Or to say it only slightly differently, who could believe he would place the means of salvation in the hands of men, who are so often unconcerned, incompetent, or even rebellious? Who would dare charge his Maker with such folly?

A Cold-blooded Calvinism

Consider another illustration. During the last war in Iraq, the news media told of an Iraqi lawyer who learned of an American soldier (I believe her name was Jessica Lynch) who was being held and tortured by Iraqi soldiers. At great risk to his own life he managed to learn the building, and the very room, in which she was being held. Then he walked some five miles—through the battle—to deliver the information to the Allied forces. The Allies sent a *special operations* team and brought her out alive. Again, this man was probably a Muslim; he may never have heard a gospel sermon.

The Calvinist differs from the Arminian in some ways. The Arminian teaches that hearing the gospel and believing it is the *condition* to escaping eternal damnation. The Calvinist says that hearing the gospel and believing it is the *means* God uses to save sinners from eternal damnation. But both of them agree that unless a person hears and believes the preached gospel he will burn in eternal damnation.

This man probably never heard the gospel preached in power; he never had an opportunity to respond to it and—according to that doctrine—if he had died in that heroic effort he would today be burning in eternal hell. **It is a cold-blooded doctrine** that consigns to eternal damnation one who has such sincere love for his fellow man—one who has such clear evidence that God's Spirit lives in his heart.

Those Who Oppose Themselves

We have no interest in disparaging those who believe that doctrine, and we will not question their sincerity. Carnal pride is a powerful thing, and—especially in matters of religion—it will insert itself in the place of the greatest honor, if it can. If there is any way to show that his efforts make the difference, he will do it.

The Spirit of God in his heart teaches him the exact opposite. Paul says, "For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh, and these are contrary the one to the other, so that ye cannot do the things that ye would," Galatians 5:17.

There is a constant warfare in the heart of the heaven-born soul. The Spirit prompts us to honor and magnify our Lord; our carnal nature would seize the credit and the attention for itself. We are told that in meekness we are to instruct “those who oppose themselves,” (II Timothy 2:25), those whose carnal nature denies what the Spirit teaches in their heart.

But, while we have no desire to belittle those who believe in Arminianism or in Calvinism, we are truly thankful to know the grace of God reaches much farther than weak, fallible, and temperamental preachers have ever gone. We are thankful to know that if one has genuine, sincere love for God and for his fellow man, he is heaven-bought, heaven-born, and heaven-bound.

Campbell, Thomas and Alexander

CAMPBELL, Thomas and Alexander: Sylvester Hassell The “Christian Connection” (or sect calling themselves “Christians”) is the resultant of three independent secession movements—the North Carolina J. O’Kelley “Republican Methodists” (1793), Vermont Baptists (1800), and Kentucky and Tennessee Presbyterians (1801). They profess to reject all creeds but the Bible; and they are Anti-Trinitarian and Arminian, and congregational in church polity, and practice immersion and open communion.

Thomas Campbell (1763-1854), an ordained minister in the “Seceder Church of Scotland,” left Ireland in 1807, and came to Western Pennsylvania; his son, Alexander Campbell (1788-1866), a licentiate minister in the same *church*, followed his father in 1809. The theological views of the Campbells became “altered and liberalized, and were regarded by many as both novel and objectionable; hence they and the few who at first sided with them formed an isolated congregation, called ‘The Christian Association,’ at Brush Run, Washington County PA, in 1811.”

Their special plea was the restoration of original apostolic Christianity, and the union of all Christians, with the Bible as the only rule of faith and practice. Becoming satisfied that immersion was the only scriptural baptism, both father and son, and the majority of their members, were immersed in 1812, by Elder Loos, a Baptist minister. Alexander was thenceforth the leader of the movement. In 1813, the Brush Run *Church* joined the Redstone Baptist Association, and in

1823 the Mahoning Baptist Association. In 1827, the Baptist Churches withdrew from the followers of Alexander Campbell, and the latter were then constituted into a separate body that have called themselves "Disciples of Christ," but have been generally known as *Campbellites*, an appellation which they indignantly repudiate at the same time that they implicitly reverence Mr. Campbell's authority.

They are extreme Arminians, and almost Pelagians, and many of them avowed Universalists; they minimize the work of the Holy Spirit in the conversion of the sinner to the very lowest degree, and maximize the printed and preached word to the very highest degree, making immersion the last and an essential part of regeneration or the new birth, without which ordinance there is no pardon or salvation, though admitting that baptism has no abstract efficacy without previous faith in Christ and repentance toward God, and yet declaring that a person may believe the gospel, be changed in heart, and quickened by the spirit, and still not be regenerate and saved without immersion.

I have been carefully reading the most approved writings of the "Disciples" for many years; and, while glad to discover some very rare indications of spiritual-mindedness, I have been heartily pained to see, in general, their thorough and pugnacious anti-spirituality, naturalism and rationalism. Many of their views are inconsistent with each other, with Christian experience, which they ridicule, and with the Bible, which they profess to revere. Says Mark .Campbell, in the Preface to his *Christian System*, pg. 6, "Judging others as we once judged ourselves, there are not a few who are advocating the Bible alone, and preaching their own opinions." This seems to me to be an exact account of himself and his followers. They claim [in 1885] 600,000 communicants in the United States, mostly in the West and Southwest, and a few in other countries.

Campbellism

CAMPBELLISM: C.H. Cayce: We are in receipt of a little magazine called *The Gospel Message*, published at Paducah, Ky., containing an article headed "The Old Paths," which we have been requested to reply to. The article is intended to defend Campbell's plea of restoring primitive Christianity. According to their usual plea, it contends that the whole church went into Babylon, and that the identity of the church was lost,

and so on. As to that position, I will say that it is plainly contradicted by the Prophet Daniel, Daniel 2:44: "And 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."

According to the Campbellite position the kingdom was left to other people, and it did not stand forever. The Saviour said, Matthew 16:18: "Upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." According to Campbellism the gates of hell did prevail against it, for it was swallowed up by Romanism, they say.

But they do not say truly. It is true that pagan rites and ceremonies were introduced into the church, but the church was not swallowed up by the flood of corruption. There was great apostasy or falling away, as predicted by the apostle. They fell from the simplicity of the gospel worship and service, but all did not fall.

It is abundantly proven by history that there were many who did not fall in with the corruptions, but stood aloof from them in all ages from the days of apostles to the present time. The church was not destroyed, but has remained separate from the world in every age, and that church is on earth yet, and was not restored by the Campbells, for she had gone to no place to be restored from. Alexander Campbell was, for a while, identified with that church (the Baptists), now known as Primitive Baptists, but when he began teaching his heretical inventions he and his followers were dropped from the fellowship of the Baptists; then they had to set out to sea without church affiliation, and they have none yet. All that they are identified with is a project, for Campbell called his movement a project." (*CAYCE vol. 3, ppg 29, 30*).

CAMPBELLISM By Campbellism we mean the doctrines advocated by Alexander Campbell and his followers, mainly among the so-called Church of Christ denomination. Most of the following quotes are from *THE WRITINGS OF S. A. PAINE*. Elder Paine lived in Texas during most of his life. He died at the very

young age of 36, but during that time he had a profound effect on the Lord's people. Concerning his death, one of his contemporaries, Elder W. H. Richards, said, "His death caused a sadness over the Baptists of the West such as has never been experienced among them before. I have often remarked that I did not think he would live long. He was such a brilliant gift. I thought that he was doing his work fast. I considered him the ablest man among the Baptists in defense of the doctrine."

hlh

History of CAMPBELLISM: S.A. Paine: Our friends are not only wrong in doctrine, but also in origin. On the church question, their claims are altogether unfounded. In fact they do not claim church succession for themselves, and, of course, could not concede it to others. They deny that the Campbells were the founders of the church, but that they did restore what was lost during the Dark Ages, and to that extent recognize them (especially Alexander) as their originator.

Well, the question naturally arises what was lost? They claim the church became extinct, and all that was preserved was the Bible or "seed of the kingdom." God preserved it and committed it, with special revelation of its teachings, to Alexander Campbell, and he sowed the seed into the hearts of men, and thereby produced children of God. These newly begotten ones were brought together by his ministry into the capacity of the original church or kingdom; and from that standpoint they claim to be the original.

The character of their origin, of course, had a great deal to do in molding their doctrinal sentiments. They must have some basis for a starting, and knowing they could not hitch onto the original by succession, they fall upon the plan of gospel production.

But we see a discrepancy in that, which is, to our mind unexplainable. If the church was lost for ages, and, as they say, there is no salvation out of the church, who sowed the seed into Campbell's heart that he should be a child of God, and thus capacitated to minister to others? Here they must falter, or

look to the Lord for a direct impact in shaping Campbell for his work. If God saved Campbell by a direct impact of his Spirit, then he saves others the same way, or else his method is changed. Again, if God saved Campbell before he restored the church, then he saved him out of the church. But our friends claim there is no salvation out of the church, and there was no church until Campbell restored it. It follows that Campbell, while in an unsaved state, restored the church.

Strange logic that says an unsaved man restores the church and then gets salvation by securing membership in that which he restores. If there was no church, and baptism puts one into the church, how could Campbell or any other man baptize one into something that did not exist? He must first reproduce the church by baptism, and then baptize others into that which baptism reproduced. If, during the Dark Ages, there was no church, and none are saved out of the church, it follows that universal damnation prevailed during the Dark Ages.

If there was a time when there was no kingdom, was the word then "the seed of the kingdom?" If so, explain how there could be a seed of that which did not exist. This idea that God's church or kingdom apostatized and became extinct is infidelity. It impeaches the testimony of heaven. It was hatched in the mind of an ambitious seeder in a rage for prominence and ascendancy to give his cunningness a basis upon which to operate.

God says, "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 other kingdoms, and it shall stand forever," Daniel 2:44.

Again, "He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest; and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his Father David; and he shall reign over the house of Jacob forever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end," Luke 2:32.

Again, "And I say also unto thee that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it," Matthew 16:18.

Again, "Wherefore, we receiving a kingdom which can not be moved, let us have grace, whereby we may serve God acceptably with reverence and godly fear," Hebrews 12:28.

Notice God says in his word that this kingdom "shall never be destroyed," "shall stand forever," "the gates of hell shall not prevail against it," "can not be moved." It seems to me that men who would, in the face of such testimony, claim that the church did apostatize so as to be extinct, have, to say the least, very little regard for God's immutable promises. But they must do this to have any show at a claim for church identity.

The church of God originated with Christ and his apostles, and has stood until this good hour, and will continue to remain until Christ shall come again to receive his own. **The Campbellite church originated with the Campbell's less than a century ago.** It can trace its identity that far, and absolutely has no claims to antiquity, either in origin or doctrine. This we will now proceed to prove.

In the memorable year of 1809 was the beginning of the Campbellite effort of reformation in an organized form. It was in the month of August of that year that the *Christian Association* was formed at Washington, Pennsylvania.

On September 8th, of the same year, was read and adopted the *Declaration of Address* of that body. Dr. Richardson in his *Memoirs of A. Campbell*, pg 237 says, "It was from the moment the significant words were uttered and accepted that the more intelligent ever afterward dated the formal and actual commencement of the reformation."

In the constitution of this association, after having agreed on its name, motive, etc. in the 4th item of resolution says, "That the society, by no means considers itself a church, nor does it at all assume to itself the powers peculiar to such a society," (*Mem. A. C. vol. 1, ppg 243,4*).

Notice, dear reader, that the first move, in a formal way, toward establishment of what we now call the Campbellite Church was on September 8, 1809. While they declared, at that time, that it was not *A church*, much less *THE church*, nor did they begin with a view of resolving it into a church, but with a view of reforming others. Their effort to reform others being so abortive, forced them to assume the attitude of an independent community or church. We can, then truthfully say, that non-recognition of this society by other religious bodies contributed principally in the establishment of the Campbellite Church as an independent ecclesiastical body. The biographer, on pg. 34, says, "His [Campbell's] overture appeared to meet with but little response, and no effort was known to be making anywhere to form, as proposed societies, auxiliary to the *Christian Association*. On the other hand, the association itself seemed to be insensibly assuming a somewhat different character from the one originally contemplated; and under the regular administrations of Campbell and himself to be gradually taking the position of a distinct religious body. This was a matter which occasioned Thomas Campbell great uneasiness; though it was a natural consequence of the antagonism which existed of necessity between the society and all the religious parties, since its avowed object was to put an end to partyism."

There is what Dr. Richardson, their historian, has to say. But hear him again. On pg. 342, vol. 1, Mr. Richardson quoting Campbell says, "It is in their (the parties) power to verify their own predictions by forcing us into a party."

It seems that the religious bodies had prophesied that the Association would be forced into a separate church or party, and Campbell, while meeting with such little encouragement, and so much resistance, said that they could "verify their predictions."

Again on pg. 348, Mr. Richardson says, "They clearly anticipated the probability of being compelled, on account of the refusal of the religious parties to accept their own overture, to resolve the *Christian Association*, into a distinct church in order to carry out for themselves, the duties and obligations enjoined on them in the Scriptures."

Again, says the historian, "Thomas Campbell had by this time become fully convinced that, on account of the continued hostility of the different parties, it was necessary that the *Christian Association* should assume the character of an independent church, in order to the enjoyment of those privileges, and the performance of those duties, which belong to the church relation. It was with great reluctance that he finally concluded to take this step, and to separate himself from those whom he desired to recognize as brethren."

Again, "At the next meeting of the *Christian Association*, accordingly, the matter was duly considered and agreed to, as the attitude which the religious parties had assumed, seemed to leave no other alternative. Before entering into this sacred relation, Thomas Campbell deemed it proper that each member should give some evidence of a fitting knowledge of the way of salvation; and he proposed, therefore, that each should be required to give a satisfactory answer to the question: "What is the meritorious cause of a sinner's acceptance with God?"

James Foster happened not to be present at the above meeting and, when on Saturday the 4th of May (1811) he with the other members assembled at Brush Run for the purpose of organizing, the question arose: Is James Foster a member, not having been present at the time the text question was expounded?" (Mem. A.C. vol. 1, ppg 365-7)

Again, "On the following day (May 5th), being the Lord's day, the church held its first communion service. Alexander preached from John 6:48, "I am the bread of life," and verse 58, "He that eateth of this bread shall live forever." (Mem. A. C. vol. 1, pg. 368,9).

We have seen, from Dr. Richardson, just when and how the Campbell's began their reformation, the failure of its purpose; and the result of that failure giving existence to the Campbellite Church.

It started, September 8, 1809, and reached the altitude of a church in May, 1811. Just about 1800 years too young to be

the church of Jesus Christ. In the face of this, our friends contend that the church of God was set up on Pentecost. If it was, one thing is certain, they do not belong to it, for they were set up (established) on May 4, 1811 at Brush Run, Pennsylvania, by Alexander Campbell.

It is said in the Bible that Christ is *Head* and *foundation* of the church. But these people have Alexander Campbell as *head* and *founder* of the institution of which they conferred by the great statesman Henry Clay to Alexander as members. Shall I prove that? Here is a recommendation of Campbell, when he was about to sail for Europe: "Dr. Campbell is among the most eminent citizens of the U.S., distinguished for his great learning and ability, for his successful devotion to the education of the youth, his piety, and as the head and founder of one of the most important and respectable religious communities in the United States." (Mem. A.C. pg. 548, vol. 2). Dear reader, who would question the intelligence and veracity of Henry Clay? His career was contemporary with Campbell, and hence was capacitated to know, and of too pure a character to misrepresent. Frederick J. Haskins, a writer of eminence and whose writings, says the Dallas News are altogether "impartial and reliable," said in that paper of Oct. 14, 1907:

"To Thomas and Alexander Campbell, former citizens of Ireland, the church known as the *disciples of Christ* owes its origin * *
* Campbell's first church had twenty-seven members * * *
Sept. 8, 1809 is a memorable date in the history of the Christian Church, for on that day was published the *Declaration of Address* of the *Christian Association* of Washington, Pennsylvania, an association which had been formed about two weeks before. This event the church will fittingly celebrate with a Centennial ceremony at Pittsburg in 1909."

How compatible and identical the testimony of Richardson, Clay and Haskins.

"In the mouth of two or three witness shall every word be established." We could make a great volume of quotations from various sources showing, that these quotations are true, but this is enough from an historical standpoint to convince any

reasonable man that what is denominated the *Campbellite Church* is purely of human origin. Campbell is *head* and *founder*.

To "Thomas and Alexander Campbell the church owes its origin" say our witnesses. It certainly does take a bulk of impudence and presumption to claim for such an institution church identity. Jesus is "head and founder" of the church of God, and established it while on earth, and the gates of hell have never prevailed against it, and will remain till time shall be no more. This church is a *house* for God's people, "a quiet habitation," a "tabernacle which shall not be taken down." Men have become dissatisfied with God's ways, and the goodness of his house, until the earth is dotted with concubines, and virgins without number; but God's "love, his dove, and undefiled is but one, She is the one of her mother, and the choice of her that bear her." I thank the God of grace that he has counted me worthy to live and suffer with humble devoted people in the holy precincts of his Kingdom on earth.

While she is tortured and reviled on earth, one sweet day Jesus will come and "present her to the Father without spot, wrinkle or any such thing." (*Writings of S. A. Paine, ppg. 53-58*)

CAMPBELLISM: S. A. Paine: The Scriptures teach that faith, repentance, confession and baptism in water are necessary conditions to be complied with by alien (dead) sinners in order to spiritual or eternal life.

"The above is an exact duplicate of a proposition affirmed by a number of the divines of Campbellism in debate with me at different times and places. Of course then, none could complain of the statement I have made of their doctrine, when such men as J. W. Chism, C.R. Nichol, and a number of others have vehemently labored in public debate trying to prove it. Now I shall be very plain in my treatise of this subject, but in a perfectly good humor. Those with whom I have debated know that, while I pity their judgment, I admire and commend their courage and pluck, where it does not culminate in too much egotism. I think they

have some pure egotists who are striving for notice and think a *spute* the shortest route to the station.

This class are perfectly willing to take a skinning every week for the name of de-ba-ting. Such as that I avoid, for it is no credit to them to take their flogging; neither is it any credit to me or my brethren to flog them.

Generally, the laity of these people are good citizens and neighbors, and among some of the best friends I have on earth are identified there, but it is generally conceded, and I can cheerfully subscribe to the concession, that among their ministry are some of the most conceited people in the wide world; but I am proud to find even exceptions to that rule. As a denomination, I have utmost respect for them, but their doctrine certainly does need undressing that the Lord's people may see its nakedness and take warning. To this end my effort shall be devoted.

The statement of their doctrine on the important question of salvation, as stated and affirmed in their proposition, is a palpable contradiction and denial of every essential element of salvation. In the first place it denies flatly, the depravity of the one to be saved. About this depravity they have a great deal to say, and often present the advocates of it in a very wrong light, and for this reason I will give that subject a short treatise.

The depravity of sinner is hereditary, entire and universal. This they deny, and of course if successfully so, they could make some show in their affirmation. I do not mean now, by saying that depravity is entire, that the sinner is entire depravity, but the sinner is entirely depraved, entirely affected with depravity, which I will fully explain later.

We will now take the assertion in its order. **First, depravity or sin is hereditary, i.e. we are born into this world having a sinful nature which invariably develops into sinful practice,** for the reason that a tree bears fruit after its kind. We do not mean that at birth the child is as corrupt as it can be, but "sin is cast and mingled in our frame; it grows with our

growth and strengthens with our strength" is a fair statement of the disease.

Take a pint cup full of water, drop into it ten drops of arsenic, the poison will so completely permeate the water until every molecule of water will be affected by the poison, hence totally or entirely poisoned; but will one dare say that because it is totally poisoned that it cannot be made more poison? Then would it not be as absurd for one to insist, that if an infant is totally affected with the poison of sin that it cannot become more sinful? That is a fudge to deceive the unguarded.

But is sin or depravity hereditary? I believe I will give them their father's testimony for them to masticate first. You will observe, when I give it, that the boys have made a gross departure.

Hear him: "The stream of humanity, thus contaminated at the fountain, cannot in this world ever rise of itself to its primitive purity and excellence. We all **inherit** a frail constitution physically, intellectually, but especially morally frail and imbecile. We have all inherited our father's constitution and fortune; for Adam, we are told, after he fell "begat a son in his own image," and that son was just as bad as any other son ever born into the world, for he murdered his own dear brother, because he was a better man than himself."

Notice, dear reader, humanity is here compared to a stream which is corrupted at its fountain. Could anything be plainer? But again he declares that "we **inherit** a constitution that is morally imbecile," *Especially* so, he says.

Now remember that Campbell understood the meaning of language, and of course, used words that expressed his idea. Remember they **inherited** moral imbecility. **"To inherit, Webster says, is "to take by descent from an ancestor, to receive by nature from a progenitor."**

"Imbecile," says Webster, "means impotent, destitute of strength either of body or mind." Could an Old Baptist present hereditary depravity any stronger? By descent we inherit moral

imbecility. Well, we are making good progress even our enemies being judges.

But we hear him further: "Because in him (Adam) they have all sinned, or been made mortal and consequently are **born** under condemnation to that death which fell upon our common progenitor because of his transgression." Stronger still! They have all sinned in Adam. Then they must all be sinners, or else how could one sin without being a sinner? And "consequently," i. e., for that reason; What reason? For the reason they are sinners "they are born under condemnation." If that doesn't affirm sin before birth I would like for some one to state it. But it is too plain to need any comment. So we try him again. "In Adam all have sinned; therefore in Adam all die."

Your nature, gentle reader, not your person, was in Adam when he put forth his hand to break the precept of Jehovah. You did not personally sin in that act; but your nature then in the person of your father, sinned against the Author of your existence. There is therefore a sin of our nature as well as personal transgression.

Some inappositely call the sin of our nature our *original sin* as if the sin of Adam was the personal offence of all his children.

"True, indeed, it is; our nature was corrupted by the fall of Adam before it was transmitted to us."

Well, well, boys, what now? Our nature was in Adam and sinned against God, and corrupted, and then transmitted to us! What does that lack proving that "we are by nature (inheritance) the children of wrath even as others?"

This is all any informed Baptist has ever claimed, that we get our depravity as a result of our corrupt nature which was in Adam being entailed upon or transmitted to his offspring in their natural conception and birth.

Be careful, boys, how you open your mouth against this, for your founder said: "Let no man open his mouth against the transmission of a moral distemper, until he satisfactorily

explains the fact, that the special characteristic vices of parents appear in their children as much as the color of their skin, their hair or the contour of their faces." You will find these quotations in A. Campbell's Christian System, ppg. 27,28. This is one time that Campbell told the truth and his admirers must subscribe to all we claim on depravity or denounce him as an heretic on this point. Come, friends, what will you do? But now we appeal to better and more unerring testimony than Campbell or any other uninspired man—the Bible.

Paul declares that sinners before quickening are "by nature the children of wrath even as others (the rest)" Ephesians 2:3. This has been fully explained by the quotation from Campbell. David, on inherent sin, say, "Behold, I was shapen in iniquity and in sin did my mother conceive me," Psalms 51:5.

But they say, that only proves that David's parents were sinners. If so, then you tell us, "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean?" Job 14:4.

I have had them try to impeach Job as a witness. They say if that be true, then Jesus Christ was depraved, because he was born of a woman, hence came from the unclean. They forget or rather ignore the fact that God was his Father, and that his mother, Mary, was divinely prepared and made a clean source from which the babe sprang. When the angel told Mary that she should "conceive and bring forth a son," she replied and said: "How shall this be, seeing I know not a man?"

"And the angel answered and said unto her, the Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee; therefore (notice, therefore, because of the power of the Highest) also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God," Luke 1:35.

Any one, who wants to, can see how the conception and birth of Jesus differs from the common or regular process of generation. **The power of the Highest is able to reverse any law of nature at his option.**

Having moved the trash from over the text we pass to another on hereditary sin. David says again, Psalms 58:3, "The wicked are estranged from the womb, they go astray as soon as they are born, speaking lies. Their poison is like the poison of a serpent; they are like the deaf adder that stoppeth her ear."

The text is very conclusive in the establishment of hereditary sin. It will bear the closest scrutiny and the most skillful criticism falters when confronted by it. They will always avoid answering until pressed to it, and then 'tis simply amusing to see the repulse and their humiliation over the defeat.

The thought I wish to emphasize first is that David has for a subject, the wicked, not the innocent that afterwards become wicked. He says, "The wicked are estranged from the womb."

This shows that the wicked are at first directly associated with the womb, and are estranged, withdrawn from the womb and hence alienated, held at a distance from the original possessor (the womb).

Webster defines *estrangle*, thus, "to withdraw, to keep at a distance, to alienate, to divert from its original possessor," etc. **How then could the wicked be estranged from the womb, if the wicked were never in the womb?**

If the womb was always a stranger to the wicked, and the wicked always a stranger to the womb, then tell me how the wicked are estranged from the womb? Of course, there is impudence enough somewhere to deny this fact if they have to deny the text to do it. But be still and hearken further: "They go astray." Who goes astray? The text says the *wicked*. *Wicked* is the antecedent of the pronoun *they*.

What wicked is it that goes astray? They that are "estranged from the womb," of course. But one says, "I thought they came from the womb innocent and holy, and at the age of accountability went astray and became wicked as a result." Yes, we knew you thought that, but the proof is what we want. What does David say? Did he tell the truth? If so, can you find a Bible witness that will contradict him.

Of course, they were not wicked by practice in the womb; only a wicked nature, "by nature a child of wrath;" this is the sinful nature that Campbell says is transmitted to us before we are born. They go astray because of the wicked nature or tendency which we sometimes call depravity, and which Campbell calls "moral imbecility." If it is "moral imbecility" then they go astray, do wrong because they have no power to do that which is morally right; and if they have not the power to do the moral right, it is because of "moral imbecility," and that hereditarily.

Right here Campbellism is bottled and I propose to drive the cork so tight the thing will smother to death, if indeed, it has any life to begin with.

But notice the next clause: "As soon as they be born speaking lies." What is the antecedent of the pronoun *they* this time? I know an answer to this is a death knell to Campbellism, but it should not be in the path of divine truth, so let it come. *Wicked* of course, is the antecedent and is equivalent to "As soon as the wicked be born." **"If the wicked be born, have not I proven my position?"**

The Bible says the "wicked are born," therefore every claim of infantile purity is subverted forever. Campbellism says: "The holy are estranged from the womb, they (the holy) go astray as soon as they reach the line of accountability and as a result become wicked."

Friendly reader, which will you have, the Bible or Campbellism? I speak of Campbellism in its latter day dress, as it is today. Tradition may tell you to choose the latter, but which is true? Remember "If the truth make you free, you shall be free indeed."

The only turn our friends endeavor to make here is to charge infant damnation upon the advocates of depravity, not because we believe or advocate it, but to prejudice the minds of others against us. Is it conclusive that because an infant is by nature a sinner, that those of them that die, die in their sin, and go to torment? By no means.

While we believe in original sin, we also believe there is a reigning, all-prevailing remedy for sin, which is sent to the heart of every infant that dies in infancy, preparing it for glory. This is sovereign grace. **Grace saves every infant that is taken from us. The child is saved like the adult and the adult is saved like the child**

Proof: "Verily (truly) I say unto you, whosoever shall not receive the Kingdom as a little child, shall in no wise enter therein," Luke 18:17.

If the child receives it upon its original purity, so does the adult. And if the adult receives it conditionally on their part, so does the little child. The Bible declares they must receive it alike. As the adult cannot receive the Kingdom upon inherent purity, and the child can not receive it conditionally, we conclude that neither plan is correct, as neither can save both classes.

But God's plan can and will save both classes, which plan is grace. Grace is so well adapted to the needs of sinners that it is like a mighty river, flows to the hearts of all for whom it was prepared, regardless of their conditions, stations, or environments of life. It saves heathens, idiots, infants, yea, all the Son received in the gift of the Father. "All the Father giveth me shall come to me," says Jesus.

But back to our subject. Is sin hereditary? "What is man that he should be clean? And he which is born of woman that he should be righteous?" Job 15:14. On the same subject, Job asks, "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean?" Job 14:4. Again, "Man is born unto trouble as the sparks fly upward." Job 5:7. Again, "How can he be clean that is born of a woman?" Job 25:4.

"For he knoweth vain man; he seeth wickedness also. Will he not then consider it? For vain man would be wise though man be born like a wild ass's colt," Job 11:12.

Do these texts seem to lend any sympathy to the thought of infantile purity? The man who would vehemently in the face of all this testimony, contend for infantile purity has made but little, if any, advancement beyond the wild ass's colt, which was his original condition at birth.

The wild ass's colt is very noisy, and very reckless. Think of his stubborn, reckless disposition! He wouldn't know an ear of corn if he were to see it. A stable or a stall would be prison to him. He wouldn't know a man from a beast. The woods is his home and he delights in it.

So sin is the home of all born in the world, and they love their home until God shines in their heart to give them a nobler life and higher conception of the things of his Kingdom. They are just as unconscious of the blessings of the Kingdom as the wild ass's colt is of the good, shelter, and comfort of the barnyard. As it is unreasonable to think of the wild ass's colt of his own volition, coming to the barnyard and taking his place there; even more unreasonable is it to think of the depraved sinner, of his own volition, taking a place quietly and humbly in the assembly of God. The colt must be tamed and domesticated before he will love his master and his Kingdom. And like the Gadarene, "Whom no man could tame," the poor sinner, who is the Gadarene, must have a visitation of Jesus, in his love and power, to clothe him and put him in his right mind, to love and serve the Lord. Then you find him so tame that he falls at the feet of his Master, full of praise and adoration.

We now conclude this chapter by giving a quotation from the New Testament.

"For 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," Romans 5:12.

Notice, "all have sinned," then all are sinners until sin is removed and that is done by the "Reigning grace of God through Jesus Christ, our Lord," Romans 5:21.

In Romans 3:12, it is said: "They are all gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable." But the objector says, I believe they are **gone** out of the way and become unprofitable, but they are not born thus, but **go** and **become** thus, at a certain age after birth. But, I ask, had you noticed it says **are** gone? The present tense copulative and past participle represent the act of going as complete. Your position is that some have gone, others are going, and others will yet go. But the text says, "All are gone." If "all are gone," who is it that yet remains to go? Come, boys, let us reason together. Don't you see your dodge smacks of ignorance?

Notice the other: "They (all) are together become unprofitable." The same form of the verb again which shows the act of becoming "unprofitable" as complete. And besides, it says they became unprofitable "together." You say they do this one at a time. **They became such in Adam, hence together.** Right where Campbell said "our nature was," and when he says, "our nature sinned against the author of our existence."

Where do waters mingle together except at the fountain head?
(*Writings of S.A. Paine ppg 1-8*)

CAMPBELLISM on Faith: S.A. Paine: While we admit that the Bible teaches faith, repentance, confession and baptism in water, and the essentiality of each and all of them for the purpose they were intended, **but we do most earnestly deny that they are to be complied with by alien sinners, or that they are in order to spiritual life.** But insist that it is a regenerated living child of God that is capacitated and required to do them. If this is true, then Campbellism has God's order reversed, and hence, is squarely arrayed against God and his adorable truths. We now begin our proof that all those things mentioned are proofs, and not causes, of a gracious state.

We begin with faith. When we say faith we mean the faith of the creature. We mean that exercise of the heart or mind that lays hold of and confides in Jesus as the "Son of God," as the "Christ" as his "Savior."

Faith is sometimes spoken of as the "faith of God," as in Romans 3:3. **There it refers to the work of God as embraced in his immutable promise.** It is by this faith, and not the faith of the creature, that the heart is purified. God has promised eternal life, and that before the world began, Titus 1:2. The promise is to as many as the Lord shall call. Acts 2:39.

Notice, eternal life is that that was promised. To have eternal life is to be a "child of God;" to be a child of God is to be an "heir of God." Romans 8:16-17.

The apostle in speaking of this heirship says, "Therefore it is of faith (God's promise), that it might be by grace; to the end the promise might be sure to all the seed." Romans 4:16.

This shows how sonship, heirship, or eternal life comes—by the faith (promise) and grace of God. It is not that faith of which I speak as being subsequent to regeneration, but the faith of the creature.

Of the creature's faith, the apostle says, "With the heart man believeth unto righteousness," Romans 10:10. Now we have a premise. The faith of the creature is with or from the heart. **If it is with the heart, is it with the wicked depraved heart, or is it with a pure heart?** If with the wicked or corrupt heart, then I ask, "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? Not one." Job 14:4. Would that not be a corrupt tree bearing good fruit? Is such a thing possible? If not, is it not impossible for a saving faith to proceed from the corrupt heart?

But if, on the other hand, you admit that the heart of the one who believes is pure, is it not then too late for this faith to purify his heart? If it is a pure heart that believes, could repentance or baptism, which follow possibly be a factor in the process of purification? It is easy to see that "Campbellism" will not bear the test when measured by Romans 10:10, which is a pet text of theirs.

If the heart is wicked, it cannot produce a clean faith, and if the heart is pure the one is already saved; so the faith of the sinner cannot be the means of saving him.

I remember that I was once debating with one of these people, and on the subject of faith I asked the question, "Does one believe with a pure or an impure heart?" Dreading the consequences of saying with an impure heart, he finally said, "with a pure heart." I then dug a hole and buried my good honest friend, for he killed himself. I have never heard from my friend since, only that he had caught up with his debating with "Hardshells."

Jesus says, "Blessed are the pure in heart for they shall see (enjoy) God." The question is: if they are pure in heart before faith, and the "pure in heart shall see God," where is the necessity of such an one performing any of the conditions? Besides, if, as their proposition says, it is the alien sinner that performs conditions, and the one who performs them is pure in heart, it follows that alien sinners are pure in heart. Jesus says, "They shall see God," hence, we would have heaven filled with alien sinners, according to Campbellism. Their stovepipe is hard to joint up; put it together here and it pulls loose yonder, and vice versa.

Another one told me, in answer to the same question, that a believer's heart was pure only from the practice of sin. Well, that puts him in exactly the same dilemma; for if the heart's practice is pure the heart is pure, or else we have "good fruit from a corrupt tree." Jesus says, "An evil man, out of the evil treasure of his heart, bringeth forth that which is evil." So if the heart is evil and its practice good, Jesus was mistaken in what he says. Campbellism puts a falsehood in the mouth of Jesus Christ; it perjures the apostles and prophets, and therefore is not the truth, and should be exposed.

Again, the apostle declares that faith is a "fruit of the Spirit," Galatians 5:22. If faith is a fruit of the Spirit, the sinner must have the Spirit before faith, as the fruit cannot exist before the tree. If the Spirit, with the sinner, precedes faith, then the

sinner is free before faith; for "where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty."

If one has liberty, he is no longer an alien; therefore, it is not an alien that believes.

Again, the one who has the Spirit is a child of God, Romans 8:14. If the one who has the Spirit is a child of God, and one must have the Spirit before faith, it follows that one is a child of God prior to faith. If one is a child of God before faith, then faith is not a condition in order thereto, but an evidence of proof that one is a child of God.

Belief is based on testimony. Hence, for one to believe in Christ he must have the testimony in his heart, as it is the heart with which they believe. Romans 10:10. It is said, I John 5:10, "The witness is within you." Again, "It is the Spirit that beareth witness, for the Spirit is truth," I John 5:6. Then, the one who believes in Jesus Christ has the Spirit of God in their heart as a witness to them.

What does the witness testify? "The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit that we are the children of God," etc., Romans 8:16.

When the Spirit thus testifies, faith springs up and we rejoice in Christ as our Savior. **Faith did not make him our Savior, but told us that he was our Savior.** But what about *baptism*? If faith recognizes him as our Savior, then baptism, which is a subsequent act of obedience, could not be a condition in making him our Savior.

"Faith works by love," Galatians 5:6. If faith works by love, it follows that none except those who love have faith. Those who love, "Are born of God, and know God; they dwell in God and God in them," I John 4:7,16.

If one who *loves* is "born of God," and "dwells in God," and one must have love before faith, it follows that one is "born of God" and "dwells in God" before faith. If so, then faith cannot be a condition, but a proof, of the new birth.

- 1st. "Faith works by love," Galatians 5:16.
- 2nd. "Those who love are born of God," I John 4:7.
- 3rd. Therefore one is born of God before faith.

Paul declares that we are *saved*, "not according to our works," "not by works of righteousness which we have done," "not by works lest any man should boast," II Timothy 1:9; Titus 3:5; Ephesians 2:22.

But, if it is by faith, it is also by works, for it is "by works that faith is made perfect," James 2:22.

If by faith, it must be by a perfect faith, or we have a perfect effect (salvation) suspended upon an imperfect cause or condition.

If faith is made perfect by works, and a perfect faith is a condition of salvation, it follows that works is [a condition] also. But the Bible declares it is not *by* works, nor *of* works, therefore the theory of "faith a condition" cannot be true.

Again, we are saved, "not by works," "not of works." Then, if by faith, it is by faith without works. But "faith without works is dead," James 2:20. Therefore, if by faith, it is by a dead faith. Preposterous!!

Think of a dead faith exercised by a dead man producing a living, new creature in Christ! Quite an improvement on the law of cause and effect.

"By him, all that believe are justified from all things, from which they could not be justified by the law of Moses," Acts 13:39. If one believes before baptism, and a "believer is justified from all things," **will some skillful Campbellite tell us what is left to be done in baptism?** Their proposition says that alien sinners believe. The Bible says that "believers are justified from all things"; therefore if each be true, alien sinners are justified from all things.

This is a ridiculous landing, but it is where their current of theology and logic lands them. Their doctrine does not only, and ridiculously, admit that alien sinners are justified from all things, but that they are justified before and without baptism. Here it is:

- 1st. Believers are justified from all things. Acts 13:39.
- 2nd. Alien sinners believe before baptism—Campbellism.
- 3rd. Therefore alien sinners are justified from all things, and that before baptism!!

There is your medicine. I know it is a bitter dose, but you prescribed it, and I am the nurse in this case, and will see that you try a course. What makes that ridiculous conclusion to the above syllogism? It cannot be due to the major premise, for it is Bible, but that second or minor premise is the trouble. It is "death in the pot." It is Campbellism, the antithesis of all truth, and by the power of the major premise, is held up in its ridiculous consequence for every fair minded Christian to disdain.

Now we build in keeping with our foundation, and see how consistent the conclusion.

- 1st. Believers are justified from all things. Acts 13:39.
- 2nd. Alien sinners are not justified from all things.
- 3rd. Therefore alien sinners do not believe.

That is better. I challenge any of their lights to find a defect in the syllogism. If he denies the first or major premise, he denies the Bible, for that is what the Bible says. He cannot deny the 2nd or minor premise without admitting that alien sinners are justified from all things, and that before baptism. So we saddle the conclusion upon him whether he likes it or not.

They also teach that the sinner, by the gospel, is taught to know God, but John declares that, "He that knoweth God heareth us; **he that is not of God heareth not us,**" I John 4:6.

We have it thus: One must know God in order to hear the gospel. To know God is life eternal. John 17:3. **Therefore one has eternal life before they can hear.**

How then do we know God? Let's go to the pattern. Paul said he was a "pattern to all that should hereafter believe on him."

Go to Acts 9, and find out just how Paul received a true knowledge of Christ. It was by revelation. Jesus said, "No man knoweth the Son save the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him," Matthew 11:27.

Campbellism denies the positive injunction of the new covenant. It positively forbids just what Campbellism is endeavoring to do—teach people to know God. "And they shall not teach every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord, for all shall know me from the least to the greatest," Hebrews 8:11.

This, our friends are trying and claiming to do—teach their neighbors to know the Lord, but the Bible positively forbids. They are therefore unscriptural on that point.

But they ask, "How do they know him?" "It is written in the prophets, and **they shall be all taught of God.** Every man therefore that hath heard and learned of the Father cometh unto me," John 6:37.

Then all the Father gave the Son shall "hear and learn of the Father and come to him." Then we have it demonstrated, that the way we know God is by hearing and learning of him. But one says, "you have surrendered it all, for it is by the gospel they hear and learn."

Mistaken again, for it says, "Everyone that hears and learns, comes." But our friends will preach to sinners for days and days; they teach them, and they learn, but fail to come. What is the trouble? They are mistaken, or the Bible is untrue, for it declares that all who "hear and learn come."

How often, the preachers in the conclusion of a series of efforts to save in their revivals, in their final appeal to sinners, say, "We have preached to you the way of salvation. You now know the way. You have heard and learned of God, but you refuse to come, and will, therefore, be lost in your sins." Does that sound like the hearing and learning of our text?

Saul, while a heedless sinner, was journeying to Damascus with murder in his heart. Suddenly the light shined, and he heard a voice from heaven, saying, "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me." He said, "Who art thou, Lord?" The voice said, "I am Jesus of Nazareth, whom thou persecutest." Acts 9. Paul heard and learned and came; for he said, "Lord what wilt thou have me to do?" There is the way that "all are taught of God." When they are thus taught, they always come.

I wish now to show you a palpable contradiction by two of their leading lights on the subject of faith.

Question: Does the alien sinner believe without the Spirit? Bentley, in question 8, says, "Yes." Coleman, in question 5, says, "No."

Can they both be right? Who then is right? They contradict each other, yet they represent the same cause— Campbellism in all its deformities.

But, to dodge and cover up the truth of the Bible, they sometimes contend that if a believer is "born again," justified, etc., that devils are "born again," "justified etc., for the reason that "Devils believed and trembled." But they always omit the following verse, which reads, "But wilt thou know, O vain man, that faith without works is dead?" James 2:19-20. This shows that the devil's faith was a dead faith; and was not from a good and honest heart, only a profession, and hence is not admissible as an argument. If they accept the devil's faith as identical with the faith of the proposition, then reason as they may, it admits devils as scriptural subjects for baptism.

Coleman says, question 26, that saving faith is a perfect faith. The Bible says, "By works is [faith] made perfect," James 2:22.

Therefore the devil's faith is not a saving faith, and, hence, is not identical with the faith of their proposition. If not identical, but a perversion, that proves their effort to meet logic by sophistry, which is really the summit of their reasoning. Again, if as in Romans 10:10, faith is from the heart, and as Coleman says, with a **pure** heart, it follows that if the devils believe with the heart, it is with a pure heart. If they have a pure heart, they are embraced in the promise, "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God," Matthew 5:8. There it is a again. By their sophistic reasoning they locate devils with the pure in heart, and embrace them in the promise, "They shall see God." That's a fair sample of Campbellite twisting, but very obnoxious to a sober mind.

So, friendly reader, you see that such unfair retaliation is only a result of emergency, and when fairly criticized makes their theory more intolerable than ever.

As we discuss faith, as an item of issue between us, we, of course, mean the genuine, and the issue is, who is the believer? And what is his condition? Is it a cause or an effect of regeneration? We contend that it is an effect, and our friends say it is a condition to be complied with by alien sinners in order to regeneration.

Our Proof

1. Believers are born of God. I John 5:1.
2. Alien sinners are not born of God.
3. Alien sinners do not believe.

The premise of the above syllogism proves our position and the process of reasoning embodied in it, reaches a conclusion which forever subverts their claim. The same is equally true of the following syllogisms.

1

1. Believers are not condemned. John 3:18.
2. Alien sinners are condemned. John 3:18.
3. Therefore, alien sinners do not believe.

2

1. Believers are justified from all things. Acts 13:39.
2. Alien sinners are not justified from all things.
3. Therefore alien sinners do not believe.

3

1. Believers are passed from death to life. John 5:24.
2. Alien sinners are not passed from death unto life.
3. Therefore alien sinners do not believe.

We claim the above syllogisms to be true, both in major and minor premise. But we will now use the Bible as the major premise and Campbellism as the minor premise, **that our readers may be refreshed with a season of amusement at the ridiculous conclusions:**

1. Believers are born of God. I John 5:1.
2. Alien sinners believe. Campbellism.
3. Therefore alien sinners are born of God!!!

Friendly reader, look at that! Look at the conclusion! Do you believe it? Is it not a legitimate deduction from the foundation used? Where is the defect? Is it in the first premise? It certainly cannot be, for that is God's word. "Let God be true and every man a liar." Where, oh, where is the trouble? Right where you always find it, in Campbellism! Look at the second premise, and you will find the hidden wedge, it is marked Campbellism. **It makes the conclusion contradict the first premise which is the plain word of God.** That is what the religious dogma will do for you, friendly reader; it will divert your mind from the simple word of God, swallow you up in conclusions diametrically opposed to the word of revelation. Here is more of it:

1

1. Believers are not condemned. John 3:18
2. Alien sinners believe. Campbellism.
3. Therefore alien sinners are not condemned.

2

1. Believers are justified. Acts 13:39
2. Alien sinners believe. Campbellism.
3. Therefore, alien sinners are justified.

3

1. Believers are passed from death unto life. John 5:24.
2. Alien sinners believe. Campbellism.
3. Therefore, alien sinners are passed from death unto life!!

The latter syllogisms put Campbellism into a dilemma from which all the brain, and wisdom and sophistry of the fraternity cannot redeem it. I have seen it tried too much.

The one great reason why many people are honestly deceived upon the subject of faith, as well as the other conditions in the catalog, is because they often find faith or belief used in the Bible as a cause or condition of salvation, not realizing that **there are many salvations subsequent to regeneration, or the new birth.**

Faith saves, repentance saves, and even baptism saves; but neither any, nor all of them combined, saves an alien sinner, but they save the child of God; and the salvation produced pertains to their joy and happiness in this life only. The new birth which precedes them all, and is absolutely essential to either, prepares the sinner for glory; and as this is done by the Spirit of God without a preacher, it follows that sinners are born again where there are no preachers.

The system that says the Spirit cannot save without the preacher makes the preacher the Savior, and the Spirit the means, or else the Holy Spirit is making poor progress or use of the means, inasmuch as a large majority of those who have it are not saved by it. How long, Oh Lord, before thy people will all make the good confession Jonah made, "Salvation is of the Lord."

I will prove that the salvation, which is by the faith of the creature, is not regeneration, but a salvation of those already born of God.

We refer you first to Romans 1:16, "I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ, for it is the power of God unto salvation to

every one that believeth, to the Jew first, and also to the Greek.”

This shows that the gospel is the power of God in the salvation of the believer. Who then is a believer? As we have proven, they are “born of God,” “justified” etc. Then the gospel saves those who are born of God. It does not born them, nor put them in a position where baptism borns them

The question is often asked, if they are already born, how, and in what way, does the gospel save them? The gospel is to God’s children what their father’s teachings, corrections, and reproofs are to you, that they, by obedience, may reverence their heavenly Father and save themselves from the lash, or chastening of God, for their disobedience.

There is a practical or gospel faith that no one can have without the gospel. Romans 10. “How can they believe on him of whom they have not heard, and how can they hear without a preacher? This is the message that Cornelius needed after God had *cleansed* and *justified* him. It was by Peter’s mouth that the Gentiles were to hear the gospel and believe. Acts 15:7. It is proven in I Corinthians 3:5. “Who then is Paul, and who is Apollos, but ministers by whom ye believed, even as the Lord gave to every man?” This shows that God gives the ability before the gospel makes a believer.

This is proven in the case of Cornelius. Acts 10. By reading we find that Cornelius was visited by the God of heaven in the form of an angel, that he was a devout man, that he feared God, that he was a praying man, that he was a just man, he was a cleansed man, that he worked righteousness. All of this was true of Cornelius before the preacher ever reached him, as is so plainly taught in the chapter. Then Peter did not go that this man might be justified, for it is stated in Acts 10:22 that he was a just man. Nor did he go that this man might be a righteous man, or that he should be born of God, for he worked righteousness, Acts 10:35; and it is plainly stated that “He that doeth righteousness is righteous,” I John 3:7. Also “everyone that doeth righteousness is born of God,” I John 2:29.

It is, therefore, plainly proven that Cornelius was a child of God before Peter reached him. Yet it is stated that Peter was to "tell him words whereby he and his house should be saved," Acts 11:14. Saved how? In the sense of being born again, or being justified, or being cleansed? No, for we have before proven all those things to be true prior to his coming. He was to hear, believe, and obey the gospel, and be saved from idolatry, and every false way; from "cunning craftiness of men, whereby they lie in wait to deceive."

So you can plainly see what kind of characters "believe with the heart unto righteousness" or that are commanded to "believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and be saved." "They believed even as God gave to every man." So it is with every Bible subject; you find one that believes, and I will show you a justified man, hence a proper subject for baptism, and I, like Peter, would say "who can forbid water?"

Elder Coleman D. Nichols said, in debate with me, that a sinner was purified in heart at faith, but when I asked him, if he baptized a child of the devil, he said yes. **A child of the devil with a pure heart?** That's theology of an inviting nature. It must, at least, be encouraging to the devils, for it gives them a clear title to heaven, for Jesus says, "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God." Matthew 3.

The trouble with Campbellism on this subject is, they apply the scriptures wrongly. **They have the wrong character believing, and the wrong salvation resulting.** Sinners are saved "not according to their works, but according to God's purpose and grace, which was given them in Christ before the world began," II Timothy 1:9

The purpose and grace was in Christ, and is administered to sinners here in time, hence saved according to grace. The sinner, being saved by grace, is enabled to then believe in Christ and rejoice in the salvation so graciously bestowed. Precious theme! (*Writings of S. A. Paine, ppg 18 - 27*)

CAMPBELLISM on Repentance: S. A. Paine: We now turn from the subject of faith to that of repentance. Repentance is

also a Bible subject, and an interesting and delightful one when properly understood and applied.

In *The Christian System* on page 53, we have a definition of repentance as given by A. Campbell, which serves a purpose at this particular juncture. He says, "Repentance is an effect of faith; for who that believeth not that God exists can have repentance toward God?" If I have proven in the preceding chapter that the believer is a child of God, and Campbell is correct in saying that repentance is an effect of faith, then Campbell and I together have proven that repentance (evangelical) is confined to the children, the family of God. This is exactly our contention. This was completely admitted by Elder C. D. Nichols in the following answers to questions I submitted in debate with him:

Question 1. Does godly sorrow work the repentance of your proposition? Answer. Yes.

Question. 2. Can one have a godly sorrow without a knowledge of God? Answer. No.

Question. 3. What is the condition of the one who knows God? Answer. Saved.

In the above, gentle reader, you see an unqualified admission that one is saved before repentance. If one is saved he is a child of God, which conclusively proves that it is a child of God who repents, and not an alien. He is not repenting, because he is a child of God, but because the light and consciousness of the new life enables him to see the corruption of his past life in nature. The love and grace shed abroad in his heart produces an abhorrence and hatred for sin, and with sorrow for sin and love to God he resolves, and puts into practice the resolution, to refrain from evil, and do service to God which constitutes Bible repentance.

Campbellism would not be so detestable in doctrine if they would rightly apply it. But we continue the quotation from Campbell. "Repentance is sorrow for sins committed; but it is more. It is a resolution to forsake them; but it is more. It is actual 'ceasing to do evil and learning to do good.' This is repentance unto life, or what is truly called reformation. True

repentance is, then, always consummated in actual reformation of life. It therefore carries in its very essence the idea of restitution.”

Mr. Campbell very orderly mentions the steps of constituents culminating in repentance, which he called *reformation*. True, repentance is a reformation; but what is reformation? Reformation, let it be borne in mind, always relates to the life already possessed! Reformation is practical betterment, or improvement of a life possessed, but is never a means of procuring a new life. If so Darwinism is true as well as Campbellism, for they are identical on this point.

Men can form and reform good habits in life, but they must first possess the respective life, inasmuch as reformation is improvement, rather than the acquisition of life. Man, in his natural state, may reform and live a better man morally, and thus adorn the life possessed. So may a man in his spiritual state, if he reform his life by closer obedience and thus adorn that life. But the everlasting task our friends have is to show how repentance or reformation is a means in the production of a new order of life. This, I fear, will stand against them, unproven through the cycles of time.

But, Mr. Campbell goes further and says repentance carries in its very essence the idea of restitution. We therefore sum up his idea thus: The alien sinner by repentance restores unto God an equivalent for all that God holds against him for sinning, for that is what restitution is. This, it seems to me, is a very great blunder for a man of scholarship to give to the public. The impossibility of this rests upon the insolvency, and, as Mr. C. has previously stated, the “moral imbecility” of the sinner.

If I had been in the habit of telling my wife a lie ever since we were married, but I today reform and tell her, the remainder of my life, the truth and nothing but the truth, what is the result? Will the truths I tell atone for and make me innocent of the lies already told? Reformation will clean the present and future, but never can cancel back indebtedness.

Suppose I contract a debt of \$1000. It is a just debt, but before maturity I become insolvent, financially *imbecile*. Now, when that debt becomes due, I wish my friends to tell us how the debtor is to pay it?

Their doctrine is, let him become very sorry for that failure, resolve to pay all debts contracted in the future, and carry out the resolution, and that will restore all injury done to his first creditor. I wish to tell you, if it were possible for a sinner to be saved by that system, he would necessarily be saved with all his sins committed before repentance hanging over him. It is impossible for us to undo a single crime committed, and unless the blood of Christ covers and redeems from that sin, all the reformation on earth could not liquidate a single one.

To be justified, or a son of God, is one thing, and to enjoy all the comforts to which a son may be entitled is another. The blood of Christ applied to our hearts justifies and cleanses from sin, so that there can be no charge laid to God's elect. It liquidates every trace of obligation in view of our ultimate glorification in heaven. But the happiness of a saint of God on earth depends in a measure upon their repentance—turning from the evil and meekly obeying their Heavenly Father. Their obedience did not make them children, nor does their disobedience destroy their sonship.

I remember, and so do you, gentle reader, when I was a child under the guidance and supervision of my father and mother, and often I would do that which they had forbidden, which would incur their displeasure and punishment. I loved my parents and realized and hated the wrong I had done; hence a sorrow would arise in my heart, accompanied with a resolution to do better, and when that resolution was carried out, everything was peace. That reformation was commendable and my efforts were augmented; but the reformation did not make me a child of that parentage, nor did my disobedience destroy my life relation to them. In all our relations of life every deviation demands a reformation, but the reformation never changes the primary order of life.

Most of the repentance mentioned in the Bible referred to an amendment in form of worship. When God's people reached the end of types and shadows and came to the church of the *first born* it was a very hard matter to wean those who had come up under the law from its forms and ceremonies, and hence it was very needful to preach repentance. They having been married to the law, it was difficult to convince them of the death of the law as their husband, and of the necessity them being married to another, even unto Christ."

John the Baptist was "sent from God" to "make ready a people prepared for the Lord." Notice he was not sent to prepare, but to make ready those who were prepared. He was to make them ready by teaching them the sublime truth that the kingdom was at hand. Christ was soon coming to plant his church on earth, and would demand that they follow him in the ordinances of his house. By this warning those who were prepared (children of God) could be ready for the Bridegroom, by repenting, forsaking the shadow (law), and adhering to the substance which was Christ.

Hence, John "came preaching in the wilderness of Judea, saying, Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." The repentance found in John's ministry had not the remotest reference to sinners repenting in order to their eternal salvation. Everyone, who is adhering to any form of worship other than the gospel form, needs to repent, not in order to be regenerated, or born again, but that they may become loyal subjects of the church of Jesus Christ. In fact, all of God's children, who are not in the church, as they hear the gospel admonition should repent, turn from their manner of life and seek and enter the kingdom. On Pentecost, those who were pricked in the heart were commanded to "repent and be baptized" etc.

But notice that the *pricking* did not prepare the heart, but only evidenced the fact of its former preparation. Neither were the hearts of all present pricked by the apostle's preaching, for some "mocked, saying, these men are full of new wine." You cannot by preaching prick a heart of stone, and such is the sinner's heart. But the heart must be mellowed by a touch of

God's power, and then, and not til then, can a gospel impression be made. It is said that God gave Saul "another heart," and that he was "turned into another man." I Samuel 10:9.

Job said, "God maketh my heart soft, and the Almighty troubleth me," Job 23:16. God said by way of promise, "I will take the stony heart out of their flesh, and will give them an heart of flesh; that they may walk in my statutes and keep mine ordinances and do them," (Ezekiel 11:19. This was demonstrated on Pentecost as on other occasions.

Our friends say that the sinner must keep the commandments and ordinances in order to get the new heart, but God says he gives the heart that they may do them. The very fact that Peter's preaching reached the hearts of some, was proof they had a God-given heart in regeneration, a heart of flesh; and predicated his command to repent on that fact. Remember that the Epistles of Christ as ministered by the apostles were "not upon tables of stone,

but upon the fleshly tables of the heart," II Corinthians 3:3. So the repentance of Acts 2:38 was not to prepare, but to make ready those God had prepared to live in the church.

Paul while at Athens beheld the city given to idolatry; he saw people worshiping at a human shrine, bowing to the workmanship of their own hands. In the face of all this Paul stated that they were worshiping God, but ignorantly. God had given them a heart of worship, and now gives them the truth by the mouth of Paul, telling them both how he is, and is not worshiped to divine acceptance. This is the beauty of the gospel; it tells the anxious ones just how to serve God. In this connection, comes that wonderfully emphasized text! "And the times of this ignorance God winked at, but now commandeth all men everywhere to repent," Acts 17:30.

We know that the repentance of this text relates to form of worship on the part of God's people, with no allusion to dead sinners or those who are not exercised by the Spirit of worship. The gospel appeals to every ignorant worshiper to repent. That

is all that any man can legitimately draw from the proposition. Remember that every time evangelical repentance is required it is at the hands of a child of God. No matter what his deviation may be, he needs to repent. The child of God out of the church needs to repent and be baptized, and live with God's people, and then to repent of every subsequent sin of his life. (*Writings of S. A. Paine; ppg 27-30*)

CAMPBELLISM on Confession: S. A. Paine: The subject of confession needs but little comment to prove all that we claim for it, and to disprove the claims of our friends.

To confess a thing, in its primary meaning, is to acknowledge that thing as your own. To confess Christ, then, is to acknowledge Christ as yours.

Before one can truly confess Christ they must possess him. If they have Christ they have life. "He that hath the Son of God hath life." Therefore it cannot be an alien sinner that confesses Christ, unless the alien sinner has life. We all agree that the alien sinner is without Christ, but our friends say they must confess him (acknowledge him as their own) in order to be saved. Therefore the sinner must confess a falsehood in order to their salvation!! Confessing an untruth will never make it a truth. We read, "Whosoever therefore shall confess me before men, him will I also confess before my Father which is in heaven," Matthew 10:32.

Our friends say that it is the alien sinner that confesses Christ. If so, it follows that Christ confesses alien sinners before the Father in heaven. That proves too much. We must accept Christ and to do that sounds out a death knell to Campbellism. It is the Lord's people that confess Christ, and it is also such that Christ confesses before his Father in heaven.

Syllogisms

1. One cannot confess Christ without first believing that he is Christ.
2. Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God. I John 5:1.

3. Therefore it is those who are born of God, and not alien sinners, that confess Christ.

1. In order for one to confess Christ, he must first know Christ.
2. Alien sinners do not know Christ. John 17:3.
3. Therefore alien sinners do not confess Christ.

1. Only those who dwell in God confess Christ. I John 4:15.
2. Alien sinners do not dwell in Christ. II Corinthians 5:17.
3. Therefore alien sinners do not confess Christ.

1. Only those that have the Father acknowledge the Son. I John 2:23.
2. Alien sinners do not have the Father.
3. Therefore alien sinners do not acknowledge (confess) the Son.

1. Only those who are of God confess that Jesus came in the flesh. I John 4:2.
2. Alien sinners are not of God.
3. Therefore alien sinners do not confess that Jesus came in the flesh.

John declares that "whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God dwelleth in him, and he in God," I John 4:15.

If the above is true, and it also be true that alien sinners confess, would it not follow that alien sinners dwell in God and God in them? That's the ridiculous conclusion into which the wave of Campbellism lands you.

The fact that those who confess Christ are children of God is too plain to admit of any tedious and lengthy argument. The duty or obligation to confess Christ is beyond question confined to those who are the happy recipients of his salvation. So until they find just one text or example where a sinner was ever authorized or commanded to confess Christ in order to salvation, their claims for confession crumble and are driven to utter defeat.

We now close this chapter which brings us to a consideration of baptism. This is their all-important theme, the darling of their theology, the culminating point in salvation, yea, it is the acme of all virtue in the salvation of sinners. (*Writings of S. A. Paine: ppg 30-32*)

CAMPBELLISM on Baptism: S. A. Paine: Let us remember the issue between our friends and myself does not involve all the elements constituting scriptural baptism. We agree as to what the elements are, but differ as to what constitutes some of those elements. Baptism, if scriptural, requires:

1. A proper subject.
2. A proper administrator.
3. A proper mode.
4. A proper design.

Upon the 3rd item we all perfectly agree that immersion or burial of the subject is the only mode, hence no issue there, and for that reason we will eliminate that item from the discussion.

On the second item we agree that the administrator must be a member of the church of Jesus Christ, but differ as to where the church is. These people are more consistent on that point than some others who claim to be the church and at the same time receive baptism at the hands of other orders. But if I were to go to my friends and say, while I was baptized by Elder J. G. Webb, a Baptist preacher, yet I had remission of sins in view of the act, they would overwhelmingly take me in. That shows, after all their boast of administratorship, that they attach no importance to that, further than it is associated with design upon the part of the candidate. They care nothing really for any item, only the design, which they say is to save the lost.

The first and fourth items bring war when mentioned. There we can find the real vital difference.

1st. A proper subject.

Now, we will agree just as far as we can. We agree that it is a believer who has repented of his sins, and confessed Christ

before men. But we very materially differ as to the condition of a penitent believer. I claim that all such are born again, but our friends contend that all such in an unbaptized state are alien sinners and must be born again. There is the issue. Now to prove that the believer is in a saved state we refer you to a list of proofs in our treatise on faith. I John 5:21; Acts 13:39; John 3:18. These texts show, in the order given, that a believer is "born of God," "has everlasting life," "justified from all things," and "not condemned." We, in those quotations, have the believer (whom we both agree is a proper subject) described; but the description by no means favors Campbellism. If a believer is "justified from all things" baptism cannot be a means of justification. If a believer is "born of God," baptism, a subsequent act, cannot be a means of the birth.

No man on earth can admit that faith in Christ is a qualification for baptism and make any start to prove water baptismal regeneration. The limb breaks behind him and lets him down, and that very abruptly.

Water baptism had its beginning with the ministry of John the Baptist. By a brief review of his ministry we might find some fact that would break some light on the question as to who is a proper subject for baptism. But before we do that, we wish to deny or rather subvert that old Campbellite dogma, or phantom—that John's baptism was not gospel baptism. To deny the validity of John's baptism is to surrender the claim of having this solemn example in the person of Jesus, for he was baptized by John. If Christ was baptized by John, for us to follow him, must we not be baptized with the same baptism that he was? If John's ministry was under the law, before the gospel, and Christ was baptized under the law, could we who are under the gospel and baptized by church authority be consistent in claiming Christian baptism. i.e. we must be baptized like Christ was baptized.

John's ministry, was not under the law, for he preached saying, *Repent*. He did not say repent after awhile, but repent now, present tense. "Repent for the Kingdom is at hand." He came to make people ready, and readiness consisted in repentance, turning from the law and its ceremonies, for the "Kingdom is at

hand." Do you suppose John could have material ready for Christ by encouraging them in the law? That is too absurd to deserve more than a passing notice. "The law and the prophets were until John; since that time the Kingdom of God is preached and every man presseth into it," Luke 16:16.

Notice the "law and prophets were until John." The law did not embrace John, but was until John. John came to condemn the law service, and to introduce the Christian service "Since that time the Kingdom is preached." Since what time? Since "until John," not since the close of John's ministry, but since its commencement. Things which are equal to the same thing are equal to each other. If Christ was baptized under the law, and our friends are baptized under the gospel, it is conclusive proof that they have not Christian baptism; or if Christ was baptized under the law, and they are baptized like Christ, they are baptized under the law, and they, therefore, have not gospel baptism.

Their own contentions declare them destitute of Christian baptism. But if Christ was baptized under the gospel (which he was), and we are baptized like Christ, then we both have Christian and gospel baptism. The very introduction of his administration shows to any fair minded person that he was not under the direction of the law, for under the law, its blessings flowed to its subjects, primarily as the lineage of Abraham. Being the seed of Abraham entitled them to all the blessings of the law, when honored by them. But when the Pharisees, who, no doubt, like Campbellites, thought John was an officer of the law, and went to John demanding baptism, and basing that demand upon their lineage to Abraham, he renounced them as a "generation of vipers," saying "who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come? Bring forth therefore fruits, meet for repentance; and think not to say within yourselves, we have Abraham to our father; for I say unto you that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham."

John here shows conclusively that he positively disclaims any connection with the law, as a guide in his ministry, for he eliminates in his demands the very basis of the law, which was inheritance by natural descent; and preaches the miraculous

power of God in preparing material for the ordinances of his ministry to his reference to God's ability to convert stones into children of Abraham. To be an heir under the law, was to be the literal seed of Abraham, but now under the gospel and reign of grace, "if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed and heirs according to the promise." Just as those under the law had to be the children of Abraham to share of the law, so it is under the gospel, that one must be Christ's to share with the "saints in light." As the observing ordinances and ceremonies under the law did not produce a child of Abraham, so it is that, under the gospel the observing of ordinances and ceremonies does not produce a child of God.

But we are so often referred to Acts 19 to prove that John's baptism was repudiated. But when we turn and read, we find no such intimation. We do find some people, who, no doubt, had been baptized by a man (Apollos) who, like the Campbellites, knew only the baptism of John i.e. knew nothing but water baptism. Acts 18:25. He, like some of our friends, was "mighty in the scriptures" (the letter of them with no scriptural understanding of them.) Acts 18:25.

This man was at Ephesus just before Paul, teaching water baptism only. Acts 18:24-25.

When Aquilla and Priscilla heard him, they expounded unto him the way of the Lord more perfectly, and he departed into Achaia. Acts 18:26-27.

Paul came to Ephesus, where Apollos had been, and found certain disciples. Acts 19:1.

Who could doubt for a moment that these were Apollos's disciples. Acts 19:1. Such circumstantial evidence pointing to a crime would convict any man in our courts of justice.

Remember now that these people had only been taught the baptism of John; as a consequence, when Paul asked if they had received the Holy Ghost; the answer was, "We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost." That was a new word to them. They had heard nothing under that name.

Well, says one, that proves they had never been baptized by the Holy Ghost, or they would know something of it. They did not know it by name, but did know it in its effect. Just as well say that a heathen that never heard the word electricity, when suddenly brought in contact with a battery and thoroughly shocked, if he could not name the power that shocked him, that it would not be proof he was not shocked. Do you suppose that if that man never heard of electricity, and someone were to ask him if he was electrified, that he could honestly and intelligently answer yes? Certainly he would not be like the untaught disciples at Ephesus, they would not as much as know whether there be any electricity. But would that prove they were never shocked?

Those people were children of God and needed to be taught and baptized by one properly authorized. One who knew something of Holy Ghost baptism as well as John's baptism. Paul told them that, "John verily baptized with the baptism

of repentance, saying unto the people that they should believe on him that should come after him, that is, on Christ." In regard to the one that should come after him, John had before said that, "He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire," Matthew 3:11.

Where is the proof that in the baptizing of these people that Apollos had baptized, that John's baptism was repudiated? They were not baptized again, because they were baptized unto John's baptism, but because they were not baptized in the name of the Holy Ghost.

We will now return and further demonstrate that John baptized only those who were born again. If he had been a Campbellite preacher, instead of renouncing these Pharisaic vipers, he would have said, come on boys, and let me baptize you, and all the viper disposition or nature will be gone; but John says, "Bring forth fruits, meet for repentance." Prove to me that God has prepared you for this solemn duty, for I have come to "make ready a people prepared for the Lord." God never sent his ministry into the world to doctor snakes, but to feed the sheep.

But our friends have the science of snakeology down so perfectly that they by their skillful treatment, can convert a snake into a sheep.

When John shrank at the thought of baptizing the Savior, Jesus said unto him, "Suffer it to be so now, for thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness," Matthew 3:15.

I introduce this to prove that baptism is an act of righteousness. It takes a righteous person to do an act of righteousness. "Little children, let no man deceive you; he that doeth righteousness is righteous, even as he is righteous," I John 3:7.

Our friends declare that the unrighteous (sinner) must do righteousness (be baptized) in order to become righteous. Those who believe their teaching on this are deceived, says John, and he commands us, "Let no man deceive you."

If, as the Savior says, baptism is a righteous act; and as John says, those who do righteousness are righteous, it follows conclusively that only the righteous are to be baptized. If it is righteous to be baptized, baptism makes no one righteous and Campbellism fails.

Read I John 2:29. "If ye know that he is righteous, ye know that everyone that doeth righteousness is born of him."

Question: Is God righteous? If yes, the text says just as true is it that those who do righteousness are born of him. If that is true, just that certain is Campbellism false. If Campbellism is true, God is unrighteous according to the text; but if God is righteous, Campbellism is false. Which, friendly reader, do you prefer to believe?

If, as the Savior says, baptism is a righteous act, and those who do righteousness are born of God, it follows that only those who are born of God should be baptized. If only those who are born of God are subjects for baptism, it forever paralyzes the idea that alien sinners are baptized in order to be born of God.

But I have had them try to evade the force of the Savior's expression by saying that the righteousness fulfilled in baptism was only on the part of the administrator; but the Savior said, "It becometh us to fulfill all righteousness."

It becometh you and me, both of us. John was the administrator and Jesus was the subject, and the subject said to the administrator, "It becometh us." But this is only a demonstration that a drowning man will grab at a straw. Unrestrained, these people would trample the simplest English to carry a point.

Here are some statements, in his own handwriting from C. D. Nichols in debate with me last August.

Do you baptize a child of God, or a child of the devil? Answer: Child of the devil.

Isn't that enough to make angels blush, and to make humble children of grace hang their heads in disgust?

Who did John baptize? Did our great Head and Exemplar give a pattern for devils to follow? Does he say to devils, follow me? Or does he say, "Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do? John 8:44.

Does that ally the Savior very closely to Campbellism? Nay, but it puts his living veto to the infidelity. My brethren reprove me sometimes for my severity on the heathenish dogma, but I expect to slay the beast whenever it gets in my path as long as God gives me life and strength to do so. Some good people are ensnared by it. I love them, but abominate the web they are in.

Not only their ridiculous positions render it odious, but their ridiculous contradictions render it so.

C.R. Nichols, in answer to the same question says, "Child of the devil is servant of the devil. Is not a child of the devil for he has quit serving him."

There is what Charley said about it. Coleman said the opposite, and they are representatives of the same people, both debating and defending the same crowd over here in Texas. Now they must not say that Paine has lied on them, for you know that Paine would be, under those circumstances, as amenable to the libel laws of Texas as any other man; and you know if these people had any strings to pull they would pull them. We have documentary proof of everything we shall lay to their charge.

Now, if Elder J. S. Newman, my brother and yokefellow in the ministry, were to write on paper in debate with one of our friends, that he baptized children of God, and I were to claim the opposite, to baptize children of the devil, there would be a cleaning up in camps, and ought to be.

Every text they undertake to use on baptism proves too much for them. Take, for instance, the language of Ananias to Paul, "Why tarriest thou? Arise, and be baptized and wash away your sins."

It is impossible to believe that command without believing that baptism washes away sins, and that Paul was to wash them away by his own act—baptism. But if the washing there is regeneration, then Paul regenerated himself, for it was he that was to wash away his sins. But they squeal at that, saying, we don't believe that the sinner saves himself. Then you don't need that text, for it was Paul that was to wash himself with his own act.

We get a similar example in I Peter 3:21, "The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us." They use this to prove that baptism is a condition in order to salvation, but the text says, "baptism saves." But you will notice that Elders Bentley and Nichols both declared that baptism was not a cause of salvation, yet they say one can not be saved without baptism. The truth or Bible on the subject is that baptism *saves*. Acts 3:21.

Baptism is an act of ours, and hence it can appropriately be said, as on Pentecost, "Save yourselves from this untoward generation." But if baptism is a figure, as Peter says it is, and

baptism saves, it follows that the salvation is figurative. If it is figurative, it suggests or points to, or represents the real. So if one is in possession of the real, he can and ought to indicate it by a figure. But as there can be no figure without the real, so it is that none except those who are really saved by the blood of Christ can express it in the figure. To prove my position, Peter says, "not the putting away the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God." Baptism, then, is the answer or expression of a good conscience. Then the conscience is good before baptism.

The blood of Christ makes the conscience good. Hebrews 9:14. Therefore, the blood of Christ, which really saves is applied before and prepares one for baptism. That is the Bible and therefore the truth of the matter, and Campbellism fails us as a struggling victim.

Those who have the experience of Paul, Cornelius, the Jailer and the Pentecostians, we say to all such be baptized and wash away your sins (figuratively); baptism saves, baptism "remits sins." But we never say that baptism gives life or that it regenerates.

I will now close by giving a quotation from A. Campbell. I believe they all take him as authority. *The Christian System*, page 207, you find the following, "Being born imparts no new life; but is simply a change of state, and introduces into a new mode of living." Now we have the boys bottled, both with A. Campbell and the Bible. Campbell declares that the birth occurs at baptism, "born of water," and that the birth only "introduces into a new mode of living." Again, on page 201, he says, "A child is alive before he is born, and the act of being born only changes its state, not its life." Now if in the plan of salvation one is born at baptism, and the child is alive before born, then it follows that the sinner is alive before baptism. If the sinner is alive before baptism, our contention in full is proven, unless as Coleman D. Nichols said, those who are begotten may never be born. (*Writings of S. A. Paine; ppg 32-38*)

CAMPBELLISM on the Gospel: S. A. Paine: Our friends with their conditional system are consistent in contending that the

gospel is indispensable in the salvation of sinners, for if faith is the condition, and as they contend that there is no faith without the gospel, they must, to be consistent, maintain that the gospel is the necessary means. Mind you, they must not only hear the gospel but obey it also. They also claim that none obey the gospel only those who obey their teaching.

The gospel, like baptism, saves but does not regenerate. It saves the living and not the dead.

"The gospel is the power of God unto salvation to everyone that believeth," Romans 1:16.

We agree that the gospel saves a believer. We have proven repeatedly the condition of a believer, that he is "born again," "has everlasting life," not "condemned," "justified," etc.

But our friends say that the gospel is the means God uses in quickening the dead sinner.

Well, that puts salvation on a very narrow basis. It does not promise salvation on what Jesus does, but on what the disciples of Alexander Campbell do. It also promises damnation on what they fail to do; for if they fail to preach, the people, of course, fail to obey. If they fail to obey, they are gone, world without end, regardless of what Jesus may have done for them. Talk about a selfish, narrow, contracted theory! We certainly have it in the superlative degree in the above. That's considerably narrower than election and grace could possibly be; for grace will save in every nation, kindred, tongue and people.

The promise of election is that "all families of the earth shall be blessed." Campbellism is, that all families have a chance, provided we preach to them. Their system gives a chance to the very few that they preach to. The Bible system makes salvation sure to all the seed, to all to whom salvation was promised, whom God declares are as innumerable as the "sand of the sea," or as the "stars of heaven."

On the gospel, they miss the mark just as they do on everything else, mistake God's purpose or design in it.

By examining the question and answers, you will observe that their position is that the gospel begets or quickens the sinner, and that baptism borns them.

"Thy word hath quickened me," Psalms 119:50. This, they claim refers to David while a sinner, and that the word was the gospel. David said "thy word" not the "preacher's words." Jesus says, "The dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God and live." There is the word that quickened David and every other one quickened from Abel to the present. Jesus says, "The words I speak unto you they are spirit and they are life," John 6:63. When Jesus speaks the sinner lives. When Jesus asked the twelve if they would also go away Peter answered and said, "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life," John 6:68.

Jesus said to the Jews, "Search the scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they that testify of me."

The Jews thought that eternal life was in the scriptures (written word), but they, like our friends, thought wrong. Eternal life is in Jesus, and "God gives eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord," Romans 6:23.

Suppose the gospel does quicken, and it was preached to a sinner and he quickened by it, yet refused to be baptized, would that sinner ever be born? Elder Nichols says no; but others with whom I have conversed say it would be a case of abortion. What awful straits they are thrown into. It may be that some of their divines can give a more respectable hue to this awful picture, if so, the quicker done, the quicker an awful horror will be removed from the minds of many.

Does the above exaggerate the theory? Dear reader, do you believe it? Is it not human from center to circumference? Begotten by the preacher, born by the preacher of the water! Look at it. Who could have the hardihood to denominate that subject a child of God? Is God its father and "Jerusalem above which is free" its mother? "Call no man on earth *father*, for one is your Father, even God."

If I believed that doctrine I would, like an obedient child imitate mother, have my priests and bow to them, saying, *father*.

Preaching is teaching, and in order for one to be taught they must of necessity have life and a mind peculiar to that life. That is true in nature, and is equally true in the spirit. Teaching does not give life, but cultivates and contributes much to the life already possessed. The natural mind is susceptible to being taught natural things, but cannot know the things of the spirit. "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, for they are spiritually discerned," I Corinthians 2:14.

The sinner is evidently the natural man referred to, and preaching the gospel is certainly a thing of the Spirit. If so, then it follows that the gospel is foolishness unto them, and they cannot receive it. That truth is recorded in the preceding chapter, I Corinthians 1:23. "We preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumbling block, and unto the Greeks foolishness; but unto them that are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God." This proves conclusively two things. First, the gospel is foolishness to the uncalled; second, the gospel did not call them. Verse 18 of the same chapter says, "The preaching of the cross is to them that perish foolishness; but unto us which are saved it is the power of God." God saves and calls the sinner "according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ before the world began," II Timothy 1:9.

Then the gospel is the power of God unto them. It takes that saving and calling by grace to enable one to believe the gospel, and to be saved in a practical way by it. Paul, in speaking of the gospel to the church (children of God at Corinth), says, "By which also are ye saved, if you keep in memory what I preached unto you, unless you have believed in vain," I Corinthians 15:2.

We should not become confused over the term *salvation*, and mistake the gospel salvation of God's people for the salvation (regeneration) of the sinner. The sower in the parable, unquestionably, represents the true minister. He sows the seed

broadcast, but the sowing never did prepare the stony ground. The ground represents the hearts of the people. The position of our friend is, that the gospel, which is the seed, prepares the hearts, which is the ground. Jesus in speaking to the ungodly said, "Ye seek to kill me, because my word hath no place in you." Again he says, "Why do you not understand my speech? Even because ye cannot hear my words," John 8:43.

Why do they not hear his words? Let him answer, "They that are of God hear God's words; ye therefore hear them not, because ye are not of God." Our friends say that one must hear and obey in order to be of God, but the Bible (Jesus) declares, they must be of God in order to hear."

Now, of course, there is a practical or gospel coming that follows. That was done when Ananias preached to him. But remember Ananias did not teach Paul to know God, for he said to Paul, "The Lord, even Jesus that appeared unto thee in the way hath sent me that thou mightest receive thy sight." Paul already knew Jesus, "whom to know is life eternal," John 17:3.

Then the gospel does not give life, but "brings life and immortality to light," I Timothy 1:10.

The gospel in its effect is compared to the rain, "My doctrine shall drop as the rain, my speech shall distill as the dew, as the small rain upon the tender herb and showers upon the grass," Deuteronomy 32:2.

The gospel is to affect the people as the rain affects the grass. If our friends will demonstrate that the rain gives life to vegetation, then we will concede that an argument is made in proof that the gospel gives life to sinners. The rain does administer to the living vegetation, by way of feeding or nourishing it, and brings the life more vividly to light, but to the dead vegetation, the effect is quite different. So it is with the gospel. While the gospel shower is falling, you can see a marked difference in the effect on different people. Some will melt in tears of rejoicing, while others will mock. Some will say, "Men and brethren, what must we do?" while others will mock and say, "These are full of new wine."

The gospel did not make the difference in the material, but only brings to light the difference already existing. I once heard a brother make a beautiful illustration of this. He said, "Take two toys, one of wax, and the other of earth; shape and color them just alike, until the natural eye could discern no difference; then place them near each other with a torch of fire between them, and you will soon see the difference in the effect produced by the same cause. The wax will soften, while the earthen will harden; and hence different effects. Fire only proved the difference. So the gospel does not make a saint or sinner, but manifests them. It is a "savor of life unto life and death unto death."

Glorious gospel! While it does not rob Jesus of the glory in the salvation of sinners, but does contribute glory to him in ascribing all honor to his matchless name. While it does not give life to sinners, it does "feed the sheep" brings "life to light," "perfects the saints," "edifies the body of Christ," brings them to the "unity of the faith," "strengthens the weak," "comforts the mourner," "saves the believer," yea, it serves as a faithful index hand, pointing us to the final day.

The glorious gospel is so adapted to the struggling, fearful ones, it says to the mourner, "You shall be comforted;" to the weary and heavy laden, "Come to Jesus for rest;" to those who feel cast down and forsaken, Jesus loves you and has borne all your grief and will never forsake you. It tells us all about Jesus, how he loved us and gave himself for us, and how he now reigns to intercede for us until he comes to take us unto himself. To those who have a heart open by God's power and love, as Lydia of old, rejoice in these things; to them it is "glad tidings;" but to those in sin it is an idle tale and repulsive to their very nature. Dear reader, if you love the gospel and feast on its fruits, heaven will be your home, for your love of the truth is proof of a change of heart, and if your heart is changed, God's grace wrought the change

I love the glorious theme of grace, for it embraces all who love the Lord; all that are of a fearful heart or a contrite spirit. Yea, it will save all in heaven that solemnly think upon his name.

“And a book of remembrance was written before him for them that feared the Lord, and that thought upon his name, and they shall be mine, saith the Lord of hosts in that day when I make up my jewels; and I will spare them as a man spareth his own son that serveth him,” Malachi 3:16-17.

But, on the other hand, this ridiculous heresy which we have been exposing speaks in thunder tones, uttering condemnation to every one of the earth that does not think and go their way. It needs only to be stated to be rejected.

Friendly readers, let me turn from this humanism and speak to you of Jesus. Jesus was the promised seed, the seed of the woman that was to “bruise the serpent’s head.” He it was that was promised in the language, “Behold the Lord God shall come with a strong hand; his arm shall rule for him; his reward is with him, and his work before him,” Isaiah 40.

In this we see a wonderful provision, a mighty Savior, clothed with authority and power, and his work (salvation of sinners) is before him. In the purpose of God, all was as certain as after it occurred. The prophet asserts this when he says, “Unto us a child is born, a son is given, and the government shall be upon his shoulder; and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counselor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace,” Isaiah 9:6.

Again, the prophet saw him in his holy attire and character when he says, “Who is this that cometh from Edom with dyed garments from Bozrah? This that is glorious in his apparel, traveling in the greatness of his strength, I that speak in righteousness mighty to save,” Isaiah 63:1.

Friendly reader, will this Jesus fail, all because Campbellite preachers will not help, or that sinners won’t let him? Will the “work before him” fail for the want of aid or permission? Or will “he do his will in the army of heaven and on earth, and none can stay his hand?” This is the wonderful Savior of whom the angel spoke when he said, “Fear not, for thou shalt bear a son, and thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he shall save his people from their sins.”

Remember that his "work was before him" and that was to save his people from their sins." The prophet declares that "He is a rock and his work is perfect." Again, "He shall not fail nor be discouraged, until he set judgment in the earth, and the isles shall wait for his law."

Paul declares, "Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners." If he came to save sinners, and he "shall not fail," it follows that all he came to save will be saved. The reason why there is no failure is because the whole affair rests upon the faithfulness of the Trinity, and nothing depending upon an arm of flesh.

Christ was born according to promise, an all sufficient Savior. The shepherds received the message from heaven at his birth, "Unto you is born this day in the city of David a Savior, Christ the Lord," Luke 2:11. "And this shall be a sign unto you; ye shall find the babe wrapped in swaddling clothes, and lying in a manger.

Though he was a *babe*, he was the "Savior, Christ the Lord." How wonderful, and how greatly to be admired is the promised Messiah as he was given to us! He was God, and yet as perfectly man. Why is this? While it is beyond our power to fully analyze the Holy One, we can only say, "Where reason fails, let faith adore." Yet we can understand why he was manifest in the flesh. This must be in order for him to be adapted as Mediator between God and man.

It is God and man at variance. God is a Spirit; man is flesh, and Jesus is both, and therefore, complete within himself as Mediator. If he is complete as Mediator, he needs not any human aid to reconcile men to God. For one to insist that any human agency, other than the humanity of Jesus, is employed in redemption is to deny that Jesus came in the flesh.

"According to the word of heaven,
The child is born, the son is given,
And in a manger lies,
He sleeps as other infants sleep,

And weeps as other infants weep
Though Lord of earth and skies.

“The Godhead is not laid aside,
The manhood is not defied—
In him they both combine;
Flesh of our flesh, bone of our bone,
He’s David’s Lord and David’s son,
Both human and divine.

“In vain may human reason try,
To comprehend the mystery
of God and man in one;
The eye of faith alone can see
The glory and the mystery
Of Mary’s infant son.”

The eye of faith pierces into the inexplicable, yet glorious, character of our Lord, and enables us to rejoice in him as the “Only name under heaven, and among men, whereby we must be saved.”

The babe grows in years and at the age of 12 years is found in the temple confounding the wise with strong reason and hard questions. When he was reproved by his parents for lingering, he replied, “Wist ye not that I must be about my Father’s business.” His history now becomes very obscure until he is found on the bank of Jordan, demanding baptism at the hands of John his harbinger. This, it seems, was a solemn separation and consecration of himself to the work that lay before him.

He was baptized, and went his way teaching his own precious gospel, doing good, working miracles, and thus demonstrating that he was the “very Christ.” He was reviled, yet he reviled not again. He was “rejected of men,” “A man of sorrow, and acquainted with grief.” Yet there were always a few that clung to him, loved him, and delighted in following him. So it is till this good day. Only a few are contented with the sure mercies of David, coming through the exalted Jesus.

The multitudes have ever been against him, and his humble followers. While his followers were few they were devoted; they looked to him for all blessings and not to man. They believed he was the Savior, and was able to keep them.

To show the weakness of man, we have only to refer you to the fact that even his disciples forsook him in the death agony, notwithstanding Peter had declared he would go with him even unto death.

Finally the hour comes; Jesus is betrayed, and falls into the hands of murderers, tried, condemned, and crucified. See him, dear reader, in the judgment hall, innocent, harmless, and undefiled! Listen to his wicked conspirators as they maliciously swear falsely against him. Apparently he is without a friend or a witness or an attorney. He must bow to their mandates. The picture is dark indeed, and if there was no help higher than man, indeed, it would be. But the scene grows darker. They place upon him a purple robe, and upon his innocent head a crown of thorns, they lead him to Calvary, they strip him, and nail his hands and feet to the rugged wood. They make bare his innocent breast, and pierce his side.

See the lovely Savior as he hangs upon the cross, the blood flowing from his wounded side. His life ebbing out until he says, "I thirst." Oh, is there no heart to pity? No hand to lovingly administer? His disciples are fled. He is left alone. "He trod the winepress alone."

Instead of water, a sponge of vinegar is pressed to his dying lips by a fiendish hand. God withdraws his divine protection, and our Savior dies. This picture is sad, but it is glorious to feel in one's poor heart that he died for me.

The sun ceased to shine, and darkness prevailed, the earth rocked, the veil of the temple was rent from top to bottom.

Dear reader, do you believe that such a death could be for a sinner, and that sinner robbed of its benefits, all because some Campbellite preacher fails to reach him and convert him to his selfish creed? Nay, but, "He suffered, the just for the unjust,

that he might bring us to God." It is Christ's suffering that brings, by redemption, the sinner to God.

Something was accomplished by the death of Jesus. If so, whatever that something was is not left to be accomplished by the Campbellite or any other fraternity. Let's see if we can find what that something was.

"He appeared once in the end of the world to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." If Christ put away sin by the "sacrifice of himself," it follows that the sin he put away is not yet left to be put away by baptism.. If Christ put your sin away by his death, then you could not be lost, because of your refusal to be baptized, unless you are lost with your sin put away.

Again, "If when we were enemies, we were reconciled by his death, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life," Romans 5:10.

If his death reconciled us to God, it follows that baptism, or any other act of ours, does not reconcile us to God.

Again, "Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree," I Peter 2:24. If Jesus bore our sins in his own body on the tree, must we bear them in hell, because we refuse to suffer a Campbellite preacher to baptize us?

Here is what the Bible declares that Jesus accomplished in his death, viz: "Redeemed us from all iniquity." Titus 2:14. "Reconciled us to God," Romans 5:10. "Put away our sins." "Bear our sins in his own body," I Peter 2:24. "Redeemed us to God." Revelation 5:9. "Justified by his blood." Romans 5:9. "Perfected forever them that are sanctified," Hebrews 10:14.

If Jesus did all of this for sinners, the question remains unanswered, "Who can lay anything to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth, yea, it is Christ that died," etc. Christ did not only die, but is risen again, and "because he lives we shall also live with him in glory." Yes, "much more being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life." Jesus lives and reigns today to ave all that he redeemed. Paul declares, "He must

reign until all enemies are put under his feet." No enemy can prevail in the capturing of a single one of his redeemed people. He is "the lion of the tribe of Judah." The Shepherd of the Sheep. He "gives unto them eternal life, and they shall never perish."

"Grace reigns unto eternal life by Jesus Christ." "He has power over all flesh that he should give eternal life to as many as the Father hath given him." O precious Redeemer, blessed Savior. He has saved me from a state of ruin, he has filled my heart with love to him and his dear people. He gently and prevailingly leads me along life's rugged pathway. He makes the rough places smooth and crooked places straight. He exalts the valley, and makes the rugged mountain low. When I pass through the fire and water, I am not destroyed. When I am low down in despondency and trouble, I have only to make my requests known unto Jesus. When I am heavy laden with care and crushed down with the load, I have only to cast my cares upon him, and realize that he cares for me. When I am racked with pain, or scorching with fever, his precious Spirit whispers consolation to me, sweetly resigning me to all my trouble. "If we suffer with him we shall also reign with him." All my sufferings are nothing to compare with the Savior's agonies here on earth.

I am trusting in him to go with me even unto death. I am sure, if I am what I profess to be, he will never forsake me, but continue his loving benefits until he shall have conducted me home to glory.

Dear reader, if Jesus is not my all, I have no hope, I have no Savior. "I commend you to him, and to the word of his grace." He is your lawgiver, and you shall obey him. If a tender lamb should chance to read this that loves Jesus and his flock, my admonition is, "Come home to your friends." Prove your love for your king by living in sweet obedience to his commands and loving fellowship with his people. This will bring joy to you through life and a sweet comfort in death.

Canaan, The Land of

The Land of CANAAN: *Sylvester Hassell:* The ancient Canaan was about 170 miles in length, and 40 in average breadth, covering some 7,000 square miles, about the size of Wales. The length of the country under Solomon's dominion was about 200 miles, with a breadth of 160 miles, and an area of some 12,000 square miles.

Canaan, or Palestine, was designed and arranged by God when he laid the foundations of the earth and divided to the nations their inheritance, to be a natural fortress for the preservation of religious truth and purity; a home in which a covenant people might be trained and educated in the household of God and directly under his eye, to be zealous of good works themselves, and to be a priesthood to mankind; to carry out in their history God's promise to the founder of their race, that in him should all the families of the earth be blessed.

And therefore God surrounded it with natural fortifications, which kept it separate and secluded—even though placed in the very midst of the most concentrated populations of the world, in the very focus toward which their intercourse with one another radiated—until the objects of their hermit-training and discipline of its inhabitants were accomplished. God hedged round the vineyard in which he planted his own noble vine with tower and trench, with sea and desert, against the boar of the wood and the beast of the field.

From the foul Baal and Astarte worship of Syria in the north, it was defended by the lofty mountains of Lebanon; from the degrading brute and plant idolatry of Egypt it was guarded, in the south, by a long stretch of pathless wilderness; from the Assyrian deification of lawless force, and the monstrous incarnations of the east, the deep depression of the Jordan valley, the swift, deep current of the river, and the intricate fastnesses of the arid hills and valleys beyond, formed a sufficient protection; while between the people and the baneful effects of the beautiful and captivating human apotheoses of Greece and Rome, the Great Sea rolled its wide waste of waters.

This remarkable isolation of the country prevented the inhabitants from having any commercial intercourse with the outlying nations, Numbers 23:9. With the single and very doubtful exception of Joppa, there was no suitable harbor in which ships could be sheltered; all the havens along the western coast being unsafe. Not a single navigable river flowed from the interior to the sea; the principal stream, the Jordan, flowing parallel with the coast, and being very rapid, crooked and broken, and so deep below the surface of the adjacent country as to be invisible and difficult to approach, and finally losing itself in an inland

gulf which is as far below the level of the ocean as the mountains around it are above.

Not a single one of the many cities that at different times held the rank of capital was situated on the seashore, Jerusalem being build in the wildest and most inaccessible part of the interior. All these circumstances favored the design of God, and acted in harmony with the spirit of the Jewish law, which discountenanced commerce as much as it encouraged agriculture. The Jews could not help being a nation of farmers. As a new seed of Adam, subjected to a new trial of obedience, they were placed in this new garden of Eden, to dress and keep it, in order that through their tilling of the ground the wilderness and the solitary place might be made glad, and the desert rejoice and blossom as the rose.

Very rich and varied were the natural resources of Canaan. No other country in the world presented, within a limited area, such diversities of soil and climate. On the one side it rose ten thousand feet above the level of the sea; on the other it sank one thousand three hundred feet below it; and between these two extremes there was the utmost variety of scenery, temperature and productions. All the seasons had their perpetual abode in this favored country. Perpetual spring smiled on the green slopes of Galilee; summer that knew no blight glowed on the tree-covered hills of Carmel; autumn lingered around the corn fields of Bethlehem and the purple vineyards of Hebron; while grim winter sat forever on his icy throne on the brow of Lebanon, and sent his cooling breath over, but dared not lift, his destroying arm upon the land.

Going from the north to the south was like passing through the circle of the year and the zones of the earth. In the deep trench of the Jordan the mild dews and soft air of the temperate zone; and far up the sides of Lebanon the icy rigor of the Arctic regions. Almost every species of the vegetable kingdom— forest-tree, fruit and flower, field and garden product—is found in Palestine.

Containing, in ancient times, from three to six million inhabitants, it was the most fertile and highly cultivated country in the world, and amply sufficed to sustain its population without any extraneous support, without any need of commerce or merchandise.

The whole landed property of the country was divided inalienably among the inhabitants in such a way as that the possession of each family was capable of yielding, in years of ordinary productiveness, not merely a comfortable, but even a luxurious maintenance. Each Israelite sat under his own vine and fig tree, without fear or famine.

The whole land was self-contained and independent, and thus its isolation from surrounding nations was still further secured. By the necessity of a careful cultivation of every inch of soil, the Jews became distinguished above other nations for habits of industry, intelligence and economy; while their worldwide variety of soil and climate fitted them for their universal destiny. (H. Macmillan's *SABBATH OF THE FIELDS. From Hassell's History*)

Carey, William

William CAREY (See under *FOREIGN MISSIONS*)

Carlstadt

CARLSTADT (See under *Martin LUTHER*)

Cassian, John

John CASSIAN (See under *PELAGIANISM*)

Cathari, The

The CATHARI Many persons, called Cathari (the pure), appeared in Northern Italy, Germany and France, during this century, who entertained sentiments similar to the Paulicians. They were stigmatized by their enemies as Manichaens; but some of them, at least, were only moderately, if at all, inclined to dualism. They earnestly opposed the manifold superstitions, idolatries and corruptions of the Catholics, and insisted upon the necessity of a pure, inward, spiritual religion. Especially in France did the Catholics put several of them to death, generally by burning." (*Hassel's History pg 433*)

Catherine of Aragon

CATHARINE of Aragon (See under the *CHURCH OF ENGLAND*)

Chalcedon, The Council of

The Council of CHALCEDON: Sylvester Hassell: The Council of Chalcedon also conferred on the *Bishops* of Rome, Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem the titles of *Patriarchs*, thus laying the foundations of the unscriptural oligarchy of the Greek Catholic *Church*; and the *Bishop* of Rome, Leo the Great, who was in office from A.D. 440 to 461, and who was a man of extraordinary mental ability and of towering ambition, laid the foundations of the unscriptural monarchy of the Roman Catholic *Church* by striving to realize Cyprian's invention of the supremacy of Peter over the other Apostles, the succession of the Bishop of Rome to Peter, and consequently that Bishop's supremacy over the whole church" (*Hassell's History pg 407*) (*See also under NESTORIANISM*)

Charlemagne

CHARLEMAGNE: Sylvester Hassell: The Mohammedans, or Saracens, after conquering Spain and southern France, were repulsed with immense slaughter by Charles Martel at Tours, in France, A.D. 732, just one hundred years after the death of Mohammed, and were driven back into Spain. Pepin the Short, the son of Charles Martel (encouraged by Pope Zachary, in order to increase the papal influence over France), dethroned in 752, Childeric III., the last of the Merovingian kings of France, and assumed the French crown, thus founding the Carolingian dynasty, the champions of Roman Catholicism.

The Exarchate of Ravenna, with its inseparable dependency of the Pentapolis, in Central Italy, having belonged to the Eastern Roman Empire since the time of Justinian, was, in 751, conquered by Astolphus, king of the Lombards, who also threatened Rome.

Pope Stephen III. addressed a letter to Pepin, pretendedly "in the name and person of the Apostle Peter himself," and urged him under the penalty of eternal damnation if he refused, and upon the promise of paradise if he consented, to undertake the defeat of Astolphus and the deliverance of Rome. Pepin complied and succeeded, and, as he says, "for the remission of his sins and the salvation of his soul," conferred on the Roman Pontiff the Exarchate of Ravenna and the Pentapolis, A.D. 754, and this grant was confirmed and enlarged by Pepin's son and successor, Charlemagne.

The **Donation of Pepin** founded **the temporal power of the pope**, which lasted eleven hundred and fifteen years, until, in 1870, at the beginning of the Franco-Prussian War, Napoleon III. Withdrew all his soldiers from Italy, and Victor

Emmanuel II. took possession of Rome. “The mutual obligations of the popes and the Carolingian family,” says Gibbon, “form the important link of ancient and modern, of civil and ecclesiastical history.”

Charlemagne reigned forty-six years (768-814). He made the first and last successful attempt to consolidate the Teutonic and Roman races in one great empire. December 25th, A.D. 800, Pope Leo III. Crowned and anointed him in Rome, as Caesar Augustus, the Emperor of the Romans. He reigned in France, in Spain as far as the Ebro, in Germany, in Hungary, and in the greatest part of Italy. His dominion was called the “**Holy Roman Empire**,” because allied with the pope, and, with varying boundaries, lasted a thousand and six years, until, in 1806, Napoleon Bonaparte compelled Francis of Austria to abdicate the title, and himself claimed, by his own military prowess, to be the true successor of Charlemagne.

Charlemagne, the pope’s new lord, whose figure stands at one end, as that of Constantine, a similar churchman, stands at the other end, of the stately porch of *St. Peter’s* at Rome, was an illiterate barbarian, though a professed patron of learning, a very licentious and ambitious man, a vigorous ruler and a bloody warrior.

He had nine wives or concubines, and a number of dissolute daughters; he fought, in thirty-three bloody campaigns, during as many years, with the Saxons, Bohemians, and Huns, professedly to civilize and Christianize them, compelling thousands of them to be baptized or to suffer death. He once slew forty-five hundred Saxon prisoners in cold blood; and finally effected the conquest of the Saxons by deporting them in France. He was, says Milman, “the Mohammedan Apostle of the Gospel.” He is said to have restored 3,700 “church” buildings; and he ordered tithes to be paid to the `clergy. (*Hassell’s History* ppg 419-420)

Charles Martel

CHARLES MARTEL: Sylvester Hassell: The Mohammedans, or Saracens, after conquering Spain and southern France, were repulsed with immense slaughter by Charles Martel at Tours, in France, A.D. 732, just one hundred years after the death of Mohammed, and were driven back into Spain. [Note: Charles Martel was the grandfather of Charlemagne the Great] (*Hassell’s History* ppg 419) (*See also under CHARLEMAGNE*)

Christ - Introduction

INTRODUCTION

Our Primitive Baptists will not accept everything John Gill wrote. He expected a literal thousand years personal reign of Christ after the present age is over. We do not agree with that. Especially early in his ministry, he believed the preached gospel is an instrument in calling the elect into divine life. He often stated, and contradicted, that thought— sometimes in the same paragraph—and he largely gave up the idea in his later years, but the notion appears over and over in his writings. Also, he did not usually make the distinction our people think he should have made between the predestination of the elect to heaven, and the predestination of events in time.

It is mainly because of those three areas that so many of our people have neglected, or outright rejected, Gill's writings. But we should not throw away the good with the bad.

In spite of what our people are convinced are some serious errors on his part, honesty requires us to admit that, as a theologian, John Gill has never had an equal; he probably never will.

We would not blindly accept the writings of any man. The only real authority is the Bible itself. Every preacher since the Apostles has been wrong from time to time. God would not allow the Apostles to make a mistake when they were penning the Holy Scriptures, but even they were sometimes wrong in their own private conduct. James and John were wrong when they wanted to sit on the Lord's right and left hand (Matthew 20:20-23). Peter was wrong when he "withdrew and separated himself" at Antioch (Galatians 2:12). And he was certainly wrong when he tried to cut that poor man's head off, when they came to arrest the Lord (John 18:10).

Everybody makes mistakes from time to time, and we should not reject somebody—or his writings—simply because he is not infallible. We just pick among what is offered, and accept what we can. When Gill was wrong, he was just plain wrong; but when he was right, it would be hard to find anybody who was more right than he was.

But even when he was wrong, he was comprehensive. He would look at any subject from every side, and list all the proof texts that relate to the subject. He would consider every possibility, and he would usually reach a conclusion. Sometimes, he would just give the various opinions available, and let you make up your own mind. He would not commit himself one way or the other. That very thing exasperates some of our people.

And, more often than not, he would talk you to death. He would explore every avenue of thought that related to the subject, and by the time he came back to the main subject, sometimes, you have trouble remembering what the subject was.

But, at the worst, if you read Gill, you will discover what the various opinions are, and you will discover most every proof text that deals with the subject. That is a benefit in itself.

In this work we have tried to reformat Gill's work in a more readable manner.

1. We have printed it in large twelve point type instead of the tiny eight or nine point type most publishers have used. It is hard to follow any line of reasoning, if you have to squint to read the material.
2. Except for those times when he cites very long passages, we have quoted all his proof texts in full. That way you do not have to be constantly looking up his proof texts. That should allow you to maintain the line of thought more easily.
3. Most writers from the 18th and 19th centuries seem to prefer very long sentences, made up of coordinate clauses, and strung together with semicolons. Sylvester Hassell's History has one sentence that runs for eleven pages. We have taken the liberty of replacing many of Gill's semicolons with periods, so you can catch your breath every now and then. That does not change the content; it just makes a stand alone sentence out of a coordinate clause. In those instances where we needed to supply a word to preserve the sense, we have enclosed the supplied word, or words, in brackets to show they are supplied.
4. And we have broken up his long paragraphs into shorter paragraphs of usually no more than four or five sentences. Every time he introduces a new thought, we have started a new paragraph.
5. We have also bolded what we consider to be his main thoughts. Hopefully that will lead your eye down the page from one main thought to another.
6. For the most part, we have left off his quotes from the Jewish Kabbalists, and from pagan philosophers. They rarely add anything beneficial to the presentation. They take up valuable space; and it seems to me, they are somewhat out of place in a discussion of the Christian religion.
7. Finally, we have left off those passages where he seems to just be chasing random thoughts. Here in the South we call that *chasing rabbits*. Those lines of thought have a way of distracting from the main theme. They interrupt your line of thought, and make it harder to sort out the subject at hand.

After all, this is an abridgement. We are not trying to reproduce all of Gill's work. That has already been done by other publishers. We hope no one is offended by our taking these liberties. If that is not acceptable, there are always the standard works available in the book stores. You should avail yourself of those, and I wish you lots of luck.

Harold Hunt

Christ - Part 1 - The Offices of Christ

PART ONE: THE OFFICES OF CHRIST

Christ: The Covenant Head

There are various characters, relations, and offices, which Christ sustains in the covenant of grace; among which, that of a federal Head is one. Christ is often said to be the "Head of the Church."

Ephesians 1:22-23 And hath put all things under his feet, and gave him *to be the head over all things* to the church, Which is his body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all.

Ephesians 5:23 For the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is *the head of the church*: and he is the savior of the body.

Colossians 1:18 And he is *the head of the body*, the church: who is the beginning, the firstborn from the dead; that in all *things* he might have the preeminence.

Ephesians 4:15-16 But speaking the truth in love, may grow up into him in all things, *which is the head, even Christ*: From whom the whole body fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love.

Colossians 2:19 And *not holding the Head*, from which all the body by joints and bands having nourishment ministered, and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God.

Matthew 23:10 Neither be ye called masters: for *one is your Master, even Christ*.

The headship of Christ in these several senses, chiefly belongs to his Kingly office.

But besides these, he is the representative head of his church, or of all the elect of God. They were all considered in him, and represented by him, when he covenanted with his Father for them.

All that he engaged to do and suffer, was not only on their account, but in their name and stead. And all that he received, promises and blessings, were not only for them, but he received them as representing them. As Christ was given to be the covenant of the people, so to be an Head of them in it.

1. Christ was considered in election; he was chosen as Head, and his people as members in him, and so they had union to him, and a representative being in him before the world began. They did not then personally exist, but Christ did, who represented them, and therefore were capable of being chosen in him, as they were.

Ephesians 1:4 According as he hath *chosen us in him* before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love:

II Timothy 1:1 Paul, an apostle of Jesus Christ by the will of God, according to the promise of life which is *in Christ Jesus*,

II Corinthians 1:20 For all the promises of God *in him* are yea, and in him Amen, unto the glory of God by us.

4. All the blessings of grace, and grants of them in the covenant of grace, given and made to the elect in it, were given and made to Christ first in their name, and as representing them, and to them in him, as considered in him, their head and representative.

II Timothy 1:9 Who hath saved us, and called us with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us *in Christ Jesus* before the world began,

Ephesians 1:3-4 Blessed *be* the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places *in Christ*: According as he hath *chosen us in him* before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love:

5. Christ, in the everlasting covenant, engaged in the name of his people, to obey and suffer in their stead; and accordingly he did both in time, as their Head and Representative. He obeyed the law, and fulfilled all righteousness, not as a single individual of human nature, and for himself, but *as the federal Head of his people, as representing them.*

Romans 8:4 That the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.

That is, in the elect of God, they being considered in Christ their Head, when he became the fulfilling end of the law for righteousness unto them; and so they were made, or accounted, the righteousness of God *in him* their Head,

Romans 10:4 For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth.

II Corinthians 5:21 For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God *in him*.

In like manner as he in their name engaged to suffer for them; so in time he suffered in their room and stead, as their head and representative; insomuch that they may be truly said to suffer with him.

They were all gathered together, recollected in one Head, *in Christ*, and sustained and represented by him when he hung upon the cross, and are said to be "crucified with him."

Ephesians 1:10 That in the dispensation of the fulness of times he might gather together in one all things *in Christ*, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth; *even in him*:

Colossians 2:12 *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.

6. In consequence of Christ's covenant engagements and performances, when he rose from the dead, he rose not as a private Person, but as a public Person, as the head and representative of all those for whom he obeyed and suffered.

Therefore they are said to be quickened and raised together with him, as they were then also justified in him, when he himself, as their Head and Surety was.

Ephesians 2:5-6 Even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together *with Christ*, (by grace ye are saved;) And hath *raised us up together*, and *made us sit together* in heavenly places *in Christ Jesus*:

Colossians 3:1 If ye then be *risen with Christ*, seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God.

Yea, Christ is also gone to heaven, not only as the Forerunner of his people, but as their Head and Representative.

He has taken possession of heaven in their name, appears in the presence of God for them, and represents them, as the high priest did the children of Israel, in the holy of holies. Hence they are said to be made to sit together in heavenly places *in Christ Jesus*.

Ephesians 2:6 And hath *raised us up together*, and made *us* sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus:

7. The federal headship of Christ, may be argued and concluded from Adam being a federal head and representative of all his natural offspring; in which he was "the figure of him that was to come."

Romans 5:14 Nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression, who is the figure of him that was to come.

[This] appears by his running the parallel between them, as heads and representatives of their respective offspring. Adam, through his fall, conveying sin and death to all his natural descendants; and Christ, through the free gift of himself, communicating grace, righteousness, and life to all his spiritual seed, the elect, the children his Father gave him.

Hence these two are spoken of as the first and last Adam, and the first and second man, as if they were the only two men in the world, being the representatives of each of their seeds, which are included in them.

I Corinthians 15:45 And so it is written, *The first man Adam* was made a living soul; *the last Adam* was made a quickening spirit.

I Corinthians 15:47 *The first man is* of the earth, earthy: *the second man is* the Lord from heaven.

Now, as Christ stands in the relation of an Head to the elect, he has all things delivered into his hands; in honor to him, and in love both to him and them, and for their good. God has given him to be "Head over all things" to the church,

Matthew 11:27 *All things are delivered unto me* of my Father: and no man knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him.

John 3:35 The Father loveth the Son, and *hath given all things into his hand*.

Ephesians 1:22 And hath *put all things under his feet*, and gave him to be *the head over all things* to the church,

All persons and things are under his command, and at his disposal, to subserve his interest as Head of the church.

CHRIST: The Mediator

Another relation, or office, which Christ bears in the covenant, is that of Mediator. Three times in the epistle to the Hebrews is he called the Mediator of the new, or better covenant or testament.

Hebrews 8:6 But now hath he obtained a more excellent ministry, by how much also he is the *mediator* of a better covenant, which was established upon better promises.

Hebrews 9:15 And for this cause he is the *mediator* of the new testament, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions *that were* under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance.

Hebrews 12:24 And to Jesus the *mediator* of the new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling, that speaketh better things than that of Abel.

The apostle Paul asserts, that there is "one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus,"

I Timothy 2:5 For *there is* one God, and one *mediator* between God and men, the man Christ Jesus.

Christ is the one and only Mediator. It will be proper to enquire,

First, In what sense Christ is the mediator of the covenant; not as Moses, who stood between God and the people of Israel, "to show" them "the word of the Lord," to receive the law, the lively oracles, and deliver them to them, said to be ordained, or disposed by angels, in the hand of a mediator, supposed to be Moses.

Deuteronomy 5:5 (I stood between the LORD and you at that time, to shew you the word of the LORD.

Galatians 3:19 Wherefore then *serveth* the law? It was added because of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made; *and it was* ordained by angels in the hand of a *mediator*.

Christ indeed is the revealer and declarer of his Father's mind and will. But this more properly belongs to him as the angel or "messenger of the covenant."

Malachi 3:1 Behold, I will send my *messenger*, and he shall prepare the way before me: and the Lord, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his temple, even *the messenger of the covenant*, whom ye delight in: behold, he shall come, saith the LORD of hosts.

Christ is a mediator of reconciliation; such an one as interposes between two parties at variance, in order to bring them together, and in some way or other reconcile them to each other. "A mediator is not of one," of one party; for where there is but one party there can be no difference, and so no need of a mediator. But "God is one," he is one party, the offended party, and man is the other, the offending party.

Christ is the mediator between them both to bring them together, who are through sin at as great distance as earth and heaven. He is the antitype of Jacob's ladder, that reaches both and joins them together; **the daysman between them, who lays his hand on them both, and makes peace between them.**

This work he performs not merely by way of entreaty, as one man may entreat another to lay aside his resentment against an offender, and not pursue him to his destruction, or as Moses entreated God with great vehemence and importunity to forgive the Israelites, or blot him out of his book.

However commendable this may be for one man to intercede with another, in such a manner; **yet it seems too low and mean an office for Christ the Son of God,** barely to entreat his Father to lay aside the marks of his displeasure against a sinner, and not so honorable for God to grant it, without satisfaction. Wherefore Christ acts the part of a mediator, by proposing to his Father to make satisfaction for the offence committed, and so appease injured justice.

Christ is a mediator of reconciliation in a way of satisfaction. Reconciliation in this way is Christ's great work as mediator. This is what was proposed in covenant, and what he therein agreed to do, and therefore is called the mediator of the covenant.

Reconciliation supposes a former state of friendship, a breach of that friendship, and a renewal of it; or a bringing into open friendship again.

Man in a state of innocence was in a state of friendship with God, had many high honors and special favors conferred upon him; being made after the image and likeness of God. [He] had all the creatures put in subjection to him, was placed in a delightful garden, [and] had a right to eat of the fruit of all the trees in it but one. To him the creatures were brought to give them names, and an help meet was provided for him.

But man being in this honor abode not long; sin soon separated chief friends, and he was driven out of his paradisaical Eden; and appeared to be, as all his posterity are, not only at a distance from God, and alienation to him, but enmity against him, as the carnal mind of man is.

Colossians 1:21 And you, that were sometime *alienated* and enemies in your mind by wicked works, yet now hath he *reconciled*.

Hereby [he] has brought them into an open state of grace and favor with God; into greater nearness to him, and into a more exalted state of friendship with him than was lost by the fall.

It should be observed, that the elect of God are considered in the covenant of grace as fallen creatures; and that Christ being a mediator of reconciliation and satisfaction for them, supposes them such.

In the covenant of works there was no mediator. While that covenant remained unbroken, and man continued in a state of integrity, he needed none. He could correspond and converse with God without one. Though he might have knowledge of Christ as the Son of God, and second person in the Trinity, which was necessary to his worship of him, **yet he knew nothing of him as mediator, nor needed him as such.** He could hear the voice of God, and abide in his presence without fear or shame. It was after he had sinned, and not before, that he hid himself among the trees, on hearing the voice of God.

Nor is there any mediator for angels. None was provided, nor admitted, for the fallen angels; they were not spared. The good angels needed not any, having never sinned; they are admitted into the divine presence without a mediator to introduce them. They stand before God, and behold his face continually.

Sin has been committed, which is offensive to God, provoking to the eyes of his glory, and deserving of his wrath, even of eternal death. The law [has been] broken, which reflects dishonor on the lawgiver, who is able to save and to destroy. Justice [has been] injured and affronted, and which insisted on making a satisfaction, and that nothing less than perfect obedience to the law, and a bearing the penalty of it.

Fallen man could not make his peace with God, nor reconcile himself to him on such terms. Christ, as mediator of the covenant, undertook to make reconciliation for elect men; and God

set him and sent him forth to be, and he is become the propitiation for their sins.

God is pacified towards them for all that they have done, and has taken away all his wrath, and turned himself from the fierceness of his anger, and removed all the visible marks and effects of his displeasure.

Nor is this reconciliation Christ is the mediator of, as thus stated, any contradiction to the everlasting love of God to his elect in Christ.

Where there is the strongest love among men, when an offence is committed, there is need of reconciliation to be made. David had the strongest affection for his son Absalom as can well be imagined. Absalom committed a very heinous offence. [He] murdered his brother Amnon, David's firstborn, and heir to his crown. He fled from justice, and from his father's wrath and vengeance he might justly fear.

Joab became a mediator between them, first more secretly, by means of the woman of Tekoah, and then more openly in his own person, and succeeded so far as to obtain leave that the young man be called from his exile. Nevertheless, when [he] returned, David would not admit him into his presence until two years after, when, and not before, a full and open reconciliation was made and declared. **Yet all this while the heart of David was towards his son,** and continued, even notwithstanding his unnatural rebellion against him.

And so the love of God to his people is from everlasting to everlasting, invariably the same. With him there is no shadow of turning; there is no change in God, as not from love to hatred, so not from hatred to love. He is in one mind, and none can turn him, no, not Christ himself.

Nor was it the work of Christ's mediation, nor the design of it, to turn the heart of God; for that proceeded according to the unalterable and unchangeable will of God. Nor did the mediation of Christ procure, nor was it intended to procure the love and favor of God to his elect. So far from it, that itself is the fruit and effect of that love.

John 3:16 For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.

Romans 5:8 But God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us.

I John 4:10 Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the *propitiation* for our sins.

It was love that set forth and sent forth Christ to be the propitiation for sin. It was owing to the good will and free favor of God, that a Mediator was admitted for sinful men; and it appeared still greater, in providing one to be a Mediator of reconciliation for them.

The reconciliation the scriptures speak of, as made by the blood, sufferings, and death of Christ, is **not a reconciliation of God to them, as to his love, but a reconciliation of them to God.** [This is] not so much of their persons, which are always acceptable and well pleasing to God, as considered in Christ, in whom they were chosen, as for their sins.

Romans 5:10 For if, when we were enemies, we were *reconciled* to God by the death of his Son, much more, being *reconciled*, we shall be saved by his life.

II Corinthians 5:19 To wit, that God was in Christ, *reconciling* the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them; and hath committed unto us the word of *reconciliation*.

Colossians 1:20-21 And, *having made peace* through the blood of his cross, by him to *reconcile* all things unto himself; by him, I say, whether they be things in earth, or things in heaven. And you, that were sometime alienated and enemies in your mind by wicked works, yet now hath he *reconciled*.

Hebrews 2:17 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.

[This] is no other than a satisfaction for them to divine justice; for the reconciliation of their persons in that way, is not to the love and affections of God, from which they were never separated, but to the justice of God, offended by their sins. **And the whole is a reconciliation of the divine perfections to each other in the business of salvation;** for though these agree among themselves, yet with respect to that, had different claims to make.

The love and grace of God pleaded for mercy, and mercy pleaded for itself, that it might be shown to the objects of

love. But justice insisted on it, that satisfaction be made for the offences committed.

The difficulty was how to answer each of these pleas. Christ interposed, and offered himself in the covenant, to be a Mediator of reconciliation, or to make satisfaction for sin. So mercy and truth have met together, and righteousness and peace have kissed each other.

Reconciliation then is the principal branch of Christ's office in the covenant as Mediator. Another follows, namely, his intercession, or advocacy, which proceeds upon reconciliation or satisfaction made.

I John 2:1-2 My little children, these things write I unto you, that ye sin not. And if any man sin, we have an *advocate* with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous: And he is the *propitiation* for our sins: and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world.

It is his being the Propitiation for sin, that is the foundation of his advocacy, or on which is grounded his plea for the remission of it. He is the Angel of God's presence, who always appears there for his people, and ever lives to make intercession for them. **He is first the Mediator of reconciliation, and then of intercession.** As they are reconciled to God by his sufferings and death, they are saved through his interceding life.

He is called the Angel of God's presence, not only because he enjoys it himself; but because he introduces his people into it, and presents their petitions to God, offers up the prayers of all saints, perfumed with the much incense of his mediation; through which they become acceptable to God.

Christ is the medium of access to God, to the throne of his grace. There is no drawing nigh of sinful men to God without a Mediator. Without him he is a consuming fire. No man can come to the Father but by Christ. He is the only Way, the new and the living Way. Through him, his blood, righteousness, and sacrifice, there is access with boldness and confidence.

Secondly, The principal fitness of Christ for his office, as Mediator, at least for the execution of it, lies in the union of the two natures, human and divine, in his one Person; whereby he is the Immanuel, God with us, God manifest in the flesh. And as he partakes of both natures, he has an interest in, and a concern for both. He is fit to be a Mediator between God and man; both to take

care of things pertaining to God and his glory, and to make reconciliation for the sins of the people.

1. It was requisite that he should be man, assume human nature into union with his divine Person, even a true body, and a reasonable soul.

(1.) That he might be related to those he was a Mediator, Redeemer, and Savior of; that he might be their brother, their near kinsman, their God, and so have an apparent right to redeem them, as the near kinsman, according to the law, had.

Leviticus 25:48-49 After that he is sold he may be redeemed again; one of his brethren may redeem him: Either his uncle, or his uncle's son, may redeem him, or *any* that is nigh of kin unto him of his family may redeem him; or if he be able, he may redeem himself.

(2.) That sin might be satisfied for, and reconciliation be made for it, in the same nature which sinned. And whereas, according to the scheme of mediation and salvation by Christ, the same individuals that sinned were not to suffer; it seems requisite and reasonable that an individual of that nature should, in their room and stead, that so it might come as near to what the law required as could be.

(3.) It was proper that the Mediator should be capable of obeying the law, broken by the sin of man. As a divine Person could not be subject to the law, and yield obedience to it; and had he assumed the angelic nature, that would not have been capable of obeying all the precepts of the law, which are required of men; and [as] universal perfect obedience was necessary for the justification of a sinner before God; hence Christ was made of a woman, that he might be made under the law, and yield obedience to it; by which obedience men are made righteous in the sight of God.

Galatians 4:4 But when the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, *made of a woman*, made under the law,

Romans 5:19 For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous.

(4.) It was meet the Mediator should be man, that he might be capable of suffering death. As God he could not die; and had he assumed the nature of an angel, that [nature] is incapable of dying. Yet suffering the penalty of the law, death, was necessary to make reconciliation.

A sacrifice for sin was to be offered, and therefore it was proper Christ should have somewhat to offer; even a true body, and a reasonable soul. Peace was to be made by blood, and reconciliation by the sufferings of death.

Therefore a nature must be assumed capable of shedding blood, and of suffering death; and without which he could not be made sin, and a curse for men, as the law required he should.

In a word, it was highly becoming, that the Captain of our salvation should be made perfect through suffering, that he might be a perfect Savior, which could not be, without the assumption of human nature.

Hebrews 2:10 For it became him, for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings.

Hebrews 2:14-15 Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; And deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage.

Hebrews 5:9 And being made perfect, he became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him;

Hebrews 8:3 For every high priest is ordained to offer gifts and sacrifices: wherefore it is of necessity that this man have somewhat also to offer.

(5.) It was fit the Mediator should be man, that he might be a merciful, as well as a faithful High Priest, have a fellow feeling with his people, and sympathize with them under all their temptations, afflictions, and distresses, and succor and relieve them, from love and affection to them, as their friend and brother.

Hebrews 2:17-18 Wherefore in all things it behooved him to be made *like unto his brethren*, that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people. For in that he himself hath suffered being tempted, he is able to succor them that are tempted.

Hebrews 4:15 For we have not an high priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted *like as we are*, yet without sin.

(6.) It was necessary that he should be holy and righteous, free from all sin, original and actual, that he might offer

himself without spot to God, take away the sins of men, and be an advocate for them.

Hebrews 7:26 For such a high priest became us, who is holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, and made higher than the heavens;

Hebrews 9:14 How much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?

I John 3:5 And ye know that he was manifested to take away our sins; and in him is no sin.

I John 2:1 My little children, these things write I unto you, that ye sin not. And if any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous:

But it was not enough to be truly man, and an innocent person. He must be more than a man, to be a mediator between God and man. It was requisite, therefore,

2. That he should be God as well as man.

(1.) That he might be able to draw nigh to God, and treat with him about terms of peace, and covenant with him; all which a mere man could not do. Therefore it is with wonder said, and as expressive of the arduousness of the task, of the difficulty of the work, and of the necessity of a divine Person to do it; "Who is this that engaged his heart to approach unto me, saith the Lord?" to mediate between him and sinful men, to lay his hands on both, and reconcile them together. **None but Jehovah's fellow could or dared to do this.**

Jeremiah 30:21 And their nobles shall be of themselves, and their governor shall proceed from the midst of them; and I will cause him to draw near, and he shall approach unto me: for who is this that engaged his heart to approach unto me? saith the LORD.

(2.) That he might give virtue and value to his obedience and sufferings; for if he had been a mere man, his obedience and righteousness would not have been sufficient to justify men, nor his sufferings and death a proper sacrifice and atonement for sin. But being God as well as man, his righteousness is the righteousness of God; and so sufficient to justify all that believe in him, and them from all their sins. **His blood is the blood of the Son of God, and so cleanses from all sin, and is a proper atonement for it.**

(3.) Being Mediator, Redeemer, and Savior, it naturally and necessarily leads men to put their trust and confidence in him, and rely upon him, for peace, pardon, and salvation. Whereas, if he was a mere man, and not God, this would entail a curse upon them; "for cursed is the man that trusteth in man, and maketh flesh his arm."

Jeremiah 17:5 Thus saith the LORD; Cursed be the man that trusteth in man, and maketh flesh his arm, and whose heart departeth from the LORD.

To worship and adore him, and ascribe divine honor and glory to him, which to do would be idolatry, was he not God.

Though he that is Mediator is to be worshiped by angels and men, yet not as mediator, but as God. **It is his Deity that is the foundation of worship, and renders him the proper object of it.** God will "not give" his "glory to another," not even the glory of being a Mediator to any other, but a divine Person.

Of Christ, in his mediatorial capacity, are the words spoken, as appears from the whole preceding context. It is necessary that the Mediator should be God, that he might be the proper object of trust, worship, honor, and glory divine.

Isaiah 42:8 I *am* the LORD: that is my name: and my glory will I not give to another, neither my praise to graven images.

Nor is it any objection to Christ being Mediator, as to his divine nature, that then he must be a Mediator to himself, or reconcile men to himself.

There is no impropriety that Christ is a Mediator for himself, or has made reconciliation and satisfaction to himself; for if the Father may be said to reconcile men to himself by his Son, why may not the Son be said to reconcile men to himself, as God, by his sufferings and death as man?

II Corinthians 5:18 And all things are of God, who hath *reconciled* us to himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given to us the ministry of *reconciliation*.

II Corinthians 5:19 To wit, that God was in Christ, *reconciling* the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them; and hath committed unto us the word of *reconciliation*.

Colossians 1:20 And, *having made peace* through the blood of his cross, by him to *reconcile* all things unto himself; by him, I say, whether they be things in earth, or things in heaven.

The mediation of Christ thus stated, meets with and militates against two errors.

One of those, who say he is only a Mediator as to his human nature; and that of others, who assert him to be only a Mediator as to his divine nature. But most certain it is, that there are various acts and works of Christ, as Mediator, in which both natures manifestly appear, and are concerned. [This is] not to make mention of the incarnation itself, or Christ's assumption of human nature, which manifestly implies both; for it was a divine Person that partook of flesh and blood, or assumed, not an angelic, but an human nature.

It was the Word, which was in the beginning with God, and was God, that was made flesh, and dwelt among men. It was he that was in the form of God, and thought it not robbery to be equal with him, that was found in fashion as a man, and took on him the form of a servant. It was God manifest in the flesh.

In the obedience of Christ both natures are to be perceived; not only the human nature, in his being obedient unto death, even the death of the cross; but the divine nature also. Otherwise, where is the wonder, that "though he were a Son, yet learned he obedience by the things which he suffered."

Hebrews 5:8 Though he were a Son, yet learned he obedience by the things which he suffered;

And it was that which gave virtue to his obedience, and made it satisfactory to the justice of God, and made the law more honorable than the perfect and perpetual obedience of angels and men could do.

In the act of laying down his life for men, both natures appear; the human nature, which is passive in it, and is the life laid down; the divine nature, or the divine Person of Christ, who is active in it, and laid down his life of himself, he having such a power over his life as man, and that at his disposal, as no mere creature ever had.

Both are to be observed in his taking of it up again; his human nature, in his body being raised from the dead; his divine nature or person, in raising it up of himself, whereby he was declared to be the Son of God with power. He was put to death in the flesh, in human nature, and quickened in the Spirit, or by his divine nature.

The sacrifice of himself, was his own act, as Mediator. What was offered up were his soul and body, his whole human nature.

This was offered by his eternal Spirit, or divine nature, which gave virtue to it, and made it a proper atoning sacrifice for sin.

To observe no more, the redemption and purchase of his people, is a plain proof of both natures being concerned in his work as Mediator.

The purchase price, or the price of redemption, is his precious blood, his blood as man; but what gave virtue to that blood, and made it a sufficient ransom price, is, that it was the blood of him that is God as well as man; and **therefore God is said to purchase the church with his own blood.**

Acts 20:28 Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which he hath *purchased with his own blood.*

3. It was not only requisite and necessary, that the Mediator should be God and man, but that he should be both in one Person, or that the two natures should be united in one Person; or, rather, that the human nature should be taken up, and united to, and subsist in the Person of the Son of God. The human nature, as it has no personality of itself, it adds none to the Son of God. It is no constituent part of his Person.

He was a divine Person, before his assumption of human nature; and what he assumed was not a person, but a nature, and is called a "thing, nature, seed,"

Luke 1:35 And the angel answered and said unto her, The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also *that holy thing* which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God.

Hebrews 2:16 For verily he took not on him *the nature of angels;* but he took on him *the seed of Abraham.*

Had it been a person, there would be two persons in Christ, and so two mediators, contrary to the express words of scripture.

I Timothy 2:5 For there is one God, and *one mediator* between God and men, the man Christ Jesus.

Hence it may be observed, that Christ is described in one nature, by qualities, works, and actions, which belong to him in the other.

Thus the Lord of glory is said to be crucified; God is said to purchase the church with his blood; and the Son of man is said to be in heaven, while he was here on earth.

I Corinthians 2:8 Which none of the princes of this world knew: for had they known it, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory.

Acts 20:28 Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which he hath *purchased with his own blood*.

John 3:13 And no man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man *which is in heaven*.

The advantage of this personal union is, that the divine nature has an influence upon, and gives virtue and dignity to whatsoever is done or suffered in the human nature; which is of the utmost concern in the mediation of Christ.

Nor is it any objection that two natures should influence one and the same action, or be concerned in the production or perfection of it; when it is observed, that the soul and body of man, united together, concur in the performance of the same action, whether good or bad. I shall next inquire,

Thirdly, How Christ came to be the Mediator of the covenant, even the Mediator of reconciliation in it. It was owing originally to a thought in the heart of God, the offended Party; whose thoughts were "thoughts of peace, and not of evil," towards offending man.

This affair began with God the Father. "All things are of God," that is, the Father, as appears by what follows; "Who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation.

II Corinthians 5:18-19 And all things are of God, who hath *reconciled* us to himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation; To wit, that God was in Christ, *reconciling* the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them; and hath committed unto us the word of *reconciliation*.

A council of peace was held between the divine Persons, which issued in a covenant of peace in which it was proposed to Christ, and he agreed to it.

Proverbs 8:23 I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was.

And God not only set him up, but set him forth, in his eternal purposes and decrees, to be the "propitiation for sin," to make

reconciliation and satisfaction for it, and declared him in prophecy to be the Prince of peace, and the Man that should appear in human nature, and make peace and reconciliation between him and men.

Romans 3:25 Whom God hath set forth *to be* a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God.

He sanctified him, or set him apart to this office before the world began; and in the fulness of time, sent him to be the propitiation, or propitiatory sacrifice, for the sins of men.

Even before his incarnation, being constituted in covenant the Mediator of it, he acted as such, throughout the whole Old Testament dispensation. He exercised in each of his offices then; his prophetic office, by making known to Adam the covenant of grace, immediately after his fall; by preaching by his Spirit to the disobedient in the times of Noah, the spirits that were in prison, in the times of the apostle Peter; and by his Spirit, in the prophets testifying beforehand his own sufferings, and the glory that should follow.

His Kingly office, in gathering, governing, and protecting his church and people, who acknowledged him as their King, Judge, and Lawgiver: and his Priestly office, through the virtue of his blood reaching backward to the foundation of the world, and therefore said to be the Lamb slain so early.

Instances there are of his intercession under the former dispensation.

Zechariah 1:12-13 Then the angel of the LORD answered and said, O LORD of hosts, how long wilt thou not have mercy on Jerusalem and on the cities of Judah, against which thou hast had indignation these threescore and ten years? And the LORD answered the angel that talked with me with good words and comfortable words.

Zechariah 3:1-4 And he shewed me Joshua the high priest standing before the angel of the LORD, and Satan standing at his right hand to resist him. And the LORD said unto Satan, The LORD rebuke thee, O Satan; even the LORD that hath chosen Jerusalem rebuke thee: *is* not this a brand plucked out of the fire? Now Joshua was clothed with filthy garments, and stood before the angel. And he answered and spake unto those that stood before him, saying, Take away the filthy garments from him. And unto him he said, Behold, I have

caused thine iniquity to pass from thee, and I will clothe thee with change of raiment.

The actual existence of Christ's human nature from eternity, was not necessary to his being a Mediator of the covenant. It was enough that he agreed in covenant, to be man in time; that this was known he would be, and was certain he should be.

Accordingly he was, from the instant of the covenant making, reckoned and accounted, and bore the name of the God-man and Mediator, and acted as such.

Some parts of his work did not require the actual existence of the human nature. He could draw nigh to God, as Jehovah's fellow, without it. He could treat with God about terms of peace, and promise to fulfil them, and covenant with God without it.

There were other parts of Christ's work as Mediator, which required its actual existence; as obedience to the law, and suffering death, the penalty of it.

But then, and not before, was it necessary for him to assume it, when the fulness of time was come agreed on, to obey and suffer. It only remains now,

Fourthly, To show what a Mediator Christ is, the excellency of him, and the epithets which belong to him as such.

1. He is the one and only Mediator; "There is one Mediator between God and man, the Man Christ Jesus," and there is no other. The papists plead for other mediators, angels and saints departed; and distinguish between a Mediator of redemption, and a mediator of intercession. The former, they own, is peculiar to Christ, the latter common to angels and saints. But there is no Mediator of intercession, but who is a Mediator of redemption and reconciliation.

Job 5:1 Call now, if there be any that will answer thee; and to which of the saints wilt thou turn?

2. Christ is a Mediator of men only, not of angels. Good angels need not any, and as for evil angels, none is provided nor admitted, as before observed. Yet not of all men; for the world, said to be reconciled to God by Christ, is not all the individuals in it; but the world Christ gave his flesh, or human nature for the life of.

There is a world for which he is not so much as a Mediator of intercession, and much less a Mediator of reconciliation.

II Corinthians 5:19 To wit, that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them; and hath committed unto us the word of *reconciliation*.

John 6:51 I am the living bread which came down from heaven: if any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever: and the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world.

John 17:9 *I pray for them*; I pray not for the world, but for them which thou hast given me; for they are thine.

The persons for whom Christ acted as a Mediator, by means of death, for the redemption of their transgressions, were such as were called, and received the promise of the eternal inheritance.

Hebrews 9:15 And for this cause he is the *mediator* of the new testament, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance.

3. Yet he is the Mediator both for Jews and Gentiles; for some of both these are chosen vessels of mercy; and God is a covenant God, not to the Jews only, but to the Gentiles also. Christ is a Propitiation, not for the sins of the Jews only, but for the sins of the whole world, or of God's elect throughout the whole world. Therefore both have access to God through the one Mediator, Christ.

Hebrews 9:15 And for this cause he is the *mediator* of the new testament, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance.

Romans 9:23-24 And that he might make known the riches of his glory on the vessels of mercy, which he had afore prepared unto glory, Even us, whom he hath called, *not of the Jews only*, but also of the Gentiles?

Romans 3:29-30 Is he the God of the Jews only? is he not also of the Gentiles? Yes, of the Gentiles also: Seeing it is one God, which shall justify the circumcision by faith, and uncircumcision through faith.

I John 2:2 And he is the propitiation for our sins: and not for ours only, but also for *the sins of the whole world*.

Ephesians 2:18 For through him we both have access by one Spirit unto the Father.

4. Christ is Mediator both for Old and New Testament saints; there is but one Mediator for both, but one Way to the Father, which

is Christ the Way, the Truth, and the Life. [There is] but one Way of life, peace, reconciliation, and salvation. [There is] but one Redeemer and Savior; but one name given under heaven among men, whereby they can be saved.

Old and New Testament saints are saved by the grace of our Lord Jesus. He is the Foundation of the apostles and prophets.

5. Christ is a prevalent Mediator, his mediation is always effectual, ever succeeds, and is infallible. As his work was to make peace and reconciliation, and he agreed and engaged to make it, he has made it. The thing is done, and done effectually. And as for his prayers, they are always heard, his intercession ever prevails, and is never in vain.

John 11:42 And I knew that thou hearest me always: but because of the people which stand by I said it, that they may believe that thou hast sent me.

6. Christ is an everlasting Mediator. He was Mediator from everlasting, and acted as such throughout the whole Old Testament period and still continues. He has an unchangeable priesthood. His blood always speaks peace and pardon, and he ever lives to make intercession.

When his mediatorial kingdom will be completed, there will be no need of him, either as a Mediator of reconciliation or intercession, at least in the manner he has been, and now is. Sin being wholly removed from the saints, even as to the being of it, they may have access to God, and he may communicate unto them, without the intervention of a Mediator; as is the case of the holy angels.

I shall observe no more, only that this office of Christ, as Mediator, includes his Kingly, Priestly, and Prophetic offices.

Christ: The Surety of the Covenant.

The suretyship of Christ is a branch of his mediatorial office.

One way in which Christ has acted the part of a Mediator between God and men, is by engaging on their behalf, to do and suffer whatever the law and justice of God required, to make satisfaction for their sins. **The Greek word for surety, *egguov*, is used but once throughout the whole New Testament, and there of Christ;** where he is said to be made, or become, "the Surety of a better testament," or covenant.

Hebrews 7:22 By so much was Jesus made a *surety* of a better testament.

And the word is derived either from *egguv*, near, because a surety draws nigh to one on the behalf of another, and lays himself under obligation to him for that other. Thus Christ drew nigh to his Father, and became a Surety to him for them. Hence those words,

Jeremiah 30:21 And their nobles shall be of themselves, and their governor shall proceed from the midst of them; and I will cause him *to draw near*, and he shall approach unto me: for who is this that engaged his heart *to approach* unto me? saith the LORD.

Or rather, it is derived from *guion*, which signifies the hand; because when one becomes a Surety, he either puts something into the hand of another for security, or rather puts his hand into the hand of another, or **strikes hands with him; a rite much used in suretyship,** and is often put for it, and used as synonymous.

Proverbs 6:1 My son, if thou be *surety* for thy friend, if thou hast *stricken thy hand* with a stranger,

Proverbs 17:18 A man void of understanding *strike hands*, and becometh *surety* in the presence of his friend.

Proverbs 22:26 Be not thou one of them that *strike hands*, or of them that are *sureties* for debts.

Snidas derives it from *gh, guh*, the earth, because that is the firmest of the elements, and remains immoveable, and may denote the firmness and security of the promise, or bond, which a surety gives to one for another.

The Hebrew word for a surety, in the Old Testament, *bre*, and elsewhere, has the signification of mixing because, as Stockins observes, in suretyship persons are so mixed among themselves, and joined together, that the one is thereby bound to the other.

Genesis 43:9 I will be *surety* for him; *of my hand* shalt thou require him: if I bring him not unto thee, and set him before thee, then let me bear the blame for ever:

Christ, as a Surety, drew nigh to his Father on the behalf of the elect, struck hands with him, and gave him firm security for them, and put himself in their place and stead, and engaged to perform everything for them that should be required of him. For the better understanding this branch of Christ's office in the covenant, it may be proper to consider,

First, In what sense Christ is the Surety of the covenant.

1st. First, He is not the Surety for his Father, to his people, engaging that the promises made by him in covenant shall be fulfilled. [This is] the Socinian sense of Christ's suretyship.

Such is the faithfulness of God that has promised, that there needs no surety for him. His faithfulness is sufficient, which he will not suffer to fail. He is God, that cannot lie, nor deny himself. There is no danger of his breaking his word, and not fulfilling his promise.

If his word was not enough, he has joined his oath to it, so that by two immutable things, in which it was impossible for God to lie, the heirs of promise might have strong consolation, in believing the fulfilment of every promise made.

Hebrews 6:18 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 upon the hope set before us.

He cannot give a greater security, than the word and oath of God, or that will lay a firmer foundation for confidence in the promises of God.

Secondly, Nor is Christ in such sense a Surety, as civilians call a fidejussor, or such a surety that is jointly engaged with a debtor, for the payment of a debt. [Nor is he] so bound for another, as that other remains under obligation, and the obligation of the surety is only an accession to the principal obligation, which is made stronger thereby, and the creditor has the greater security. **Yet still the principal debtor is left under his debt.** That is not removed from him, and he is under obligation to pay it, if able. And it is first to be demanded of him, or should his surety desert his suretyship, and not make satisfaction. But now none of these things are to be supposed in Christ's suretyship.

1. He is not a mere accessory to the obligation of his people for payment of their debts. He and they are not engaged in one joint bond for payment; he has taken their whole debt upon himself, as the apostle Paul did in the case of Onesimus. He has paid it off, and entirely discharged it alone.

2. Nor was any such condition made in his suretyship engagements for his people, that they should pay if they were able. God the Father, to whom Christ became a Surety, knew, and he himself, the Surety, knew full well, when this suretyship was entered into, that they were not able to pay, and never would be. Yea, [they knew] that it was impossible for them, in their circumstances, ever to pay; for having failed in their obedience to

God, all after acts of obedience, though ever so perfect, could not make amends, or satisfy for that disobedience, since to those God has a prior right.

And their failure in obedience, brings upon them a debt of punishment, which is everlasting, and *ad infinitum*. **And, if left on them, [they] would be ever paying, and never paid.**

Luke 7:41-42 There was a certain creditor which had two debtors: the one owed five hundred pence, and the other fifty. And when they had nothing to pay, he frankly forgave them both. Tell me therefore, which of them will love him most?

Matthew 18:24-25 And when he had begun to reckon, one was brought unto him, which owed him ten thousand talents. But forasmuch as he had not to pay, his lord commanded him to be sold, and his wife, and children, and all that he had, and payment to be made.

Matthew 5:26 Verily I say unto thee, Thou shalt by no means come out thence, till thou hast paid the uttermost farthing.

Matthew 25:46 And these shall go away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous into life eternal.

3. Nor is such a supposition to be made, that Christ might desert his suretyship, withdraw himself from it. This indeed has been supposed by some; but though Christ was not obliged to become a Surety, he voluntarily engaged in this work, and cheerfully took it on him. Yet when he had undertaken it, he could not relinquish it, without being guilty of disobedience to his Father, and of unfaithfulness to his own engagements.

From the instant he became a Surety for his people, he became a Servant to his Father, and he called and reckoned him as such. [He] laid his commands upon him, both to obey his law, and lay down his life for his people, both which he undertook to do, and did perform.

Otherwise he could not have had the character of God's righteous Servant, nor would have been faithful to him that appointed him, nor to himself, and consequently could not be without sin, which God forbid should ever be said or supposed of the holy Jesus, who did no sin, nor was guile found in his mouth. Yet this has been supposed of him by some, and the dreadful consequences of it, which have been blasphemously uttered by some schoolmen and popish writers, not fit to be mentioned.

Isaiah 49:3 And said unto me, *Thou art my servant*, O Israel, in whom I will be glorified.

Isaiah 42:1 *Behold my servant*, whom I uphold; mine elect, in whom my soul delighteth; I have put my spirit upon him: he shall bring forth judgment to the Gentiles.

Hebrews 3:2 Who was faithful to him that appointed him, as also Moses was faithful in all his house.

4. Nor is it to be supposed, that Christ might not fulfil his suretyship engagements, or not make satisfaction, as might be expected; since if he did not, it must be either for want of will, or want of power. [It is] not of will, since the persons he became a surety for, he bore the strongest affection to. These were the sons of men, in whom was all his delight from everlasting; and such his love to them, that nothing whatever could separate from it.

Nor could it be for want of power, since, as a divine Person, he is the mighty God; as Mediator, has all power in heaven and in earth; as man, was made strong by the Lord for this work, and had a power, as such, to lay down his life, and take it up again.

And should he have deserted his suretyship, and not have made the promised and expected satisfaction, the purposes of God, respecting the salvation of the elect by Christ, must have been frustrated, and made null and void. The council of peace held concerning it would have been without effect; the covenant of grace abolished; the salvation of God's people not obtained, and the glory of God, of his grace, mercy, truth, and faithfulness lost.

Yea, Christ himself must have been deprived of his mediatorial glory; all too shocking to be admitted.

Thirdly, Christ is in such sense a Surety, as civilians call an expromissor, one that promises out and out, absolutely engages to pay another's debt; takes another's obligation, and transfers it to himself, and by this act dissolves the former obligation, and enters into a new one, which civilians call *novation*.

The obligation no longer lies on the principal debtor, but he is set free, and the Surety is under the obligation, as if he was the principal debtor, or the guilty person.

Now this sort of suretyship being most similar, and coming nearest to Christ's suretyship, is made use of to express and explain it; though they do not in everything tally; for **the civil law neither describes nor admits such a Surety among men as Christ is**. [He] so

substituted himself in the room and stead of sinners, as to suffer punishment in soul and body for them. But in some things there is an agreement.

1. Christ, by his suretyship, took the whole debt of his people upon himself, and made himself solely responsible for it. He has dissolved thereby their obligation to payment or punishment, having taken it on himself, so that they were by it entirely set free from the very instant he became their Surety.

Job 33:24 Then he is gracious unto him, and saith, Deliver him from going down to the pit: I have found a ransom.

2. When Christ became a Surety for his people, their sins were no longer imputed to them, but were imputed to Christ, were placed to his account, and he became responsible for them. It was not, at the time of his sufferings and death, that God laid on him first the iniquities of his people, and they were imputed and reckoned to him, and he accounted them as his own.

II Corinthians 5:19 To wit, that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them; and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation.

Isaiah 53:6 All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the LORD hath laid on him the iniquity of us all.

By which it appears, that obligation to payment of debts, or punishment, did not lie upon the principal debtor, or guilty person, but upon Christ, who became their Surety; for,

3. The Old Testament saints were really freed from guilt, condemnation, and death, before the actual payment was made by Christ their Surety. Some had as full an application of the pardon of their sins, and as clear a view of their interest in Christ's righteousness, as their justifying righteousness before God, as any of the New Testament saints ever had.

The one were saved by the grace of Christ as the other; yea, they were received into heaven, and actually glorified, before the suretyship engagements of Christ were fulfilled.

Isaiah 43:25 I, even I, am he that blotteth out thy transgressions for mine own sake, and will not remember thy sins.

Acts 15:11 But we believe that through the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ we shall be saved, even as they.

Hebrews 11:13-16 These all died in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of them, and embraced them, and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth. For they that say such things declare plainly that they seek a country. And truly, if they had been mindful of that country from whence they came out, they might have had opportunity to have returned. But now they desire a better country, that is, an heavenly: wherefore God is not ashamed to be called their God: for he hath prepared for them a city.

So it is a plain case, that the obligation to payment and punishment lay not on those for whom Christ became a Surety, but was transferred from them to him.

4. It is certain that the Old Testament saints had knowledge of the suretyship engagements of Christ, and prayed and pleaded for the application of the benefits of them to them

Job 19:25 For I know that my redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth:

Psalms 119:122 Be *surety* for thy servant for good: let not the proud oppress me.

Isaiah 38:14 Like a crane or a swallow, so did I chatter: I did mourn as a dove: mine eyes fail with looking upward: O LORD, I am oppressed; *undertake for me.*

And which they enjoyed: and such was the dignity of Christ's person, and his known faithfulness to his engagements, and the eternity of them, which with God has no succession. They were always present with him, and in full view, as if actually performed. **Before and after made no difference in the sight of God, with whom a thousand years are as one day, and eternity itself as but a moment.**

And now, from this suretyship of Christ arise both the imputation of sin to Christ, and the imputation of his righteousness to his people; this is the ground and foundation of both, and on which the priestly office of Christ stands, and in virtue of which it is exercised,

II Corinthians 5:21 For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.

Hebrews 7:20-22 And inasmuch as not without an oath he was made priest: (For those priests were made without an oath; but this with an oath by him that said unto him, The Lord sware and will not

repent, Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec:) By so much was Jesus made a *surety* of a better testament.

Secondly, I proceed to consider what Christ as a Surety, engaged to do.

1st, He engaged to pay the debts of his people, and satisfy for the wrong and injury done by them; this may be

illustrated by the instance of the apostle Paul engaging for Onesimus.

Philemon 1:18-19 If he hath wronged thee, or oweth thee ought, put that on mine account; I Paul have written it with mine own hand, I will repay it: albeit I do not say to thee how thou owest unto me even thine own self besides.

Sin is a wrong and injury done to divine justice, and to the holy law of God, broken by it; which Christ undertook to satisfy for.

Matthew 6:12 And forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors.

Luke 11:4 And forgive us our sins; for we also forgive every one that is indebted to us. And lead us not into temptation; but deliver us from evil.

There is a twofold debt paid by Christ, as the Surety of his people. The one is a debt of obedience to the law of God; this he engaged to do, when he said, "Lo, I come to do thy will;" thy law is within my heart. And accordingly he was made under the law, and yielded perfect obedience to it, by which his people are made righteous.

The other is a debt of punishment, incurred through failure of obedience in them; the curse of the law he has endured, the penalty of it, death. By paying both these debts, the whole righteousness of the law is fulfilled in his people, considered in him their Head and Surety.

Now let it be observed, that these debts are not pecuniary ones, though there is an allusion to such, and the language is borrowed from them; but criminal ones.

[They are] a wrong and injury done, as supposed in the case of Onesimus; and are of such a nature as deserve and require punishment in body and soul, being transgressions of the righteous law of God. **God is to be considered, not merely as a creditor, but as the Judge of the whole earth,** who will do right, and who will by no means clear the guilty, without a satisfaction to his justice. Yet there is a mixture of grace, mercy, and goodness in God, with his justice in this affair, by admitting a Surety to obey, suffer, and die, in

the room and stead of his people. [This] He was not obliged unto; nor does the law give the least hint of an allowance of it.

Nor do the civil laws of men admit of any such thing, that an innocent person should suffer death in the room of one that is guilty, even though he consents to it, and desires it.

[This is] because no man has a power over his own life, to dispose of it at pleasure; but God, who can dispense with his own law, if he pleases, has thought fit to explain it, and put a construction on it in favor of his people, where it is not express. [He can] allow of a commutation of persons, that his Son should stand in their legal place and stead, obey, suffer, and die for them, that they might be made the righteousness of God in him.

This is owing to his sovereign grace and mercy; nor is [it] at all inconsistent with his justice, since Christ fully consented to all this. **[He] is the Prince of life, and had power over his own life, as man, to lay it down, and take it up again;** and since justice is fully satisfied, by the obedience and death of Christ, and the law magnified and made honorable, and more so than it could have been by all the obedience and sufferings of angels and men put together.

2nd, Another thing which Christ as a Surety engaged to do, was to bring all the elect safe to glory. This may he illustrated by Judah's suretyship for Benjamin; thus expressed to his father.

Genesis 43:9 I will be *surety* for him; of my hand shalt thou require him: if I bring him not unto thee, and set him before thee, then let me bear the blame for ever:

And thus Christ became a Surety to his divine Father, for his beloved Benjamin, the chosen of God, and precious. As he asked them of his Father, and they were given into his hands, to be preserved by him, that none of them might be lost. He agreed that they should be required of his hand, everyone of them, and pass under the hand of him that telleth them. Their whole number appears complete, and none missing; as will be the case.

Hebrews 2:13 And again, I will put my trust in him. And again, Behold I and the children which God hath given me.

Christ engaged to bring his people to his Father; this was the work proposed to him, and which he agreed to do.

Isaiah 49:5 And now, saith the LORD that formed me from the womb to be his servant, to bring Jacob again to him.

[He will] recover the lost sheep, to ransom them out of the hands of him that was stronger than they; to redeem them from all iniquity, and from the law, its curse and condemnation, and save them with an everlasting salvation, and bring them safe to his Father in heaven. Because he laid himself under obligation to do all this, he says, "them also I must bring," into his fold here, and into heaven and glory hereafter.

John 10:16 And other sheep I have, which are not of this fold: them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice; and there shall be one fold, and one shepherd.

[He will] set them before his Father; as he did at his death, when all the elect were gathered together in one Head, even in him, to present them in the body of his flesh, through death, holy, unblameable, and unreprouvable in the sight of God.

[This] he now does in heaven, where he appears in the presence of God for them, and they are set down in heavenly places in him, as their Head and Surety.

[This] he will do at the last day, when he will deliver up the kingdom to the Father, the mediatorial kingdom, the kingdom of priests, complete and perfect, as he received them. Having first presented them to himself, as a glorious church, without spot or wrinkle, he will present them faultless before the presence of his Father's glory, with exceeding joy.

[They] will be so far from bearing any blame, [he] having so fully discharged his suretyship engagements, that he will appear without sin unto salvation; even without sin imputed, without the wrong done by his people put on his account; all being fully answered for according to agreement.

Christ: The Testator Of The Covenant.

***First*, The covenant of grace bears the name, and has the nature of a testament. It is often called the new and better testament, as administered under the gospel dispensation.**

Matthew 26:28 For this is my blood of *the new testament*, which is shed for many for the remission of sins.

Hebrews 7:22 By so much was Jesus made a surety of *a better testament*.

Hebrews 9:15 And for this cause he is the mediator of *the new testament*, that by means of death, for the redemption of the

transgressions that were under *the first testament*, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance.

[This is] in distinction from the former. It is called a testament, in allusion to the last will and testament of men.

1. It is the will of God himself, and not another, the will of him that is sovereign and absolute, who does according to his will in heaven and in earth, in nature, providence, and grace.

The covenant is founded on the will of God, and is the pure effect of it. He was not obliged to make it. He freely and of his own accord came into it; so all the contracting parties in it.

A man's will, or testament, ought to be voluntary. He is not to be forced nor drawn, nor pressed to make it, contrary to his inclination; or otherwise it is not his own will. The covenant, or testament of God, is of his own making, without any influence from another. All the articles in it are of his free good will and pleasure; as, that he will be the covenant God of his people; that they shall be his sons and daughters; that they shall be his heirs, and joint heirs with Christ; that they shall enjoy all the blessings of grace, redemption, pardon, justification, regeneration, perseverance in grace and glory; for he hath bequeathed, in this will, both grace and glory to his people.

Luke 12:32 Fear not, little flock; for it is *your Father's good pleasure* to give you the kingdom.

2. As a will consists of various legacies to various persons, so does the covenant of grace; some to Christ, for he, under different considerations, is a legatee in it, and a testator of it. All the elect, his spiritual seed and offspring, are bequeathed unto him, as his portion and inheritance, and with which he is greatly delighted.

Deuteronomy 32:9 For the LORD'S portion *is* his people; Jacob is the lot of *his inheritance*.

Psalms 2:8 Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for *thine inheritance*, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession.

Psalms 16:6 The lines are fallen unto me in pleasant places; yea, I have *a goodly heritage*.

[This is] his mediatorial kingdom, a kingdom of priests, and which he disposed of to him in a testamentary way, as the word there used signifies. There are other legacies, such as before suggested, respecting grace and glory, left in this will for the brethren of Christ, among whom he is the firstborn, and so appointed principal heir, yea, heir of all things, and they joint heirs with him.

And what is given to them, is in trust with him for them, particularly the inheritance bequeathed, which they obtain in him, and is reserved with him in heaven for them.

3. In wills, what a man disposes of, is, or should be, his own.

No man has a power to dispose, nor ought to dispose of, what is another's, or not his own. Otherwise, his will is a void will, and such bequests void bequests. All the blessings of goodness, whether of nature, providence, or grace, are all the Lord's own, and he has a sovereign right to dispose of them as he pleases, and to give them to whomsoever he will; and against which no one has any just cause or reason to object. And if he does, it is to no purpose.

Matthew 20:15 Is it not lawful for me to do what I will with mine own? Is thine eye evil, because I am good?

4. This will, or testament, of Jehovah, is an ancient one. It was made in eternity.

It is called an everlasting covenant, or testament; not only because it always continues, and will never become null and void, but because it is from everlasting. The bequests and donations made in it were made before the world began.

II Timothy 1:9 Who hath saved us, and called us with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus *before the world began*,

It is, indeed, sometimes called a new testament, not because newly made, but because newly published and declared, at least in a more clear and express manner. A new and fresh copy of it has been delivered out to the heirs of promise.

5. It is a will or testament that is unalterable.

Galatians 3:15 Brethren, I speak after the manner of men; Though it be but a man's covenant, yet if it be confirmed, no man disannulleth, or addeth thereto.

The covenant of grace is ordered in all things, and sure. This testament, or will, is founded upon the immutability of the divine counsel; so that the heirs of promise, the legatees in it, may have strong consolation, and be fully assured of enjoying their legacies in it. [These] are the sure mercies of David, of David's Son and Antitype, as all the promises of it are Yea and Amen in him.

6. Testaments, or wills, are generally sealed as well as signed. The seals of God's will or testament are not the ordinances. **Circumcision was no seal of the covenant of grace. It was a**

seal to Abraham, and to him only, that he should be the father of believing Gentiles; and that the same righteousness of faith should come upon them, which came upon him, when in uncircumcision.

Nor is baptism, which is falsely said to come in the room of it, and much less is it a seal of the covenant; nor the ordinance of the Lord's Supper; for though the blood of Christ, one of the symbols in it, is yet not that itself. **But the seals are the Holy Spirit of God, and the blood of Christ.**

And yet the Holy Spirit is not such a seal that makes the covenant, or testament, surer in itself, only assures the Lord's people of their interest in it, by witnessing it to their spirits, by being in them the earnest of the inheritance bequeathed them, and by sealing them up unto the day of redemption.

Properly speaking, the blood of Christ is the only seal of this testament, by which it is ratified and confirmed; and therefore called the blood of the covenant, and the blood of the new testament.

Zechariah 9:11 *As for thee also, by the blood of thy covenant I have sent forth thy prisoners out of the pit wherein is no water.*

Matthew 26:28 *For this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins.*

Hebrews 13:20 *Now the God of peace, that brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, that great shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant,*

7. To all wills there are commonly witnesses, and often three, and in some cases three are required. Now as God sware by himself, because he could swear by no greater; so because no other and proper witnesses could be had, to witness this will made in eternity, God himself, or the three divine Persons, became witnesses to it, the Three that bare record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost,

I John 5:7 *For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one.*

Unless we choose to conceive of things in this manner; that as the Father, the first Person, gives the lead in all things in nature and in grace, and as he did in the council of peace, so in the covenant of grace, or in this testament, he may be considered as the maker of the will, or testament, and the Son and Spirit as witnesses to it.

8. This will, or testament, is registered in the sacred writings, from thence the probate of it is to be taken; the public notaries,

or amanuenses, that have copied it under a divine direction, are the prophets and apostles. Hence the writings of the one are called the Old Testament, and the writings of the other the New Testament, the latter being the more clear, full, and correct copy.

The covenant of grace having the nature of a testament, shows that there is no restipulation in it on the part of men; no more than there is a restipulation of legatees in a will; what is bequeathed to them being without their knowledge and consent, and without anything being required of them, to which they give their assent. The covenant of grace is properly a covenant to Christ, in which he restipulates; but a testament to his people, or a pure covenant of promise.

Also it may be observed, that the legacies in this testament are owing to the goodwill of the testator, and not to any merit in the legatees. "For if they which are of the law be heirs," if they that seek eternal life by the works of the law be heirs of grace and glory, then, says the apostle, "faith is made void, and the promise made of none effect," which declare it to be a free donation. And so again, "If the inheritance be of the law," or to be obtained by the works of it, "it is no more of promise." These will not consist with, but contradict one another. "But God gave it to Abraham by promise," as he has done to all the legatees in his covenant or will.

Romans 4:14 For if they which are of the law be heirs, faith is made void, and the promise made of none effect:

Galatians 3:18 For if the inheritance be of the law, it is no more of promise: but God gave it to Abraham by promise.

Secondly, The Son of God, the Lord Jesus Christ, may be considered as testator of the covenant of grace, as it is a will or testament.

Hebrews 9:15-17 And for this cause he is the mediator of the new testament, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance. For where a testament is, there must also of necessity be the death of the testator. For a testament is of force after men are dead: otherwise it is of no strength at all while the testator liveth.

1. Christ as God has an equal right to dispose of things as his divine Father, seeing all that the Father has are his; as all the perfections of deity, so all persons, and all things in nature, providence, and grace. Particularly all the blessings of grace and of glory. He is over all God blessed for ever, and all things are of him

and owe their being to him, and are at his dispose. Yea, all things are delivered by the Father to him as mediator, and if the Spirit disposes of his gifts and graces, dividing them to every man severally as he will; the Son of God may be reasonably thought to have a power and right to dispose of the blessings of his goodness to whomsoever he pleases.

2. Nothing is disposed of in the covenant, or testament, without his counsel and consent; for though with respect to creatures, angels and men, it may be said of God, "with whom took he counsel?" yet with his Son, the Wonderful Counselor, the Angel of the great council, he did; for the council of peace was between them both, the Father and the Son, which respected the salvation of men, and the donation of grace and glory to them.

3. Nor was anything given in covenant, or disposed of in the will and testament of God, but with respect to the death of Christ; all promised in covenant was on condition of Christ's making his soul an offering for sin, and of pouring out his soul unto death.

Isaiah 53:10-12 Yet it pleased the LORD to bruise him; he hath put him to grief: when thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of the LORD shall prosper in his hand. He shall see of the travail of his soul, and shall be satisfied: by his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many; for he shall bear their iniquities. Therefore will I divide him a portion with the great, and he shall divide the spoil with the strong; because he hath poured out his soul unto death: and he was numbered with the transgressors; and he bare the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors.

All the blessings of grace bestowed on Old Testament saints, as they were legacies in this testament, so they were given forth in virtue of the blood of the covenant, which had a virtue that reached backward; Christ being the lamb slain from the foundation of the world. And there is no blessing of grace in the covenant, but what is on account of the death of Christ the testator.

Redemption of transgressions, that were under both the first and second testaments, was by means of death, and without shedding of blood there was no remission under either dispensation. And it is the death of Christ that secures from condemnation, as well as by it reconciliation is made.

4. Whatever is given in this will, is given to Christ first, to be disposed of by him, so that he is the executor as well as the testator of it; he was set up as mediator from everlasting; was

prevented with the blessings of goodness, or had them first given to him. He was possessed of a fulness of grace, and grace was given to the elect in him before the world began.

Not only the blessings of grace were put into his hands to dispose of, but eternal life, for he has power to give eternal life to as many as the Father hath given him. Whether this be considered as an inheritance which He, the Word of God's grace, the essential Word, is able to give among them that are sanctified by faith in him; or as a kingdom prepared for them in the purposes of God, and which Christ gives a right unto, and a meetness for. Yea, he himself disposes of it in a testamentary way, "and I appoint unto you a kingdom," dispose of it to you by will and testament.

Luke 22:29 And I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me;

Thirdly, The death of Christ is necessary to put this will in force, to give strength unto it, that it may be executed according to the design of the maker of it.

Hebrews 9:16-17 For where a testament *is*, there must also of necessity be the death of the testator. For a testament is of force after men are dead: otherwise it is of no strength at all while the testator liveth.

It is not the death of any, only of the testator himself, that gives validity to his will, or renders it executable; and it is only the death of Christ that gives force and strength unto, or ratifies and confirms the covenant of grace; not the death of slain sacrifices, for though by the blood and death of these the first testament was dedicated, ratified, and confirmed in a typical way, as these were types of Christ in his bloodshed and death.

Hebrews 9:19-22 For when Moses had spoken every precept to all the people according to the law, he took the blood of calves and of goats, with water, and scarlet wool, and hyssop, and sprinkled both the book, and all the people, Saying, This *is* the blood of the testament which God hath enjoined unto you. Moreover he sprinkled with blood both the tabernacle, and all the vessels of the ministry. And almost all things are by the law purged with blood; and without shedding of blood is no remission.

Yet the new testament is only, really, truly, and properly ratified and confirmed by the death of Christ itself. And whereas the Father and the Spirit were jointly concerned with Christ in making this will or testament, it was not necessary that they should die, nor could they, since they never assumed a nature

capable of dying. Only it was necessary that one of the testators should assume a nature capable of death, and in it die to give force to this will.

And infinite wisdom judged it most proper and fitting that the Son of God should do it, who took upon him, not the nature of angels, who are incorporeal, immaterial and immortal spirits, and die not. But he became a partaker of flesh and blood, of human nature, that he might die and ratify the testament and will he was concerned in the making of.

And this was necessary to give it strength and force: not as if it was alterable until the death of Christ, as the wills of men are until their death, which while they live are liable to be altered again and again; for the first thoughts of God always remain, and that to all generations. His mind is never turned, his counsel is immutable, and so his covenant and testament founded thereon is unalterable; nor that the inheritance bequeathed in this will could not be enjoyed before the death of Christ. This indeed is the case with respect to the wills of men. The legacies are not payable, nor estates bequeathed enjoyed, until the testator dies.

But such is not only the certainty of Christ's death, and which with God was as if it was, before it really was. But such is the virtue and efficacy of it, that it reaches backward to the beginning of the world, as before observed.

Wherefore the Old Testament saints not only received the promise of eternal inheritance, but enjoyed it before the death of Christ, though in virtue of it, for they are said to "inherit the promises," that is, the things promised,

Hebrews 9:15 And for this cause he is the mediator of the new testament, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance.

Hebrews 6:11 And we desire that every one of you do shew the same diligence to the full assurance of hope unto the end:

But the death of Christ was necessary to confirm the covenant or testament, that the legatees might appear to have a legal right to what was bequeathed to them, law and justice being satisfied thereby; so that no caveat could be put in against them, and no obstruction made to their claim of legacies, and their enjoyment of them; and no danger of this will being ever set aside.

Christ: Our Intercessor

Secondly, another branch of Christ's priestly office is his intercession.

I. Christ was [appointed] to be an Intercessor, or was to make intercession for his people. When Christ was called to the office of a priest, and invested with it, which was done in the council and covenant of grace, he was put upon making request on their behalf. He is bid to ask them of his Father, as his portion and inheritance, to be possessed and enjoyed by him. [This] is promised him on making such a request as he did, and they were given him.

Psalms 2:8 *Ask of me*, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession.

John 17:6 I have manifested thy name unto the men which thou gavest me out of the world: thine they were, and thou gavest them me; and they have kept thy word.

He not only asked [for] them, but life for them, spiritual and eternal life, with all the blessings and comforts of life; which, upon asking, were given.

God gave him the desires of his heart, and did not withhold the request of his lips. All blessings were bestowed upon his chosen in him. And grace, which is comprehensive of all blessings, was given them in him before the world began.

Psalms 21:2 Thou hast given him his heart's desire, and hast not withholden *the request* of his lips. Selah.

Psalms 21:4 *He asked* life of thee, and thou gavest it him, *even* length of days for ever and ever.

Ephesians 1:3 Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ:

II Timothy 1:9 Who hath saved us, and called us with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began.

This asking, or requesting, is a species of Christ's intercession, and an early instance of it, and of his success in it. [It is] a specimen of what was to be done by him hereafter. The intercession of Christ was spoken of in prophecy in the books of the Old Testament.

Now two sorts of persons are spoken of in it; one who are called saints, excellent ones, in whom was all Christ's delight.

Psalms 16:3 But to the saints that are in the earth, and to the excellent, in whom is all my delight.

And another sort, that "hastened after another god," another savior, and not Christ; concerning whom he says, "I will not take up their names into my lips," Psalms 16:4. **That is, he would not pray or make intercession for them;** and has the same sense.

John 17:9 I pray for them: *I pray not for the world,* but for them which thou hast given me; for they are thine.

"I pray for them; I pray not for the world," and saying that he would not take the names of some into his lips, supposes that he would take the names of others; that is, pray and intercede for them.

But what most clearly foretells the intercession of Christ, and is a prophecy of it, is a passage in Isaiah 53:12.

Isaiah 53:12 Therefore will I divide him a portion with the great, and he shall divide the spoil with the strong; because he hath poured out his soul unto death: and he was numbered with the transgressors; and he bare the sin of many, and *made intercession* for the transgressors.

"And made intercession for the transgressors." That is, [he] would make intercession for them, according to the prophetic style used in that chapter. [This] was particularly fulfilled, when Christ upon the cross prayed for his enemies,

Luke 23:34 Then said Jesus, *Father, forgive them;* for they know not what they do. And they parted his raiment, and cast lots.

The types of Christ's intercession are many. As Abel's sacrifice was a type of Christ's, so his speaking after his death was a type of Christ's speaking since his death. It is said of Abel, that he, "being dead, yet speaketh."

Hebrews 11:4 By faith Abel offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain, by which he obtained witness that he was righteous, God testifying of his gifts: and by it he being dead yet speaketh.

So Christ, though dead, is alive, and lives for ever, and makes intercession, and speaks for his people. As Abel's blood had a voice in it, so has the blood of Christ; but with this difference.

The blood of Abel cried against his brother; Christ's blood cries for his brethren, on their behalf. Abel's blood cried for

vengeance on the murderer; Christ's blood calls for, and speaks peace and pardon to guilty men.

Hebrews 12:24 And to Jesus the mediator of the new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling, that speaketh better things than that of Abel.

Melchizedek, as he was a type of Christ, in his kingly and priestly offices, so in that part of the latter which respects intercession; **he prayed for Abraham,** that he might be blessed both with temporal and spiritual blessings, with blessings both in heaven and on earth.

Genesis 14:19 And he blessed him, and said, Blessed be Abram of the most high God, possessor of heaven and earth:

So Christ prays and intercedes for his people, that they may have all the blessings of goodness here and hereafter bestowed upon them.

Abraham likewise was a type of Christ in his intercession, when he so warmly interceded for Sodom and Gomorrah. At least [he prayed] for the righteous in those cities; in which he so far succeeded, that righteous Lot and his, were delivered from destruction in them.

Aaron being a good spokesman, one that could speak well, was a type of Christ, who has the tongue of the learned, and can speak well on the behalf of his distressed ones; and who can plead their cause thoroughly, effectually, and infallibly.

So was Moses, when the children of Israel had sinned in making the golden calf, and were threatened with destruction, he interposed in their behalf, and pleaded they might be spared, or otherwise, that he might be blotted out of the book of life, or die.

And such is the love of Christ to the spiritual Israel of God, that he has died for them; and pleads his death that they might live.

Particularly the entrance of the high priest once a year, with the blood of beasts, with a censer of burning coals, and an handful of incense, was an eminent type of Christ's entrance into heaven, and his intercession there. [He] went in thither, not with the blood of beasts, but with his own blood; and so to a better purpose. The burning coals were emblems of his painful sufferings; and the incense put upon them represented his powerful mediation and intercession, founded upon his sufferings and death, and satisfaction for sin made thereby.

Likewise the high priest going into the most holy place, with the names of the children of Israel on his breastplate, and bearing their judgment before the Lord, and taking away the sin of

their holy things, typified Christ as the representative of his people in heaven; appearing in the presence of God for them, presenting his sacrifice for the taking away of their sins.

Leviticus 16:12-14 And he shall take a censer full of burning coals of fire from off the altar before the LORD, and his hands full of sweet incense beaten small, and bring it within the vail: And he shall put the incense upon the fire before the LORD, that the cloud of the incense may cover the mercy seat that is upon the testimony, that he die not: And he shall take of the blood of the bullock, and sprinkle it with his finger upon the mercy seat eastward; and before the mercy seat shall he sprinkle of the blood with his finger seven times.

Exodus 28:29-30 And Aaron shall bear the names of the children of Israel in the breastplate of judgment upon his heart, when he goeth in unto the holy place, for a memorial before the LORD continually. And thou shalt put in the breastplate of judgment the Urim and the Thummim; and they shall be upon Aaron's heart, when he goeth in before the LORD: and Aaron shall bear the judgment of the children of Israel upon his heart before the LORD continually.

II. Christ is an intercessor; he has executed, he is executing, and will continue to execute this office. The inquiries to be made concerning it are: where, when, and in what manner, he has made, or does make intercession; for what he intercedes, and for whom; and the excellency and usefulness of his intercession.

First, Where, when, and in what manner his intercession has been and is performed? And it may be considered as,

1. Before his incarnation: that he then interceded, and was a Mediator between God and man, is evident from that access to God which was then had. Upon the sin and fall of our first parents they were driven from the presence of God, and no access could be had unto him, nor communion with him, on the foot of works. None [could be had], but through Christ, the Mediator, who is the only Mediator between God and men.

There never was, nor never will be any other. Through him both Jews and Gentiles, Old and New testament saints, have access to God. Those under the former dispensation put up their prayers to God through Christ, and for his sake; and through his mediation and intercession they were heard and accepted.

So Daniel prayed to be "heard for the Lord's sake;" that is for Christ's sake.

Daniel 9:17 Now therefore, O our God, hear the prayer of thy servant, and his supplications, and cause thy face to shine upon thy sanctuary that is desolate, for the Lord's sake.

Christ was then "the Angel of God's presence," who was not only in the presence of God, but appeared there for his people, and by whom they were introduced and admitted into the presence of God, had audience of him, and acceptance with him.

Isaiah 63:9 In all their affliction he was afflicted, and the angel of his presence saved them: in his love and in his pity he redeemed them; and he bare them, and carried them all the days of old.

We have an instance of Christ's intercession for the people of the Jews, when in distress, who is **represented as an angel among the myrtle trees in the bottom;** signifying the low estate the Jews were in; and as interceding and pleading with God for them. "And the Lord answered the angel that talked with me, with good and comfortable words." His intercession was acceptable, prevalent, and succeeded.

Zechariah 1:11-13 And they answered the angel of the LORD that stood among the myrtle trees, and said, We have walked to and fro through the earth, and, behold, all the earth sitteth still, and is at rest. Then the angel of the LORD answered and said, O LORD of hosts, how long wilt thou not have mercy on Jerusalem and on the cities of Judah, against which thou hast had indignation these threescore and ten years? And the LORD answered the angel that talked with me with good words and comfortable words.

But a more clear and full instance of Christ's intercession for his people in distress, through sin, is in Zechariah 3:1-4, where **Joshua, a fallen saint, is represented as greatly defiled with sin;** and Satan standing at his right hand, to accuse and charge him, and get judgment to pass against him. **Christ, the angel of the covenant, appears on his behalf,** rebukes Satan, and pleads electing and calling grace in favor of the criminal. And, on the foot of his own sacrifice to be offered, satisfaction [being] made, [he] orders his filthy garments to be taken away, and him to be clothed with change of raiment, his own righteousness, and dismissed.

Zechariah 3:1-4 And he shewed me Joshua the high priest standing before the angel of the LORD, and Satan standing at his right hand to resist him. And the LORD said unto Satan, The LORD rebuke thee, O Satan; even the LORD that hath chosen Jerusalem rebuke thee: is not this a brand plucked out of the fire? Now Joshua was clothed with filthy garments, and stood before the angel. And he answered

and spake unto those that stood before him, saying, Take away the filthy garments from him. And unto him he said, Behold, I have caused thine iniquity to pass from thee, and I will clothe thee with change of raiment.

2. Christ acted as an intercessor in his state of humiliation.

We often read of his praying to God, and sometimes a whole night together, and of his offering up prayers and supplications, with strong crying and tears, especially in the garden and on the cross; which might be chiefly on his own account, though not without regard to his people.

At other times we find him praying for particular persons; as at the grave of Lazarus, where he wept and groaned in Spirit, and inwardly put up supplications, which were heard; for he thanks his Father for hearing him; and declared he always heard him.

John 11:41-42 Then they took away the stone from the place where the dead was laid. And Jesus lifted up his eyes, and said, Father, I thank thee that *thou hast heard me*. And I knew that *thou hearest me always*: but because of the people which stand by I said it, that they may believe that thou hast sent me.

And he prayed for Peter particularly, when tempted, that his faith might not fail, and was heard; for though he fell by the temptation, he was at once recovered.

Luke 22:32 But *I have prayed for thee*, that thy faith fail not: and when thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren.

He prayed for all his disciples. (John 17)

[This] is a specimen of his intercession in heaven for all his elect. Yea, he prayed for his enemies, such of his elect who were then in a state of enmity; and who, in consequence of his intercession, were converted and comforted; though they had been concerned in taking away his life.

Luke 23:34 Then said Jesus, *Father, forgive them*; for they know not what they do. And they parted his raiment, and cast lots.

Acts 2:36-41 Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ. Now when they heard this, they were pricked in their heart, and said unto Peter and to the rest of the apostles, Men and brethren, what shall we do? Then Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. For

the promise is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call. And with many other words did he testify and exhort, saying, Save yourselves from this untoward generation. Then they that gladly received his word were baptized: and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls.

Such virtue is there in his blood, and in his intercession founded upon it!

3. Christ is now interceding in heaven for his people. He is gone to heaven, entered there, and is set down at the right hand of God; where he ever lives to make intercession.

Romans 8:34 Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also *maketh intercession* for us.

Hebrews 7:25 Wherefore he is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to *make intercession* for them.

So his intercession is sometimes represented, as after his death and resurrection from the dead, and session at God's right hand. [This] is performed, perhaps not vocally, as on earth; for as he could request and intercede before he assumed an human nature, even in the council and covenant of peace, without a voice, so he can now in heaven; though it is not improbable, but that he may make use of his human voice at his pleasure. Though it cannot with certainty be affirmed, yet it is not to be denied.

However, it is certain that he does not intercede in like manner as when on earth, with prostration of body, cries, and tears; which would be quite inconsistent with his state of exaltation and glory, being set down at the right hand of God, and crowned with glory and honor.

Nor [does he intercede] as supplicating an angry Judge, and entreating him to be pacified, and show favor; for peace is made by the blood of Christ's cross. God is pacified towards his people for all that they have done.

Nor [does he intercede] as litigating a point in a court of judicature; for though Christ has names and titles taken from such like procedures, as counselor, pleader, and advocate; yet not as engaged in a cause dependant and precarious.

But the intercession of Christ is carried on in heaven, by appearing in the presence of God there for his people. It is enough that he shows himself, as having done, as their Surety, all that law and justice could require. By presenting his blood, his sacrifice, and righteousness, Christ is gone with his blood into the holiest of all, and sprinkled it on the throne of mercy, before God.

He is in the midst of the throne, as a Lamb that had been slain; his sacrifice being always in view of his divine Father, and his righteousness always in sight; with which God is well pleased, because by it his law is magnified and made honorable, and his justice satisfied. All which, of themselves, speak on the behalf of his people.

Moreover, Christ intercedes, not as asking a favor, but as an advocate in open court, who pleads, demands, and requires, according to law, in point of right and justice, such and such blessings to be bestowed upon, and applied unto such persons he has shed his blood for. **He speaks, not in a charitative, but in an authoritative way,** declaring it as his will, on the ground of what he has done and suffered, that so it should be. A specimen of this we have in the finishing blessing of all, glorification.

John 17:24 Father, I will that they also, whom thou hast given me, be with me where I am; that they may behold my glory, which thou hast given me: for thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world.

Christ performs this his office also by offering up the prayers and praises of his people; which become acceptable to God through the sweet incense of his mediation and intercession.

Revelation 8:3-4 And another angel came and stood at the altar, having a golden censer; and there was given unto him much incense, that he should offer it with the prayers of all saints upon the golden altar which was before the throne. And the smoke of the incense, which came with the prayers of the saints, ascended up before God out of the angel's hand.

Hebrews 13:15 By him therefore let us offer the sacrifice of praise to God continually, that is, the fruit of our lips giving thanks to his name.

I Peter 2:5 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.

Once more, Christ executes this office by seeing to it, that all the blessings of grace promised in covenant, and ratified by his blood, are applied by his Spirit to the covenant ones.

So he sits as a Priest on his throne, and sees the travail of his soul with satisfaction; when, as those he engaged for are reconciled by his death, so they are saved by his interceding life. [They] are effectually called by grace, and put into the possession of what was stipulated and procured for them.

Secondly, The next thing to be considered is, what Christ makes intercession for more particularly? For the conversion of his unconverted ones. "Neither pray I for those alone," says he, meaning his disciples that were called, "but for them also which shall believe on me through their word."

John 17:20 Neither *pray I* for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word.

[He prays] for the comfort of those that are convinced of sin, distressed with a sense of it, and need comfort. In consequence of his intercession, he sends the Comforter to them, to take of his things, and show them to them, and shed abroad his love in them, and so fill them with joy and peace in believing; insomuch that they have peace in him while they have tribulation in the world.

And [he prays] particularly for discoveries and applications of pardoning grace and mercy; "If any man sin, we have an Advocate with the Father." Not that he pleads for sinning, nor that any may be connived at in it; but that he may have a manifestation and application of the pardon of it, in consequence of his blood shed for it.

And as Christ has a fellow feeling with his people under temptations, and helps them that are tempted; this is one way of doing it, interceding for strength for them to bear up under temptations, to be carried through them, and delivered out of them; and so that they might have persevering grace to hold on, and out, unto the end. He prays not that they be taken out of the world, but that they may be kept from the evil of it.

John 17:11 And now I am no more in the world, but these are in the world, and I come to thee. Holy Father, keep through thine own name those whom thou hast given me, that they may be one, as we are.

John 17:15 *I pray not* that thou shouldest take them out of the world, but that thou shouldest keep them from the evil.

Lastly, he intercedes for their glorification, one principal branch of which will lie in beholding his glory.

John 17:24 Father, I will that they also, whom thou hast given me, be with me where I am; that they may behold my glory, which thou hast given me: for thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world.

This was the joy set before him, and which he kept in view in all his sufferings; and for the sake of which he endured them so cheerfully. And it is that which is uppermost in his heart, in his intercession for them. Nor will he cease pleading till he has all his people in heaven with him.

Thirdly, The persons Christ makes intercession for are not the world, the men of it, and all that are in it; for Christ himself says, "*I pray not for the world,*" but for those that were chosen and given him out of the world; and who, in due time, are effectually called out of it by his grace. The objects of Christ's intercession are the same with those of election, redemption, and effectual calling; to whom Christ is a propitiation, for them he is an advocate.

John 17:9 *I pray for them:* I pray not for the world, but for them which thou hast given me; for they are thine.

I John 2:1-2 My little children, these things write I unto you, that ye sin not. And if any man sin, we have *an advocate* with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous: And he is the propitiation for our sins: and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world.

The high priest bore upon his heart, in the breastplate of judgment, only the names of the children of Israel. And they are only the spiritual Israel of God whom Christ bears upon his heart, whom he represents and intercedes for in the holiest of all. And [he prays] not for those only who actually believe, but for those who shall hereafter; even who are, for the present, enemies to him, and averse to his rule over them; as his prayers in the garden, and on the cross, show.

John 17:20 Neither *pray I* for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word.

Luke 23:34 Then said Jesus, Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do. And they parted his raiment, and cast lots.

It is for all the elect Christ intercedes, that have been, are, or shall be, scattered up and down in each of the parts of the world, and in all ages and periods of time, that they be partakers of his grace here, and be glorified with him hereafter. Hence says the apostle,

“Who shall lay anything to the charge of God’s elect?” Not only God justifies them, Christ died for them, is risen again, and is at the right hand of God; but [he] makes intercession for them, and answers to, and removes all charges brought against them.

Romans 8:33-34 Who shall lay any thing to the charge of Gods elect? *It is* God that justifieth. Who *is* he that condemneth? *It is* Christ that died, yea rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also *maketh intercession* for us.

[He prays] for those, even though and while they are sinners and transgressors; for so it is said of him in prophecy; “and hath made intercession for the transgressors.”

Isaiah 53:12 Therefore will I divide him a portion with the great, and he shall divide the spoil with the strong; because he hath poured out his soul unto death: and he was numbered with the transgressors; and he bare the sin of many, and *made intercession* for the transgressors.

As he died for such, yea, the chief of sinners, and calls them by his grace, and receives them into fellowship with himself, it is no wonder that he should pray and intercede for them.

Fourthly, The excellent properties and use of Christ’s intercession. Christ is an only intercessor. “There is but one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus.”

I Timothy 2:5 For there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus.

Though the Spirit of God makes intercession for the saints, it is within them, not without them, at the right hand of God; and it is with groans unutterable. Not so Christ in heaven, **saints in heaven are no intercessors for saints on earth.** They are ignorant of their persons and cases, and therefore cannot intercede for them.

Nor [do] angels [intercede], as say the papists, who distinguish between mediators of redemption and mediators of intercession. The latter they say angels are, and Christ the former. But the Scripture knows no such distinction.

He that is the Redeemer is the only Intercessor. He that is the Propitiation is the sole Advocate. And he is every way fit for it. Being the Son of God, he has interest in his Father’s heart. Being the mighty God, he is mighty to plead, thoroughly to plead the cause of his people.

And having offered up himself as man, to be a sacrifice for them, he has a sufficient plea to make on their behalf. Having the tongue of the learned, can speak well for them. Being Jesus Christ the righteous, the holy and harmless High Priest, is a proper person to be the advocate for those that sin. As such he is with the Father, at hand, and to be called unto; is ready to defend the cause of his people, and deliver them from their adversary.

He is a prevalent advocate and intercessor; he is always heard. He was when on earth, and now in heaven; his mediation is always acceptable, and ever succeeds.

John 11:41-42 Then they took away the stone from the place where the dead was laid. And Jesus lifted up his eyes, and said, Father, I thank thee that thou hast heard me. And I knew that thou hearest me always: but because of the people which stand by I said it, that they may believe that thou hast sent me.

And he performs this his office freely, willingly, and cheerfully. He never rejects any case put into his hands, nor refuses to present the petitions of his people to his divine Father; but is always ready to offer up the prayers of all saints with the much incense of his mediation.

Revelation 8:3-4 And another angel came and stood at the altar, having a golden censer; and there was given unto him much incense, that he should offer it with the prayers of all saints upon the golden altar which was before the throne. And the smoke of the incense, which came with the prayers of the saints, ascended up before God out of the angel's hand.

And his intercession is perpetual. Though he was dead he is alive, and lives for evermore; and "he ever lives to make intercession for them" that come unto God by him.

Hebrews 7:25 Wherefore he is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make *intercession* for them.

Christ - Part 2 - Our Prophet, Priest and King

**PART TWO
CHRIST: OUR PROPHET
PRIEST AND KING**

Christ as Prophet

Having gone through Christ's estates of humiliation and exaltation, **I shall next consider the offices sustained and executed by him in those estates.** His office in general is that of Mediator, which is but one. The branches of it are threefold, his prophetic, priestly, and kingly offices; all which are included in his name, Messiah, or Christ, the anointed.

[The] prophets, priests, and kings [were] anointed, when invested with their several offices; as Elisha the prophet, by Elijah; Aaron the priest, and his sons, by Moses; Saul, David, and Solomon, kings of Israel.

These offices seldom, if ever, met in one person; Melchizedek was king and priest, but not a prophet; Aaron was prophet and priest, but not a king; David and Solomon were kings and prophets, but not priests. The greatest appearance of them was in Moses, but whether all together is not so clear. He was a prophet; none like him arose in Israel till the Messiah came. He was king in Jeshurun; and officiated as a priest, before his brother Aaron was invested with that office, but not afterwards.

But in Christ they all meet; he is a Prophet mighty in deed and word, a Priest after the order of Melchizedek, and is King of kings and Lord of lords.

The case and condition of his people required him to take upon him and execute these offices. They are dark, blind, and ignorant, and need a prophet to enlighten, teach, and instruct them, and make known the mind and will of God unto them. They are sinful, guilty creatures, as all the world are before God, and need a Priest to make atonement for them.

In their unconverted state they are enemies to God, and disobedient to him, and need a powerful Prince to subdue them; to cause his arrows to be sharp in their hearts, whereby they fall under him, and become willing to serve him, in the day of his power. And in their converted state are weak and helpless, and need a King to rule over them, protect and defend them.

And though there are many other names and titles of Christ, yet they are all reducible to these offices of Prophet, Priest, and King.

It may be observed, that these are executed by Christ in the order in which they are here put. He first exercised the prophetic office, which he entered into upon his baptism, and continued it throughout his life. At his death, as a Priest, he offered himself a sacrifice to God for the sins of his people, and now ever lives to make intercession for them. And upon his ascension to heaven, was made and declared Lord and Christ, and sits as a King on his throne, and has been ever since exercising his kingly office; and will do so more apparently hereafter.

I shall begin with his prophetic office; which was foretold in the writings of Moses and the prophets; the proof and evidence of which, as belonging to Jesus, lies in his miracles. Each of the parts of his office will be inquired into; and the time of his execution of it.

First, It was foretold that Christ should appear in the character of a Prophet, and therefore was expected by the Jews as such. Hence when they saw the miracles he wrought, they said, "This is of a truth that Prophet that should come into the world," John 6:14, meaning, that was prophesied of by Moses, to whom the Lord said,

Deuteronomy 18:15,18 The LORD thy God will raise up unto thee a *prophet* from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto him ye shall hearken....I will raise them up a *prophet* from among their brethren, like unto thee, and will put my words in his mouth; and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him.

[This] cannot be understood of a succession of prophets, as say the Jews, for a single Person is only spoken of. And this [is] not Joshua, nor David, nor Jeremiah. Only Jesus of Nazareth, to whom they are applied, and with whom all the characters agree.

Acts 3:22 For Moses truly said unto the fathers, A *prophet* shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren, like unto me; him shall ye hear in all things whatsoever he shall say unto you.

Acts 7:37 This is that Moses, which said unto the children of Israel, A *prophet* shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren, like unto me; him shall ye hear.

He was raised up of God as a Prophet. This the people of the Jews were sensible of; and therefore glorified God on that account, and considered it as a kind and gracious visitation of his.

Luke 7:16 And there came a fear on all: and they glorified God, saying, That a great *prophet* is risen up among us; and, That God hath visited his people.

He was raised up "from among his brethren," being the Son of Abraham, the Son of David; of the tribe of Judah; born in Bethlehem; and so was of the Israelites, according to the flesh.

He was "like unto Moses," a prophet, like unto him, and greater than he. As the law came by Moses, grace and truth came by Christ. As Moses was raised up, and sent to be a redeemer of Israel out of Egypt; Christ was raised up, and sent to be a Savior and Redeemer of his people, from a worse than Egyptian bondage. As Moses was faithful in the house of God, so Jesus; they are compared together. But the preference is given to Christ. The words of God were "put into the mouth" of Christ.

Hebrews 3:2-6 Who was faithful to him that appointed him, as also Moses was faithful in all his house. For this man was counted worthy of more glory than Moses, inasmuch as he who hath builded the house hath more honor than the house. For every house is builded by some man; but he that built all things is God. And Moses verily was faithful in all his house, as a servant, for a testimony of those things which were to be spoken after; But Christ as a son over his own house; whose house are we, if we hold fast the confidence and the rejoicing of the hope firm unto the end.

The doctrine, he preached was not his own, but his Father's.

He spoke not of himself. What he spoke, as the Father said unto him, so he spoke. And he spoke all that he received from him, and that he commanded him. [He] was faithful to him that appointed him, and therefore to be hearkened to; as his Father directed his apostles to do; saying, "This is my beloved Son; hear ye him," Matthew 17:5 plainly referring to the above prophecy.

John 7:16 Jesus answered them, and said, My doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me.

John 8:29 And he that sent me is with me: the Father hath not left me alone; for I do always those things that please him.

John 12:49-50 For I have not spoken of myself; but the Father which sent me, he gave me a commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak. And I know that his commandment is life everlasting: whatsoever I speak therefore, even as the Father said unto me, so I speak.

John 15:15 Henceforth I call you not servants; for the servant knoweth not what his lord doeth: but I have called you friends; for all things that I have heard of my Father I have made known unto you.

John 17:6 I have manifested thy name unto the men which thou gavest me out of the world: thine they were, and thou gavest them me; and they have kept thy word.

John 17:8 For I have given unto them the words which thou gavest me; and they have received them, and have known surely that I came out from thee, and they have believed that thou didst send me.

The qualifications of Christ for this prophetic office were also foretold; which lie in the gifts and graces of the Spirit, which he received without measure. "The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me, because the Lord hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek," from which passage of scripture Christ preached his first sermon, at Nazareth; and having read the text, said, "This day is this scripture fulfilled in your ears."

Isaiah 61:1 The Spirit of the Lord GOD is upon me; because the LORD hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek; he hath sent me to bind up the brokenhearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound.

Luke 4:16-21 And he came to Nazareth, where he had been brought up: and, as his custom was, he went into the synagogue on the sabbath day, and stood up for to read. And there was delivered unto him the book of the prophet Esaias. And when he had opened the book, he found the place where it was written, The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor; he hath sent me to heal the brokenhearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised, To preach the acceptable year of the Lord. And he closed the book, and he gave it again to the minister, and sat down. And the eyes of all them that were in the

synagogue were fastened on him. And he began to say unto them, This day is this scripture fulfilled in your ears.

Isaiah 11:1-2 And there shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a Branch shall grow out of his roots: And the spirit of the LORD shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the LORD;

There are also several names of Christ, by which he is called in the Old Testament, which refer to his prophetic office. [He is] a Messenger, the messenger of the covenant, whose work it was to explain it, and declare the sense of it. [This is] the same with the apostle of our profession, "an interpreter, one among a thousand, to show unto man his uprightness." [He is] an interpreter of the mind and will of God, who lay in his bosom, and has revealed it, and whose business it was to preach righteousness, even his own, in the great congregation, and has done it.

Job 33:23 If there be a messenger with him, an interpreter, one among a thousand, to shew unto man his uprightness:

Psalms 40:9 I have preached righteousness in the great congregation: lo, I have not refrained my lips, O LORD, thou knowest.

He goes by the name of Wisdom, who cries and calls to the sons of men, and gives instructions to them.

Proverbs 1:20 Wisdom crieth without; she uttereth her voice in the streets.

Proverbs 8:1-2 Doth not wisdom cry? and understanding put forth her voice? She standeth in the top of high places, by the way in the places of the paths.

He is called a Counselor, not only because he was concerned in the council of peace; but because he gives counsel and advice in the Gospel, and by ministering of it, both to saints and sinners.

Isaiah 9:6 For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be

called Wonderful, *Counselor*, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace.

Revelation 3:18 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.

He is represented as a Teacher of the ways of God, and of the truths of the Gospel, called his law, or doctrine.

Isaiah 2:2-3 And it shall come to pass in the last days, that the mountain of the LORD'S house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it. And many people shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the LORD, to the house of the God of Jacob; and *he will teach us* of his ways, and we will walk in his paths: for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the LORD from Jerusalem.

Isaiah 42:4 He shall not fail nor be discouraged, till he have set judgment in the earth: and the isles shall wait for his law. (See also Revelation 3:18 above.)

Likewise, as a Speaker, who has the tongue of the learned, to speak a word in season.

Isaiah 50:4 The Lord GOD hath given me the tongue of the learned, that I should know how *to speak* a word in season to him that is weary: he wakeneth morning by morning, he wakeneth mine ear to hear as the learned.

Isaiah 52:6 Therefore my people shall know my name: therefore they shall know in that day that I am he that doth speak: behold, it Isaiah 1.

Hebrews 2:3 How shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation; which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard him.

Moreover, he is called a Light, to lighten the Gentiles, as well as the Jews; and to give a clear knowledge of the truth as it is in himself.

Isaiah 9:2 The people that walked in darkness have seen a great *light*: they that dwell in the land of the shadow of death, upon them hath the *light* shined.

Isaiah 42:6 I the LORD have called thee in righteousness, and will hold thine hand, and will keep thee, and give thee for a covenant of the people, for a *light* of the Gentiles;

And likewise “a Witness of the people,” and to bear witness to the truth he came into the world; and a faithful witness he is.

Isaiah 55:4 Behold, I have given him for a *witness* to the people, a leader and commander to the people.

John 18:37 Pilate therefore said unto him, Art thou a king then? Jesus answered, Thou sayest that I am a king. To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear *witness* unto the truth. Every one that is of the truth heareth my voice.

Revelation 3:14 And unto the angel of the church of the Laodiceans write; These things saith the Amen, the faithful and true *witness*, the beginning of the creation of God;

All which belonged to, and pointed at the prophetic office of Christ, and have all appeared and met in our Jesus; yea, the very place, and more particular parts of Judea, where he was chiefly to exercise as a prophet were foretold. (See Isaiah 9:1, compared with Matthew 4:12-15).

Isaiah 9:1 Nevertheless the dimness shall not be such as was in her vexation, when at the first he lightly afflicted the land of Zebulun and the land of Naphtali, and afterward did more grievously afflict her by the way of the sea, beyond Jordan, in *Galilee of the nations*.

Matthew 4:12-15 Now when Jesus had heard that John was cast into prison, he departed into Galilee; And leaving Nazareth, he came and dwelt in Capernaum, which is upon the sea coast, in the borders of Zabulon and Nephthalim: That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias the prophet, saying, The land of Zabulon, and the land of Nephthalim, *by the way of the sea, beyond Jordan, Galilee of the Gentiles*.

Secondly, The evidence and proof of Jesus being that prophet that was to come, are the miracles which were wrought by him. Upon Christ's working the miracle of feeding five thousand persons with five loaves and two small fishes; some of the Jews, that saw the miracle, were convinced, and said, "This is of a truth that Prophet that should come into the world," John 6:14.

And upon his raising from the dead the widow's son of Nain, as he was carrying to the grave, they said, "A great Prophet is risen up among us," Luke 7:16. So Nicodemus was convinced that Christ was "a Teacher come from God," from his miracles, John 3:2.

The Jews expected, that when the Messiah came he would do many and great miracles; as they had just reason for it; for it was foretold he should.

Isaiah 35:4-6 Say to them that are of a fearful heart, Be strong, fear not: behold, your God will come with vengeance, even God with a recompense; he will come and save you. Then the eyes of the blind shall be opened, and the ears of the deaf shall be unstopped. Then shall the lame man leap as an hart, and the tongue of the dumb sing: for in the wilderness shall waters break out, and streams in the desert.

Therefore, when they saw what kind of miracles, and what numerous ones were wrought by Christ, some of the Jews were convinced by them that he was the Christ.

John 7:31 And many of the people believed on him, and said, When Christ cometh, will he do more *miracles* than these which this man hath done?

When John sent two of his disciples to Christ, to inquire of him, whether he was "he that should come," the prophet that was to come; or whether they were to "look for another," he bids them go and tell John what they had seen and heard, meaning the miracles wrought by him, which he particularly mentions, and closes the account with saying, "the poor have the gospel preached to them," Matthew 11:2-5 plainly intimating, that he was that prophet that should preach glad tidings to the poor; and his miracles were a confirmation of it.

And he frequently appeals to his miracles, not only as proofs of his Deity, but of his Messiahship, which miracles were true and

undoubted ones; they were such as exceed the laws and power of nature.

John 5:36 But I have *greater witness* than that of John: for the works which the Father hath given me to finish, the same works that I do, *bear witness* of me, that the Father hath sent me.

John 10:37-38 If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not. But if I do, though ye believe not me, believe the works: that ye may know, and believe, that the Father is in me, and I in him.

[This is] what a mere creature could never perform. Nor could they be attributed to diabolical influence, for Satan, had he a power to work miracles, would never assist in them. [He would not] confirm doctrines subversive of his kingdom and interest, as our Lord argues.

Matthew 12:24-26 But when the Pharisees heard it, they said, This fellow doth not cast out devils, but by Beelzebub the prince of the devils. And Jesus knew their thoughts, and said unto them, Every kingdom divided against itself is brought to desolation; and every city or house divided against itself shall not stand. And if Satan cast out Satan, he is divided against himself; how shall then his kingdom stand?

Nor did Christ ever work any miracles to serve any temporal interest of his own, but purely for the good of men, and the glory of God. And these were openly and publicly done, and liable to the strictest examination; so that there could be no fraud nor deceit in them.

Thirdly, the next thing to be considered is, the parts of the prophetic office executed by Christ; and which lay, 1st, in foretelling future events.

As he is God omniscient, he knew all things future, even the more contingent, and did foretell them; as of a colt tied at a certain place, which he bid his disciples go and loose; and intimated to them what would be said by the owners of it, and what they should say to them; and of a man's carrying of a pitcher of water, whom his disciples were to follow, which would lead them to the master of a house, where the Passover was to be provided for him and them.

Mark 11:2-5 And saith unto them, Go your way into the village over against you: and as soon as ye be entered into it, ye shall find a colt

tied, whereon never man sat; loose him, and bring him. And if any man say unto you, Why do ye this? say ye that the Lord hath need of him; and straightway he will send him hither. And they went their way, and found the colt tied by the door without in a place where two ways met; and they loose him. And certain of them that stood there said unto them, What do ye, loosing the colt? And they said unto them even as Jesus had commanded: and they let them go.

Mark 14:13,16 And he sendeth forth two of his disciples, and saith unto them, Go ye into the city, and there shall meet you a man bearing a pitcher of water: follow him..... And his disciples went forth, and came into the city, and found as he had said unto them: and they made ready the Passover.

But more particularly and especially, Christ foretold his sufferings and death; and the kind and manner of it, crucifixion, the means by which his death should be brought about, by one of his disciples betraying him into the hands of his enemies. He knew from the beginning who would betray him; and declared to his disciples in general, that one of them would do it. And to Judas in particular he directed his discourse, and bid him do what he did quickly.

Matthew 16:21 From that time forth began Jesus to shew unto his disciples, how that he must go unto Jerusalem, and suffer many things of the elders and chief priests and scribes, and be killed, and be raised again the third day.

Matthew 20:18-19 Behold, we go up to Jerusalem; and the Son of man shall be betrayed unto the chief priests and unto the scribes, and they shall condemn him to death, And shall deliver him to the Gentiles to mock, and to scourge, and to crucify him: and the third day he shall rise again.

John 12:31-32 Now is the judgment of this world: now shall the prince of this world be cast out. And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me.

And when the time drew nigh for the execution of the scheme Judas had formed, Christ said to his disciples with him, "He is at hand that doth betray me." And immediately Judas appeared with a great multitude, and a band of soldiers, to seize on Jesus, upon a signal given them.

John 6:64 But there are some of you that believe not. For Jesus knew from the beginning who they were that believed not, and who should betray him.

John 13:18 I speak not of you all: I know whom I have chosen: but that the scripture may be fulfilled, He that eateth bread with me hath lifted up his heel against me.

John 13:21 When Jesus had thus said, he was troubled in spirit, and testified, and said, Verily, verily, I say unto you, that one of you shall betray me.

Matthew 26:46-47 Rise, let us be going: behold, he is at hand that doth betray me. And while he yet spake, lo, Judas, one of the twelve, came, and with him a great multitude with swords and staves, from the chief priests and elders of the people.

Christ foretold the behavior of his disciples towards him, upon his being apprehended, that they would all be offended with him and forsake him; and that, particularly, Peter would deny him thrice before the cock crew, all which exactly came to pass.

Matthew 26:31 Then saith Jesus unto them, All ye shall be offended because of me this night: for it is written, I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep of the flock shall be scattered abroad.

Matthew 26:34 Jesus said unto him, Verily I say unto thee, That this night, before the cock crow, thou shalt deny me thrice.

Matthew 26:56 But all this was done, that the scriptures of the prophets might be fulfilled. Then all the disciples forsook him, and fled.

Matthew 26:74-75 Then began he to curse and to swear, saying, I know not the man. And immediately the cock crew. And Peter remembered the word of Jesus, which said unto him, Before the cock crew, thou shalt deny me thrice. And he went out, and wept bitterly.

Likewise, his resurrection from the dead, on the third day; which he gave out, both in more obscure and figurative expressions, and in more plain and easy ones, and directed to the sign of the prophet Jonah, as a token of it. And notwithstanding all the precautions of the Jews, so it came about, who owned, that in his lifetime he predicted it.

John 2:19 Jesus answered and said unto them, Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up.

Matthew 16:21 From that time forth began Jesus to shew unto his disciples, how that he must go unto Jerusalem, and suffer many things of the elders and chief priests and scribes, and be killed, and be raised again the third day.

Matthew 12:39-40 But he answered and said unto them, An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign; and there shall no sign be given to it, but the sign of the prophet Jonas: For as Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale's belly; so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth.

Matthew 26:63-66 But Jesus held his peace. And the high priest answered and said unto him, I adjure thee by the living God, that thou tell us whether thou be the Christ, the Son of God. Jesus saith unto him, Thou hast said: nevertheless I say unto you, Hereafter shall ye see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven. Then the high priest rent his clothes, saying, He hath spoken blasphemy; what further need have we of witnesses? behold, now ye have heard his blasphemy. What think ye? They answered and said, He is guilty of death.

Christ - Part 2 - Our Prophet, Priest and King

He spoke beforehand of the treatment and usage his disciples should meet with from men after he was gone; that they should be delivered up to councils, and scourged in synagogues, and be brought before kings and governors for his sake; and that they should be put to death, and those that killed them think they did God good service: all which came to pass, and was fulfilled in all his disciples,

Matthew 10:17-18 But beware of men: for they will deliver you up to the councils, and they will scourge you in their synagogues; And ye shall be brought before governors and kings for my sake, for a testimony against them and the Gentiles.

John 16:2 They shall put you out of the synagogues: yea, the time cometh, that whosoever killeth you will think that he doeth God service.

He predicted the destruction of Jerusalem; the signs going before of it, its distresses, and what followed upon it, Matt. :4 1-51 which, in every particular, was accomplished, as the History of Josephus abundantly shows.

To observe no more, the book of the Revelation is a prophecy delivered by Christ to John, concerning all that were to befall the church and world, so far as the church was concerned with it, from the resurrection of Christ to his second coming; the greater part of which has been most amazingly fulfilled; and there is the utmost reason to believe the rest will be fulfilled in due time.

2nd. Another part of the prophetic office of Christ lay in the ministration of the word; which is sometimes in scripture called prophecy.

I Corinthians 14:3 But he that *prophesieth* speaketh unto men to edification, and exhortation, and comfort.

This was not only exercised by Christ, in interpreting the law, giving the true sense of it, and pointing out its spirituality and extensiveness, and vindicating it from the false glosses of the Pharisees, Matthew 5, but chiefly in preaching the gospel; for which he was in the highest degree qualified; and was most assiduous in it, preaching it in one city, and then in another, whereunto he was sent, and that throughout all Galilee, and other parts, and which he delivered with such authority as the Scribes and Pharisees did not, even the whole of it; declaring all that he had heard of the Father, and who spoke his whole mind and will by him; and so sealed up prophecy.

Luke 4:43 And he said unto them, I must preach the kingdom of God to other cities also: for therefore am I sent.

Matthew 4:23 And Jesus went about all Galilee, teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the gospel of the kingdom, and healing all manner of sickness and all manner of disease among the people.

Matthew 7:29 For he taught them as one having authority, and not as the scribes.

Hebrews 1:1-2 God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, Hath in these

last days spoken unto us by his Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds.

Matthew 22:16 And they sent out unto him their disciples with the Herodians, saying, Master, we know that thou art true, and teachest the way of God in truth, neither carest thou for any man: for thou regardest not the person of men.

[He spoke] with such wisdom, prudence, and eloquence, as never man spake,

John 7:46 The officers answered, Never man spake like this man.

[He spoke] with such gracefulness, and such gracious words, grace being poured into his lips, as was astonishing to those that heard him.

Psalms 45:2 Thou art fairer than the children of men: grace is poured into thy lips: therefore God hath blessed thee for ever.

Luke 4:22 And all bare him witness, and wondered at the gracious words which proceeded out of his mouth. And they said, Is not this Joseph's son?

This part of his prophetic office lay not only in the external ministry of the word, but in a powerful and internal illumination of the mind, in opening the heart, as Lydia's was, to attend to the things spoken; and in opening the understanding to understand the Scriptures, and to receive and embrace the truths thereof; the word coming not in word only, but with power, and in the Holy Ghost, and much assurance.

Fourthly, The time when this office was executed by Christ; and it may be observed, that this office may be considered as executed either immediately or mediately.

1. Immediately, by Christ, in his own Person, by himself; and this was here on earth, in his state of humiliation; for he came a Teacher from God; being sent and anointed by him to preach the gospel; and on which office he entered quickly after his baptism, and continued in the exercise of it until his death; but only to the lost sheep of Israel, to whom he was sent, and to them only did he give his apostles a commission to preach the gospel during that time. He

was "a Minister of the circumcision," that is, a Minister to the circumcised Jews, and to them only.

Romans 15:8 Now I say that Jesus Christ was a minister of the circumcision for the truth of God, to confirm the promises made unto the fathers:

2. . Mediatly, by his Spirit, and by the prophets of the Old Testament, and by the apostles and ministers of the New; and in this sense he exercised the office of a Prophet both before and after his state of humiliation.

(1.) Before his incarnation: he did indeed sometimes personally appear in an human form, and preached the gospel to men, as to our first parents in the garden of Eden, immediately after their fall; declaring, that "the Seed of the woman," meaning himself, would "break the serpent's head," and thus the gospel, strictly speaking, "began to be first spoken by the Lord."

Genesis 3:15 And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel.

Hebrews 2:3 How shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation; which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard him;

And so, under the name of the Angel of the Lord, and very probably in an human form, he appeared to Abraham, and preached the gospel to him; saying, "In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed."

Genesis 22:15-18 And the angel of the LORD called unto Abraham out of heaven the second time, And said, By myself have I sworn, saith the LORD, for because thou hast done this thing, and hast not withheld thy son, thine only son: That in blessing I will bless thee, and in multiplying I will multiply thy seed as the stars of the heaven, and as the sand which *is* upon the sea shore; and thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies; And in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed; because thou hast obeyed my voice.

Galatians 3:8 And the scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed.

He was with the thousands of angels at mount Sinai, even he who ascended on high, and led captivity captive. He was with Moses in the wilderness, to whom he spoke at Sinai; and gave unto him the lively oracles of God.

Psalms 68:17-18 The chariots of God are twenty thousand, even thousands of angels: the Lord is among them, as in Sinai, in the holy place. Thou hast ascended on high, thou hast led captivity captive: thou hast received gifts for men; yea, for the rebellious also, that the LORD God might dwell among them.

Acts 7:38 This is he, that was in the church in the wilderness with the angel which spake to him in the mount Sina, and with our fathers: who received the lively oracles to give unto us.

But at other times we read of his preaching by his Spirit unto men. Noah was a preacher of righteousness, even of the righteousness of faith; and Christ preached in him, and by him. He, by his Spirit, went and preached to the ungodly world, to those who were disobedient in the times of Noah; the same who in the times of the apostle were spirits in prison.

And as Christ was spoken of by all the holy prophets that were from the beginning of the world; so he, by his Spirit, spoke in them, and testified of his own sufferings, and the glory that should follow.

I Peter 3:18-21 For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit: By which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison; Which sometime were disobedient, when once the longsuffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls were saved by water.

I Peter 1:11 Searching what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow.

(2.) Christ continued to exercise his prophetic office, after his state of humiliation was over, and he was raised from the dead, and had glory given him. He appeared to his disciples after that, and expounded to them the scriptures concerning himself, and opened their understanding, that they might understand them. [He]

spoke unto them of the things concerning the kingdom of God, and instructed them in them, and renewed their commission to preach and baptize, and enlarged it. [He] promised his presence with them, and with their successors to the end of the world; and by them, and not in his own person, after his ascension to heaven.

He went and preached peace to them that were nigh, and to them that were afar off, both Jews and Gentiles, Christ speaking in and by his ministers; so that they that hear them, hear him; and they that despise them, despises him. And so he continues, and will continue, to exercise his prophetic office in and by his ministers, and by his Spirit attending their ministrations, throughout all ages, to the end of time, until he has gathered in all his chosen ones.

Christ as Priest

I. Christ was to be a Priest. This was determined on in the purposes and decrees of God: God set him forth proeyeto [pro-eh-theh-to], foreordained him, "to be a propitiation," that is, to be a propitiatory sacrifice, to make atonement and satisfaction for sin. [This] is one part of Christ's priestly office, on which, redemption by his blood is founded. To [this] he was "verily foreordained before the foundation of the world."

Romans 3:25 Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God.

I Peter 1:18-20 Forasmuch as ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from your vain conversation received by tradition from your fathers; But with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot: Who verily was foreordained before the foundation of the world, but was manifest in these last times for you,.

The sufferings and death of Christ, whatever he endured from Jews and Gentiles, were all according to the "determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God," and were no other than what his "hand and counsel determined before to be done," and which he endured in the execution of his priestly office; of which, the decrees of God are the spring and rise.

Acts 2:23 Him, being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain.

Acts 4:27-28 For of a truth against thy holy child Jesus, whom thou hast anointed, both Herod, and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles, and the people of Israel, were gathered together, For to do whatsoever thy hand and thy counsel determined before to be done.

To this office Christ was called of God. He did not glorify himself to be called an High Priest, but his divine Father, whose only begotten Son he is, called him to take upon him this office, invested him with it, and swore him into it, in the council and covenant of peace. **He was made a Priest with an oath, to show the importance, dignity, validity, and perpetuity of his priesthood.**

Psalms 110:4 The LORD hath sworn, and will not repent, Thou art a *priest* for ever after the order of Melchizedek.

[To this] Christ agreed; saying, "Sacrifice and offering that wouldst not;" I foresee that sacrifices of slain beasts, offered by sinful men, will not be, in the issue, acceptable to thee; nor be sufficient to atone for sin; "But a body hast thou prepared me," in purpose, council, and covenant; which I am ready, in proper time, to assume, and offer up a sacrifice to divine justice."

Hebrews 10:5 Wherefore when he cometh into the world, he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldst not, but a body hast thou prepared me:

And these eternal decrees, and mutual transactions, are the basis and foundation of Christ's priesthood; and made it sure and certain. In the prophecies of the Old Testament Christ is spoken of as a Priest.

Psalms 40:6-7 Sacrifice and offering thou didst not desire; mine ears hast thou opened: burnt offering and sin offering hast thou not required. Then said I, Lo, I come: in the volume of the book it is written of me.

Psalms 110:4 The LORD hath sworn, and will not repent, Thou art a *priest* for ever after the order of Melchizedek.

But still more plainly in Zechariah 6:12-13, where the Messiah, called the Man the Branch, who was to spring up and build the temple, and bear the glory, is said to be "a priest upon his throne."

Zechariah 6:12-13 And speak unto him, saying, Thus speaketh the LORD of hosts, saying, Behold the man whose name *is* The BRANCH; and he shall grow up out of his place, and he shall build the temple of the LORD: Even he shall build the temple of the LORD; and he shall bear the glory, and shall sit and rule upon his throne; and he shall be a *priest* upon his throne: and the counsel of peace shall be between them both.

Moreover, each of the parts of Christ's priestly office are particularly prophesied of, as that he should "make his soul an offering for sin," and should make "intercession for the transgressors."

Isaiah 53:10,12 Yet it pleased the LORD to bruise him; he hath put him to grief: when thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of the LORD shall prosper in his hand.....Therefore will I divide him a portion with the great, and he shall divide the spoil with the strong; because he hath poured out his soul unto death: and he was numbered with the transgressors; and he bare the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors.

To which may be added, that he sometimes appeared in the habit of a priest, clothed in linen.

(Ezekiel 9:2 And, behold, six men came from the way of the higher gate, which lieth toward the north, and every man a slaughter weapon in his hand; and one man among them was *clothed with linen*, with a writer's inkhorn by his side: and they went in, and stood beside the brazen altar.

Daniel 10:5 Then I lifted up mine eyes, and looked, and behold a certain man *clothed* in linen, whose loins were girded with fine gold of Uphaz:

There were several types of Christ as a priest. Among these the first and principal was "Melchizedek, king of Salem, and priest of the most high God," according to whose order Christ was to be, and is a priest.

Genesis 14:18 And Melchizedek king of Salem brought forth bread and wine: and he *was* the *priest* of the most high God.

Hebrews 5:10 Called of God an *high priest* after the order of Melchisedec.

Hebrews 7:15 And it is yet far more evident: for that after the similitude of Melchisedec there ariseth another *priest*,

Hebrews 7:17 For he testifieth, Thou art a *priest* for ever after the order of Melchisedec.

His title, king of Salem, that is, peace, agrees with Christ, who is the prince of peace, and who is both king and priest on his throne, as this person was. Christ's perpetual, never changing, priesthood is shadowed out by his being a priest, "not after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an endless life."

Hebrews 7:16 Who is made, not after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an endless life.

Aaron the high priest was an eminent type of Christ, though Christ was not of the same tribe with him, nor made a priest after the same law, nor of the same order, but of one more ancient than his, and which continued in Christ when his was abolished. Yet there are many things in which Aaron typified Christ; in his priesthood, as in the separation of him from his brethren; in the unction of him when installed into his office; in his habit and several vestments with which he was clothed, his mitre, robe and brodered coat, ephod and the girdle of it, with the breastplate of judgment.

But especially in the sacrifices which he offered, which were all typical of the sacrifice of Christ; and in his entrance into the most holy place, bearing the names of the children of Israel in the breastplate of judgment on his heart; in carrying in the burning coals and incense, with the blood of slain beasts, all typical of the intercession of Christ, as founded on his sacrifice. He was a good spokesman, one that could speak well; as Christ has the tongue of the learned to speak on the behalf of his people.

All the common priests were types of Christ, in their ordination from among men, and for men, and to offer gifts and sacrifices for them, though they were many, and he but one. Their sacrifices

[were] many, and were daily offering, and his but one, and once offered, and which was sufficient.

Indeed all the sacrifices offered up from the beginning of the world, were all typical of the sacrifice of Christ our great high priest. The sacrifice of Abel, which was offered up in the faith of the sacrifice of Christ; and those of Noah, which for the same reason were of a sweet smelling savor to God.

The Passover lamb was a type of Christ, our Passover, sacrificed for us; and so were the lambs of the daily sacrifice morning and evening, and all other sacrifices offered up to the times of Christ's coming, sufferings, and death, which put an end to them all.

II. Christ is come in the flesh, and is come as an high priest. He came to give his life a ransom for many, and he has given himself a ransom price for all his people, which has been testified in due time; and which is a considerable branch of his priestly office, the whole of which he was abundantly qualified, being both God and man.

1. As man; he is mediator according to both natures, but the mediator is particularly said to be "the man Christ Jesus."

I Timothy 2:5 For there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus;

He became man, and was made in all things like unto his brethren, persons of that nature elect; that he might be fit to be a priest, and officiate in that office, and "that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God," [all things pertaining to] the glory of the divine perfections, and particularly his justice. [He became man] to make reconciliation for the sins of the people, atonement for them, whereby the justice of God and all his perfections would be glorified.

Hebrews 2:17 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.

Christ being man, is taken from among men, and ordained for men, for their use and service, as the priests of old were, not for

angels; the good angels needed none, and those that sinned were not spared. No priest, no savior, nor salvation were provided for them, and therefore Christ took not on him their nature; but that of men, that they and they only might reap the benefit of his priestly office.

And being man he had something to offer for them, a human body and a human soul, which as God he had not. As such he was impassible, not capable of sufferings and death. And had he assumed an angelic nature, that is not capable of dying, for angels die not; which it was necessary our high priest should, that by means of death he might obtain redemption from transgressions, both under the Old and under the New Testament. It was proper that satisfaction should be made in that nature that sinned. And [it was proper] that those of that nature, and not others, should enjoy the advantages of it.

Also by being man he has another qualification of a priest, which is to be compassionate to persons in ignorance, difficulties, and distress. Hereby Christ becomes a merciful high priest, one that has a fellow feeling with his people in all their infirmities, afflictions, and temptations.

To which may be added, that Christ's human nature is holy, harmless, and undefiled; clear of original and actual transgression. Such an high priest became us, is suitable for us, since he could, as he did, offer himself without spot to God. And being Jesus Christ the righteous, he is a very proper person to be an advocate or intercessor for transgressors.

2. As God, or a divine person; being the great God, he was able to be a Savior, and to work out a great salvation. Being the mighty God, he was mighty to save to the uttermost. And being an infinite person, [he] could make infinite satisfaction for the sins of men, and render his sacrifice acceptable to God, and sufficient to put away, and to put an end unto the sins of his people; and could put a virtue and efficacy into his blood, to cleanse from all sin, and bring in a righteousness that could justify from all, and could make his intercession and mediation for his people always prevalent with God.

III. Christ has executed, and is executing, and will continue to execute, his priestly office; the parts of which are more principally these two, offering sacrifice, and making intercession. To

which may be added, a third, blessing his people; for it was the work of the high priest, as to do the two former, so the latter.

First, Offering a sacrifice. The work of the priests was to offer sacrifice for sin. Christ was once offered up to bear the sins of many, and the punishment of them, and to make atonement for them. He has offered himself a sacrifice to God, of a sweet smelling savor.

Hebrews 5:3 And by reason hereof he ought, as for the people, so also for himself, to offer for sins.

Hebrews 9:28 So Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation.

Ephesians 5:2 And walk in love, as Christ also hath loved us, and hath given himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweetsmelling savor.

1. It may be inquired, who is the sacrificer? Christ is altar, sacrifice, and priest. As he had something to offer as man, he has offered it. As it became him as a priest to do it, he has done it. It is his own act and deed, and is frequently ascribed unto him.

Hebrews 9:14 How much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?

Ephesians 5:2 And walk in love, as Christ also hath loved us, and hath given himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweetsmelling savor.

2. What it was he offered; or what was the sacrifice? Not slain beasts; their blood could not take away sin. It was not their blood he shed; but it was his own, with which he entered into the holy place. It was his flesh he gave for the life of the world, of his chosen ones. It was his body which was offered up once for all. It was his soul that was made an offering for sin, and all as in union with his divine Person. **Therefore [it is] said to be himself which was the sacrifice.**

Strictly speaking, it was his human nature which was the sacrifice. The divine nature was the altar on which it was offered.

[It] sanctified the gift or offering, and gave it a virtue and efficacy to atone for sin. **It was through the "eternal Spirit" he offered up himself.**

Hebrews 9:14 How much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?

3. To whom was the sacrifice offered? It was offered to God, as it is often said to be to God, against whom sin is committed, and therefore to him was the sacrifice for it offered. [His] justice must be satisfied; without which, God will by no means clear the guilty. Therefore Christ was set forth and appointed to be the propitiation for sin, to declare the righteousness of God, to show forth his justice, the strictness of it, and give it satisfaction.

Ephesians 5:2 And walk in love, as Christ also hath loved us, and hath given himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet-smelling savor.

Hebrews 9:14 How much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?

Romans 3:25-26 Whom God hath set forth *to be* a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; To declare, I say, at this time his righteousness: that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus.

[God's justice] being satisfied, the sacrifice of Christ became acceptable, and of a sweet smelling savor to God.

Ephesians 5:2 And walk in love, as Christ also hath loved us, and hath given himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet-smelling savor.

4. For whom was the sacrifice offered? Not for himself; he needed none, as did the priests under the law. He was cut off, but not for himself, being without sin. Nor for angels; the elect angels needing no sacrifice, having not sinned. And evil angels were not spared, and so their nature was not taken by him, nor a sacrifice offered for them. But for elect men, called his church, his sheep, his

children; for whom he laid down his life, and gave himself an offering to God.

His sacrifice was a vicarious one; as were those under the law, which were typical of his. Christ our Passover, was sacrificed for us, in our room and stead. Christ suffered, the just for the unjust, in the room and stead of them. He died for the ungodly, or they must have died; and became the ransom price for them.

5. What the nature, excellency, and properties of this sacrifice of Christ? It is a full and sufficient sacrifice, adequate to the purposes for which it was offered. Such were not the legal sacrifices. They could not make those perfect for whom they were offered; nor purge their consciences from sin; nor take it away from them. But Christ has, by his sacrifice, perfected forever all those for whom it is offered.

Hebrews 10:1-4 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. For then would they not have ceased to be offered? because that the worshipers once purged should have had no more conscience of sins. But in those sacrifices there is a remembrance again made of sins every year. For it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins.

Hebrews 10:14 For by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified.

It is an unblemished sacrifice, as all under the law were to be, which was typical of this. As the Passover lamb, the lambs for the daily sacrifice, Christ the sacrifice is a Lamb without spot and blemish, free from original and actual sin. In him was no sin, and so [he was] fit to be a sin offering for the sins of others; and was offered up, "without spot" to God. This sacrifice was free and voluntary. Christ gave himself an offering; he laid down his life freely. He showed no reluctance, but was "brought as a lamb to the slaughter."

Isaiah 53:7 He was oppressed, and he was afflicted, yet he opened not his mouth: he is brought as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before her shearers is dumb, so he openeth not his mouth.

It was but one offering, and but once offered up. The priests under the law stood daily offering the same sacrifices, because insufficient. But Christ having offered one sacrifice for sin, offered no more, that being sufficient and effectual to answer the designs of it.

Wherefore in the Lord's Supper, which is only a commemoration of this sacrifice, there is no reiteration of it. It is not an offering up again the body and blood of Christ, as the papists in their mass pretend. That has been done once, and it is needed no more.

6. What are the ends and uses of this sacrifice, and the blessings which come by it? Christ "is come an High Priest of good things to come."

Hebrews 9:11 But Christ being come an high priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building;

There are many good things which come through Christ's priesthood. Particularly through his sacrifice is a full expiation of sin, and atonement for it. Christ has, by the sacrifice of himself, put away sin for ever; finished it, made an end of it, and reconciliation for it. And the perfection of his sanctified ones, that were set apart for himself in eternal election; those he has "perfected for ever," by his one sacrifice.

Hebrews 10:14 For by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified.

They are perfectly redeemed, justified, pardoned, and saved by it. By giving himself for them a sacrifice, in their room and stead, he has obtained "eternal redemption" for them. Through it he has redeemed them from all iniquity.

Titus 2:14 Who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works.

Peace is made for them by the blood of his cross; and through his sufferings and death they are reconciled unto God.

Romans 5:10 For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life.

Full pardon of sin is procured, which was not to be had without shedding of blood, and a full satisfaction is made for sin. [This] is made through the sacrifice of Christ; and so there is redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins, free and full forgiveness of them.

Ephesians 1:7 In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace;

In a word "eternal salvation" is the fruit and effect of this sacrifice. Christ being "made perfect" through sufferings, and thereby made perfect satisfaction for sin, he is "become the author of eternal salvation" to his people. [This] is owing to his being *called* and officiating, as "an High Priest after the order of Melchizedek."

Hebrews 5:9-10 And being made perfect, he became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him; Called of God an high priest after the order of Melchisedec.

Christ as King

The prophetic and priestly offices of Christ having been considered; the kingly office of Christ is next to be treated of. **Christ is king in a twofold sense: he is a king by nature.** As he is God, he is God over all. As the Son of God, he is heir of all things. As he is God the Creator, he has a right of dominion over all his creatures. **And he is king by office, as he is mediator.**

Accordingly he has a two-fold kingdom, the one natural, essential, universal, and common to him with the other divine persons.

The kingdom of nature and providence is his, what he has a natural right unto, and claim upon. [1] It is essential to him as God; dominion and fear are with him. [2] It is universal, it reaches to all creatures visible or invisible, to all in heaven, earth, and hell. [3] It is common to the three divine persons, Father, Son, and Spirit, who are joint creators of all the creatures, and have a joint rule, government, and dominion over them.

And as Christ is the creator of all, nothing that is made being made without him, but all things by him, he has a right to rule over them.

[1] This kingdom of his extends to angels, good and bad. He is the head of all principality and power. Of the good angels, he is their creator, lord, and king, from whom all worship, homage, and obedience are due unto him; and who are at his command to do his will and pleasure; and whom he employs as ministering spirits in nature, providence, and grace, as he pleases.

[2] And the evil angels, though they have left their first estate, cast off their allegiance to him, and rebelled against him, yet, whether they will or no, **they are obliged to be subject to him.** And even when he was manifest in the flesh, they trembled at him, and were obliged to quit the possession of the bodies of men at his command, and could do nothing without his leave.

[3] Men also good and bad, are under the government of Christ as God, who is Lord of all. He not only is king of saints, who willingly become subject to him; but even those who are sons of Belial, without a yoke, who have cast off the yoke, and will not have him to reign over them. Whether they will or not, they are obliged to yield unto him; over whom he rules with a rod of iron, and will break them in pieces as a potter's vessel. So easy, so inevitable, and so irreparable is their ruin and everlasting destruction by him.

This his kingdom rules over all men, of all ranks and degrees, the highest and the greatest. He is King of kings, and Lord of lords. He sets them up and puts them down at his pleasure. By him they reign, and to him they are accountable.

But besides this, there is another kingdom that belongs to Christ as God-man and Mediator. This is a special, limited kingdom. This concerns only the elect of God, and others only as they may have to do with them, even their enemies. The subjects of this kingdom are those who are chosen, redeemed, and called from among men by the grace of God, and bear the name of saints. Hence the title and character of Christ with respect to them is "king of saints."

This kingdom and government of his is what is put into his hands to dispense and administer, and may be called a dispensatory, delegated government; what is given him by his Father, and he has received authority from him to exercise, and for which he is accountable to him.

When the number of his elect are completed in the effectual calling, he will deliver up the kingdom to the Father, perfect and entire, that God may be all in all. And this is the kingly office of Christ, now to be treated of; and which will be done much in the same manner the other offices have been treated of.

I. I shall show that Christ was to be a king; as appears by the designation of his Father, in his purposes, council, and covenant; by the types and figures of him; and by the prophecies concerning him.

1. That he was to be a king, appears by the designation and appointment of him by his Father to this office; "I have set my king upon my holy hill of Zion," says Jehovah.

Psalms 2:6 Yet have I set *my king* upon my holy hill of Zion.

That is, he had set up Christ his Son, in his eternal purposes, to be king over his church and people; and therefore calls him his king, because of his choosing, appointing, and setting up. And as he appointed him to be a king, he appointed a kingdom to him.

Luke 22:29 And I appoint unto you a *kingdom*, as my Father hath appointed unto me.

In the council and covenant of grace, Christ was called to take upon him this office, "feed the flock of slaughter," the church, subject to the persecutions of men. The act of feeding them, designs the rule and government, care and protection of the people of God. In allusion to shepherds, by which name kings and rulers are sometimes called, to which Christ assented and agreed; saying, "I will feed the flock of slaughter," take the care and government of them, upon which he was invested with the office of a king, and was considered as such.

Zechariah 11:4 Thus saith the LORD my God; Feed the flock of the slaughter.

Hebrews 1:8 But unto the Son he saith, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever: a sceptre of righteousness *is* the sceptre of thy kingdom.

2. It appears from the types and figures of Christ, in his kingly office. Melchizedek was a type of him; not only in his priestly

office, of whose order Christ was; but in his kingly office, both offices meeting in him, as they do in Christ, who is a priest upon his throne. From his quality as a king he had his name Melchizedek, king of righteousness, or righteous king. And such an one is Christ, a king that reigns in righteousness; and from the place and seat of his government, king of Salem; that is, king of peace; agreeable to which, **one of Christ's titles belonging to him, in his kingly office, is, prince of peace.**

Hebrews 7:1 For this Melchisedec, *king* of Salem, priest of the most high God, who met Abraham returning from the slaughter of the kings, and blessed him;

David was an eminent type of Christ in his kingly office; for his wisdom and military skill, his courage and valour, his wars and victories, and the equity and justice of his government. Hence Christ, his antitype, is often, with respect to the Jews, in the latter days, called David their king, whom they shall seek and serve; and who shall be king over them.

Jeremiah 30:9 But they shall serve the LORD their God, and *David their king*, whom I will raise up unto them.

Ezekiel 33:23-24 Then the word of the LORD came unto me, saying, And *David* my servant shall be *king* over them; and they all shall have one shepherd: they shall also walk in my judgments, and observe my statutes, and do them.

Hosea 3:5 Afterward shall the children of Israel return, and seek the LORD their God, and *David their king*; and shall fear the LORD and his goodness in the latter days.

Solomon also was a type of Christ as king. Hence Christ, in "the Song of Songs," is frequently called Solomon, and king Solomon.

Songs 3:7 Behold his bed, which is *Solomon's*; threescore valiant men are about it, of the valiant of Israel.

Songs 3:9 *King Solomon* made himself a chariot of the wood of Lebanon.

Songs 3:11 Go forth, O ye daughters of Zion, and behold *King Solomon* with the crown wherewith his mother crowned him in the day of his espousals, and in the day of the gladness of his heart.

Songs 8:11,12 *Solomon* had a vineyard at Baalhamon; he let out the vineyard unto keepers; every one for the fruit thereof was to bring a thousand pieces of silver. My vineyard, which *is* mine, *is* before me: thou, O *Solomon*, must have a thousand, and those that keep the fruit thereof two hundred.

Because of his great wisdom, his immense riches, the largeness of his kingdom, and the peaceableness of it; in all which he is exceeded by Christ; and who, speaking of himself, says, "a greater than Solomon is here."

Matthew 12:42 The queen of the south shall rise up in the judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it: for she came from the uttermost parts of the earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon; and, behold, *a greater than Solomon is here.*

3. This still more fully appears, that Christ was to be a King, by the prophecies concerning him, in this respect; as in the very first promise or prophecy of him.

Genesis 3:15 And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel.

"The Seed of the woman," meaning Christ, should break the "serpent's head," that is, destroy the devil, and all his works; which is an act of Christ's kingly power, and is expressive of him as a victorious prince, and triumphant conqueror over all his and his peoples enemies.

Balaam foretold, that "there should come a Star out of Jacob, and a Sceptre," that is, a Sceptre bearer, a King, should "rise out of Israel."

Numbers 24:17 I shall see him, but not now: I shall behold him, but not nigh: there shall come a Star out of Jacob, and a Sceptre shall rise out of Israel, and shall smite the corners of Moab, and destroy all the children of Sheth.

[This] prophecy, some way or other, coming to the knowledge of the Magi, or wise men in the East, upon the appearance of a new star, led them to take a journey into Judea, to inquire after the birth of the King of the Jews, where he was born.

In the famous prophecy of Isaiah, concerning Christ, it is said, that "the government should be upon his shoulders," one of his titles be, "the Prince of peace;" and that of his government, and the peace of it, there should be no end; as well as it should be ordered and established with justice and judgment

Isaiah 9:6-7 For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given; and the government shall be upon his shoulder; and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counselor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, *The Prince of Peace*. Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even for ever. The zeal of the Lord of hosts will perform this.

To the same purpose is another prophecy in Jeremiah of the Messiah, the Man the Branch, it is said, "And a King shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice in the earth; and this is his name whereby he shall be called, The Lord our Righteousness." There can be no doubt but Christ is here meant; as well as in that known prophecy of the place of his birth, Bethlehem Ephratah; of which it is said, "Out of thee shall he come forth unto me, that is to be Ruler in Israel," the King of Israel, as Christ is sometimes called.

Jeremiah 23:5-6 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. In his days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely: and this *is* his name whereby he shall be called, THE LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS.

Micah 5:2 But thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting.

To which may be added, another prophecy of Christ, as King, and which was fulfilled in him; "Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion----behold thy King cometh unto thee."

Zechariah 9:9 Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion; shout, O daughter of Jerusalem: behold, *thy King* cometh unto thee: he is

just, and having salvation; lowly, and riding upon an ass, and upon a colt the foal of an ass.

Matthew 21:4-5 All this was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, saying, 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.

Yea, the angel that brought the news to the virgin Mary, of Christ's conception and incarnation, foretold unto her, that this her Son should be "great, and be called the Son of the Highest," and that "the Lord God would give unto him the throne of his father David," and that he should "reign over the house of Jacob for ever; and of his kingdom there should be no end."

Luke 1:32-33 He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest: and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David: And he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever; and of *his kingdom* there shall be no end.

II. I proceed to show, that Christ is a King; as it was decreed and determined he should be, and according to the types of him, and prophecies concerning him. And,

1. Christ was a King before his incarnation, during the Old Testament dispensation. He was King over the people of Israel; not as a body politic; though their civil government was a theocracy; but as a church, a kingdom of priests, or a royal priesthood. And he is the Angel that was with them, the church in the wilderness, which spoke to Moses on mount Sinai; from whose right hand went the fiery law, the oracles of God; for the rule, government, and instruction of that people.

He is the Angel that went before them, to guide and direct them, and to rule and govern them, whose voice they were to obey. He appeared to Joshua, with a drawn sword in his hand, and declared himself to be the Captain of the Lord's hosts, to fight their battles for them, and settle them in the land of Canaan. David speaks of him as a King. (Psalms 45)

He represents him as a very amiable Person, grace being poured into his lips, and he fairer than the children of men; as a majestic and victorious Prince, whose queen stands at his right hand, in gold of

Ophir. His church, is called upon to worship him, to yield homage and subjection to him; because he is her Lord and King. As such he is acknowledged by the church in the times of Isaiah.

Isaiah 33:22 For the LORD is our judge, the LORD *is* our lawgiver, the LORD is *our king*; he will save us.

Isaiah 26:13 O LORD our God, other lords beside thee have had dominion over us: but by thee only will we make mention of thy name.

2. Christ was King in his state of incarnation; he was born a King, as the wise men understood it he was, by the prophecy of him, and by the star that appeared, that guided them to come and worship him as such. The angel that brought the news of his birth to the shepherds, declared, that that day was born a Savior, Christ the Lord, Head and King of his church. [This is] agreeable to the prophecy of him by Isaiah, that the child born, and Son given, would have the government on his shoulders, and be the Prince of peace.

Christ himself acknowledges as much, when he was asked by Pilate, whether he was a King? he answered in a manner which implied it, and gave assent unto it; though at the same time, he declared his kingdom was not of this world, but of a spiritual nature.

John 18:36-37 Jesus answered, My kingdom is not of this world: if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews: but now is my kingdom not from hence. Pilate therefore said unto him, Art thou a king then? Jesus answered, Thou sayest that I am a king. To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth. Every one that is of the truth heareth my voice.

He began his ministry with giving notice, that the "kingdom of heaven was at hand," that is, his own kingdom, which was going to take place, with some evidence of it. He assures the Jews, that the kingdom of God was then within them, or among them; though it came not with the observation of the vulgar: nor with outward show, pomp, and splendor, like that of an earthly king.

Matthew 4:17 From that time Jesus began to preach, and to say, Repent: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand.

Luke 17:20-21 And when he was demanded of the Pharisees, when the kingdom of God should come, he answered them and said, The kingdom of God cometh not with observation: Neither shall they say, Lo here! or, lo there! for, behold, the kingdom of God is within you.

Christ was known, and owned by some, as a King, though not by many. Nathaniel made the following noble confession of faith in him, respecting his person and office, upon a conviction of his being the omniscient God.

John 1:49 Nathanael answered and saith unto him, Rabbi, thou art the Son of God; thou art the King of Israel.

When Christ entered into Jerusalem, in a very public manner, whereby was fulfilled the prophecy of him as a King, not only the children cried, Hosanna to the Son of David! expressive of his royal character and dignity; but the disciples, in so many words, said, "Blessed be the King, that cometh in the name of the Lord!"

Zechariah 9:9 Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion; shout, O daughter of Jerusalem: behold, *thy King* cometh unto thee: he is just, and having salvation; lowly, and riding upon an ass, and upon a colt the foal of an ass.

Matthew 21:4-5 All this was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, saying, 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.

Matthew 21:9 And the multitudes that went before, and that followed, cried, saying, Hosanna to the Son of David: Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord; Hosanna in the highest.

Luke 19:38 Saying, Blessed be the King that cometh in the name of the Lord: peace in heaven, and glory in the highest.

Moreover, Christ, in the days of his flesh on earth, received authority from his divine Father, to execute judgment; that is, to exercise his kingly office in equity and justice. This before his sufferings and death; and had all things requisite to it, delivered unto him by his Father.

John 5:22 For the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son:

John 5:27 And hath given him authority to execute judgment also, because he is the Son of man.

Matthew 11:27 All things are delivered unto me of my Father: and no man knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him.

After his resurrection from the dead, and before his ascension to heaven, he declared, that "all power was given him in heaven and in earth," in virtue of which, he appointed ordinances, renewed the commission of his disciples to administer them, promising his presence with them, and their successors, to the end of the world.

Matthew 28:18-20 And Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world. Amen.

All which shows how false the notion of the Socinians is, that Christ was no King, nor did he exercise his kingly office before his ascension to heaven. It is true, indeed,

3. That upon his ascension to heaven, he "was made both Lord and Christ," not but that he was both Lord and Christ before, of which there was evidence. But then he was declared to be so, and made more manifest as such. **Then he was exalted as a Prince, as well as a Savior,** and highly exalted, and had a name given him above every name. Angels, authorities, and powers, were made subject to him.

Acts 2:36 Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ.

He then received the promise of the Spirit, and his gifts from the Father, which he plentifully bestowed upon his apostles; whom he sent forth into all the world, preaching his gospel with great

success, and causing them to triumph in him in every place where they came, and so increased and enlarged his kingdom.

He went forth by them with his bow and arrows, conquering and to conquer, making the arrows of his word sharp in the hearts of his enemies, whereby they were made to submit unto him; sending forth the rod of his strength out of Zion, the gospel, the power of God unto salvation. He made multitudes willing in the day of his power on them, to be subject to him; whereby his kingdom and interest were greatly strengthened in the world.

4. That all the rites and ceremonies used at the inauguration of kings, and their "regalia," are to be found with Christ. Were kings anointed? As Saul, David, and Solomon were, so was Christ. From whence he has his name, Messiah. He whose throne is for ever and ever, is anointed with the oil of gladness above his fellows; that is, with the gifts and graces of the Holy Spirit without measure. As he more eminently was, upon his ascension to heaven, when he was made, or declared, Lord and Christ; and, indeed, because of this ceremony used at the instrument of kings into their office, the original investiture of Christ with the kingly office is expressed by it; "I have set," or as in the Hebrew text, "I have anointed my King upon my holy hill of Zion."

Psalms 2:6 Yet have I set *my king* upon my holy hill of Zion.

Psalms 45:6-7 Thy throne, O God, *is* for ever and ever: the sceptre of *thy kingdom is* a right sceptre. Thou lovest righteousness, and hatest wickedness: therefore God, thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows.

Were kings crowned at the time of their inauguration? So was Christ at his ascension to heaven. He was then "crowned with glory and honor." His Father set "a crown of pure gold on his head." [This was] not a material one; the phrase is only expressive of the royal grandeur and dignity conferred upon him.

His mother, the church, is also said to crown him. And so does every believer set the crown on his head, when, rejecting all self-confidence, and subjection to others, they ascribe their whole salvation to him, and submit to him, as King of saints. He, as a mighty Warrior, and triumphant Conqueror, is represented as having many crowns on his head, as emblematical of the many great and

glorious victories he has obtained over all his, and the enemies of his people.

Hebrews 2:9 But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honor; that he by the grace of God should taste death for every man.

Psalms 21:3 For thou preventest him with the blessings of goodness: thou settest a crown of pure gold on his head.

Song of Solomon 3:11 Go forth, O ye daughters of Zion, and behold king Solomon with the crown wherewith his mother crowned him in the day of his espousals, and in the day of the gladness of his heart.

Revelation 19:12 His eyes were as a flame of fire, and on his head *were* many crowns; and he had a name written, that no man knew, but he himself.

Do kings sometimes sit on thrones when in state? Isaiah, in vision, saw the Lord sitting on a throne, high and lifted up, when he saw the glory of Christ, and spake of him. And when our Lord had overcome all his enemies, he sat down with his Father on his throne, as he makes every overcomer sit down with him on his throne. This throne of his is for ever and ever, and when he comes to judge the world, he will sit on a great white throne; an emblem of his greatness, purity, and justice, in discharging this part of his kingly office, judging quick and dead.

Isaiah 6:1 In the year that king Uzziah died I saw also the Lord sitting upon a throne, high and lifted up, and his train filled the temple.

Psalms 45:6 Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever: the sceptre of thy kingdom *is* a right sceptre.

Revelation 3:21 To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne, even as I also overcame, and am set down with my Father in his throne.

Revelation 20:11 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.

Do kings sometimes hold sceptres in their hands, as an ensign of their royalty? So does Christ; his sceptre is a "sceptre of righteousness;" he reigns in righteousness; He has a golden sceptre of clemency, grace, and mercy, which he holds forth towards his own people, his faithful subjects. And he has an iron one, with which he rules his enemies.

Psalms 45:6 Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever: the sceptre of thy kingdom *is* a right sceptre.

Psalms 2:9 Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron; thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel.

Do kings sometimes appear in robes of majesty and state? Christ is arrayed with majesty itself. "The Lord reigneth, he is clothed with majesty."

Psalms 93:1 The LORD reigneth, he is clothed with majesty; the LORD is clothed with strength.

So is he appareled, as now set down on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens; of which his transfiguration on the mountain was an emblem, when his face did shine as the sun, and his raiment was white as the light.

Hebrews 8:1 Now of the things which we have spoken this is the sum: We have such an high priest, who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens;

Matthew 17:2 And was transfigured before them: and his face did shine as the sun, and his raiment was white as the light.

III. Having shown that Christ was to be a King, and is one; I shall next consider the exercise and administration of the kingly office by him; and observe,

First, his qualifications for it. David, who well knew what was requisite to a civil ruler, or governor, says, "He that ruleth over men, must be just, ruling in the fear of God." This he said with a view to the Messiah, as appears by what follows.

I Samuel 23:3-4 The God of Israel said, the Rock of Israel spake to me, He that ruleth over men must be just, ruling in the fear of God. And he shall be as the light of the morning, when the sun riseth,

even a morning without clouds; as the tender grass springing out of the earth by clear shining after rain.

With [him] these characters fully agree. He is the righteous Branch, raised up to David; and sits upon his throne, and establishes it with judgment and justice; a king that reigns in righteousness, and governs according to the rules of justice and equity; who with righteousness judges, and reproveth with equity; the girdle of whose loins is righteousness, and faithfulness the girdle of his reins, all the while he is executing his kingly office. His sceptre is a sceptre of righteousness; and his throne is established by it. One of the characters of Zion's King, by which he is described, is just, as well as lowly.

Jeremiah 23:5-6 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. In his days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely: and this is his name whereby he shall be called, THE LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS.

Isaiah 9:7 Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even for ever. The zeal of the LORD of hosts will perform this.

Isaiah 11:4-5 But with righteousness shall he judge the poor, and reprove with equity for the meek of the earth: and he shall smite the earth with the rod of his mouth, and with the breath of his lips shall he slay the wicked. And righteousness shall be the girdle of his loins, and faithfulness the girdle of his reins.

Psalms 45:6 Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever: the sceptre of *thy kingdom* is a right sceptre.

Zechariah 9:9 Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion; shout, O daughter of Jerusalem: behold, *thy King* cometh unto thee: he is just, and having salvation; lowly, and riding upon an ass, and upon a colt the foal of an ass.

And the other character, "ruling in the fear of God," is found in him; on whom the Spirit of the fear of the Lord rests, and makes him of quick understanding in the fear of the Lord, so that he judges

impartially; not through favor and affection to any, nor according to the outward appearance; but with true judgment.

Isaiah 11:2-3 And the spirit of the LORD shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the LORD; And shall make him of quick understanding in the fear of the LORD: and he shall not judge after the sight of his eyes, neither reprove after the hearing of his ears:

A king should be as wise as an angel of God, to know all things appertaining to civil government, as the woman of Tekoah said David was; even to know and to be able to penetrate into the designs of his enemies, to guard against them, to provide for the safety and welfare of his subjects. Such is David's Son and Antitype, the Messiah; on whom rests "the Spirit of wisdom and understanding, of counsel and of knowledge," and who has all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge. All that wisdom by which kings reign, and princes decree judgment, is from him; to which may be added, "the Spirit of might" rests upon him.

Isaiah 11:2 And the spirit of the LORD shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the LORD.

He has power and authority to execute judgment, to enforce his laws, and command obedience from his subjects. All power in heaven and on earth is given to him, and which he exercises. Yea, he is the Lord God omnipotent; and as such reigns. How capable therefore, on all accounts, must he be to exercise his kingly office? Matthew 28:18 And Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth.

Revelation 19:6 And I heard as it were the voice of a great multitude, and as the voice of many waters, and as the voice of mighty thunderings, saying, Alleluia: for the Lord God omnipotent reigneth.

Secondly, Who are his subjects? A king is a relative term, and connotes subjects. A king without subjects, is no king.

The natural and essential kingdom of Christ, as God, reaches to all creatures; as has been observed; "His kingdom ruleth over all."

Psalms 103:19 The LORD hath prepared his throne in the heavens; and his kingdom ruleth over all.

But his kingdom, as Mediator, is special and limited, and is over a certain number of men; who go under the names of Israel, the house of Jacob, the holy hill of Zion, and are called saints. Hence Christ is said to be "King of Israel," to reign over "the house of Jacob," to be set King upon "the holy hill of Zion," and to be "King of saints."

John 1:49 Nathanael answered and saith unto him, Rabbi, thou art the Son of God; thou art the King of Israel.

Luke 1:33 And he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end.

Psalms 2:6 Yet have I set my king upon my holy hill of Zion.

Revelation 15:3 And they sing the song of Moses the servant of God, and the song of the Lamb, saying, Great and marvelous are thy works, Lord God Almighty; just and true are thy ways, thou King of saints.

By Israel, and the house of Jacob, are not meant the people of the Jews, as a body politic, of whom Christ was never king in such a sense; nor carnal Israel, or Israel according to the flesh, especially the unbelieving part of them, who would not have him to reign over them, in a spiritual sense; nor only that part of them called the election of grace among them; the lost sheep of the house of Israel Christ came to seek and save, and so to rule over, protect, and keep; **but the whole spiritual Israel of God's, consisting both of Jews and Gentiles;** even that Israel God has chosen for his special and peculiar people, among all nations; whom Christ has redeemed by his blood, out of every kindred, tongue, and people; and whom, by his Spirit, he effectually calls, through grace; and who are saved in him, with an everlasting salvation.

These are meant by the holy hill of Zion, over which he is set, appointed, and anointed King; even all those whom God has loved with an everlasting love, and chosen in Christ his Son, and who are sanctified and made holy by his Spirit and grace; and are brought to make an open profession of his name, and become members of his visible church, and are immoveable in grace and holiness; for all

which they are compared to mount Zion, the object of God's love and choice, a hill visible, holy, and immovable.

To these Christ stands in the relation, and bears the office of a King. They are his voluntary subjects; and who say of him and to him, "Just and true are thy ways, thou King of saints!" The church of God is Christ's kingdom, and the members of it his subjects.

Revelation 15:3 And they sing the song of Moses the servant of God, and the song of the Lamb, saying, Great and marvelous *are* thy works, Lord God Almighty; just and true *are* thy ways, thou King of saints.

Thirdly, The form and manner of Christ's executing his kingly office; which is done.

1st. Externally, by the ministry of the word, and administration of ordinances; and in the exercise of discipline in his church, which is his kingdom.

And, —2nd. Internally, by his Spirit and grace, in the hearts of his people; and by his power, with respect to their enemies.

1st, Externally, by the word and ordinances, and church discipline.

1. By the ministry of the word; which is his sceptre he holds forth, and by which he invites his people to come and submit to him; and by which he rules and governs them when come.

It is the rod of his strength he sends out of Zion, and which is the power of God unto salvation to them that believe. It is signified by the weapons of warfare, the sword of the Spirit, the bow and arrows, with which Christ rides forth, conquering and to conquer; and with which he smites the hearts of his people, while enemies to him, and causes them to fall under him, and be subject to him. It is the rule and standard of their faith and practice, he sets before them, showing them what they are to believe concerning him, and what is their duty in obedience to him.

It is the "magna charta" which contains all their privileges and immunities he grants them; and which he, as their King, inviolably maintains. It is according to this his word, that he will execute that branch of his kingly office, judging the world in righteousness at the last day.

2. By the administration of ordinances; as baptism. Christ, in virtue of that power in heaven and earth, which he received as King of saints, issued out a command, and gave a commission to his apostles, as to preach the gospel, so to baptize, such as are taught by it, in the name of the three divine Persons; and directed that all such who become members of his visible church, the subjects of his kingdom, should first submit to this ordinance of his; as the instance of the first converts after the commission given shows; who were first baptized, and then added to the church. This is part of that yoke of Christ's kingdom, which is easy; and one of those commandments of his, which are not grievous.

The Lord's Supper is another of the ordinances kept by the church at Corinth, as delivered to them; for which the apostle commends them; the account of which he had from Christ himself, and delivered to them; and which he suggests was to be observed in his churches, and throughout his kingdom, to the end of the world.

Public prayer in the house of God, is another appointment in Christ's kingdom, the church; which is distinct from the duty of private prayer, in private meetings, and in the family, and the closet; and is what goes along with the public ministry of the word; and is meant by what the apostles proposed to give themselves continually to; and which was attended to by the first Christians, and continued in, and by which they are described, and for it commended.

Acts 2:42 And they continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers.

Acts 4:31 And when they had prayed, the place was shaken where they were assembled together; and they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and they spake the word of God with boldness.

Acts 6:4 But we will give ourselves continually to prayer, and to the ministry of the word.

Singing of psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs, in a public manner, in the churches, is another ordinance of Christ, enjoined them.

Ephesians 5:19 Speaking to yourselves in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody in your heart to the Lord,

and in doing which, they express their joy and gladness, in Zion's King

Colossians 3:16 Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly in all wisdom; teaching and admonishing one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing with grace in your hearts to the Lord.

Psalms 149:2 Let Israel rejoice in him that made him: let the children of Zion be joyful in their King.

3. In the exercise of church discipline; about which Christ, as King in his church, has given orders and directions; in case of private offences, the rules how to proceed.

Matthew 18:15-18 Moreover if thy brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone: if he shall hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother. But if he will not hear *thee*, *then* take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established. And if he shall neglect to hear them, tell *it* unto the church: but if he neglect to hear the church, let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican. Verily I say unto you, Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.

In case of public, scandalous sins, which bring a public disgrace on religion, and the church; the delinquents are to be rebuked before all in a public manner, and rejected from the communion of the church.

I Timothy 5:20 Them that sin rebuke before all, that others also may fear.

In case of immoralities and disorderly walking, such are to be withdrawn from, till repentance is given to satisfaction; and in case of false doctrines, and heretical opinions, such that hold them, are not only to be rebuked sharply, in a ministerial way, that they may be sound in the faith; but being incorrigible, are to be cut off from the communion of the church.

Titus 1:13 This witness is true. Wherefore rebuke them sharply, that they may be sound in the faith;

Titus 3:10 A man that is an heretic after the first and second admonition reject.

4. For the execution and due performance of all this, the ministry of the word, administration of ordinances, and exercise of church discipline, **Christ has appointed officers in his church and kingdom;** whom he qualifies and empowers for such purposes; who have a rule and government under Christ, and over the churches, to see his laws and rules carried into execution; and who are to be known, owned, and acknowledged, as having rule over the churches; and to be submitted to and obeyed by them, so far as they act according to the laws of Christ.

Ephesians 4:10-12 He that descended is the same also that ascended up far above all heavens, that he might fill all things.) And he gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; For the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ:

I Thessalonians 5:12 And we beseech you, brethren, to know them which labour among you, and are over you in the Lord, and admonish you;

Hebrews 13:7 Remember them which have the rule over you, who have spoken unto you the word of God: whose faith follow, considering the end of their conversation.

Hebrews 13:17 Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves: for they watch for your souls, as they that must give account, that they may do it with joy, and not with grief: for that is unprofitable for you.

2nd, The kingly office of Christ is exercised internally, by his Spirit and grace in the hearts of his people, and by his power, with respect to their enemies; and which chiefly lies in the conversion of his people; in the protection of them from their enemies; and in the utter abolition and destruction of them.

1. In the conversion of his people; which is no other than a rescue of them out of the hands of those who have usurped a dominion over them. While unregenerate, they are in a state of enmity to Christ, and in open rebellion against him; they who are reconciled by him, are not only enemies in their minds, by wicked works; but enmity itself, while their minds remain carnal; and such they were when reconciled to God, by the death of Christ; and so they continue until the enmity is slain, by his powerful grace in them;

by which the arrows of his word are made sharp in them; and thereby they are conquered, and fall under him.

While in a state of nature, other lords have dominion over them, sin, Satan, and the world. Sin reigns in their mortal bodies, and they yield their members instruments of unrighteousness! and are servants and slaves to sin, even unto death; for it reigns in them to death. Though its reign is so severe and rigorous, yet they yield a ready obedience to it. "We ourselves," says the apostle, "were foolish and disobedient," disobedient to God, and disobedient to Christ, "serving divers lusts and pleasures."

Satan, the prince of the power of the air, works in them, while they are the children of disobedience; and they have their conversation according to him, and according to the course of the world, while in such a state; and live according to the will of men, and not according to the will of God.

Isaiah 26:13 O LORD our God, other lords beside thee have had dominion over us: but by thee only will we make mention of thy name.

Titus 3:3 For we ourselves also were sometimes foolish, disobedient, deceived, serving divers lusts and pleasures, living in malice and envy, hateful, and hating one another.

Ephesians 2:2-3 Wherein in time past ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience: Among whom also we all had our conversation in times past in the lusts of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind; and were by nature the children of wrath, even as others.

Satan particularly, the god of this world, has power over them, and leads them captive at his will, until the prey is taken from the mighty, and the lawful captive is delivered. He is the strong man armed, that keeps the palace and goods in peace, till a stronger than he comes; who is Christ, the King of glory, who causes the everlasting doors of men's hearts to lift up, and let him in. When he enters, [he] binds the strong man armed, dispossesses him, and spoils his armor, wherein he trusted. [He] sets up a throne of grace in the heart, where he himself sits and reigns, having destroyed sin, and caused grace to reign, through righteousness; and will not suffer sin to have any more dominion there. By the power of his grace he makes those

his people willing to submit to him, and serve him, and him only, disclaiming all other lords.

Isaiah 26:13 O LORD our God, other lords beside thee have had dominion over us: but by thee only will we make mention of thy name.

Isaiah 33:22 For the LORD *is* our judge, the LORD *is* our lawgiver, the LORD is our king; he will save us.

Christ, as King in Zion, enacts laws, appoints ordinances, and gives out commands, which he enjoins his subjects to observe and obey; and those he writes, not on paper, nor on tables of stone, nor on monuments of brass, but upon the tables of the heart. He puts his Spirit within his people, to enable them to walk in his statutes, and to keep his judgments, and do them.

Moreover, Christ being set up as an ensign to the people, they flock unto him, and enlist themselves under his banner, and become volunteers, in the day of his power, or when he musters his armies; and declare themselves willing to endure hardness, as good soldiers of Christ; to fight the Lord's battles, the good fight of faith, and against every enemy. When they are clad by him with the whole armor of God, and become more than conquerors, through their victorious Lord and King; by, and under whom, they abide as his faithful subjects and soldiers unto death.

2. Christ's kingly office is further exercised, in the protection and preservation of his people from their enemies; out of whose hands they are taken, and who attempt to reduce them to their former captivity and slavery. They are protected and preserved from sin: not from the indwelling and actings of it in them; but from its dominion and damning power. The grace that is wrought in them is preserved, and its reigning power is continued and confirmed.

Christ, as a Prince, as well as a Savior, gives repentance to his people, attended with the manifestation and application of pardon of sin; and he not only gives this grace; but every other, faith, hope, and love. These are his royal bounties, and are principles of grace, wrought in the souls of his people; according to which, and by the influence of which, he rules and governs them. These he preserves, that they are not lost; that their faith fail not. Their hope remains, as an anchor, sure and steadfast; and their love continues,

and the fear of God, put into them, abides; so that they shall never depart from him.

He is able to keep them from falling, finally and totally, and he does keep them. They are in his hands, out of which none can pluck them.

They are protected by him from Satan; not from his assaults and temptations, to which the most eminent saints are exposed; but from being destroyed by him, who goes about like a roaring lion, seeking whom he may devour, and would gladly devour them. But Christ is able to help them, and does; and knows how to deliver them out of temptation, and does, in his time and way, and bruises Satan under their feet; so that, instead of being destroyed by him, he himself is destroyed by Christ.

They are protected from the world, its force and fury. He makes their wrath to praise him, and restrains the remainder of it. In short, he protects them from every enemy; and from the last enemy, death; not from dying a corporal death, but from the sting of it; and from it as a penal evil; and from a spiritual death ever more taking place in them; and from an eternal death, by which they shall not be hurt, and which shall have no power over them.

3. Christ's kingly office appears to be exercised in the utter destruction of the said enemies of his people. He came to finish transgression, and make an end of sin; and he did it meritoriously, on the cross; where the old man was crucified, that the body of sin might be destroyed; and by his Spirit and grace he weakens the power of sin in conversion; and will never leave, till he has rooted out the very being of it in his people.

He came to destroy Satan, and his works; and he has destroyed him; and spoiled his principalities and powers, on the cross; and rescued his people out of his hands, at conversion; and will not only bruise him under their feet shortly, but will bind him, and cast him into the bottomless pit for a thousand years; and after loosed from thence, will cast him into the lake which burns with fire and brimstone, where he will continue for ever.

Christ has also overcome the world; so that it could not hinder him from doing the work he came about. And he gives his people that faith by which they overcome it also. Nothing they meet with in it, even tribulation, persecution, and everything of that kind,

shall not be able to separate them from Christ, from a profession of him, and love unto him. They become more than conquerors over the world, through Christ that loved them. [He] must reign till all enemies are put under his feet; and the last enemy that shall be destroyed is death, which will be destroyed at the resurrection; when mortal shall put on immortality, and corruption incorruption. Then that saying will be brought to pass, that "death is swallowed up in victory," in a victory obtained by Christ over that and every other enemy.

I Corinthians 15:25-26 For he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy *that* shall be destroyed *is* death.

I Corinthians 15:54 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.

Fourthly, The properties of Christ's kingdom and government; showing the nature and excellency of it.

1. It is spiritual; not carnal, earthly, and worldly. "My kingdom," says Christ, "is not of this world."

John 18:36 Jesus answered, My kingdom is not of this world: if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews: but now is my kingdom not from hence.

Though it is in the world, it is not of it. Its original is not from it; it is not founded on maxims of worldly policy. It is not established by worldly power, nor promoted and increased by worldly means, nor attended with worldly pomp and grandeur. "The kingdom of God," that is, of Christ, "cometh not with observation," with outward glory and splendor.

Luke 17:20 And when he was demanded of the Pharisees, when the kingdom of God should come, he answered them and said, The kingdom of God cometh not with observation:

The Jews, at the coming of Christ, having lost the notion of the spirituality of his kingdom, thought of nothing but an earthly and worldly one; and expected the Messiah as a temporal king, who

would deliver them from the Roman yoke; and make them a free and flourishing people, as in the days of David and Solomon. This was the general and national belief; the disciples and followers of Christ were possessed of it; as appears from the request of the mother of Zebedee's children, and from the question of the apostles to Christ, even after his resurrection.

Matthew 20:20-21 Then came to him the mother of Zebedee's children with her sons, worshiping him, and desiring a certain thing of him. And he said unto her, What wilt thou? She saith unto him, Grant that these my two sons may sit, the one on thy right hand, and the other on the left, in thy kingdom.

Acts 1:16 Men and brethren, this scripture must needs have been fulfilled, which the Holy Ghost by the mouth of David spake before concerning Judas, which was guide to them that took Jesus.

But this notion was contrary to the prophecies of the Messiah; which represent him as poor, mean, and abject; a man of sorrows and griefs, despised of men; and should be treated ill, and be put to death.

Isaiah 53:2-4 For he shall grow up before him as a tender plant, and as a root out of a dry ground: he hath no form nor comeliness; and when we shall see him, there is no beauty that we should desire him. He is despised and rejected of men; a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief: and we hid as it were our faces from him; he was despised, and we esteemed him not. Surely he hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows: yet we did esteem him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted.

Isaiah 53:8 He was taken from prison and from judgment: and who shall declare his generation? for he was cut off out of the land of the living: for the transgression of my people was he stricken.

Isaiah 53:12 Therefore will I divide him a portion with the great, and he shall divide the spoil with the strong; because he hath poured out his soul unto death: and he was numbered with the transgressors; and he bare the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors.

Zechariah 9:9 Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion; shout, O daughter of Jerusalem: behold, thy King cometh unto thee: he is

just, and having salvation; lowly, and riding upon an ass, and upon a colt the foal of an ass.

Not being able to reconcile these prophecies, with those which speak of him as exalted and glorious, they have feigned and expect two messiahs. The one they call the son of Ephraim, who shall make a poor figure, be unsuccessful, and shall be slain in the war of Gog and Magog. The other they call the son of David, who prospers, gains many victories, and shall live long; restore the Jews to their own land, and make them an happy people.

But the true Messiah was neither to destroy his enemies with carnal weapons; but smite them with the rod of his mouth, and consume them with the breath of his lips, his gospel. Nor [was he] to save his people by bow, by sword, by horses and horsemen; but by himself, his righteousness and sacrifice.

His kingdom was not to be, and has not been, set up and spread by the sword, by dint of arms; as the kingdom of Mahomet has been; but by his Spirit and grace attending the ministration of his gospel.

The kingdom of Christ is spiritual; he is a spiritual King, the Lord from heaven, the second Adam, that is spiritual, the Lord and Head of his church. His throne is spiritual; he reigns in the hearts of his people by faith. His sceptre is a spiritual sceptre, a sceptre of righteousness. His subjects are spiritual men born of the Spirit, and savor the things of the Spirit of God.

They are subdued, and brought to submit to Christ by spiritual means; not by carnal weapons of warfare, but by the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God; the kingdom of God is within them, set up in their hearts, where grace reigns. It lies not in outward things; it is "not meat and drink," and such like carnal things; "but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost."

They are spiritual promises Christ makes to them, to encourage them in their obedience to him; and spiritual blessings and layouts are bestowed upon them by him; and even their enemies, with whom their conflict is, are spiritual wickedness in high places; and are not to be fought with carnal weapons; nor to be subdued and conquered by means of them; but by the shield of faith and sword of the Spirit; even by the rod of Christ's mouth, and the breath of his lips.

2. Christ's kingdom is a righteous one; this has been suggested already; the whole administration of it is righteous. He is a King that reigns in righteousness, his throne is established by it. His sceptre is a right sceptre; justice and judgment are executed in his kingdom, and nothing else, by Christ the King. No injustice, violence, or oppression. Just and true are his ways, who is King of saints.

3. Christ's kingdom is a peaceable kingdom. He is the prince of peace. His gospel, which is his sceptre, is the gospel of peace. His subjects are sons of peace. The kingdom of grace in them, lies in peace and joy in the Holy Ghost.

4. Christ's kingdom is gradually carried on. So it has been from the first. It arose from a small beginning, in the external administration of it. It was like a little stone cut out of the mountain, without hands, which will, in due time, fill the face of the whole earth. It was like a grain of mustard seed, the least of all seeds, in the times of Christ, which grows up to a large tree; as Christ's kingdom afterwards greatly increased, first in Judea, and then in the Gentile world; notwithstanding all the opposition made unto it; until the whole Roman empire became Christian, and paganism abolished in it.

5. Christ's kingdom is durable. Of his government there will be no end. His throne is for ever and ever; he will reign over the house of Jacob evermore. His kingdom is an everlasting kingdom. Christ will never have any successor in his kingdom; for he lives for evermore and has the keys of hell and death in his hands.

As his Priesthood is an unchangeable priesthood, which passes not from one to another, as the Aaronic priesthood did, by reason of the death of priests; **so his kingdom is an unchangeable kingdom,** which passes not from one to another. He being an everliving and everlasting King; his kingdom will never give way to another; nor be subverted by another; as earthly kingdoms are, and the greatest monarchies have been. The Babylonian monarchy gave way to the Persian and Median, and was succeeded by that. The Persian to the Grecian; and the Grecian to the Roman.

But Christ's kingdom will stand for ever; his church, which is his kingdom, is built on a rock; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. The word and ordinances of the gospel, by which the government of Christ is externally administered, will always continue. The gospel is an everlasting gospel, the word of God,

which abides for ever. And the ordinances of baptism, and the Lord's Supper, are to be administered until the second coming of Christ.

The internal kingdom of grace, set up in the hearts of Christ's subjects, is a kingdom that cannot be moved. Grace can never be lost; it is a governing principle, and reigns unto eternal life by Christ. Even when Christ shall have finished his mediatorial kingdom, and delivered it up to his Father, complete and perfect; all the elect of God being gathered in, he will not cease to reign, though in another and different manner.

Christ - Part 3 - Christ's Humiliation

PART THREE CHRIST'S HUMILIATION

Christ's Humiliation

Christ's state of humiliation began at his incarnation, and was continued through the whole of his life unto death.

Philippians 2:7-8 But made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men: And being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross.

The apostle illustrates and confirms [this] by placing it in a contrast with his glorious estate previous to it. By how much the higher he was in that state, the lower and meaner he appears in this. And higher it was not possible for him to be, than as described by the apostle, as *in the form of God*, in his nature and essence; and as *equal with God* his Father; having the same perfections, names, works, and worship ascribed to him.

Now in his state of humiliation he appeared the reverse of this. He, who was in the form of God, was not only made in the likeness of man, and in fashion as a man, but took on him the form of a servant, who was equal to his divine Father, made himself of no account among men, and became obedient in all things to his Father, and that even to death itself, the accursed death of the cross.

I. The humiliation of Christ took place at his incarnation, and therefore in the above account of it, the phrases of being "made in

the likeness of men," and of "being found in fashion as a man," are used as expressive of it. [This is] to be understood of his being really and truly man. Though the assumption of the human nature into union with the person of the Son of God was an exaltation of it, and gave it a preeminence to all the other individuals of human nature, and even to angels themselves, as has been shown, yet **it was an humbling of the person of Christ to take a nature so inferior to his into union with him.**

Psalms 89:19 Then thou spakest in vision to thy holy one, and saidst, I have laid help upon one that is mighty; I have exalted one chosen out of the people.

I see not why the phrase of *humbling* may not be used with respect to this matter of the person of the Son of God, since it is used of the divine Being.

Psalms 113:6 Who *humbleth* himself to behold the things that are in heaven, and in the earth!

And if it is an humbling of God, a stoop of Deity, to look upon things in heaven and earth; a condescension in him to dwell on earth, whom the heaven of heavens cannot contain, it must be much more so for the Word and Son of God, who was in the beginning with God, and was God, and to whom the creation of all things is ascribed, to be made flesh and dwell among men.

I Kings 8:27 But will God indeed dwell on the earth? behold, the heaven and heaven of heavens cannot contain thee; how much less this house that I have builded?

John 1:1-3,14 In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made..... And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth.

First, The humiliation of Christ appeared both in his conception and birth; though there were some things relating to his conception which were very illustrious and glorious; as a remarkable prophecy concerning it some hundreds of years before it was.

Isaiah 7:14 Therefore the Lord himself shall give you a sign; Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel.

The dispatch of an angel to the virgin to acquaint her with it, when near or at the instant of it, and that it itself was of the mighty power of the Holy Spirit.

Luke 1:26,31,35 And in the sixth month the angel Gabriel was sent from God unto a city of Galilee, named Nazareth.....And, behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a son, and shalt call his name JESUS.....And the angel answered and said unto her, The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God.

Yet it was amazing humility that he who was the Son of God, and lay in the bosom of his Father, should by assumption of human nature into union with his divine person, lie nine months in the womb of a virgin; and he that ascended on high, should first descend into these lower parts of the earth. And though there were many great and glorious things that attended his birth, which made it very illustrious, as an unusual star, which guided the wise men from the east to the place of his nativity, who worshiped him, and presented gifts unto him. An angel appeared in a glorious form to the shepherds, who acquainted them with his birth. A multitude of the heavenly host descended and joined with him, singing "Glory to God in the highest" on account of it.

Yet, besides many things that followed it were very inglorious; as Herod's search after him to take away his life; the flight of his parents with him into Egypt, where they continued for a while in fear and obscurity; and the massacre of a great number of infants in and about Bethlehem. It may be observed,

1. That he was "born of a woman," which very phrase is expressive of meanness.

Job 14:1 Man that is born of a woman is of few days, and full of trouble.

[He was] born of a sinful woman, though he himself without sin. [He was] "made of a woman," made of one that was made by

him, and to whom he stood in the character of Creator, Lord and Savior, as she herself owned.

Galatians 4:4 But when the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law.

Luke 1:46-47 And Mary said, My soul doth magnify the Lord, And my spirit hath rejoiced in God my Savior.

2. [He was] born of a poor woman; for though his mother, the virgin, was of the house of David, of that illustrious family, yet when that family was become very low, like a tree cut down to its roots; for when in such a state was the Messiah to spring from it, as he did, according to the prophecy.

Isaiah 11:1 And there shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a Branch shall grow out of his roots:

That his mother was a poor woman, appears from the usage she met with at the time of her delivery in the inn, where there was no room for her to be received in, because of her poverty; and therefore was obliged to lay her newly born infant in a manger. Into what a low estate was our Lord brought!

As also from her bringing the offering of the poorer sort at her purification. Persons of ability were obliged to offer a lamb on such an occasion, but if poor, a pair of turtledoves or two young pigeons, which she did.

Luke 2:7 And she brought forth her firstborn son, and wrapped him in swaddling clothes, and laid him in a manger; because there was no room for them in the inn.

Luke 2:24 And to offer a sacrifice according to that which is said in the law of the Lord, A pair of turtledoves, or two young pigeons.

Hence the Jews upbraided Christ with the meanness of his parentage, saying, "Is not this the carpenter's son?" is not his mother called Mary?" plain Mary," and "his brethren James and Joses," and "Simon and Judas?" and "his sisters, are they not all with us?" Do not we know them, what a low life family they are?

3. He was born in a poor country village; for though it was the birth place of David, and called his city, and so famous on that

account; yet in Christ's time was mean and obscure, and said to be "little among the thousands of Judah."

He afterwards lived in a very despicable place, where he was brought up; despicable to a proverb; "Can any good thing come out of Nazareth?"

John 1:46 And Nathanael said unto him, Can there any good thing come out of Nazareth? Philip saith unto him, Come and see.

4. The nature he was conceived and born in, and which he assumed, though without sin, yet had all the sinless infirmities of human nature. His soul was subject to sorrow, grief, anger, etc. and his body to hunger, thirst, weariness, etc. It was a nature inferior to angels. At least he was for a while, through the sufferings of death, made a little lower than they, and who at certain times, when in distress, ministered to him and relieved him. Into such a low estate and condition did Christ come in our nature.

Hebrews 2:9 But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honor; that he by the grace of God should taste death for every man.

Matthew 4:11 Then the devil leaveth him, and, behold, angels came and ministered unto him.

Luke 22:43 And there appeared an angel unto him from heaven, strengthening him.

Secondly, The humiliation of Christ appeared in all the stages of life into which he came. He passed through the states of infancy, childhood, and youth, as other men do; he was wrapped in swaddling bands, as newly born infants are. [He] hung upon his mother's breasts as soon as born, and received his nourishment from thence, as infants do. He endured the painful rite of circumcision when eight days old, and was presented in the temple according to usual custom. He continued in the infant state, both with respect to body and mind, the usual time, for ought appears.

His case was not like the first Adam's. He [Adam] was created as one in the prime of life, a grown man, and in the full exercise of his rational powers at once. But so it was not with the second Adam. **He was an infant of days; he grew in body as children do. His reasoning faculties were not opened at once, but**

gradually, for it is said, he increased in wisdom as well as "in stature."

Luke 2:40,52 And the child grew, and waxed strong in spirit, filled with wisdom: and the grace of God was upon him.....And Jesus increased in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and man.

As he grew up in his childhood and youthful state, though we have but little account of it, it appears to be attended with much meanness and obscurity, even to his manhood.

We have but one circumstance related of him in this time, which is that of his coming up to Jerusalem with his parents at the Passover, when twelve years of age. Though there were some things then appeared in him very remarkable and uncommon, in taking his place among the doctors, hearing and asking them questions; yet he returned with his parents, and lived in subjection to them (Luke 2:42-51).

And it seems as if he was brought up to a mechanic business.

It was a commonly received tradition of the ancients, that he was brought up to the trade of a carpenter; and there are some things which make it probable. It is a question put by the Jews.

Mark 6:3 Is not this the carpenter, the son of Mary, the brother of James, and Joses, and of Juda, and Simon? and are not his sisters here with us? And they were offended at him.

Nor was it ever denied that he was. They suggest, that he had no liberal education, was not brought up in any of their public schools or academies.

John 7:15 And the Jews marveled, saying, How knoweth this man letters, having never learned?

And it cannot be supposed that he should live an inactive life the greater part of his days. Besides the poverty of his parents, which would not admit of the maintenance of him without business, what greatly prevails upon me to give into this sentiment is, that the second Adam must bear the first Adam's curse, even that part of it which lay in getting his bread by the sweat of his brow.

Genesis 3:19 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.

O what a low estate was our Lord brought into on our account! Add to all this, that his whole life, until he was thirty years of age, was a life of obscurity.

From the time of his coming out of Egypt and being had to Nazareth in his infancy, we hear nothing of him, excepting that single instance of being at Jerusalem when twelve years of age, until he came from Galilee to Jordan unto John to be baptized of him; and then he was about thirty years of age.

Luke 3:23 And Jesus himself began to be about thirty years of age, being (as was supposed) the son of Joseph, which was *the son* of Heli,

Now what astonishing condescension and humility is this, and how great was the humiliation of Christ in this state.

The greatest personage that ever was in the world, the Son of God in human nature, and who came to do the greatest work that ever was done in the world, should be in the world thirty years running, and scarce be known at all by the inhabitants of it; at least not known who and what he was, at most but by very few.

John 1:10 He was in the world, and the world was made by him, and the world knew him not.

Thirdly, The public life of Christ began at his baptism, for by that he was made manifest in Israel; and for that purpose John came baptizing with water.

[John] had this signal given him, that on whomsoever he should see the Spirit of God descending, the same was he; which when he saw he bore testimony of him that he was the Son of God, and pointed him out as the Lamb of God, that, takes away the sin of the world.

Though there were some things attending the baptism of Christ which made it illustrious, as not only John's testimony of him, but the descent of the Spirit on him as a dove, and a voice from his Father heard, saying, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased" (John 1:29-36),

Matthew 3:16-17 And Jesus, when he was baptized, went up straightway out of the water: and, lo, the heavens were opened unto

him, and he saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove, and lighting upon him: And lo a voice from heaven, saying, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.

Yet his submission to the ordinance itself was an instance of his humiliation; his coming many miles on foot, from Galilee to Jordan, to John to be baptized of him, is a proof of it.

He that had the power of baptizing with the Holy Ghost and with fire, was baptized in water. He that knew no sin, nor did any, was baptized with the baptism of repentance, as though he had been a sinner.

And he that was John's Lord and Master, was before him, and preferred to him, and whose shoe latchet John was not worthy to unloose; and who could have ordered him to attend him at any place convenient for baptism, which for some reasons he thought fit to submit unto. Yet [he] took the pains and fatigue of a journey to go to him for that purpose; and though John modestly declined it at first, having some hint of him who he was, yet being pressed by him, he agreed to administer the ordinance to him, and did.

[This] was done to fulfil all righteousness, and in obedience to the will of God, and to set an example to us, that we should tread in his steps; and in all which appear wonderful humility and condescension.

Matthew 3:13-15 Then cometh Jesus from Galilee to Jordan unto John, to be baptized of him. But John forbad him, saying, I have need to be baptized of thee, and comest thou to me? And Jesus answering said unto him, Suffer it to be so now: for thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness. Then he suffered him.

Fourthly, Immediately after his baptism Christ was harassed with the temptations of Satan, which was another branch of his humiliation and low estate he came into. "He suffered being tempted;" and he "was tempted in all points like as we are, yet without sin."

Hebrews 2:18 For in that he himself hath suffered being tempted, he is able to succor them that are tempted.

Hebrews 4:15 For we have not an high priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin.

That is, with all sorts of temptations, though not altogether in the same manner, nor had they the same effect on him as on us. Satan tempted him, not by stirring up any corruption, or provoking any lust in him, as he provoked David, stirred up the lust of pride and vanity in him to number the people. **In Christ was no sin, lust, or corruption to stir up. Satan could find nothing of this kind in him to work upon.**

Nor did he tempt him by putting any evil into him, as he put it into the heart of Judas Iscariot to betray his Lord, and into the hearts of Ananias and Sapphira to lie unto the Holy Ghost. Nor could he get any advantage over Christ by any of his temptations. He was forced after all his temptations in the wilderness to leave him, and in the garden and on the cross, he was foiled by him.

Yea he, and his principalities and powers, were spoiled and triumphed over. But inasmuch as by these temptations Christ in his human nature was harassed and distressed, they are a part of his humiliation, and require a particular consideration.

Those we have the clearest account of are they which began in the wilderness; for he was "led up of the Spirit into the wilderness to be tempted of the devil."

Matthew 4:1 Then was Jesus led up of the Spirit into the wilderness to be tempted of the devil.

That is, he was influenced and directed by the Spirit of God, who had lighted on him at his baptism, under an impulse of his, both inward and outward, to go up from the habitable parts of the wilderness, where John was preaching and baptizing, and where he himself had been baptized, to the mountainous and uninhabitable parts of it, which were quite desolate and uncultivated; where were no provisions, nor any man to converse with, none but wild beasts, to whom he was exposed, and with whom he was, another instance of his low estate.

Mark 1:13 And he was there in the wilderness forty days, tempted of Satan; and was with the wild beasts; and the angels ministered unto him.

The time when he was here tempted was quickly after his baptism. Matthew says *then* he was led to be tempted, that is,

when he had been baptized. Mark says it was *immediately*. And thus as it was with Christ the head, so it often is with his members; that as he was tempted, after his baptism, after the Spirit of God had descended upon him, and filled him with his gifts and graces without measure; and after he had had such a testimony from heaven of his divine Sonship: so his people, after they have had communion with God in ordinances, and have had some sealing testimonies of his love, fall into temptations, and fall by them; as the disciples of Christ after the supper, who, when tempted, all forsook him and fled, and one denied him.

Moreover, it was after Christ had fasted forty days, and when he was hungry, that the tempter came to him and attacked him. Two of the evangelists say he tempted him forty days. So he might tempt him, more or less, all the forty days, at times. But when they were ended, and Christ was an hungred, then he set upon him with greater violence, as judging it a proper opportunity to try the utmost of his power and skill with him. So Satan suits his temptations to the constitutions, circumstances, and situation men are in.

The first temptation was by putting an if upon the Sonship of Christ; "If thou be the Son of God;" though there could be no doubt made of this, since a testimony of it from heaven had just been given; and the devils themselves have acknowledged, that Christ is the Son of God.

Luke 4:41 And devils also came out of many, crying out, and saying, Thou art Christ the Son of God. And he rebuking *them* suffered them not to speak: for they knew that he was Christ.

And thus the children of God are sometimes tempted to call in question their sonship, because of inward corruptions and outward afflictions. Or it may be, Satan argued from hence, *if*, or *seeing*, thou art the Son of God, as has been testified by a voice from heaven, and thou thyself affirmest; as a proof of it, "command that these stones be made bread." Or "this stone," as Luke expresses it; that is, one of the stones which lay near by, and were in sight.

And Satan might hope to succeed in this temptation, since Christ was now hungry, and he might insinuate a concern for his welfare. And the rather as he succeeded with the first Adam, in tempting him to eat of the forbidden fruit; and as he might suggest,

he would, by such an act of omnipotence, give proof of his divine Sonship.

But though Christ could have done this, as well as God could raise up out of stones children unto Abraham; yet as it was needless to do it in proof of his Sonship, since that had been so well attested already, by a voice from heaven; nor for his sustenance, since he had been sustained by the power and providence of God forty days without food, he might be longer.

Besides, he never wrought a miracle for his own support; nor would he do it now, at the instance of the devil, which was what he wanted him to do, in obedience to him, and at his motion. Wherefore Christ's answer is; "It is written, Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God."

Deuteronomy 8:3 And he humbled thee, and suffered thee to hunger, and fed thee with manna, which thou knewest not, neither did thy fathers know; that he might make thee know that man doth not live by bread only, but by every *word* that proceedeth out of the mouth of the LORD doth man live.

Which signifies, that men may live by that which is not properly bread, as by manna, on which the Israelites lived in the wilderness, to which the passage quoted refers.

And besides, without bread, in any sense, a man may be supported by the power and providence of God, as Moses and Elijah were, and as Christ now had been. Therefore, to take such a method as he was tempted to, would have seemed to have been a distrust of that power and providence by which he had been sustained. Thus, by quoting scripture, to repel Satan's temptations, Christ has taught us to make use of the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God, to withstand the temptations of Satan also.

The second temptation was, after Satan had prevailed on Christ, or he condescended to go along with him, or he suffered him to take him to the city of Jerusalem, and place him on the pinnacle of the temple, or on the battlements of it, **to cast himself down from thence; in order to give proof of his divine Sonship,** in a public manner, before the inhabitants of Jerusalem, Priests, Scribes, and common people; by which he might suggest it would gain him great credit and esteem.

And as for his preservation in it, he quotes, in imitation of him, a passage of scripture, where it is written, "He shall give his angels charge concerning thee," etc. which, however applicable to Christ, as well as to his members, is perverted, since a material clause is omitted, "to keep thee in all thy ways;" whereas Satan was endeavoring to lead him out of the right way, tempting him to the sin of suicide; which he did, either out of envy and malice, and the malignity of his nature; or to prevent, if he had any notion of it, Christ's dying in the room and stead of his people, in a judicial way, for their salvation.

However, Christ resisted the temptation, by saying, "It is written again, Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God," as Christ was; which was testified by a voice from heaven, declaring him to be the Son of God, and so Lord and heir of all things. In like manner the children of God are often tempted by Satan to destroy themselves; which shows the similarity between Christ's temptations and theirs.

The third temptation was, after the devil had taken Christ, by his permission, to an exceeding high mountain, one of those about Jerusalem, or not far from it, and had showed him, by a diabolical and false representation of things to the sight, "all the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them," alluring him with a promise of these **to "fall down and worship him."** To promise Christ these was impertinent; since the earth is his, and the fulness thereof, the world, and they that dwell therein, as the maker of them; and all power in heaven and earth is given him as Mediator.

To pretend that these were in his power to dispose of to whomsoever he pleased, as it is in Luke, was intolerable arrogance; when he had not the least thing in the world at his disposal. He could not touch any of Job's substance without permission, and a grant from God; nor go into a herd of swine without leave. But to propose to Christ, that he should fall down and worship him, was the height of insolence and impudence!

This shows what the original sin of the devil was, affectation of Deity, and to be worshiped as God. Hence he has usurped the title of the God of this world; and has prevailed upon the ignorant part of it, in some places, to give him worship. Indeed, to sacrifice to idols, is to sacrifice to devils. But, not content with this, he sought to

be worshiped by the Son of God himself; than which nothing could be more audacious and impious.

Wherefore Christ rejected his temptation with indignation and abhorrence; saying, "Get thee hence, Satan," or, as Luke has it, "Get thee behind me, Satan; for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve," upon which the devil left him, finding he could do nothing with him; and angels came and ministered to him.

Deuteronomy 6:13 Thou shalt fear the LORD thy God, and serve him, and shalt swear by his name.

After which we hear no more of him, till the time of Christ's death drew nigh, when Christ observed to his disciples, that "the prince of this world cometh," to meet him in the garden, where he was in an agony, and had a combat with him; and his sweat was as drops of blood falling to the ground; and when were the hour and power of darkness, when all the posse of devils were let loose upon him, and cast their fiery darts at him; but he got the victory over them all.

Yet, notwithstanding that, these various assaults and temptations of Satan, to which he was subject, and by which he was harassed, must be considered as a part of his humiliation, and of that low estate he was brought into.

Fifthly, Christ's humiliation appeared in the reproaches, indignities, and persecutions he endured from men, even contradiction of sinners against himself. The reproaches with which God and his people were reproached, fell on him. These so thick and fast, and so heavy, that, in prophetic language, reproach is said to have broken his heart.

Psalms 69:9 For the zeal of thine house hath eaten me up; and the reproaches of them that reproached thee are fallen upon me.

Psalms 69:20 Reproach hath broken my heart; and I am full of heaviness: and I looked for some to take pity, but there was none; and for comforters, but I found none.

Sometimes his enemies the Jews upbraided him with the meanness of his descent and pedigree, the low estate of his family, as has been observed; with his illiberal education, and the

illiterateness of his followers. **Sometimes they attacked his moral character**, affirmed they knew him to be a sinner: charged him with Sabbath breaking, with being a glutton and a wine bibber, and an encourager of men in sinful practices.

They traduced his miracles, which they could not deny as facts, as if done by the help of the devil. **[They] said he had a devil**, and was familiar with one, by whom he did his works; they called him a deceiver of the people, and **charged him with preaching false doctrines**, and delivering out hard sayings not to be borne with.

Nay, they endeavored to fix the imputation of blasphemy on him, because, being a man, he made himself God, and equal to him. They represented him as a seditious person, that went about teaching men not to give tribute to Caesar; as well as having an intention to destroy their law; and as setting men to pull down their temple.

In short, they not only rejected him as the Messiah, with the greatest contempt and abhorrence of him; but sought to take away his life in a violent manner; sometimes by having him to the brow of an hill to cast him down headlong. At other times they took up stones to stone him; nor were they satisfied until they had brought him to the dust of death.

Sixthly, There was a very great degree of meanness and poverty which appeared throughout the whole life of Christ, private and public; to which the apostle has respect, when he says; "Ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus," where he puts Christ's riches and poverty in contrast, that by so much the greater his riches were in his former state, by so much the more does his poverty seem to be in his low estate.

II Corinthians 8:9 For ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that, though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor, that ye through his poverty might be rich.

He was rich in the perfections of his nature, in the possession of heaven and earth, and all therein; and in the revenues of glory arising from the kingdom of nature and providence. **Yet he who was Lord of all became poor to make us beggars rich.** And this is to be understood of poverty in a literal sense; for Christ was not spiritually poor.

Some instances of his meanness and poverty in private life have been observed before; as, that he was born of poor parents, had not a liberal education, and was brought up to a mechanic business.

When he came into public life, it does not appear that he had any certain dwelling house to live in; so that "the foxes, and the birds of the air," enjoyed more than he did.

Matthew 8:20 And Jesus saith unto him, The foxes have holes, and the birds of the air have nests; but the Son of man hath not where to lay his head.

To what a low estate was our Lord brought! Though he could have supported himself, and his twelve apostles, by working miracles for his and their sustenance; yet he never did, but lived upon the contributions and ministrations of some good women, and others.

Luke 8:2-3 And certain women, which had been healed of evil spirits and infirmities, Mary called Magdalene, out of whom went seven devils, And Joanna the wife of Chuza Herod's steward, and Susanna, and many others, which ministered unto him of their substance.

When the collectors of tribute came to him for the tribute money, he had none to pay them, but ordered Peter to cast his hook into the sea, and take up a fish, and out of that a piece of money, and pay the tribute for him and for himself.

Matthew 17:24-27 And when they were come to Capernaum, they that received tribute money came to Peter, and said, Doth not your master pay tribute? He saith, Yes. And when he was come into the house, Jesus prevented him, saying, What thinkest thou, Simon? of whom do the kings of the earth take custom or tribute? of their own children, or of strangers? Peter saith unto him, Of strangers. Jesus saith unto him, Then are the children free. Notwithstanding, lest we should offend them, go thou to the sea, and cast an hook, and take up the fish that first cometh up; and when thou hast opened his mouth, thou shalt find a piece of money: that take, and give unto them for me and thee.

At his death he had nothing to leave to his mother for her support; but seeing her, and his disciple John, when on the cross, said to her, "Behold thy son," and to him, "Behold thy mother," signifying, that he should take care of her; and from that time that disciple took her to his own house.

John 19:26-27 When Jesus therefore saw his mother, and the disciple standing by, whom he loved, he saith unto his mother, Woman, behold thy son! Then saith he to the disciple, Behold thy mother! And from that hour that disciple took her unto his own home.

Nor had he any tomb of his own, or family vault to be interred in; but was laid in one belonging to another, even Joseph of Arimathea. And this poverty of his was signified by hints, types, and prophecies, that he should be thus poor and needy; and which were hereby fulfilled.

Psalms 40:17 But I am poor and needy; yet the Lord thinketh upon me: thou art my help and my deliverer; make no tarrying, O my God.

Zechariah 9:9 Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion; shout, O daughter of Jerusalem: behold, thy King cometh unto thee: he is just, and having salvation; lowly, and riding upon an ass, and upon a colt the foal of an ass.

Seventhly, Upon the whole, it clearly appears, that Christ indeed "humbled himself, and made himself of no reputation."

Philippians 2:7-8 But made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men: And being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross.

[He] emptied himself; not of the fulness of grace it pleased the Father should dwell in him; this was with him, and seen, in him, when he became incarnate; and still continues with him; out of which saints receive grace for grace, much less of the perfections of his divine nature, the whole fulness of which dwells in him bodily

John 1:14 And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth.

John 1:16 And of his fulness have all we received, and grace for grace.

Colossians 2:9 For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily.

Every perfection in Deity was asserted by him in his state of humiliation, as omniscience, omnipresence, omnipotence.

John 2:24-25 But Jesus did not commit himself unto them, because he knew all *men*, And needed not that any should testify of man: for he knew what was in man.

John 3:13 And no man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, *even* the Son of man which is in heaven.

Revelation 1:8 I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, saith the Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty.

Christ did not lay aside the form of God, in which he was; or lay down his divine nature, which was impossible; nor deny his equality with God, which would be to deny himself. **But he consented to have his divine glory covered and veiled, as to the ordinary manifestation of it,** and in common. I say as to the ordinary manifestation of it; for it sometimes did break forth in an extraordinary way by miracles.

John 2:11 This beginning of miracles did Jesus in Cana of Galilee, and manifested forth his glory; and his disciples believed on him.

There, were some, though but few, which saw his glory as the glory of the only begotten of the Father. The greater part saw no form nor comeliness in him, wherefore he should be desired by them.

John 1:14 And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth.

Isaiah 53:3 He is despised and rejected of men; a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief: and we hid as it were our faces from him; he was despised, and we esteemed him not.

He did not give up his equality with God the Father; but he was content that that for a time should be out of sight; and so behave, and be so treated, as if he was not his fellow. He was willing, in the human nature, and in his office capacity, to act in subordination to his Father; to say what he bid him say, and do what he bid him do; even to the laying down of his life; for which he had a commandment from his Father. **Yea, he owned that in that his**

present state and circumstances, his Father was greater than he.

John 12:49,20 For I have not spoken of myself; but the Father which sent me, he gave me a commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak. And I know that his commandment is life everlasting: whatsoever I speak therefore, even as the Father said unto me, so I speak.

John 10:18 No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This commandment have I received of my Father.

John 14:28 Ye have heard how I said unto you, I go away, and come again unto you. If ye loved me, ye would rejoice, because I said, I go unto the Father: for my Father is greater than I.

He was content to be had in the utmost disesteem by men, to be emptied of his good name, character, and reputation, to be reckoned a worm, and no man; to be a Samaritan, and have a devil; and to be called and abused as if he was the worst of men; and to be made sin, and a curse for his people, to repair the loss of honor sustained by the sins of men; so that Christ's humiliation was his own voluntary act and deed.

Christ's Incarnation

I shall now proceed to consider, the particular, special, and important doctrines of the gospel, which express the grace of Christ, and the blessings of grace by him; and shall begin with the incarnation of the Son of God.

Luke 2:10-11 And the angel said unto them, Fear not: for, behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people. For unto you is born this day in the city of David a Savior, which is Christ the Lord.

The whole gospel is a mystery; the various doctrines of it are the mysteries of the kingdom; It is the mystery of godliness, and, without controversy, great.

I Timothy 3:16 And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen

of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory.

This is the basis of the Christian religion; a fundamental article of it.

I John 4:2-3 Hereby know ye the Spirit of God: Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God: And every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God: and this is that spirit of antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now already is it in the world.

The incarnation of Christ is a most extraordinary and amazing affair. It is wonderful indeed, that the eternal Son of God should become man; that he should be born of a pure virgin, without any concern of man in it.

It is a most mysterious thing, incomprehensible by men, and not to be accounted for upon the principles of natural reason; and is only to be believed and embraced upon the credit of divine revelation, to which it solely belongs.

Now whatever notion the heathens had of an incarnate God, or of a divine Person born of a virgin, in whatsoever manner expressed; this was not owing to any discoveries made by the light of nature, but what was traditionally handed down to them, and was the broken remains of a revelation their ancestors were acquainted with. Otherwise, the incarnation of the Son of God, is a doctrine of pure revelation; in treating of which I shall consider,

First, The subject of the incarnation, or the divine Person that became incarnate. The evangelist John says it was the Word, the essential Word of God.

John 1:14 And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth.

[He was] therefore not the Father; for he is distinguished from the *Word*, in the order of the Trinity,

I John 5:7 For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the *Word*, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one.

And, he is said to be the "Word with God," that is, with God the Father; and therefore must be distinct from him,

Revelation 19:13 And he was clothed with a vesture dipped in blood: and his name is called The *Word* of God.

John 1:1 In the beginning was the *Word*, and the Word was with God, and the *Word* was God.

Besides, the Father never so much as appeared in an human form; and much less took real flesh; nay, never was seen in any shape by the Jews.

John 5:37 And the Father himself, which hath sent me, hath borne witness of me. Ye have neither heard his voice at any time, nor seen his shape.

And though their ancestors heard a voice, and a terrible one at Sinai, they saw no similitude.

Deuteronomy 4:12 And the LORD spake unto you out of the midst of the fire: ye heard the voice of the words, but saw no similitude; only ye heard a voice.

And wherever we read of any visible appearance of a divine Person in the Old Testament, it is always to be understood, not of the first, but of the second Person.

And it may be further observed, that the Father prepared a body, an human nature in his purpose, council and covenant, for another, and not for himself, even for his Son

Hebrews 10:5 Wherefore when he cometh into the world, he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a body hast thou prepared me:

To which may be added, that that divine Person who came in the flesh, or became incarnate, is always distinguished from the Father, as being sent by him.

Romans 8:3 For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh:

Galatians 4:4 But when the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law,

That is, God the Father, in both passages; as appears from the relation of the Person to him, sent in the flesh, his Son.

Nor is it the Holy Spirit that became incarnate, for the same reasons that the Father cannot be thought to be so. Besides, he had a peculiar hand, and a special agency, in the formation of the human nature, and in its conception and birth. When the Virgin hesitated about what was told her by the angel, **she was assured by him, that the Holy Ghost should come upon her, and the power of the Highest should overshadow her.**

Luke 1:35 And the angel answered and said unto her, The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God.

Matthew 1:18 Now the birth of Jesus Christ was on this wise: When as his mother Mary was espoused to Joseph, before they came together, she was found with child of the Holy Ghost.

Matthew 1:20 But while he thought on these things, behold, the angel of the Lord appeared unto him in a dream, saying, Joseph, thou son of David, fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife; for that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost.

It remains, that it is the second Person, the Son of God, who is meant by "the Word that was made flesh," or became incarnate. Indeed, it is explained of him in the same passage; for it follows, "And we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father." And it is easy to observe, that the same divine Person that bears the name of the Word, in the order of the Trinity, in one place, has that of the Son in another; by which it appears they are the same.

I John 5:7 For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the *Word*, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one.

Matthew 28:19 Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the *Son*, and of the Holy Ghost:

When this mystery of the incarnation is expressed by the phrase, "God manifest in the flesh," not God the Father, nor the Holy Spirit, but God the Son is meant, as it is explained,

I John 3:8 He that 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.

Romans 8:3 For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own *Son* in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh:

Galatians 4:4 But when the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth his *Son*, made of a woman, made under the law,

Now the Logos, the Word and Son of God, who is made flesh or become incarnate, is not to be understood of the human soul of Christ, for this Word was "in the beginning with God," that is, was with him from all eternity.

Proverbs 8:22-23,30 The LORD possessed me in the beginning of his way, before his works of old. I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was.....Then I was by him, as one brought up *with him*: and I was daily his delight, rejoicing always before him;

Whereas the human soul of Christ is one of the souls that God has made; a creature, a creature of time, as all creatures are.

Time is an inseparable adjunct and concomitant of a creature. **A creature before time, is a contradiction.** Besides, this Word "was" God, a divine Person, distinct from the Father, though with him, the one God; which cannot be said of the human soul.

Likewise, to it is ascribed the creation of all things. "All things were made by him," not as an instrument, but as the efficient cause. "And without him was not anything made that was made." And since the human soul is what is made, being a creature, if that is the Word and Son of God, it must be the maker of itself, seeing nothing that is made is made without it.

Hebrews 1:1-2 God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, Hath in these

last days spoken unto us by his *Son*, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds;

Hebrews 1:10 And, Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth; and the heavens are the works of thine hands:

Colossians 1:16-17 For by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him, and for him: And he is before all things, and by him all things consist.

To which may be added, that the human soul of Christ is a part of the human nature assumed by him; it is included in the word *flesh* the Word, or Son of God, is said to be made, as will be shown presently. It is a part of that nature of the seed of Abraham, in distinction from the nature of angels, which the Word, or Son of God, a divine Person, took upon him, and into union with him.

Hebrews 2:14 Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil.

Hebrews 2:16 For verily he took not on him the *nature of* angels; but he took on him the seed of Abraham.

I proceed,

Secondly, To observe, in what sense the Word, or Son of God, was "made flesh," became a partaker "of flesh and blood, came in the flesh," and was "manifest in the flesh," all which phrases are made use of to express his incarnation, and signify, that he **who is truly God really became man, or assumed the whole human nature,** as will be seen presently, into union with his divine person.

John 1:14 And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth.

Hebrews 2:14 Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that

through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil.

I John 4:2-3 Hereby know ye the Spirit of God: Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God: And every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God: and this is that spirit of antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now already is it in the world.

I Timothy 3:16 And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory.

Socinus is so bold as to say, that if any passages of scripture could be found, in which it is expressly said that God was made man, or put on and assumed human flesh, the words must be taken otherwise than as they sound, this being repugnant to the majesty of God. The contrary to this will soon appear; and though this is not to be found in scripture just syllabically, the sense clearly is, as in the scriptures referred to. But there is no dealing with such a man who will talk at this rate; and who elsewhere says, on another account, that the greatest force must be used with the words of the apostle Paul, rather than such a sense be admitted, which yet is obvious.

It will be proper to inquire, both what is meant by flesh, and what by being made flesh.

1st, What is meant by flesh, in the phrases and passages referred to. And by it is meant, not a part of the human body, as that may be distinguished from other parts, as the bones, etc. nor the whole human body, as that may be distinguished from the soul or spirit of a man; as in,

Matthew 26:41 Watch and pray, that ye enter not into temptation: the spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak.

But [flesh indicates] a whole individual of human nature, consisting of soul and body; as when it is said, "There shall no flesh be justified in his sight," and again, "That no flesh should glory in his presence."

Romans 3:20 Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight: for by the law is the knowledge of sin.

I Corinthians 1:29 That no flesh should glory in his presence.

Genesis 6:12 And God looked upon the earth, and, behold, it was corrupt; for all flesh had corrupted his way upon the earth.

Luke 3:6 And all flesh shall see the salvation of God.

Such acts as being justified and glorying, can never be said of the flesh or body, abstractly considered; but of the whole man, or of individuals of human nature, consisting of soul and body. And in this sense are we to understand it, when it is used of the incarnation of the Son of God, who took upon him the whole nature of man, assumed a true body and a reasonable soul, being in all things made like unto his brethren.

So his flesh signifies his human nature, as distinct from the Spirit, his divine nature.

Romans 1:3-4 Concerning his Son Jesus Christ our Lord, which was made of the seed of David according to the flesh; And declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead:

I Peter 3:18 For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit:

1. He took a true body, not a mere phantom, spectre, or apparition, the appearance of a body, and not a real one; as some fancied, and that very early, even in the times of the apostle John, and afterward. **[They] imagined, that what Christ was, and did, and suffered, were only seeming, and in appearance, and not in reality.** Hence they were called *Docetae*, and this they argued from his being sent in the *likeness* of sinful flesh; and being found in fashion as a man; and from the appearances of Christ before his coming; of which same kind they supposed his appearance was when he came. As for the text in,

Romans 8:3 For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh.

Likeness there, is not to be connected with the word flesh, but with the word sinful. He was sent in real flesh, but that flesh

looked as if it was sinful. It might seem so to some, because he took flesh of a sinful woman, was attended with griefs and sorrows, the effects of sin; had the sins of his people imputed to him, and which he bore in his own body on the tree; all which made his flesh appear as if it was sinful, though it was not; and hindered not its being real flesh. As to,

Philippians 2:8 And being found in fashion *as* a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross.

The *as* there is not a note of similitude, but of certainty; *as in*,

Matthew 14:5 And when he would have put him to death, he feared the multitude, because they counted him *as* a prophet.

[It] signifies, that Christ was really a man, as John was accounted a real prophet, and not merely like one.

[This] is evident by his being obedient unto death, as follows. As for the appearances of Christ in an human form, before his coming in the flesh, the Scriptures speak of; admitting they were only appearances, and not real, it does not follow, that therefore his coming in the flesh, in the fulness of time, was of the same kind; but rather the contrary follows.

However, it is certain that Christ partook of the same flesh and blood as his children and people do; and therefore, if theirs is real, his must be so. Likewise, his body is called the body of his flesh, his fleshly body, to distinguish it from the token of his body in the supper; and from his mystical and spiritual body, the church.

Colossians 1:22 In the body of his flesh through death, to present you holy and unblameable and unreprouable in his sight:

All his actions, and what is said of him from his birth to his death, and in and after it, show it was a true body that he assumed.

He was born and brought into the world as other men are. When born, his body grew and increased in stature, as other human bodies do.

The Son of man came eating and drinking; he traveled through Judea and Galilee. He slept in the ship with his disciples. He was seen, and heard, and handled by them. He was buffeted, scourged, bruised, wounded, and crucified by men. His body, when dead, was asked of the governor by Joseph, was taken down from the cross by him, and laid in his tomb. The same identical body, with the prints of the nails and spear in it, was raised from the dead, and seen and handled by his disciples; to whom it was demonstrated, that he had flesh and bones, a spirit has not. Yea, the very infirmities that attended him, though sinless, were proofs of his body being a true and real one; such as his fatigue and weariness in traveling.

John 4:6 Now Jacob's well was there. Jesus therefore, being wearied with his journey, sat thus on the well: and it was about the sixth hour.

Luke 22:44 And being in an agony he prayed more earnestly: and his sweat was as it were great drops of blood falling down to the ground.

In short, it was through weakness of the flesh that he was crucified; which was not in appearance, but in reality.

The body he assumed was mortal, as it was proper it should be, since the end of his assumption of it was to suffer death in it. But being raised from the dead, it is become immortal, and will never die more, but will remain, as the pledge and pattern of the resurrection of the bodies of the saints, which will be fashioned like to his glorious body; and which will be the object of the corporal vision of the saints after their resurrection, with joy and pleasure, to all eternity.

2. Christ assumed a reasonable soul, with his true body, which make up the nature he took upon him, and are included in the flesh he was made, as has been seen; and is the flesh and blood he partook of.

The Arians deny that Christ has an human soul. They say, that the Logos, or the divine nature in him, such a one as it is, supplied the place of an human soul. This nature, they say, is not the same, but like to the nature of God; that it was created by him; which they ground on,

Proverbs 8:22 The LORD possessed me in the beginning of his way, before his works of old.

[They] read [this], "He created me," and they make this the first and principal creature God made, and by which he created others; that it is a superangelic spirit, and is in the room of an human soul to Christ. **But Christ asserts, that he had a soul;** and which, he says, was exceeding sorrowful; and which was an immaterial and immortal spirit; and which, when his body died, and was separated from it, he commended into the hands of his divine Father.

Matthew 26:38 Then saith he unto them, My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death; tarry ye here, and watch with me.

Had he not an human soul, he would not be a perfect man; and could not be called, as he is, the man Christ Jesus. The integral parts of man, and which constitute one, are soul and body; and without which he cannot be called a man. These distinguish him from other creatures.

On the one hand he is distinguished from angels, immaterial and immortal spirits, with which his soul has a cognation, by having a body, or by being an embodied spirit; whereas they are incorporeal.

So, on the other hand, he is distinguished from mere animals, who have bodies as well as he, by his having a rational and immortal soul.

If Christ was without one, he could not be in all things like unto us; being deficient in that which is the most excellent and most noble part of man. But that he is possessed of an human soul, is evident from his having an human understanding, will, and affections. He had an human understanding, knowledge, and wisdom, in which he is said to grow, and which in some things were deficient and imperfect.

Luke 2:52 And Jesus increased in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and man.

Mark 13:32 But of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father.

He had an human will, distinct from the divine will, though not opposite, but in subjection to it.

John 6:38 For I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me.

Luke 22:42 Saying, Father, if thou be willing, remove this cup from me: nevertheless not my will, but thine, be done.

And he had human affections, as love,

Mark 10:21 Then Jesus beholding him loved him.

Yea, even those infirmities, though sinless passions, prove the truth of his human soul; as sorrow, grief, anger, amazement, and consternation.

Matthew 26:38 Then saith he unto them, My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death: tarry ye here, and watch with me.

Mark 3:5 And when he had looked round about on them with anger, being grieved for the hardness of their hearts.

Mark 14:33 And he taketh with him Peter and James and John, and began to be sore amazed, and to be very heavy;

Besides, if he had not had an human soul, he could not have been tempted in all points like as we are, since the temptations of Satan chiefly respect the soul, the mind, and the thoughts of it, and affect and distress that.

Hebrews 4:15 For we have not an high priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin.

Nor could he have borne the wrath of God, nor have had a sensation of that; which it is certain he had, when the weight of the sins of his people lay on him, and pressed him sore.

Psalms 89:38 But thou hast cast off and abhorred, thou hast been wroth with thine anointed.

Nor could he have been a perfect sacrifice for their sins; which required his soul as well as his body.

Isaiah 53:10 Yet it pleased the LORD to bruise him; he hath put him to grief: when thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of the LORD shall prosper in his hand.

Hebrews 10:10 By the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all.

Nor [could he] have been the Savior of their souls; as he is both of body and soul, giving life for life, body for body, soul for soul.

I Peter 1:9 Receiving the end of your faith, even the salvation of your souls.

2nd, In what sense the Word, or Son of God, was made flesh, and so became incarnate. The Word could not be made at all, that is, created, since he is the Maker and Creator of all things. Therefore he himself could not be made or created. Nor was he, nor could be, made, converted, and changed into flesh. **The divine nature in Christ could not be changed into human nature; for he is the Lord, that changes not.** He is the same in the *yesterday* of eternity, in the day of time, and *for ever* to all eternity.

By the incarnation nothing is added to, nor altered in the divine nature and personality of Christ. The human nature adds nothing to either of them. They remain the same they ever were. Christ was as much a divine Person before his incarnation as he is since. The union of the human nature to the divine nature, is to it as subsisting in the Person of the Son of God. So it is always to be understood, whenever we speak of the union of the human nature to the divine nature.

It is not united to the divine nature, simply considered; or as that is common to the three Persons; for then each would be incarnate; but as it has a peculiar subsistence in the Person of the Son of God. So the human nature has its subsistence in his Person, and has a glory and excellency given it. But that gives nothing at all to the nature and person of the divine Word and Son of God.

But, as other scriptures explain it, God the Word, or Son, was made and became "manifest in the flesh." The Son that was in the bosom of the Father, the Word of life, that was with him from all eternity, was manifested in the flesh in time, to the sons of men; and that in order to take away sin, and destroy the works of the devil.

I Timothy 3:16 And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen

of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory.

I John 1:1-2 That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled, of the Word of life; (For the life was manifested, and we have seen *it*, and bear witness, and shew unto you that eternal life, which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us;)

I John 3:5 And ye know that he was manifested to take away our sins; and in him is no sin.

I John 3:8 He that 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.

And the incarnation of the Word or Son of God, is expressed and explained by his partaking of flesh and blood; and by a taking on him the nature of man; or by an assumption of the human nature into union with his divine Person; so that **both natures, divine and human, are united in one Person.** There is but one Lord, and one Mediator between God and man.

The Nestorians so divided and separated these natures, as to make them distinct and separate Persons; which they are not, but one.

And the Eutychians, running into the other extreme, mixed and confounded the natures together; interpreting the phrase, "the Word was made flesh," of the divine nature being changed into the human nature; and the human nature into the divine nature; and **so blended together as to make a third;** just as two sort of liquors, mixed together, make a third different from both.

But this is to make Christ neither truly God, nor truly man; the one nature being confounded with and swallowed up in the other.

But this union of natures is such, that though they are closely united, and not divided, yet they retain their distinct properties and operations. As the divine nature to be uncreated, infinite, omnipresent, impassible, etc. the human nature to be created, finite, in some certain place, passible, etc. at least the latter, before the

resurrection of Christ. But of this union, and the nature of it, more hereafter.

Thirdly, The parts of the incarnation are next to be considered, conception and nativity.

1st, Conception; this is a most wonderful, abstruse, and mysterious affair; and which to speak of is very difficult.

1. This conception was by a virgin. It was a virgin that conceived the human body of Christ, as was foretold it should; which was very wonderful, and therefore introduced with a note of admiration. "Behold, a virgin shall conceive and bear a Son!" This was a "new thing," unheard of and astonishing; which God "created in the earth," in the lower parts of the earth, in the virgin's womb, "A woman compassed," or conceived, "a man," without the knowledge of man.

Isaiah 7:14 Therefore the Lord himself shall give you a sign; Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel.

Jeremiah 31:22 How long wilt thou go about, O thou backsliding daughter? for the LORD hath created a new thing in the earth, A woman shall compass a man.

This was not natural, but supernatural; though Mela the geographer, speaks of some women in a certain island who conceived without copulation with men; but that is all romance. Plutarch asserts, such a thing was never known. This conception was made *in* the virgin, and not without her. So says the text; "That which is conceived in her, is of the Holy Ghost."

It was a notion of some of the ancient heretics, the Valentinians, and of late, the Mennonites, that the human nature of Christ was formed in heaven, and came down from thence into the virgin, and passed through her as water through a pipe, as their expression was; so that, according to them, he was not conceived in her, nor took flesh of her. To countenance this, it is observed, that the "second man" is said to be "the Lord from heaven."

I Corinthians 15:47 The first man is of the earth, earthy: the second man is the Lord from heaven.

But the words are not to be understood of the descent of the human nature of Christ from heaven, but of his divine Person from thence; not by change of place, but by assumption of the human nature into union with him; by virtue of which union the man Christ has the name of the "Lord from heaven," and not because of the original and descent of the human nature from thence. In this sense, and in this sense only, are we to understand the words of Christ, when he says, "I came down from heaven," namely, that **he descended in and by the human nature; not by bringing it down from thence, but by taking it into union with his divine Person.**

John 6:38 For I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me.

2. This conception was through the power and influence of the Holy Ghost, overshadowing the virgin. In the same instant the human body was thus conceived, formed, and organized, the human soul of Christ was created and united to it, by him who "forms the spirit of man within him."

And in that very instant the body was conceived and formed, and the soul united to it, did the Son of God assume the whole human nature at once, and take it into union with his divine Person, and gave it a subsistence in it; **so that the human nature of Christ never had a subsistence of itself.** From the moment of its conception, formation, and creation, it subsisted in the Person of the Son of God. Hence the human nature of Christ is not a person. A person is that which subsists of itself: but that the human nature of Christ never did; therefore,

3. It was a nature, and not a person, that Christ assumed so early as at its conception. It is called "the holy Thing," and not a person. "The seed of Abraham," or the nature of the seed of Abraham; the *form* and *fashion* of a man, that is, the nature of man; as "the form of God" in the same passage, signifies the nature of God.

Luke 1:35 And the angel answered and said unto her, The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God.

Hebrews 2:16 For verily he took not on him the *nature* of angels; but he took on him the seed of Abraham.

Philippians 2:6-8 Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God: But made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men: And being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross.

The Nestorians asserted the human nature of Christ to be a person; and so made two persons in Christ, one human and one divine; and of course four persons in the Deity, contrary to,

I John 5:7 For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one.

But there is but one Person of the Son, one Son of God, one Lord of all, one Mediator between God and man. If the two natures in Christ were two distinct separate persons, the works and actions done in each nature could not be said of the same Person. The righteousness wrought out by Christ in the human nature, could not be called the righteousness of God, nor the blood shed in the human nature the blood of the Son of God, nor God be said to purchase the church with his blood, nor the Lord of life and glory to be crucified, nor the Son of man to be in heaven, when he was here on earth.

I treat of the union of the two natures, divine and human, in the person of the Son of God, under the article of conception, and before the birth of Christ, as it certainly was. Hence when Mary paid a visit to her cousin Elizabeth, before the birth of Christ, and just upon the conception of him, she was saluted by her thus; "Whence is this to me, that the mother of my Lord should come unto me?"

Luke 1:43 And whence *is* this to me, that the mother of my Lord should come to me?

Wherefore, before I proceed to consider the second part of the incarnation, the nativity of Christ, I shall further observe some things concerning the union, which took place at the conception; and of the effects of it.

1. Of the union itself; concerning which let it be observed,

(1.) That though Christ, by assuming the human nature, united it to his divine Person; yet there is a difference between assumption and union. Assumption is only of one nature; union is of both. Christ only assumed the human nature to his divine Person; but both natures, human and divine, are united in his Person.

That he has two distinct natures is evident; in that, according to the flesh, or human nature, he is the Son of David; and according to the Spirit of holiness, or the divine nature, he is the Son of God.

He was of the father's, according to the flesh, or human nature; but, according to the divine nature, God over all, blessed for ever. He was put to death in the flesh, in the human nature; but quickened in or by the Spirit, the divine nature, yet but one Person.

Romans 1:3-4 Concerning his Son Jesus Christ our Lord, which was made of the seed of David according to the flesh; And declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead:

Romans 9:5 Whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever. Amen.

(2.) This union is hypostatical, or personal; but not an union of persons. The union of Father, Son, and Spirit in the Deity, is an union of three Persons in one God. But this is not an union of two persons; but of two natures in one person.

(3.) This an union of natures; but not a communication of one nature to another; not of the divine nature, and the essential properties of it, to the human nature; for though "the fulness of the Godhead dwells bodily" in Christ, that is, substantially and really, not in shadow and type. Yet the perfections of the Godhead are not communicated to the manhood, as to make that uncreated, infinite, immense, and to be everywhere, etc. The properties of each nature remain distinct, notwithstanding this union.

Colossians 2:9 For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily.

And hence it appears, that the human nature of Christ is no loser, but a gainer, and is not inferior, but superior to other individuals of human nature, by its not being a person, subsisting of itself; because it has a better subsistence in the Person of the Son of God, than it could have had of itself; or than any creature has, angel or man.

(5.) This union is indissoluble: though death dissolved the union between the body and soul of Christ, it did not, and could not, dissolve the union between the human nature and person of Christ.

Wherefore, in consequence of this union, he raised up the temple of his body, when destroyed, the third day, and thereby declared himself to be the Son of God with power.

John 2:19 Jesus answered and said unto them, Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up.

Romans 1:4 And declared *to be* the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead:

And when his body lay in the grave, he rested in hope of the resurrection of it.

Psalms 16:10 For thou wilt not leave my soul in hell; neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption.

(4.) A very high and glorious exaltation of it, after his death and resurrection from the dead.

It was highly exalted by being united to the Person of the Son of God, and though it came into a state of humiliation in it, yet being raised from the dead, is highly exalted, far above all principality and power, and might and dominion, and above every name that is named in this world or in that to come. **It is set down at the right hand of God, where angels are never bid to come; and where angels, authorities, and powers, are made subject to it.**

Ephesians 1:20-21 Which he wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places, Far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come:

Philippians 2:9-10 Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name: That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth;

Hebrews 1:13 But to which of the angels said he at any time, Sit on my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool?

I Peter 3:22 Who is gone into heaven, and is on the right hand of God; angels and authorities and powers being made subject unto him.

(3.) With respect to the Person of Christ, the effects of this union are:

(1.) A communication of idioms, or properties, as the ancients express it; that is, of the properties of each nature, which are, in common, predicated of the Person of Christ, by virtue of the union of natures in it. For though each nature retains its peculiar properties, and does not communicate them to each other; yet they may be predicated of the Person of Christ. **Yea, he may be denominated in one nature, from a property which belongs to another.**

Thus in his divine nature he is God, the Son of God, the Lord of glory. Yet in this nature is described by a property which belongs to the human nature, which is to be passible, and suffer. Hence we read of God purchasing the church with his blood; and of the blood of the Son of God cleansing from all sin; and of the Lord of glory being crucified.

Acts 20:28 Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood.

I John 1:7 But 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.

I Corinthians 2:8 Which none of the princes of this world knew: for had they known *it*, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory.

And on the other hand, in his human nature he is called the Son of man; and yet as such, is described by a property which

belongs to the divine nature, which is to be omnipresent, to be everywhere. So it is said,

John 3:13 And no man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, *even* the Son of man which is in heaven.

[He] was in heaven at the same time he was here on earth; which was true of his Person, though denominated from his human nature. Thus what cannot be said of Christ in the abstract, is true of him in the concrete, by virtue of this union. It cannot be said, that the Deity of Christ suffered; or that the humanity of Christ is everywhere. But it may be said, that God, the Son of God suffered; and that the Son of man was in heaven when on earth, or everywhere.

It cannot be said, that the Deity is humanity; nor the humanity Deity, nor equal to God. But it may be said, that God the Word is man, and the man Christ is God, Jehovah's Fellow; because these names respect the Person of Christ, which includes both natures.

(2.) A communion of office, and of power and authority to exercise it in both natures.

Thus by virtue of this union Christ bears the office of a Mediator, and exercises it in both natures. There is "one Mediator between God and man, the Man Christ Jesus."

I Timothy 2:5 For there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus;

But he is not Mediator only in his human nature, and only exercises it in that. He took upon him, and was invested with this office before his assumption of human nature, and could and did exercise some parts of it without it, as has been shown in its proper place. But there were others that required his human nature; and when, and not before it was requisite, he assumed it; and in it, as united to his divine Person, he is God-man, is Prophet, Priest, and King, Judge, Lawgiver, and Savior; and has power over all flesh, to give eternal life to as many as the Father has given him. Upon his resurrection, had all power in heaven and earth given him, to appoint ordinances, and commission men to administer them; and had authority also to execute judgment, both in the world and in the church; because he is the Son of man.

Matthew 28:18 And Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth.

John 17:2 As thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him.

John 5:27 And hath given him authority to execute judgment also, because he is the Son of man.

(3.) A communion of operations in both natures, to the perfecting of the same work; which, therefore, may be called "theandric," or the work of the God-man, there being a concurrence of both natures in the performance of it, which, when done, is ascribed to his Person. Thus, for instance, the sacrifice of himself, as the propitiation for the sins of men; as God-man and Mediator.

He is [1] the Priest that offers; [2] his human nature, consisting of soul and body, is the Sacrifice; and [3] his divine nature is the altar which sanctifies it, and gives it its atoning virtue.

His blood was shed in the human nature, to cleanse from sin. But it is owing to its union with the Son of God that such an effect is produced by it. The redemption of men is by the ransom price of the life and blood of Christ; **but it is the divine nature,** to which the human is united, in the Person of the Son of God, **that makes it a sufficient one.**

The mission of the Spirit, by Christ, is owing both to his intercession in the human nature, and to his power and authority in the divine nature.

(4.) The adoration of the Person of Christ, having both natures united in him, is another effect of this union.

The human nature of Christ is not the formal object of worship. It is a creature, and not to be worshiped as such. Nor is worship given for the sake of it, or as singly considered. But then the divine Person of Christ having that nature in union with him, is the object of worship. **The flesh of Christ is not worshiped, but the incarnate God is. A whole Christ is worshiped, but not the whole of Christ.** "When he bringeth in the first begotten into the world," which was at the time of the incarnation, "he saith, let all the angels of God worship him."

Hebrews 1:6 And again, when he bringeth in the firstbegotten into the world, he saith, And let all the angels of God worship him.

And upon his resurrection from the dead, God has "given him a name which is above every name; that at the name of Jesus should bow," that is, in a way of religious adoration, and though Christ, as man, is not the object of such adoration; yet what he has done in the human nature, is a motive and argument why blessing and honor should be given to his Person, having both natures united in him.

Philippians 2:9-10 Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name: That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth;

Revelation 5:12-13 Saying with a loud voice, Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing. And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, *be* unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever.

2nd. The birth, or nativity of Christ, the other part of the incarnation, is next to be considered.

1. Of whom born; of a virgin, of the house of David, and of the tribe of Judah.

(1.) Of a virgin: this was hinted at in the first promise of "the seed of the woman," and is fully expressed by Isaiah; "A virgin shall conceive and bear a Son," to fulfil which prophecy, before Joseph and Mary cohabited as man and wife, and so, while she was a virgin, "she was found with child of the Holy Ghost."

Matthew 1:18-23 Now the birth of Jesus Christ was on this wise: When as his mother Mary was espoused to Joseph, before they came together, she was found with child of the Holy Ghost. Then Joseph her husband, being a just man, and not willing to make her a public example, was minded to put her away privily. But while he thought on these things, behold, the angel of the Lord appeared unto him in a dream, saying, Joseph, thou son of David, fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife: for that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost. And she shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call his name JESUS:

for he shall save his people from their sins. Now all this was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying, Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel, which being interpreted is, God with us.

And it was brought about in this manner, that the human nature of Christ might be clear of original sin, which it otherwise must have been infected with, had it been conceived and born in the ordinary and natural way of generation; for "whatsoever is born of the flesh, is flesh," carnal and corrupt. But being produced in this extraordinary and supernatural way, by the power of the Holy Ghost, that which was born of the virgin is "the holy Thing," free from all spot and blemish of sin.

Moreover, so it was, that as the ruin of men came by means of a virgin; for the fall of Adam was before he knew his wife. So the Savior of men from that ruin, came into the world by a virgin. So it was ordered by the wisdom of God, that Christ should appear to have but one Father, having none as man, and so be but one Person; whereas, had he had two fathers, there must have been two persons.

(2.) Christ was born of a virgin of the house of David; as in,

Luke 1:27 To a virgin espoused to a man whose name was Joseph, of the house of David; and the virgin's name was Mary.

The phrase of the house of David, is equally true of the virgin, as of Joseph, and may be connected with her. **God promised to David, that the Messiah should be of his seed.** Accordingly, of his seed he raised up unto Israel, a Savior Jesus, who is therefore called the Son of David; and is both "the root and offspring of David," the root of David, as God, and David's Lord; and the offspring of David, as man, descending from him.

Acts 13:23 Of this mans seed hath God according to his promise raised unto Israel a Savior, Jesus:

Revelation 22:16 I Jesus have sent mine angel to testify unto you these things in the churches. I am the root and the offspring of David, and the bright and morning star.

(3.) He was born of a virgin of the tribe of Judah; as she must be, since she was of the house of David, which was of that tribe.

It is manifest, as the apostle says, that our Lord sprang out of the tribe of Judah, as it was foretold he should.

Genesis 49:10 The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come; and unto him shall the gathering of the people be.

Hebrews 7:14 For it is evident that our Lord sprang out of Juda; of which tribe Moses spake nothing concerning priesthood.

2. The birth of Christ, or his coming into the world, was after the manner of other men.

His generation and conception were extraordinary; but his birth was in the usual manner. He came into the world after he had lain the common time in his mother's womb; for it is said, "the days were accomplished that she should be delivered." She went her full time with him, and brought forth him, her firstborn Son, as other women do; and no doubt with pains and sorrow, as every daughter of Eve does, and presented, him to the Lord when the days of her purification were ended, according to the law, as it is written, "Every male that openeth the womb, shall be called holy to the Lord."

Luke 2:6 And so it was, that, while they were there, the days were accomplished that she should be delivered.

Luke 2:22-23 And when the days of her purification according to the law of Moses were accomplished, they brought him to Jerusalem, to present him to the Lord; (As it is written in the law of the Lord, Every male that openeth the womb shall be called holy to the Lord;)

So that in these respects Christ was made in all things like unto his brethren.

(3.) The place of his birth was Bethlehem, according to the prophecy in,

Micah 5:2 But thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting.

Here it was expected he would be born; and this was so well known to the Jews, that when Herod inquired of the chief priests and Scribes where Christ should be born; they, without any hesitation, immediately reply, in "Bethlehem of Judea," and quote the above prophecy in proof of it.

Matthew 2:4-6 And when he had gathered all the chief priests and scribes of the people together, he demanded of them where Christ should be born. And they said unto him, In Bethlehem of Judaea: for thus it is written by the prophet, And thou Bethlehem, in the land of Juda, art not the least among the princes of Juda: for out of thee shall come a Governor, that shall rule my people Israel.

Yea, this was known by the common people,

John 7:42 Hath not the scripture said, That Christ cometh of the seed of David, and out of the town of Bethlehem, where David was?

And so it was wonderfully brought about in providence; that though Joseph and Mary lived in Galilee, yet through a decree of Caesar Augustus to tax the whole empire, they were both obliged to come to the city of Bethlehem, the city of David, to be taxed, being of the lineage and house of David. And while they were on that business there, the virgin was delivered of her Son (Luke 2:1-7).

Bethlehem signifies the house of bread; a fit place for the Messiah to be born in, who is the bread that came down from heaven, and gives life unto the world.

(4.) The time of his birth was as it was fixed in prophecy; before the sceptre, or civil government, departed from Judah.

Herod was king in Judea when he was born; before the second temple was destroyed; for he often went into it, and taught in it. And it was at the time pointed at in Daniel's weeks.

Genesis 49:10 The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come; and unto him shall the gathering of the people be.

Malachi 3:1 Behold, I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me: and the Lord, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his temple, even the messenger of the covenant, whom ye delight in: behold, he shall come, saith the LORD of hosts.

Haggai 2:6-7 For thus saith the LORD of hosts; Yet once, it is a little while, and I will shake the heavens, and the earth, and the sea, and the dry land; And I will shake all nations, and the desire of all nations shall come: and I will fill this house with glory, saith the LORD of hosts.

Haggai 2:9 The glory of this latter house shall be greater than of the former, saith the LORD of hosts: and in this place will I give peace, saith the LORD of hosts.

Daniel 9:24 Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the most Holy.

The exact year of the world in which he was born, is not agreed on by chronologers; but it was about, or a little before or after the four thousandth year of the world. Nor can the season of the year, the month and day in which he was born, be ascertained. However, the vulgar account seems not probable. The circumstance of the shepherds watching their flocks by night, agrees not with the winter season. It is more likely it was in autumn, sometime in the month of September, at the feast of tabernacles, which was typical of Christ's incarnation. And there seems to be some reference to it in,

John 1:14 And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth.

"The Word was made flesh, and dwelt," or "tabernacled" among us. The temple of Solomon, a type of Christ's human nature, was dedicated at the feast of tabernacles, and as Christ, the Passover, was sacrificed at the very time of the Passover; and the Holy Ghost was given on the very day of Pentecost, typified by the firstfruits offered on that day; **so it is most reasonable to suppose, that Christ was born at the very feast of tabernacles, a type of his incarnation;** and which feast is put for the whole ministry of the word and ordinances, to be observed in gospel times.

Zechariah 14:16 And it shall come to pass, that every one that is left of all the nations which came against Jerusalem shall even go up

from year to year to worship the King, the LORD of hosts, and to keep the feast of tabernacles.

However, it was in the fulness of time, or when the time was fully up he was to come, that God sent him, and he came.

And in due time, in the fittest and most proper time, infinite Wisdom saw meet he should come. God could have sent him sooner; but he did not think fit to do it. But he sent him at the most seasonable time; when the wickedness of men was at its height, both in Judea and in the Gentile world; and there appeared a necessity of a Savior of men from it; and when the insufficiency of the light of nature, of the power of man's free will, which had been sufficiently tried among the philosophers; and of the law of Moses, and of the works and sacrifices of it, to take away sin, and save men from it, had been clearly evinced.

To conclude, it was in time, and not before time, that Christ became man. **To talk of the human nature of Christ, either in whole or in part, as from eternity, is contrary both to scripture and reason;** nor can that man, or human nature, be of any avail or benefit to us; but he that is the Seed of the woman, the Son of Abraham, the Son of David, and the Son of Mary.

Christ's Humiliation: His Active Obedience

The humiliation of Christ may be seen in his obedience to God, through the whole course of his life, even unto death.

First, He took upon him the form of a servant,

Philippians 2:7 But made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men:

This is an instance of his amazing humility and condescension; that he, who was the Son of God, of the same nature with God, and equal to him, the brightness of his Father's glory, and the express image of his person, should voluntarily become the Servant of him.

Hebrews 5:8 Though he were a Son, yet learned he obedience by the things which he suffered.

He was chosen of God, in his eternal purposes, to be his Servant; and therefore is called, his Servant elect.

Isaiah 42:1 Behold my servant, whom I uphold; mine elect, in whom my soul delighteth; I have put my spirit upon him: he shall bring forth judgment to the Gentiles.

Isaiah 49:3 And said unto me, Thou art my servant, O Israel, in whom I will be glorified.

-
And Christ, the Son of God, accepted of this office; agreed to be the Servant of God, to come into the world, and do his will and work.

Psalms 40:7-8 Then said I, Lo, I come: in the volume of the book it is written of me, I delight to do thy will, O my God: yea, thy law is within my heart.

And accordingly, he was prophesied of as the Servant of the Lord, that should come.

Zechariah 3:8 Hear now, O Joshua the high priest, thou, and thy fellows that sit before thee: for they are men wondered at: for, behold, I will bring forth my servant the BRANCH.

Isaiah 42:1 Behold my servant, whom I uphold; mine elect, in whom my soul delighteth; I have put my spirit upon him: he shall bring forth judgment to the Gentiles.

In the fulness of time he was sent, and came not to be ministered unto, as a monarch, but to minister as a servant.

He quickly appeared to be under a law, and was subject to the law of circumcision; and being had in his infancy to Egypt, the house of servants; to his ancestors, according to the flesh, was an emblem of that servile state he was come into. And very early did he declare, that he must be about his Father's business.

As a servant, he had work to do, and much work, and that very laborious; which lay, [1] not only in working miracles, which were works his Father gave him to finish, as demonstrations of his Deity, and prods of his Messiahship; [2] nor only in going about from place to place, healing all manner of diseases, and so doing good to the bodies of men; [3] nor only in preaching the gospel, for which he was qualified and sent, and thereby did good to the souls of men; but

chiefly in fulfilling the law of God, both in the preceptive and penal part of it, in the room and stead of his people.

Thereby [he] wrought out the great work of all he came to do, the redemption and salvation of men. This was the work assigned him by God his Father, as his servant.

Now throughout the whole of his work, as a servant, he appeared very diligent and constant. Very early he discovered an inclination to be about it. Very eager was he at it. When in it, it was his meat and drink; and he was continually, constantly employed in it.

John 4:34 Jesus saith unto them, My meat is to do the will of him that sent me, and to finish his work.

John 9:4 I must work the works of him that sent me, while it is day: the night cometh, when no man can work.

Nor did he leave working till he had completed the whole. In all which he was faithful to him that appointed him; and very justly did he obtain the character of God's "righteous Servant."

Isaiah 11:5 And righteousness shall be the girdle of his loins, and faithfulness the girdle of his reins.

Isaiah 53:11 He shall see of the travail of his soul, and shall be satisfied: by his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many; for he shall bear their iniquities.

Secondly, When Christ became incarnate, and took upon him the form of a servant, and really was one, he, as such, was subject to the law of God. Hence these two things are joined together, as having a close connection with each other.

Galatians 4:4 But when the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law,

1st, Christ was made under the judicial, or civil law of the Jews. He was by birth a Jew, and is called one,

Zechariah 8:23 Thus saith the LORD of hosts; In those days it shall come to pass, that ten men shall take hold out of all languages of the

nations, even shall take hold of the skirt of him that is a Jew, saying, We will go with you: for we have heard that God *is* with you.

It is manifest that he sprung from the tribe of Judah; which tribe, in process of time, gave the name of Jews to the whole people of Israel; and because our Lord was of that tribe, he is called the Lion of the tribe of Judah.

Hebrews 7:14 For it is evident that our Lord sprang out of Juda; of which tribe Moses spake nothing concerning priesthood.

Revelation 5:5 And one of the elders saith unto me, Weep not: behold, the Lion of the tribe of Juda, the Root of David, hath prevailed to open the book, and to loose the seven seals thereof.

He was born at Bethlehem, in the tribe of Judah, and was of the seed of David, who was of that tribe; and is therefore said to be **the root and offspring of David.**

Revelation 22:16 I Jesus have sent mine angel to testify unto you these things in the churches. I am the root and the offspring of David, and the bright and morning star.

Wherefore, since he, the salvation of God, and Savior of men, as to his human nature, was of the Jews; it was fit and proper he should be subject to their civil government, and to the laws of it.

He was charged with sedition, yet falsely, for he was subject to their government, though it was then in the hands of the Romans. [He] not only paid tribute himself, but directed others to do the same.

Matthew 17:24-27 And when they were come to Capernaum, they that received tribute money came to Peter, and said, Doth not your master pay tribute? He saith, Yes. And when he was come into the house, Jesus prevented him, saying, What thinkest thou, Simon? of whom do the kings of the earth take custom or tribute? of their own children, or of strangers? Peter saith unto him, Of strangers. Jesus saith unto him, Then are the children free. Notwithstanding, lest we should offend them, go thou to the sea, and cast an hook, and take up the fish that first cometh up; and when thou hast opened his mouth, thou shalt find a piece of money: that take, and give unto them for me and thee.

Matthew 22:17-21 Tell us therefore, What thinkest thou? Is it lawful to give tribute unto Caesar, or not? But Jesus perceived their wickedness, and said, Why tempt ye me, ye hypocrites? Shew me the tribute money. And they brought unto him a penny. And he saith unto them, Whose *is* this image and superscription? They say unto him, Caesar's. Then saith he unto them, Render therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's; and unto God the things that are God's.

And to this law he submitted,

1. That it might appear he was of the nation of the Jews, as it was prophesied of, and promised he should; as, that he should be of the seed of Abraham, of the tribe of Judah, and of the Jewish fathers, according to the flesh.

Genesis 22:18 And in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed; because thou hast obeyed my voice.

Genesis 49:10 The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come; and unto him shall the gathering of the people be.

Matthew 1:1 The book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham.

Romans 9:5 Whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever. Amen.

2. That it might be manifest that he came before the Jewish polity was at an end; as it was foretold he should.

Genesis 49:10 The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come; and unto him shall the gathering of the people be.

And Christ being under and subject to the civil law, showed that the sceptre and lawgiver had not departed, but civil government yet continued. Though now, for many hundreds of years it has wholly departed, and is not, in any form or shape, among that people; which has fulfilled the prophecy in,

Hosea 3:4 For the children of Israel shall abide many days without a king, and without a prince, and without a sacrifice, and without an image, and without an ephod, and without teraphim:

Therefore the Messiah must be come long ago, before they were without one, as he did; for Herod was king when he was born.

3. Christ became subject to the civil law, to teach his followers subjection to civil magistrates; and this is the doctrine of his apostles.

Romans 13:1 Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God.

Titus 3:1 Put them in mind to be subject to principalities and powers, to obey magistrates, to be ready to every good work.

I Peter 2:13 Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake: whether it be to the king, as supreme.

2nd, Christ was made under the ceremonial law, and became subject to that. He was circumcised when eight days old, according to that law; and was presented in the temple at the time of his mother's purification, as the law required. At twelve years of age he came with his parents to Jerusalem, to keep the Passover. And when he had entered on his public office, it was his custom constantly to attend synagogue worship. It was one of the last actions of his life, to keep the Passover with his disciples. Now he became subject to this law,

1. Because it looked to him, and centered in him. It was a shadow of good things to come by him. The feasts of tabernacles, Passover, and Pentecost; the sabbaths of the seventh day of the week, and of the seventh year, and of the seven times seventh year, were shadows, of which he is the substance. All the ablutions, washings, and purifications enjoined by it, were typical of cleansing by his blood. All the sacrifices of it, daily, weekly, monthly, and yearly, all pointed to his sacrifice.

2. He was made under this law, in order to fulfil it; for it became him to fulfil all righteousness, ceremonial as well as moral

righteousness. All things in it were to have an end, and had an end, even a fulfilling end in him.

3. He was made under it, that by fulfilling it he might abolish it, and put an end to it. When it was fulfilled, it was no longer useful. There was a necessity of the disannulling of it, because of its weakness and unprofitableness. Accordingly, this law of commandments was abolished. This handwriting of ordinances was blotted out; this middle wall of partition between Jews and Gentiles was broken down; and the rituals of it pronounced weak and beggarly elements.

Believers in Christ were directed to take care they were not entangled with this yoke of bondage; nor should they judge and condemn one another for any neglect of it. Christ has answered to the whole, by being made under it.

3rd, Christ was made under the moral law. Under this he was as a man; being "made of a woman." In course he was made under the law; for every man, as a creature of God, is subject to him, its Creator and Lawgiver, and to his law. To fear God, and keep his commandments, is the whole duty of man; and is the duty of every man. [It] was the duty of Christ, as man.

But besides this, Christ was made under it, as the surety and substitute of his people. As he became their surety, he engaged to fulfil the law in their room and stead. This is a very principal part of that will of God, which he declared his readiness to come and do; saying, "Lo, I come to do thy will, O God! thy law is within my heart."

Psalms 40:7-8 Then said I, Lo, I come: in the volume of the book it is written of me, I delight to do thy will, O my God: yea, thy law *is* within my heart.

1. He was made under it, in order to fulfil the precepts of it; which to do is righteousness, and is that righteousness which he undertook to work out in perfect agreement with the commands of the law, and which he perfectly obeyed.

Deuteronomy 6:25 And it shall be our righteousness, if we observe to do all these commandments before the LORD our God, as he hath commanded us.

He always did the things which pleased the Father, and all that was pleasing to him; even every command of his righteous law. Nor did he fail in any one instance. He never committed one sin; and so did not transgress the law in any one particular; but was holy and harmless throughout the whole of his life and conversation.

2. He submitted to the penal part of the law. The law pronounces a curse on all those that do not perfectly observe its precepts. **Christ being the Surety of his people, was made a curse for them;** or endured the curse of the law in their stead, that he might redeem them from it.

Galatians 3:10 For as many as are of the works of the law are under the curse: for it is written, Cursed *is* every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them.

Galatians 3:13 Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us: for it is written, Cursed *is* every one that hangeth on a tree.

The penal sanction of the law was death. It threatened with it, in case of sin or disobedience to it. The wages of sin is death. Christ therefore, as the substitute of his people became obedient to death, even the death of the cross, for them.

3. All this he became and did, to fulfil the law in their room; and that the righteousness of it might be fulfilled in them, and so deliver them from the bondage, curse, and condemnation of it; that being, through Christ, dead to them, and they to that, that they might live unto God in a spiritual and evangelic manner.

Thirdly, Christ taking upon him the form of a servant, in human nature, and being made under the law, he was obedient to it, throughout the whole course of his life, to the time of his death. [This] is meant by that phrase, "Became obedient unto death," that is, until death, as well as in it, and by submission to it.

1. There is the obedience of Christ to men. He was obedient to his earthly parents. He not only lived in a state of subjection to them in his childhood and youth, but continued his filial affection for them, and regard to them, particularly to his mother, when a grown man. His words to her in John 2:4 do not express irreverence

towards her. Nor did she so understand them, showing no resentment at them, but the contrary. Nor do those in Matthew 12:48-49 signify any disrespect to her, nor want of affection to her; but his great affection for his spiritual relations, and that he retained his filial duty and regard to her to the last, appears by his bequeathing her to the care of one of his disciples.

John 2:4 Jesus saith unto her, Woman, what have I to do with thee? mine hour is not yet come.

Matthew 12:48-49 But he answered and said unto him that told him, Who is my mother? and who are my brethren? And he stretched forth his hand toward his disciples, and said, Behold my mother and my brethren!

John 19:27 Then saith he to the disciple, Behold thy mother! And from that hour that disciple took her unto his own home.

Christ also yielded obedience to civil magistrates, as before observed, by paying the tribute money; hence in prophecy he is called, the Servant of rulers.

Isaiah 49:7 Thus saith the LORD, the Redeemer of Israel, and his Holy One, to him whom man despiseth, to him whom the nation abhorreth, to a servant of rulers, Kings shall see and arise, princes also shall worship, because of the LORD that is faithful, and the Holy One of Israel, and he shall choose thee.

2. There is the obedience of Christ to God; for his Servant he was. It was his law he was made under; and to which he yielded obedience. [It] is that obedience by which his people are made righteous; though there are many things in which Christ was obedient to God, which do not come into the account of his obedience for the justification of men as,

(1.) The miraculous actions which were performed by him.

These were necessary to be done, for they were predicted of him, and were expected from him. Hence the Jews said, "When Christ cometh, will he do more miracles than these which this man hath done?"

John 7:31 And many of the people believed on him, and said, When Christ cometh, will he do more miracles than these which this man hath done?

Isaiah 35:5-6 Then the eyes of the blind shall be opened, and the ears of the deaf shall be unstopped. Then shall the lame man leap as an hart, and the tongue of the dumb sing: for in the wilderness shall waters break out, and streams in the desert.

And these were done to prove his proper Deity, that he was truly God; that he was in the Father, and the Father in him; that is, that he was of the same nature with him, and equal to him; for the truth of which he appeals to those works of his.

John 10:38 But if I do, though ye believe not me, believe the works: that ye may know, and believe, that the Father is in me, and I in him.

John 14:11 Believe me that I am in the Father, and the Father in me: or else believe me for the very works' sake.

These were also proofs of his being the true Messiah. [They] were given by him as evidences of it to the two disciples John sent to him, to know whether he was the Messiah expected or not.

Matthew 11:3-5 And said unto him, Art thou he that should come, or do we look for another? Jesus answered and said unto them, Go and shew John again those things which ye do hear and see: The blind receive their sight, and the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, the dead are raised up, and the poor have the gospel preached to them.

Now these were done in obedience to his Father. He gave him those works to finish, and because they were done by his direction, and in his name, and by his authority, they are called the works of his Father.

John 5:36 But I have greater witness than that of John: for the works which the Father hath given me to finish, the same works that I do, bear witness of me, that the Father hath sent me.

John 10:25 Jesus answered them, I told you, and ye believed not: the works that I do in my Father's name, they bear witness of me.

John 10:37 If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not.

And yet these are no part of that obedience by which men are made righteous. These were done to answer the above ends; and

they are recorded, that we might believe in the Son of God, and in his righteousness. But, as Dr. Goodwin observes, they are not ingredients in that righteousness in which we believe. Nor,

(2.) His obedience in the ministration of the gospel. He had from God his mission and commission to preach the gospel. He was qualified for it as man, through the unction of the Holy Spirit. He was sent of God to preach to this and the other city, to these and the other people. He became the minister of the circumcision, or a minister to the circumcised Jews; both for the truth and faithfulness of God, to confirm the promises made to the fathers; and in obedience to the will of God, who gave him a commandment what he should say, and what he should speak.

Accordingly he said and spoke what was delivered to him; not his own doctrine, but his Father's, in which he sought, not his own, but his glory; and so showed himself to be true, and no unrighteousness in him.

Romans 15:8 Now I say that Jesus Christ was a minister of the circumcision for the truth of God, to confirm the promises made unto the fathers:

John 8:28 Then said Jesus unto them, When ye have lifted up the Son of man, then shall ye know that I am he, and that I do nothing of myself; but as my Father hath taught me, I speak these things.

John 12:49 For I have not spoken of myself; but the Father which sent me, he gave me a commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak.

John 12:50 And I know that his commandment is life everlasting: whatsoever I speak therefore, even as the Father said unto me, so I speak.

John 7:16-18 Jesus answered them, and said, My doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me. If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself. He that speaketh of himself seeketh his own glory: but he that seeketh his glory that sent him, the same is true, and no unrighteousness is in him.

-

But now it was not his faithful execution of this his prophetic office, nor of the whole of his office as Mediator, which is the obedience or righteousness by which a sinner is justified.

Though it is the righteousness of the Mediator; yet not the fidelity and righteousness he exercised in the execution of his office, is that by which men are justified. **Nor,**

(3.) His obedience to the ceremonial law, which he was under, as has been shown; and to which he yielded obedience; of which many instances have been given. But this is no part of our justifying righteousness. **The greater number of those that are made righteous by Christ's obedience, were never under this law;** and so under no obligation to yield obedience to it; nor their surety for them. But,

(4.) It is Christ's obedience to the moral law, which he was under, and to which he was obedient throughout his life, unto death; and is what all men are subject, and ought to be obedient to; and for lack of which obedience, Christ has yielded a perfect one, in the room and stead of his people, concerning which may be observed, his qualifications and capacity for it, his actual performance of it, and the excellency of his obedience, whereby it appears to have answered the end and design of it.

1st, The qualifications and capacity of Christ to yield perfect obedience to the law.

1. His assumption of human nature, which was necessary to his obedience. As God he could not obey. He therefore took upon him a nature in which he could be subject to God, and yield obedience to him. [This] was fit and proper to be done in that nature in which disobedience had been committed.

2. He was made under the law, for this purpose; which has been particularly explained and enlarged on.

3. He had a pure and holy nature, quite conformable to the pure, holy, and righteous law of God. [He was] clear of all irregular affections, desires, motions, or lusts. [He] is called, "the holy Thing," said to be "without spot or blemish," harmless and undefiled; entirely free from both original and actual transgression, and so fit for pure and perfect obedience to be performed in it.

4. [He] was possessed of a power of free will to that which is holy, just, and good, agreeable to the law of God. In the state of innocence the will of man was free to that which is good only. In man fallen, his will is only free to that which is evil. In a man regenerate, there being two principles in him, there is a will to that which is good, and a will to that which is evil; so that he cannot do oftentimes what he would.

But the human will of Christ was entirely free to that which is good; and as he had a will and power to do, so he always did the things which pleased his Father.

5. He had a natural love to righteousness, and an hatred of sin, and from this principle flowed an entire conformity to the law, throughout the whole of his life, and all the actions of it.

Psalms 45:7 Thou lovest righteousness, and hatest wickedness: therefore God, thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows.

2nd, His actual performance of it; for as he came to fulfil it, he has fulfilled it; and is become the end of it, for righteousness, to everyone that believes.

The moral law consists of two tables; and is reduced, by Christ, to two points, love to God, and love to our neighbor; and both have been exactly observed and obeyed by Christ.

1. The first table of the law; which includes,

(1.) Love to God; Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart,"

Matthew 22:37-38 Jesus said unto him, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment.

[This] was never obeyed and fulfilled to such perfection and purity as by Christ; and which he has fully shown by his regard to the whole will of his Father, to all his commands, even to the laying down of his life for men. Therefore [he] voluntarily went forth to meet the prince of this world in the garden, and deliver up himself into the hands of his emissaries, in order to suffer and die, according to his Father's will.

John 14:31 But that the world may know that I love the Father; and as the Father gave me commandment, even so I do. Arise, let us go hence.

(2.) Faith and trust in God. To believe God, and to believe in him, is to have him before us, as the law requires. Christ very early exercised faith and hope on him as his God; even when he was upon his mother's breasts. And when in the midst of his enemies, and in suffering circumstances, he expressed the strongest degree of confidence in him.

Psalms 22:9 But thou art he that took me out of the womb: thou didst make me hope when I was upon my mother's breasts.

Psalms 22:10 I was cast upon thee from the womb: thou art my God from my mother's belly.

Isaiah 50:7-9 For the Lord GOD will help me; therefore shall I not be confounded: therefore have I set my face like a flint, and I know that I shall not be ashamed. He is near that justifieth me; who will contend with me? let us stand together: who *is* mine adversary? let him come near to me. Behold, the Lord GOD will help me; who is he that shall condemn me? lo, they all shall wax old as a garment; the moth shall eat them up.

(3.) The whole worship of God; not only internal, which lies in the exercise of faith, hope, love, etc., just observed; but external, as prayer and praise; both which Christ was often in the exercise of.

Luke 6:12 And it came to pass in those days, that he went out into a mountain to pray, and continued all night in prayer to God.

Luke 10:21 In that hour Jesus rejoiced in spirit, and said, I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes: even so, Father; for so it seemed good in thy sight.

[He] not only directed to the worship and service of God, and of him only; but set an example by his constant attendance on public worship on Sabbath days. He showed his regard to it, by inveighing against all innovations in it, the doctrines, traditions, and

commandments of men, as vain and superstitious; and by resenting every degree of profanation, even of the place of public worship.

Matthew 4:10 Then saith Jesus unto him, Get thee hence, Satan: for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.

Matthew 13:54 And when he was come into his own country, he taught them in their synagogue, insomuch that they were astonished, and said, Whence hath this man this wisdom, and these mighty works?

-
Matthew 15:3 But he answered and said unto them, Why do ye also transgress the commandment of God by your tradition?

Matthew 15:6 And honor not his father or his mother, he shall be free. Thus have ye made the commandment of God of none effect by your tradition.

Matthew 15:9 But in vain they do worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men.

Matthew 21:12-13 And Jesus went into the temple of God, and cast out all them that sold and bought in the temple, and overthrew the tables of the moneychangers, and the seats of them that sold doves, And said unto them, It is written, My house shall be called the house of prayer; but ye have made it a den of thieves.

(4.) Honor and reverence of the name of God; and though Christ himself was dishonored by men, he was careful to honor his God and Father, and not take his name in vain. "I honor my Father," says he, "and ye dishonor me." With what reverence does he address him in his prayer; saying, "Holy Father, and righteous Father?"

John 8:49 Jesus answered, I have not a devil; but I honor my Father, and ye do dishonor me.

John 17:11 And now I am no more in the world, but these are in the world, and I come to thee. Holy Father, keep through thine own name those whom thou hast given me, that they may be one, as we are.

-

John 17:25 O righteous Father, the world hath not known thee: but I have known thee, and these have known that thou hast sent me.

(5.) Sanctification of the Sabbath; for though Christ was charged with breaking it, by doing acts of mercy on it; which he vindicated, and so cleared himself from the aspersion of his enemies, yet he was constant in the observation of it for religious service. It was his constant custom to go to the synagogue on Sabbath days, and there either hear or read the scriptures, and expound them.

Luke 4:16 And he came to Nazareth, where he had been brought up: and, as his custom was, he went into the synagogue on the sabbath day, and stood up for to read.

Luke 4:31 And came down to Capernaum, a city of Galilee, and taught them on the sabbath days.

2. The second table of the law; which includes,

(1.) Honoring of parents, and obedience to them; the first commandment with promise, and the first in this table; and which, how it was observed by Christ, both in youth and manhood, has been remarked already, and in which he was a pattern to others of filial obedience.

Luke 2:51 And he went down with them, and came to Nazareth, and was subject unto them: but his mother kept all these sayings in her heart.

(2.) Love to our neighbor as ones self, and which is the second commandment, and like to the first,

Matthew 22:39 And the second *is* like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.

And this was never fulfilled by any as by Christ; who has shown the greatest love, pity, and compassion, both to the bodies and souls of men. Greater love hath no man, than what he has expressed to men, by suffering and dying for them, and working out their salvation.

John 15:13 Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends.

(3.) Doing all good to men the law requires, and no injury to the persons and properties of men, which that forbids; and which Christ punctually observed. He went about continually from place to place, doing good to the bodies of men, by healing all manner of diseases; and to the souls of men, by preaching wholesome doctrine to them.

Nor did he ever, in one single instance, do any injury to the person of any man, by striking, smiting, or killing; nor to the property any one. He did "no violence," committed no act of rapine or robbery, or took away any man's substance by fraud or force.

Acts 10:38 How God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power: who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil; for God was with him.

Isaiah 53:9 And he made his grave with the wicked, and with the rich in his death; because he had done no violence, neither was any deceit in his mouth.

(4.) As all malice, impurity, and evil concupiscence, are forbidden in this table of the law; none of these appeared in Christ; no, not the least shadow of them; no malice, nor hatred of any man's person; no unchaste desires, looks, words, and actions; no evil covetousness, or lust after what is another's; nor after any worldly riches and grandeur, so that the law, in both its tables, was precisely obeyed by him.

3rd, The obedience which Christ yielded to the law, has these peculiar excellencies in it.

1. It was voluntary; he freely offered himself to become man, to be made under the law, and yield obedience to it, in other words, to do the will of God; saying, "Lo, I come to do thy will, O God!" and when he was come, it was his meat and drink. He took as much delight and pleasure in doing the will and work of God, and went about it as willingly and as cheerfully, as a man does in eating and drinking.

Hebrews 10:7 Then said I, Lo, I come (in the volume of the book it is written of me,) to do thy will, O God.

John 4:34 Jesus saith unto them, My meat is to do the will of him that sent me, and to finish his work.

2. It is perfect and complete. There is no command but what Christ inviolably kept. No one, in any one instance, was broken by him. "He did no sin;" whatever was commanded, he did; and whatever was forbidden, he avoided. Hence those that are justified by his obedience and righteousness, are all fair, without spot, perfectly comely through his comeliness put upon them.

3. It excels the obedience of men and angels; not only the obedience and righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, who pretended to a strict observance of the law, but of the most truly righteous persons. "There is not a just man upon earth, that does good and sinneth not."

Ecclesiastes 7:20 For there is not a just man upon earth, that doeth good, and sinneth not.

But Christ did all that was good, without sin. The obedience and holiness of angels is chargeable with folly, in comparison of the purity and holiness of God; but the obedience and righteousness of Christ is without any blemish, weakness, or imperfection.

4. It was wrought out in the room and stead of his people. He obeyed the law, and satisfied it in all its demands, that the righteousness of it might be fulfilled in them, or for them, in him, as their head and representative.

Hence he, being the end of the law for righteousness unto them, it is unto them, and comes upon them.

5. It is the measure and matter of the justification of them that believe in him, that is, by the imputation of this obedience, or righteousness, unto them.

Romans 5:19 For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous.

I Corinthians 1:30 But of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption:

II Corinthians 5:21 For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.

6. It is an obedience well pleasing in the sight of God, because voluntary, perfect, superior excellency, performed in the room and stead of his people, and by which they are justified. God is well pleased with his Son, and with his people, considered in him; and with his righteousness and obedience imputed to them; because by it the law is magnified and made honorable. Christ always did the things which pleased his Father. His obedience, in all the parts of it, is acceptable to him; and so are his people on account of it, in whose room and stead it was performed. This is what is commonly called the active obedience of Christ, which he performed in life, agreeable to the precepts of the law.

Christ's Humiliation: His Passive Obedience in his Sufferings and Death

Another part of Christ's humiliation, lies in his sufferings and death; to which he readily submitted. He was "obedient unto death," and in it.

He cheerfully endured all sufferings for the sake of his people, it was his Father's will and pleasure he should. He "was not rebellious, neither turned away his back from the smiters, nor his face from shame and spitting." And when the time was come to suffer death, in the room and stead of his people, according to the counsel of God, and his own agreement; he was like the innocent dumb sheep. "So he opened not his mouth," said not one word against the sentence of death being executed on him.

He was not reluctant to become a sacrifice for the sins of men. But as he had "received a commandment" from his Father to lay down his life, as well as to take it up again; he readily and voluntarily obeyed that commandment; **and this is what is sometimes called his passive obedience.**

Isaiah 50:5-6 The Lord GOD hath opened mine ear, and I was not rebellious, neither turned away back. I gave my back to the smiters, and my cheeks to them that plucked off the hair: I hid not my face from shame and spitting.

Isaiah 53:7 He was oppressed, and he was afflicted, yet he opened not his mouth: he is brought as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before her shearers is dumb, so he openeth not his mouth.

John 10:18 No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This commandment have I received of my Father.

First, I shall observe what the sufferings of Christ were which he endured. They were foretold by the prophets, "who testified beforehand" of them; and the apostles said no other things than what "Moses and the prophets did say should come, that Christ should suffer," etc.

I Peter 1:11 Searching what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow.

Acts 26:22-23 Having therefore obtained help of God, I continue unto this day, witnessing both to small and great, saying none other things than those which the prophets and Moses did say should come: That Christ should suffer, and that he should be the first that should rise from the dead, and should shew light unto the people, and to the Gentiles.

This was intimated in the first revelation made of the Messiah; "Thou shalt bruise his heel."

Genesis 3:15 And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel.

The twenty second Psalm, and fifty third of Isaiah, and ninth of Daniel, are illustrious prophecies of his sufferings, and which have had their exact accomplishment in him. Christ's whole life was a life of sufferings, from the cradle to the cross. He suffered very early from Herod, who sought to destroy him; and which obliged his parents to flee with him into Egypt. He suffered much from Satan's temptations; for his temptations were sufferings. "He suffered, being tempted," and from the reproaches and persecutions of men. His life, throughout, was a life of meanness and poverty, which must be reckoned a branch of his sufferings.

But what may more eminently and particularly be called his sufferings, are those which he endured as preparatory to his death, which led on to it, and issued in it: and death itself, and what attended it.

1st. The things preparatory to his death, and which led on to it, and issued in it.

1. The conspiracy of the chief priests and elders to take away his life. This they had often meditated, and had made some fruitless attempts upon him. But a few days before his death it became a more serious affair; and they met, together in a body, in the palace of the high priest, to consult the most crafty methods to take him and kill him, whereby was fulfilled what was foretold, "the rulers take counsel together," the ecclesiastic rulers, as well as the civil ones.

Matthew 26:3-4 Then assembled together the chief priests, and the scribes, and the elders of the people, unto the palace of the high priest, who was called Caiaphas, And consulted that they might take Jesus by subtlety, and kill him.

Psalms 2:2 The kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers take counsel together, against the LORD, and against his anointed, saying,

2. The offer of Judas Iscariot to them, to betray him into their hands. A little before the Passover, Christ and his disciples supped at Bethany, when Satan put it into the heart of Judas to betray him; which Christ, being God omniscient, knew, and gave an hint of it at supper; and said to Judas, "That thou doest, do quickly," upon which, he set out for Jerusalem that night, and went to the chief priests, where they were assembled, and covenanted with them to betray his Master into their hands for thirty pieces of silver. This was one part of Christ's sufferings, to be betrayed by one of his own disciples; and which, in prophecy, is observed as such. The sum of money is foretold for which he agreed with them; and which also is observed as an instance of great disesteem of him.

Psalms 41:9 Yea, mine own familiar friend, in whom I trusted, which did eat of my bread, hath lifted up his heel against me.

Zechariah 11:12-13 And I said unto them, If ye think good, give me my price; and if not, forbear. So they weighed for my price thirty pieces of silver. And the LORD said unto me, Cast it unto the potter: a goodly price that I was priced at of them. And I took the thirty pieces of silver, and cast them to the potter in the house of the LORD.

3. After Christ had eat his last Passover with his disciples, and had instituted and celebrated the ordinance of the Supper, he went into a garden, where he used sometimes to go. Here more manifestly his sufferings began.

He saw what was coming upon him, the sins of his people he stood charged with as their surety, and the wrath of God for them. This caused him to be exceeding sorrowful, even unto death. At this his human nature shrunk; and he prayed that, if possible, the cup might pass from him. The agony he was in was so great, and the pressure on his mind to heavy, and so much affected his body, that his sweat

was, as it were, great drops of blood falling to the ground. This was a foretaste of what he was after more fully to endure.

Matthew 26:38-39 Then saith he unto them, My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death: tarry ye here, and watch with me. And he went a little further, and fell on his face, and prayed, saying, O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me: nevertheless not as I will, but as thou wilt.

Luke 22:44 And being in an agony he prayed more earnestly: and his sweat was as it were great drops of blood falling down to the ground.

4. Judas knowing the place Christ resorted to, and where he now was, came with a band of soldiers he had from the chief priests, and with a multitude of others, armed with swords and clubs, as if they came out against a thief, to take him as our Lord observed to them, when with a kiss he betrayed him to them. After he had given them proof of his almighty power, and how easily he could have made his escape from them, [he] voluntarily surrendered himself unto them; who laid hold on him, and bound him as a malefactor, and had him to Caiaphas the high priest.

5. In whose palace he endured much from men, rude and inhumane. Some "spit in his face, and buffeted him; and others smote him with the palms of their hands." One particularly struck him with the palm of his hand, as with a rod, saying, "Answerest thou the high priest so?" all which Christ took patiently, whereby the prophecies concerning him were fulfilled.

Isaiah 50:6 I gave my back to the smiters, and my cheeks to them that plucked off the hair: I hid not my face from shame and spitting.

Micah 5:1 Now gather thyself in troops, O daughter of troops: he hath laid siege against us: they shall smite the judge of Israel with a rod upon the cheek.

6. Still more he endured in the hall of Pilate the Roman governor, to whom the Jews delivered him bound. Here he was accused of sedition, and of stirring up the people against the Roman government; as he had been before in the high priest's palace of an evil design to destroy the temple; which were all forged and false; as is said in prophetic language.

Psalms 35:11 False witnesses did rise up; they laid to my charge things that I knew not.

Though he appeared to be innocent, and that to the judge himself, who would willingly have let him go; yet such were the enmity and malice of the chief priests and elders, and of the multitude of the people, that they were the more vehement and incessant in their cries, to have Barabbas, a robber, released, and Jesus crucified: which verified what David, in the person of the Messiah, said.

Psalms 69:4 They that hate me without a cause are more than the hairs of mine head: they that would destroy me, being mine enemies wrongfully, are mighty: then I restored that which I took not away.

Upon [this] he was scourged by Pilate, or by his orders; to which he willingly submitted according to,
Isaiah 50:6 I gave my back to the smiters, and my cheeks to them that plucked off the hair: I hid not my face from shame and spitting.

Then [he] was delivered to the Roman soldiers, who used him extremely ill. [They] platted a crown of thorns, and put it upon his head, which gave him pain, as well as disgrace, which is now crowned with glory and honor. [They] put a reed in his right hand, for a sceptre, whose proper sceptre is a sceptre of righteousness. And, in a mock way, [they] bowed to him, to whom every knee shall bow in the most solemn manner. Having before stripped him of his garments, [they] put on him a soldier's coat, as fit apparel for a king. Having put on his clothes again, when they had sated themselves with sport, [they] led him forth to be crucified, according to the sentence the governor had passed upon him.

At the instance of the Jews, bearing his own cross they laid upon him, as was the custom with the Romans. Plutarch says, when malefactors were brought out to be punished, everyone carried his own cross. Only Christ meeting with Simon, a Cyrenean, by the way, they obliged him to bear the cross after him; that is, one end of it, and so crucified him. Which leads on to consider,

2nd, The death itself he died. He was obedient to "the death of the cross." Hence his blood shed on it is called, "the blood of the cross," and the cross is put for the whole of his sufferings and death.

Colossians 1:20 And, having made peace through the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself; by him, I say, whether they be things in earth, or things in heaven.

Ephesians 2:16 And that he might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby:

— This was plainly foretold and pointed out in prophecy, particularly in the twenty second Psalm, described by the dislocation and starting out of his bones; by the fever upon him, which usually attended crucifixion; and especially by the piercing of his hands and feet; and was typified by the lifting up of the brazen serpent by Moses in the wilderness; and the phrase of lifting up from the earth, is used by Christ himself, to signify what death he should die.

John 3:14 And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up:

John 12:32-33 And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me. This he said, signifying what death he should die.

This kind of death was a shameful one. Hence Christ is said to endure the cross, and despise the shame; that is, the shame that attended it.

Hebrews 12:2 Looking unto Jesus the author and finisher of our faith; who for the joy that was set before him endured the cross, despising the shame, and is set down at the right hand of the throne of God.

[This] lay not so much in his being crucified naked, and so exposed, was that truly the case, as in its being the punishment of strangers, of servants, and slaves, and such like mean persons; but not of freemen and citizens of Rome. Hence it was called "servile supplicium," a servile punishment.

— It was also a painful and cruel one, as the thing itself speaks; to have the whole body stretched to the uttermost; the hands and feet, those sensible parts of it, pierced; and to have the weight of the body depending on them! It was so cruel, that the most humane among the Romans, wished to have it disused, even to servants; and the more mild and gentle of the emperors would order persons to be strangled before they were nailed to the cross.

It was reckoned an accursed death. And though Christ was not accursed of God, but was his beloved Son, while he was suffering this death; **yet it was a symbol of the curse; and he was hereby treated as if he was one accursed;** and it became a clear case hereby, that he bore the curse of the law in the room and stead of sinners. Yea, that he was made a curse for them, "for it is written, Cursed is everyone that hangeth on a tree."

Galatians 3:13 Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us: for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree:

There were several circumstances which attended the death of Christ, which made it the more ignominious and distressing; as the place where he suffered, Golgotha, so called from the skulls of malefactors executed there; and was as infamous as our Tyburn. It was as scandalous to be crucified in the one place, as to be hanged in the other.

- **Here he was crucified between two thieves,** as if he had been guilty of the same, or a like transgression, as theirs; and so fulfilled the prophecy in

Isaiah 53:12 Therefore will I divide him a portion with the great, and he shall divide the spoil with the strong; because he hath poured out his soul unto death: and he was numbered with the transgressors; and he bare the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors.

He "was numbered among the transgressors," and, instead of giving him a cup of wine with frankincense, which they used to give in kindness to a person about to be executed, to intoxicate him, that he might not be sensible of his misery, **they gave to Christ vinegar mixed with gall,** or sour wine with myrrh, and such like bitter ingredients, the more to distress him; of which he, in prophecy, complains,

Psalms 69:21 They gave me also gall for my meat; and in my thirst they gave me vinegar to drink.

Then they parted his garments, and cast lots upon his vesture; by which it seems that he was crucified naked, the more to expose him to shame and contempt; and which was predicted in

Psalms 22:18 They part my garments among them, and cast lots upon my vesture.

While he was suffering, he endured the trial of cruel mocking, from all sorts of people; not only from travelers that passed by, and from the multitude of common people, assembled on the occasion; but from the chief priests, scribes, and elders; and even from the thieves, with whom he was crucified, to all which respect is had in prophecy,

Psalms 22:7-8 All they that see me laugh me to scorn: they shoot out the lip, they shake the head, saying, He trusted on the LORD that he would deliver him: let him deliver him, seeing he delighted in him.

Psalms 22:12-13 Many bulls have compassed me: strong bulls of Bashan have beset me round. They gaped upon me with their mouths, as a ravening and a roaring lion.

Psalms 22:16 For dogs have compassed me: the assembly of the wicked have inclosed me: they pierced my hands and my feet.

And for three hours together, while he was on the cross, there was darkness over all the land, the sun, as it were, blushing and hiding its face at the heinousness of the sin now committed by the Jews, or as refusing to yield any relief and comfort to Christ, now sustaining as a surety the wrath of God, for the sins of his people; and might be an emblem of that greater darkness upon his soul, being now forsaken by his Father.

Amos 8:9 And it shall come to pass in that day, saith the Lord GOD, that I will cause the sun to go down at noon, and I will darken the earth in the clear day:

And when this was over, he quickly gave up the ghost.

Let it be observed, that Christ was "put to death in the flesh," as the apostle expresses it, that is, in the body. That only suffered death; not his soul, that died not; but was commended into the hands of his divine Father; nor his Deity, or divine nature, which was impassible, and not capable of suffering death. Yet the body of Christ suffered death, in union with his divine person. Hence the Lord of glory is said to be crucified, and God is said to purchase the church with his blood.

I Peter 3:18 For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit.

I Corinthians 2:8 Which none of the princes of this world knew: for had they known it, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory.

Acts 20:28 Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood.

The death of Christ, as the death of other men, lay in the disunion of, or in a dissolution of the union between soul and body. These two were parted for a while; the one was commended to God in heaven; the other was laid in the grave.

-
But hereby he was not reduced to a state of non-existence, as say the Socinians. His soul was with God in paradise; and his body, when taken from the cross, was laid in a sepulchre, and where it saw no corruption. The death of Christ was real not in appearance only, as some of the ancient heretics affirmed.

Nor was he taken down from the cross alive; but was really dead, as appears by the testimony of the centurion that guarded the cross, to Pilate, by the soldiers not breaking his legs, with the others crucified with him, perceiving he was dead, and by one of them piercing his side, the pericardium from whence flowed blood and water; after which, had he not been dead before, he must have died then.

And lastly, his death was voluntary for though his life was taken from the earth, seemingly in a violent manner, with respect to men, being cut off in a judicial way; yet not without his full will and consent. **He laid it down of himself,** and gave himself freely and voluntarily to be a sacrifice, through his death, for the sins of his people.

Now, besides this corporal death which Christ endured, there was a death in his soul, though not of it, which answered to a spiritual and an eternal death.

As the transgression of the first Adam, involved him and all his posterity in, and exposed them to, not only a corporal death, but to a moral or spiritual, and an eternal one; so the second Adam, as the

surety of his people, in order to make satisfaction for that transgression, and all others of theirs, must undergo death, in every sense of the threatening.

Genesis 2:17 But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.

And though a moral or spiritual death, as it lies in a loss of the image of God; in a privation of original righteousness; in impotence to that which is good, and in an inclination, bias, and servitude of the mind to that which is evil; **could not fall upon the pure and holy soul of Christ; which must have made him unfit for his mediatorial work; yet there was something similar to it**, so as to be without sin and pollution; as darkness of soul, disquietude, distress, want of spiritual joy and comfort, amazement, agony, his soul being sorrowful even unto death, pressed with the weight of the sins of his people on him, and a sense of divine wrath on account of them.

What he endured both in the garden and on the cross, especially when he was made sin and a curse, and his soul was made an offering for sin, was tantamount to an eternal death, or the sufferings of the wicked in hell; for though they differ as to circumstance of time and place; the persons being different, the one finite, the other infinite; yet, as to the essence of them, the same.

Eternal death consists in these two things, punishment of loss, and punishment of sense. The former lies in an eternal separation from God, or a deprivation of his presence for ever; "Depart from me, ye cursed." The latter is an everlasting sense of the wrath of God, expressed by "everlasting fire."

Now Christ endured what was answerable to these. For a while he suffered the loss of his Father's gracious presence, when he said, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me!" And he endured the punishment of sense, when God was wroth with him, his anointed; when his wrath was poured out like fire upon him; and his heart melted like wax within him, under it; and "the sorrows of hell" compassed him about.

Psalms 89:38 But thou hast cast off and abhorred, thou hast been wroth with thine anointed.

Psalms 22:14 I am poured out like water, and all my bones are out of joint: my heart is like wax; it is melted in the midst of my bowels.

Psalms 18:5 The sorrows of hell compassed me about: the snares of death prevented me.

Eternity is not of the essence of punishment; and only takes place when the person punished cannot bear the whole at once. Being finite, as sinful man is, cannot make satisfaction to the infinite Majesty of God, injured by sin, the demerit of which is infinite punishment: and as that cannot be borne at once by a finite creature, it is continued ad infinitum. But Christ being an infinite Person, was able to bear the whole at once; and the infinity of his Person, abundantly compensates for the eternity of the punishment.

Secondly, Let us next inquire into the cause, reason, and occasion of the sufferings and death of Christ; and how he came to undergo them.

1. With respect to God, and his concern in them. To trace this, we must go back as far as the eternal decrees and purposes of God. These are the foundation, source, and spring of them; for it was by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, that Christ was delivered into the hands of the Jews, and was taken, and by wicked hands was crucified and slain. Herod and Pontius Pilate, the Gentiles, and the people of the Jews, did no other things against him than what the hand and counsel of God determined before should be done; and therefore it was necessary they should be done.

Acts 2:23 Him, being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain:

Acts 4:27-28 For of a truth against thy holy child Jesus, whom thou hast anointed, both Herod, and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles, and the people of Israel, were gathered together, For to do whatsoever thy hand and thy counsel determined before to be done.

Hence all things were overruled by the providence of God in time, to bring about what he had decreed should be; and without it nothing could have been done. Pilate had no power over him, but what was given him from above. So great an hand had

God in the sufferings of his Son, that he is said to bruise and put him to grief; to awake the sword of justice against him; to spare him not, but deliver him up for us all, into the hands of men, to justice and to death. The moving cause of all this was, the great love he bore to his chosen ones in Christ.

John 3:16 For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.

I John 4:9-10 In this was manifested the love of God toward us, because that God sent his only begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him. Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son *to be* the propitiation for our sins.

Romans 5:8 But God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us.

2. With respect to Christ, and his will, as to his sufferings and death, we must have recourse to the council and covenant of grace and peace; in which the plan of salvation was formed upon the obedience, and sufferings, and death of Christ. These were proposed to him, and he readily assented to them; and said, "Lo, I come to do thy will, O God!" which was, to become incarnate; to obey, suffer, and die, in the room and stead of his people. What moved him thereunto was, his free and unmerited love to them; and which is so fully and strongly expressed therein.

John 15:13 Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends.

I John 3:16 Hereby perceive we the love *of God*, because he laid down his life for us: and we ought to lay down *our* lives for the brethren.

Ephesians 5:2 And walk in love, as Christ also hath loved us, and hath given himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet-smelling savor.

Ephesians 5:25 Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it;

3. With respect to Satan; the concern he had therein, in putting it into the heart of Judas, to betray his Lord and

Master; and in stirring up the chief priests and elders of the Jews to conspire to take away his life; and so strongly to move for it, and insist upon with the Roman Governor: **this arose from that old enmity that was between him and the woman's seed;** in which he betrayed great ignorance of the way of man's salvation, or else acted in great contradiction to himself, and to his own scheme.

4. With respect to men; these acted from different motives, and with different views. Judas [acted] from a spirit of covetousness, to gain a small sum of money from the Jews; they, from envy and malice to the Person of Christ, delivered him to Pilate, and moved to have him crucified; and he, against his own conscience, and the remonstrance of his wife, passed sentence of death on him, and delivered him to be crucified, to get and continue an interest in the affections of the Jews, and retain the good will and favor of his prince, the Roman emperor.

5. But the true causes and reasons why it was the pleasure of God, and the will of Christ, from their great love to men, that he should suffer for them, were their sins and transgressions; to make satisfaction for them, and save them from them. It was not for any sin of his own, for he never committed any, but for the sins of others; he was wounded for our transgressions. He was bruised for our sins; he was stricken for the transgressions of his people; he died for their sins, according to the scriptures.

Isaiah 53:5 But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed.

Isaiah 53:8 He was taken from prison and from judgment: and who shall declare his generation? for he was cut off out of the land of the living: for the transgression of my people was he stricken.

I Corinthians 15:3 For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures;

- ***Thirdly, The effects of the sufferings and death of Christ, or the things procured thereby, are many.***

1. The redemption of his people from sin, from Satan, from the curse and condemnation of the law, and from wrath to come. [This] is through his blood, his sufferings, and death. He

gave his flesh for the life of the world of his elect, and gave his life a ransom for them; and being made perfect through sufferings, became the author of salvation to them.

Ephesians 1:7 In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace;

John 6:51 I am the living bread which came down from heaven: if any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever: and the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world.

Matthew 20:28 Even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many.

Hebrews 2:10 For it became him, for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings.

Hebrews 5:9 And being made perfect, he became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him;

2. Reconciliation, which is by the death of Christ; and peace, which is made by his blood; even a complete atonement for sin. [This] is obtained through Christ's being a propitiation for it, which he is, through his blood; that is, his sufferings and death.

Romans 3:25 Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God.

Romans 5:10 For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life.

Colossians 1:20 And, having made peace through the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself; by him, I say, whether they be things in earth, or things in heaven.

3. Pardon of sin; which is a branch of redemption, through the blood of Christ, which was shed for the remission of sin; and without shedding of blood there is no remission.

Ephesians 1:7 In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace;

Matthew 26:28 For this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins.

Hebrews 9:22 And almost all things are by the law purged with blood; and without shedding of blood is no remission.

4. Justification, which is sometimes ascribed to the blood of Christ; that is, to his sufferings and death; the consequence of which is, deliverance, and security from wrath to come,

Romans 5:9 Much more then, being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him.

5. In short, the complete salvation of all God's elect. Christ came to gather together the children of God that were scattered abroad, by dying for them to seek and to save that which was lost; even to save all his people from their sins, by finishing transgression, making an end of sin, making reconciliation for iniquity, and bringing in everlasting righteousness; and by obtaining an entire conquest over all enemies, sin, Satan, and death, and hell,

John 11:51-52 And this spake he not of himself: but being high priest that year, he prophesied that Jesus should die for that nation; And not for that nation only, but that also he should gather together in one the children of God that were scattered abroad.

Matthew 1:21 And she shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call his name JESUS: for he shall save his people from their sins.

Daniel 9:24 Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the most Holy.

6. In all which the glory of God is great; the glory of his mercy, grace, and goodness; the glory of his wisdom, truth, and faithfulness; the glory of his power, and the glory of his justice and holiness.

Fourthly, The properties of Christ's death and sufferings.

1. They were real; and not imaginary, or in appearance only.

As he really became incarnate, so he really suffered and died; which was confirmed by the testimony of the centurion, and the soldiers that guarded him; by his hands, feet, and side being pierced, and the prints of these being seen after his resurrection.

2. They were voluntary; he willingly agreed in council and covenant to undergo them.

He came readily into the world, in the time appointed for that purpose; and was earnestly desirous of, and even straitened until they were accomplished. He freely surrendered himself into the hands of his enemies; and cheerfully laid down his life, and resigned his breath.

3. They were necessary. He ought to suffer; he could not be excused from suffering; because of the decrees of God; the covenant and agreement he entered into with his Father, the prophecies concerning them, and the types and figures on them. **Besides, the redemption and salvation of his people could not be procured in any other way.**

4. They were efficacious, or effectual to the purposes for which they were endured; as redemption, reconciliation, etc.

[This] efficacy they had from the dignity of his Person, as the Son of God; hence his blood cleansed from all sin. His righteousness justified from all; and it is unto all, and upon all them that believe, to the justification of them. His sacrifice is of a sweet smelling savor with God; and a full and proper atonement for the sins of men.

5. They are expiatory and satisfactory. The sufferings of saints are by way of fatherly chastisement; but they have no efficacy to expiate sin, or make atonement for it. But Christ's sufferings, through the infiniteness of his Person, are a complete atonement for all the sins of his people. By his sacrifice and death he has put away sin for ever, and perfected for ever them that are sanctified.

Christ's Burial

The last degree of Christ's humiliation, and which it ended in, is his burial.

I Corinthians 15:4 And that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the scriptures:

First, Christ was to be buried, according scripture prophecies; which are the following.

1. Psalms 16:10 For thou wilt not leave my soul in hell; neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption.

The whole Psalm is concerning Christ, and this verse particularly is applied to him, and strongly argued to belong to him, and not to David, by two apostles, Peter and Paul.

Acts 2:25-31 For David speaketh concerning him, I foresaw the Lord always before my face, for he is on my right hand, that I should not be moved: Therefore did my heart rejoice, and my tongue was glad; moreover also my flesh shall rest in hope: Because thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption. Thou hast made known to me the ways of life; thou shalt make me full of joy with thy countenance. Men *and* brethren, let me freely speak unto you of the patriarch David, that he is both dead and buried, and his sepulchre is with us unto this day. Therefore being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne; He seeing this before spake of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in hell, neither his flesh did see corruption.

Acts 13:34-37 And as concerning that he raised him up from the dead, *now* no more to return to corruption, he said on this wise, I will give you the sure mercies of David. Wherefore he saith also in another *psalm*, Thou shalt not suffer thine Holy One to see corruption. For David, after he had served his own generation by the will of God, fell on sleep, and was laid unto his fathers, and saw corruption: But he, whom God raised again, saw no corruption.

Indeed, they produce it in proof of Christ's resurrection; but it is, at the same time, a proof of his burial in the grave, from whence he was raised. Some understand it, of his "descent into

hell," as it is expressed in some creeds, that of the Apostles, the Nicene, and the Athanasian creeds, though foisted into them in later times.

The papists interpret [this] of the local descent of the soul of Christ into hell, as it signifies the place of the damned, at least into an apartment of it, they call *limbus patrum*, whither they say he went, to complete his sufferings; to preach the gospel to the Old Testament saints; to fetch their souls from thence, and to triumph over Satan.

But it is certain, that the soul of Christ, upon its separation from his body, went not to hell, but to heaven, being committed by him into the hands of his Father. Nor needed he to go thither to complete his sufferings, which ended on the cross, when he said, "It is finished." Nor [did he go there] to preach the gospel, which belongs to the present life, and not to the state of the dead; and which had been preached to the Old Testament saints in their lifetime. Nor [did he go there] to fetch their souls from thence, which were in heaven; as not only Enoch and Elijah, both in soul and body; but the souls of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; and all the rest of the saints. Nor [did he go] to triumph over the devil and his angels, that he did when on the cross.

Colossians 2:15 And having spoiled principalities and powers, he made a shew of them openly, triumphing over them in it.

And by soul is meant the dead body of Christ; as the word nephesh sometimes signifies.

Now this prophecy manifestly implies that Christ's dead body should be laid in the grave, though it should not be left there; and though it should not lie there so long as to be corrupted, or that any worm or maggot should have power over him, as the Jews express it.

2. Another passage is in

Psalms 22:15 My strength is dried up like a potsherd; and my tongue cleaveth to my jaws; and thou hast brought me into the dust of death.

3. Some take the words in Isaiah 11:10 to be a prophecy of Christ's burial; "And his rest shall be glorious."

-

Isaiah 11:10 And in that day there shall be a root of Jesse, which shall stand for an ensign of the people; to it shall the Gentiles seek: and his rest shall be glorious.

That the passage belongs to the Messiah, is clear from Isaiah 11:1-2, and following; and from the quotation and application of it to the times of Christ.

Isaiah 11:1-2 And there shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a Branch shall grow out of his roots: And the spirit of the LORD shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the LORD.

Romans 15:12 And again, Esaias saith, There shall be a root of Jesse, and he that shall rise to reign over the Gentiles; in him shall the Gentiles trust.

Psalms 16:9 Therefore my heart is glad, and my glory rejoiceth: my flesh also shall rest in hope.

And though his being buried was an instance of his humiliation, and a proof of the low estate into which he was brought; yet it was, in some sense, glorious, inasmuch as he was honorably interred in the grave of a rich man; as the next prophecy suggests.

4. In the passage in Isaiah 53:9 "and he made his grave with the wicked, and with the rich in his death," in which words there is some difficulty.

Isaiah 53:9 And he made his grave with the wicked, and with the rich in his death; because he had done no violence, neither was any deceit in his mouth.

Could they be transposed thus, "he made his grave with the rich, and he was with the wicked in his death," facts would exactly answer to it; for he died between two thieves, and so was with the wicked in his death; and he was buried in the sepulchre of Joseph of Arimathea, a rich man, and so had his grave with the rich. But it might be using too much freedom with the text to transpose it at pleasure.

The general sense of the words may be this, that after his death both rich men and wicked men were concerned in his burial, and were about his grave. Joseph and Nicodemus, two

rich men, in taking down from the cross his body, and laying it in the tomb, enwrapped by them in linen with spices. And wicked soldiers were employed in guarding the sepulchre.

2nd , There was a scripture type of his burial, and which our Lord himself takes notice of; "for as Jonah was three days and three nights in the whale's belly, so shall the son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth."

Matthew 12:40 For as Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale's belly; so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth.

-
That is, as Jonah was as it were buried so long in the belly of the whale, so Christ should lie a like time under the earth, called "the heart of it," as elsewhere "the lower parts" of it, into which Christ "descended," that is, the grave.

Ephesians 4:9 (Now that he ascended, what is it but that he also descended first into the lower parts of the earth?)

Secondly, As Christ should be buried according to prophecy and type, so in fact he was buried, as all the evangelists relate.

Matthew 27:59-60 And when Joseph had taken the body, he wrapped it in a clean linen cloth, And laid it in his own new tomb, which he had hewn out in the rock: and he rolled a great stone to the door of the sepulchre, and departed.

Mark 15:46-47 And he bought fine linen, and took him down, and wrapped him in the linen, and laid him in a sepulchre which was hewn out of a rock, and rolled a stone unto the door of the sepulchre. And Mary Magdalene and Mary the mother of Joses beheld where he was laid.

Luke 23:53 And he took it down, and wrapped it in linen, and laid it in a sepulchre that was hewn in stone, wherein never man before was laid.

Luke 23:55 And the women also, which came with him from Galilee, followed after, and beheld the sepulchre, and how his body was laid.

-

John 19:39-42 And there came also Nicodemus, which at the first came to Jesus by night, and brought a mixture of myrrh and aloes, about an hundred pound weight. Then took they the body of Jesus, and wound it in linen clothes with the spices, as the manner of the Jews is to bury. Now in the place where he was crucified there was a garden; and in the garden a new sepulchre, wherein was never man yet laid. There laid they Jesus therefore because of the Jews' preparation day; for the sepulchre was nigh at hand.

Though with different circumstances, yet not contradictory; what is omitted by one is supplied by another; and from the whole we learn,

1. That the body being begged of Pilate by Joseph of Arimathea, a rich man, it was taken down from the cross, and was wrapped or wound about in fine clean linen, as was the manner of the Jews.

John 11:44 And he that was dead came forth, bound hand and foot with graveclothes: and his face was bound about with a napkin. Jesus saith unto them, Loose him, and let him go.

When he was bound hand and foot like a prisoner; and which may denote the dominion death had over him; for when the apostle says, "death hath no more dominion over him," it supposes that it once had; as it had when he was bound with grave clothes and was laid in the grave, until he was loosed from the pains or cords of death, and declared to be the Son of God with power by his resurrection from the dead.

Romans 6:9 Knowing that Christ being raised from the dead dieth no more; death hath no more dominion over him.

The fine clean linen, in which he was wrapped, may be an emblem of his innocence, purity, and holiness; who notwithstanding all appearances and charges, was holy, harmless, and as a lamb without spot and blemish; and likewise of his pure and spotless righteousness, now wrought out, and brought in by his active and passive obedience completely finished, called fine linen, clean and white, which is the righteousness of the saints.

Revelation 19:8 And to her was granted that she should be arrayed in fine linen, clean and white: for the fine linen is the righteousness of saints.

[In this] his dead members, his people, who are in themselves dead in law, and dead in sin, being enwrapped, or having his righteousness imputed to them, it is unto justification to life.

2. Nicodemus, another rich man, brought a mixture of myrrh and aloes, about an hundred pound weight; which spices, along with the linen clothes, were wound about the body of Christ; which **may denote the savouriness and acceptableness of the righteousness of Christ to God,** and to sensible sinners; all whose garments smell of myrrh, aloes, and cassia.

Psalms 45:8 All thy garments smell of myrrh, and aloes, and cassia, out of the ivory palaces, whereby they have made thee glad.

Songs 4:11 Thy lips, O my spouse, drop as the honeycomb: honey and milk are under thy tongue; and the smell of thy garments is like the smell of Lebanon.

Also the savouriness of Christ's death and sacrifice, how agreeable to God, being satisfactory to his justice, and so a sweet smelling savor to him.

Ephesians 5:2 And walk in love, as Christ also hath loved us, and hath given himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweetsmelling savor.

And the savor of a crucified Christ diffused through the preaching of the gospel, which is like a box of ointment poured forth, and emits such a sweet savor as attracts the love and affections of souls unto him; and whereby the ministers of it become a sweet savor to God and men.

II Corinthians 2:14-15 Now thanks *be* unto God, which always causeth us to triumph in Christ, and maketh manifest the savor of his knowledge by us in every place. For we are unto God a sweet savor of Christ, in them that are saved, and in them that perish:

Song of Solomon 1:3 Because of the savor of thy good ointments thy name *is as* ointment poured forth, therefore do the virgins love thee.

3. The body being thus enwrapped was laid in Joseph's own tomb, a new one, in which no man had been laid; and this was cut out of a rock. As Jacob, the patriarch and type of Christ, was honorably buried by his son Joseph, so Christ, the antitype of him, and who is sometimes called Israel, was honorably buried by another Joseph, and he a rich man, which fulfilled the prophecy.

Isaiah 53:9 And he made his grave with the wicked, and with the rich in his death; because he had done no violence, neither was any deceit in his mouth.

Christ was laid, not in his own, but in another's tomb; which, as it is expressive of his meanness and low estate, who in his lifetime had not where to lay down his head to sleep in, and at his death had no tomb of his own to lay his dead body in; so it denotes, that what he did and suffered, and was done to him, were not for himself but for others.

He died not for his own sins, but for the sins of others; and he was buried, not so much for his own sake, but for others, that they and their sins might be buried with him. So he rose again for their justification. It was a new tomb in which Christ was laid, who wherever he comes makes all things new. He made the grave for his people quite a new and another thing to what it was; as, when he is formed, and lies, and dwells in the hearts of men, old things pass away, and all become new.

Moreover this tomb was "hewn out in the rock," as was sometimes the manner of rich men to do, to prepare such sepulchres while living for the greater security of their bodies when dead.

Isaiah 22:16 What hast thou here? and whom hast thou here, that thou hast hewed thee out a sepulchre here, as he that heweth him out a sepulchre on high, and that graveth an habitation for himself in a rock?

This prevented any such objection to be made to the resurrection of Christ, that the apostles through some subterraneous passages got to the body of Christ and took it away. To all this may be added, that at the door of this new tomb hewn out of a rock a great stone was rolled, and this stone sealed by the Jews themselves; so that no pretense could be made for a fraud or imposture in this affair.

4. The tomb in which Christ's body was laid was "in a garden." Nor was it unusual for great personages to have their sepulchres in a garden, and there to be buried. Manasseh and Amon his son, kings of Judah, were buried in a garden.

II Kings 21:18 And Manasseh slept with his fathers, and was buried in the garden of his own house, in the garden of Uzza: and Amon his son reigned in his stead.

II Kings 21:26 And he was buried in his sepulchre in the garden of Uzza: and Josiah his son reigned in his stead.

Christ's sufferings began in a garden, and the last act of his humiliation was in one. This may put us in mind of the garden of Eden, into which the first Adam was put, and out of which he was cast for his sin.

And [it] may lead us to observe, that as sin was first committed in a garden, whereby Adam and his posterity came short of the glory of God, **so sin was finished in a garden;** there it was buried, there the last act of Christ's humiliation for it was performed. Hereby way was made for our entrance into the garden of God, the heavenly paradise above.

A garden is a place where fruit trees grow, and fruit is in plenty; and may direct us to think of the fruits of Christ's death, burial, and resurrection; who compares himself to a grain of wheat, which unless it falls into the ground and die, it abides alone; but if it dies, it brings forth much fruit, such as redemption, reconciliation, pardon of sin, etc.

John 12:24 Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone: but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit.

As also that as Christ's removal from the cross was to a garden, so the removal of saints at death will be from the cross of afflictions and tribulations, to the garden of Eden, the paradise of God, where there are pleasures for evermore.

5. The persons concerned in the burial of Christ, and attended his grave, were many and of various kinds, and on different accounts. The persons principally concerned in the interment of him were Joseph of Arimathea and Nicodemus, both rich men. Though before they did not openly profess Christ, yet now being wonderfully animated, influenced, and strengthened by the power and grace of God, boldly appear in his cause, and are not ashamed to own him, and act on his behalf, though crucified and slain, and lay under so much ignominy and contempt.

And this was so ordered by the wise providence of God, that it might appear, that though Christ was loaded with the reproaches of the multitude of the people of all sorts, yet he had some friends among the rich and honorable, who had courage enough to espouse his cause; and such faith in him, and love to him, as publicly to do the kind offices they did to him, in his greatest debasement and lowest state of humiliation.

There were some women also who attended his cross, and followed him to his grave; and continued sitting over against the sepulchre. They saw where he was and how his body was laid there, and went and prepared spices to anoint it. They came early on the first day of the week; but were prevented doing it by his resurrection from the dead.

Here the power and grace of God were seen in spiring and strengthening the weaker vessels to act for Christ, and show their respect to him, when all his disciples forsook him and fled. This conduct of the women was a rebuke of theirs.

Besides these, there were the Roman soldiers, who were placed as a guard about the sepulchre; and which, not only gave proof of the truth of his death, and of the reality of his burial; but also of his resurrection; though they were tampered with to be an evidence against it.

Thirdly, The ends, uses, and effects of Christ's burial, require some notice.

1. To fulfil the prophecies and type before mentioned.

2. To show the truth and reality of his death.

3. That it might appear, that by his death and sacrifice, he had made full satisfaction for sin, and a complete atonement for it; that as by his hanging on the tree, it was manifest that he bore the curse, and was made a curse for his people; so by his body being taken down from the cross, and laid in the grave, it was a token that the curse was at an end, and entirely abolished, agreeable to the law.

4. To sanctify the grave, and make that easy and familiar to saints, and take off the dread and reproach of it: Christ pursued death, the last enemy, to his last quarters and strong hold, the grave; drove him out from thence, and snatched the victory out of

the hand of the grave; so that believers may, with pleasure, go and see the place where their "Lord lay," which is now sanctified, and become a sleeping and resting place for them until the resurrection morn; and may say and sing, in the view of death and the grave; "O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?" For,

5. In Christ's burial, all the sins of his people are buried with him; as the "old man was crucified with him; that the body of sin might be destroyed."

Romans 6:6 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.

So being dead, that, and its deeds, are buried with him. These may be signified by the grave clothes with which he was bound, and from which being loosed, he left them in the grave; signifying that the sins of his people, with which he was held, but now freed from, having atoned for them, would never rise up against them; being left in his grave, and cast into the depths of the sea, and, by the Lord, behind his back, so as never to be seen and remembered more.

This is emblematically represented in the ordinance of baptism, designed to exhibit to view the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ, and of believers in him.

Romans 6:4-6 Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection: 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.

Colossians 2:12 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.

6. This is an instance of the great humiliation of Christ; not only to be brought to death, but to the dust of death. The man, when laid in the grave, is a vile body, mean, abject, and contemptible; it is sown in dishonor and weakness. So was the body of Christ; he descended into, and lay in the lower parts of the earth,

where death and the grave had dominion, and triumphed over him for a while. So did the enemies of Christ, as the enemies of the two witnesses will, over their dead bodies, saying, as in prophetic language, "And now that he lieth," that is, in the grave, "he shall rise up no more."

Psalms 41:8 An evil disease, say they, cleaveth fast unto him: and *now* that he lieth he shall rise up no more.

But they were mistaken; though he died once, he will die no more; death shall have no more dominion over him. Though while he was in the grave it had dominion over him; but now he is loosed from the cords and pains of death, and lives for evermore, having the keys of hell and death. He is quickened and justified in the Spirit; and is risen again for the justification of his people: which is the next thing to be considered.

Christ - Part 4 - Christ's Exaltation

PART FOUR CHRIST'S EXALTATION

Christ's Resurrection

Having gone through Christ's state of humiliation, I pass on to his state of exaltation.

Philippians 2:6-10 Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God: But made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men: And being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. Wherefore God also hath highly *exalted* him, and given him a name which is above every name: That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth;

Acts 2:33 Therefore being by the right hand of God *exalted*, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath shed forth this, which ye now see and hear.

Acts 5:31 Him hath God *exalted* with his right hand to be a Prince and a Savior, for to give repentance to Israel, and forgiveness of sins.

The several steps and instances of his exaltation are, [1] his resurrection from the dead, [2] ascension to heaven, [3] session at the right hand of God, and his [4] second coming to judge the world at the last day.

I shall begin with the first of these, for the first step of Christ's exaltation is, his resurrection from the dead.

I Peter 1:21 Who by him do believe in God, that raised him up from the dead, and gave him glory; that your faith and hope might be in God.

This is one of the principal articles of the Christian faith; a very important one, and on which the truth of the whole gospel depends.

I Corinthians 15:4 And that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the scriptures:

I Corinthians 15:14 And if Christ be not risen, then *is* our preaching vain, and your faith *is* also vain.

First, I shall consider the prophecies and types of Christ's resurrection from the dead, and how they have been fulfilled.

1st. Scripture prophecies; and the apostle Paul takes notice of several of them in one discourse of his.

Acts 13:33-35 God hath fulfilled the same unto us their children, in that he hath raised up Jesus again; as it is also written in the second psalm, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee. And as concerning that he raised him up from the dead, now no more to return to corruption, he said on this wise, I will give you the sure mercies of David.

Wherefore he saith also in another psalm, Thou shalt not suffer thine Holy One to see corruption.

1. A passage in Psalms 2:7, which was not said to David; nor could it be said to any other man, since it never was said to any of the angels

Psalms 2:7 I will declare the decree: the LORD hath said unto me, Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee.

Hebrews 1:5 For unto which of the angels said he at any time, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee? And again, I will be to him a Father, and he shall be to me a Son?

[This is not] so to be understood of Christ, as if his resurrection was the cause of his being, or of his being called the Son of God. **But the sense is, that by his resurrection**

from the dead, he would be declared, as he was, to be the Son of God with power; and the truth of his divine Sonship confirmed thereby; and so this prophecy fulfilled.

John 19:7 The Jews answered him, We have a law, and by our law he ought to die, because he made himself the Son of God.

Romans 1:4 And declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead:

2. Another prophecy of Christ's resurrection is in Psalms 16:10, which is produced both by the apostle Peter, and by the apostle Paul, as foretelling the resurrection of Christ.

Psalms 16:10 For thou wilt not leave my soul in hell; neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption.

Acts 2:31 He seeing this before spake of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in hell, neither his flesh did see corruption.

Acts 13:35-37 Wherefore he saith also in another psalm, Thou shalt not suffer thine Holy One to see corruption. For David, after he had served his own generation by the will of God, fell on sleep, and was laid unto his fathers, and saw corruption: But he, whom God raised again, saw no corruption.

His dead body would be laid in a grave, and lie buried there for a time, so that it would not be left there, not so long as to be corrupted, but would be raised from thence.

3. Another scripture quoted by the apostle Paul, as referring to the resurrection of Christ, and as a proof of it is in Isaiah 55:3.

Acts 13:34 And as concerning that he raised him up from the dead, now no more to return to corruption, he said on this wise, I will give you the sure mercies of David.

Isaiah 55:3 Incline your ear, and come unto me: hear, and your soul shall live; and I will make an everlasting covenant with you, even the sure mercies of David.

By David is meant Christ, as he often is in prophecy.

Jeremiah 30:9 But they shall serve the LORD their God, and David their king, whom I will raise up unto them.

Ezekiel 34:23 And I will set up one shepherd over them, and he shall feed them, even my servant David; he shall feed them, and he shall be their shepherd.

Ezekiel 34:24 And I the LORD will be their God, and my servant David a prince among them; I the LORD have spoken it.

Ezekiel 37:24-25 And David my servant shall be king over them; and they all shall have one shepherd: they shall also walk in my judgments, and observe my statutes, and do them. And they shall dwell in the land that I have given unto Jacob my servant, wherein your fathers have dwelt; and they shall dwell therein, even they, and their children, and their children's children for ever: and my servant David shall be their prince for ever.

Hosea 3:5 Afterward shall the children of Israel return, and seek the LORD their God, and David their king; and shall fear the LORD and his goodness in the latter days.

By his mercies, the blessings of the covenant of grace, which are with him; so called, because they flow from the grace and mercy of God; and which being put into his hands, are sure to all the elect through him; and particularly through his resurrection from the dead; **for had he died, and not rose again from the dead, the blessings of the covenant would not have been ratified and confirmed.**

4. There is another passage, foretelling the resurrection of Christ.

Isaiah 26:19 Thy dead men shall live, together with my dead body shall they arise. Awake and sing, ye that dwell in dust: for thy dew is as the dew of herbs, and the earth shall cast out the dead.

Matthew 27:52-53 And the graves were opened; and many bodies of the saints which slept arose, And came out of the graves after his resurrection, and went into the holy city, and appeared unto many.

If the words are to be rendered, "As my dead body," or, "as sure as my dead body shall they arise," either way they predict the resurrection of Christ, of Christ's dead body; which is both the exemplar, earnest, and pledge of the resurrection of the saints. Once more.

5. Another prophecy of the resurrection of Christ, and of its being on the third day, is, as is generally understood.

Hosea 6:2 After two days will he revive us: in the third day he will raise us up, and we shall live in his sight.

[These] words are thought to be spoken of the Messiah, whose coming is prophesied of in the following verse; and though they are expressed in the plural number, this may be no objection to the application of them to Christ, and his resurrection; since **he rose again, not as a single Person, but as a public Head, representing all his people, who are therefore said to be raised up together with him.**

Ephesians 2:6 And hath raised us up together, and made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus:

Colossians 3:1 If ye then be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God.

2nd, Scripture types; some of which are,

1. Types of the thing itself in general; [1] as the first Adam's awaking out of a deep sleep, when the woman was presented to him, formed of one of his ribs. [2] the deliverance of Isaac, when his father received him in a figure as from the dead; [3] the bush Moses saw burning with fire, and not consumed; [4] the budding and blossoming of Aaron's dry rod; [5] the living bird let fly, after it had been dipped in the blood of the slain bird, used in the purification of the leper; [6] and the scapegoat, let go into the wilderness, when the other taken with it was slain.

2. Others are types of the time of it in particular; as well as of the thing itself; [1] as the rescue of Isaac from the jaws of death, on the third day, from the time Abraham had the order to sacrifice him, and from which time he was looked upon by him as a dead man; to which others add [2] the preferment of Joseph in Pharaoh's court, on the third year from his being cast into prison by Potiphar; putting a year for a day, as sometimes a day is for a year; but the principal type of all, respecting this matter, is that of [3] the deliverance of Jonah from the whale's belly when he had been three days in it, at least part of three natural days, and which our Lord himself makes mention of as such.

Matthew 12:40 For as Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale's belly; so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth.

Secondly, As it was foretold that Christ should rise from it, and that on the third day; accordingly he did; of which there were many witnesses and full evidence. As,

1. The testimony of angels. Matthew speaks of but one angel, that descended and rolled away the stone from the sepulchre. But Luke makes mention of two men in shining garments, that is, angels, who appeared in such a form. And John calls them angels, and represents them as sitting, the one at the head and the other at the feet, where the body of Jesus had lain. [These angels] told the women that came to the sepulchre, that Christ was not there, but risen. And so as angels were the first that brought the tidings of Christ's incarnation and birth to the shepherds, they were the first that made the report of his resurrection to the women.

Matthew 28:2 And, behold, there was a great earthquake: for the angel of the Lord descended from heaven, and came and rolled back the stone from the door, and sat upon it.

Matthew 28:5-6 And the angel answered and said unto the women, Fear not ye: for I know that ye seek Jesus, which was crucified. He is not here: for he is risen, as he said. Come, see the place where the Lord lay.

Luke 24:5-6 And as they were afraid, and bowed down their faces to the earth, they said unto them, Why seek ye the living among the dead? He is not here, but is risen: remember how he spake unto you when he was yet in Galilee,

John 20:12 And seeth two angels in white sitting, the one at the head, and the other at the feet, where the body of Jesus had lain.

2. [These women] were good and sufficient witnesses of what they saw and heard. They were present when the body of Christ was laid in the sepulchre; they saw where it was laid, and how it was laid; they went home to prepare spices, and when the Sabbath was over, came with them to the sepulchre, to anoint the body with them.

[There], to their great surprise, they saw the stone was rolled away from it; they entered into it, and found the body was gone. They saw the angels, who assured them that Christ was risen; and as they were returning to the disciples with the news, Christ himself met them, whom they knew and worshiped, and held by the feet. They had all the evidence of his being risen they could well have, and of his being risen in a real body; which was not only visible to them, but palpable by them.

Mark 16:4 And when they looked, they saw that the stone was rolled away: for it was very great.

Luke 24:2-3 And they found the stone rolled away from the sepulchre. and they entered in, and found not the body of Jesus.

Matthew 28:9 And as they went to tell his disciples, behold, Jesus met them, saying, All hail. And they came and held him by the feet, and worshiped him.

3. Even the soldiers that guarded the sepulchre were witnesses of Christ's resurrection. They saw the angel roll away the stone. They were terrified with the sight, and with the earthquake they felt. They left their station, and went to the chief priests, and reported what was done, that Christ was risen from the dead.

[This] appears by the method the priests took to stifle the matter, by bribing them with money, to contradict what they had said, and give out that the disciples came by night, and took the body away, while they slept. [This] is so far from invalidating their first report, that it serves but to corroborate it, that they spoke the truth at first, but a lie at last; since, **if asleep, how could they know and attest the coming of the disciples to the grave, and taking the body from thence?**

Matthew 28:4 And for fear of him the keepers did shake, and became as dead men.

Matthew 28:11-15 Now when they were going, behold, some of the watch came into the city, and shewed unto the chief priests all the things that were done. And when they were assembled with the elders, and had taken counsel, they gave large money unto the soldiers, Saying, Say ye, His disciples came by night, and stole him away while we

slept. And if this come to the governor's ears, we will persuade him, and secure you. So they took the money, and did as they were taught: and this saying is commonly reported among the Jews until this day.

After this, Christ was seen of many men, even of many hundreds. First he was seen of Cephas, or Peter; then of the twelve disciples; after that of above five hundred brethren at once; next of James, then again of all the apostles; and, last of all, he was seen of the apostle Paul, both at his conversion, and afterwards in the temple.

I Corinthians 15:5-8 And that he was seen of Cephas, then of the twelve: After that, he was seen of above five hundred brethren at once; of whom the greater part remain unto this present, but some are fallen asleep. After that, he was seen of James; then of all the apostles. And last of all he was seen of me also, as of one born out of due time.

Acts 26:16,19 But rise, and stand upon thy feet: for I have appeared unto thee for this purpose, to make thee a minister and a witness both of these things which thou hast seen, and of those things in the which I will appear unto thee..... Whereupon, O king Agrippa, I was not disobedient unto the heavenly vision:

Now the apostles were witnesses chosen before of God for this purpose, and are to be credited; for— **(1) They were such who knew Christ full well**, who had been some years his disciples and followers, had attended his ministry, had seen his miracles, and had been his constant companions in his lifetime; and after he was risen from the dead, had eaten and drank with him; and had not only a glance or two of him; but he was seen by them at certain times for the space of forty days; and showed himself alive to them by infallible proofs.

Acts 1:3 To whom also he shewed himself alive after his passion by many infallible proofs, being seen of them forty days, and speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God:

Acts 10:41 Not to all the people, but unto witnesses chosen before of God, even to us, who did eat and drink with him after he rose from the dead.

(2.) They were men not over credulous, nay, slow of heart to believe, as our Lord upbraids them. And even with respect to this matter; though the women that had been at the sepulchre gave such a plain account of things, with such striking circumstances; yet “their words seemed to them as idle tales, and they believed them not.”

Nay, when Christ had appeared to all the disciples but one; and they were fully convinced of the truth and reality of his resurrection, and reported this to Thomas, who was not with them; yet so incredulous was he, and would not receive their united report, that he declared he would not believe that Christ was risen, unless he saw the print of the nails in his hands, and put his finger into it, and thrust his hand into his side, all which he was indulged with by Christ and then, and not before, declared his faith in it. Now had they been a credulous sort of men, easy of belief, ready to receive anything that was told, their testimony might have been objected to; but they were all the reverse.

Luke 24:11 And their words seemed to them as idle tales, and they believed them not.

John 20:25 The other disciples therefore said unto him, We have seen the Lord. But he said unto them, Except I shall see in his hands the print of the nails, and put my finger into the print of the nails, and thrust my hand into his side, I will not believe.

John 20:27 Then saith he to Thomas, Reach hither thy finger, and behold my hands; and reach hither thy hand, and thrust *it* into my side: and be not faithless, but believing.

(3.) The disciples were men of holy lives and conversation, of strict probity, honesty, and integrity; never charged with any vice or immorality. It may be said of them what the apostle Paul says of himself, that “in simplicity and godly sincerity they had their conversation in the world.” And the testimony of such persons merits regard in any affair.

(4.) They could have no sinister end, or any worldly advantage in view, in contriving and telling such a story; they could expect no other but to be mocked and hated, reproached and persecuted, by all sorts of men, by Jews and Gentiles; as in fact they were.

Acts 4:1-3 And as they spake unto the people, the priests, and the captain of the temple, and the Sadducees, came upon them, Being grieved that they taught the people, and preached through Jesus the resurrection from the dead. And they laid hands on them, and put them in hold unto the next day: for it was now eventide.

Acts 17:18 Then certain philosophers of the Epicureans, and of the Stoicks, encountered him. And some said, What will this babbler say? other some, He seemeth to be a setter forth of strange gods: because he preached unto them Jesus, and the resurrection.

Nay, not only they risked their credit and reputation, but life itself; and exposed themselves to the severest sufferings, and most cruel death.

I Corinthians 15:30 And why stand we in jeopardy every hour?

I Corinthians 15:32 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.

(5.) The resurrection of Christ is not only confirmed by the above witnesses, but the Holy Ghost himself is a witness of it, by the miracles which were wrought under his influence, in confirmation of it; the apostles, with great power, that is, with miracles, signs, and wonders, and mighty deeds, “gave witness of the resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ.”

Acts 5:30-32 The God of our fathers raised up Jesus, whom ye slew and hanged on a tree. Him hath God exalted with his right hand to be a Prince and a Savior, for to give

repentance to Israel, and forgiveness of sins. And we are his witnesses of these things; and so is also the Holy Ghost, whom God hath given to them that obey him.

(6.) It is as certain, and of it there is full evidence, that Christ rose again from the dead on the third day, according to scripture prophecies and types. It was on the first day of the week Christ rose from the dead. All the evangelists agree that it was on that day the women came to the sepulchre with their spices, and found things as they were; which showed that Christ was risen, which laid the foundation for the observation of that day to be kept by Christians in a religious manner.

Matthew 28:1 In the end of the Sabbath, as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week, came Mary Magdalene and the other Mary to see the sepulchre.

Mark 16:1-2 And when the Sabbath was past, Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James, and Salome, had bought sweet spices, that they might come and anoint him. And very early in the morning the first day of the week, they came unto the sepulchre at the rising of the sun.

Luke 24:1 Now upon the first day of the week, very early in the morning, they came unto the sepulchre, bringing the spices which they had prepared, and certain others with them.

John 20:1 The first day of the week cometh Mary Magdalene early, when it was yet dark, unto the sepulchre, and seeth the stone taken away from the sepulchre.

Acts 20:7 And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them, ready to depart on the morrow; and continued his speech until midnight.

I Corinthians 16:1-2 Now concerning the collection for the saints, as I have given order to the churches of Galatia, even so do ye. Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come.

And it was early in the morning on that day, about the break of it, towards sunrising; a fit time, very suitable to the Sun of righteousness, who arises on his people with healing in his wings; and this day was the third day from his death.

Matthew 12:40 For as Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale's belly; so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth.

Thirdly, The manner of Christ's rising from the dead comes next to be considered.

1. It was in his body; not in his divine nature; which, as it was not capable of suffering and dying, so not the subject of the resurrection; nor his human soul; for that died not with the body; but went to heaven, to paradise, on its separation from

it; but in his body: as he was put to death in the flesh, so he was raised from the dead in it.

It was the body only that died, and that only was raised again. When Christ said, “Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up,” the evangelist observes, that “he spoke of the temple of his body.”

John 2:19 Jesus answered and said unto them, Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up.

John 2:21 But he spake of the temple of his body.

2. It was the same body that was raised that died, and was laid in the grave. It was a real body, consisting of flesh, blood, and bones, and was not only to be seen, but to be handled. It was the same identical body, as appears from the print of the nails in his hands, and the mark in his side made by the spear.

Luke 24:39-40 Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself: handle me, and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have. And when he had thus spoken, he shewed them his hands and his feet.

John 20:25 The other disciples therefore said unto him, We have seen the Lord. But he said unto them, Except I shall see in his hands the print of the nails, and put my finger into the print of the nails, and thrust my hand into his side, I will not believe.

John 20:27 Then saith he to Thomas, Reach hither thy finger, and behold my hands; and reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into my side: and be not faithless, but believing.

3. It was raised immortal, clear of all former infirmities, as weariness, hunger, thirst, etc. it was, before, mortal, as the event showed. Christ was crucified through weakness: but was raised powerful, immortal, and incorruptible, never to die more. Nor shall death have any more dominion over him. He lives for evermore, and has the keys of hell and death, the government of the grave, and can open it at his pleasure, and let out the inhabitants of it free.

Romans 6:9 Knowing that Christ being raised from the dead dieth no more; death hath no more dominion over him.

Revelation 1:18 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.

4. It was raised very glorious; of which his transfiguration upon the mountain, before his decease, was an emblem and pledge. He might not appear in so much glory immediately after his resurrection, and during his stay with his disciples, before his ascension, they not being able to bear the luster of his countenance, it really had. Yet now, being crowned with glory and honor, his body is a glorious one, according to which the bodies of the saints will be fashioned, at the resurrection of the just.

Philippians 3:21 Who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself.

5. Yet it has the same essential parts and properties of a body it ever had. Not only being flesh and blood, which a spirit has not, but circumscribed by space; not everywhere, but limited to some certain place; it is received up into heaven, and there it is retained, and will be retained, until the restitution of all things.

6. And lastly, The resurrection of Christ was attended with wonderful events; as with an earthquake, which made it grand and solemn, and alarmed the watch to be attentive to it, and be witnesses of it. [It] was expressive of the mighty power of God, by which it was performed; and it was followed with a resurrection of many of the saints, showing the efficacy of it; and as a pledge, earnest, and confirmation of the future resurrection of all the righteous at the last day.

Matthew 28:2 And, behold, there was a great earthquake: for the angel of the Lord descended from heaven, and came and rolled back the stone from the door, and sat upon it.

Matthew 27:52-53 And the graves were opened; and many bodies of the saints which slept arose, And came out of the graves after his resurrection, and went into the holy city, and appeared unto many.

Fourthly, The causes of the resurrection of Christ from the dead deserve notice.

Ephesians 1:19 And what *is* the exceeding greatness of his power to us-ward who believe, according to the working of his mighty power,

Acts 2:24 Whom God hath raised up, having loosed the pains of death: because it was not possible that he should be holden of it.

Acts 2:32 This Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we all are witnesses.

Acts 3:13 The God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob, the God of our fathers, hath glorified his Son Jesus; whom ye delivered up, and denied him in the presence of Pilate, when he was determined to let him go.

Acts 3:15 And killed the Prince of life, whom God hath raised from the dead; whereof we are witnesses.

Acts 4:10 Be it known unto you all, and to all the people of Israel, that by the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, whom ye crucified, whom God raised from the dead, even by him doth this man stand here before you whole.

Acts 5:30 The God of our fathers raised up Jesus, whom ye slew and hanged on a tree.

Being a work *ad extra*, all the three divine persons were concerned in it. **It is sometimes ascribed to God the Father**, which words are said to the Son by God the Father, who raised him from the dead.

Ephesians 1:17-20 That the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory, may give unto you the spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of him: The eyes of your understanding being enlightened; that ye may know what is the hope of his calling, and what the riches of the glory of his inheritance in the saints, And what *is* the exceeding greatness of his power to us-ward who believe, according to the working of his mighty power, Which he wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places,

Acts 13:30 But God raised him from the dead:

Acts 13:33 God hath fulfilled the same unto us their children, in that he hath raised up Jesus again; as it is also written in the second psalm, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee.

I Peter 1:3 Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which according to his abundant mercy hath begotten us again unto a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead,

At other times it is ascribed to the Son himself. He declared beforehand, that when the temple of his body was destroyed, he would raise it up again; and that, as he had power to lay down his life, he had power to take it up again, which he did; and was thereby declared to be the Son of God with power.

John 2:19,21 Jesus answered and said unto them, Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up.....But he spake of the temple of his body.

John 10:18 No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This commandment have I received of my Father.

Romans 1:4 And declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead:

The Spirit, the third Person, had also a concern in it; for the declaration of Christ's Sonship with power was "according to the Spirit of holiness," or the Holy Spirit, "by the resurrection from the dead," that is, by raising Christ from the dead.

And as God, by his Spirit, will raise the members of Christ at the last day, so by the same Spirit, he raised Christ, their, Head, on whose resurrection theirs depends.

I Peter 3:18 For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit:

Romans 8:11 But if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you.

Fifthly, The effects of Christ's resurrection from the dead, or the ends which were to be, and have been, or will be, answered by it.

1st. With respect to God, the chief end of all, was his glory; for "Christ was raised from the dead by," some read it, to "the glory of the Father."

- Romans 6:4 Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life.

Philippians 2:11 And that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ *is* Lord, to the glory of God the Father.

[This is] to the glory of his perfections; as particularly, his truth and faithfulness, in fulfilling types, promises, and prophecies concerning this matter; for what the apostles and ministers of the New Testament say of it, is no other than what Moses and the prophets did say should come to pass; namely, "that Christ should suffer, and that he should be the first that should rise from the dead."

And since God spoke of it by them, the veracity of God required it should be done, and that is glorified by it. Also the power of God; to raise one from the dead, is the work of almighty power.

Acts 26:22-23 Having therefore obtained help of God, I continue unto this day, witnessing both to small and great, saying none other things than those which the prophets and Moses did say should come: That Christ should suffer, and that he should be the first that should rise from the dead, and should shew light unto the people, and to the Gentiles.

I Corinthians 6:14 And God hath both raised up the Lord, and will also raise up us by his own power.

- Ephesians 1:19-20 And what *is* the exceeding greatness of his power to us-ward who believe, according to the working of his mighty power, Which he wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places,

Moreover, the justice of God is glorified in it; when Christ had done his work as a Surety, it was but just and equitable that he should be discharged, be loosed from the cords of death, and be detained no longer a prisoner in the grave; and that he should be

honorably and legally acquitted; as he was when a messenger was dispatched from heaven to roll away the stone of the sepulchre, and set him free.

Being thus raised from the dead, he was justified in the Spirit; and hereby the justice of God was glorified, as also his wisdom, grace, and goodness; which appeared in forming the scheme of salvation, and in the kind designs of God to his people; all which would have been defeated, if Christ had not been raised from the dead.

2nd. With respect to Christ.

1. Hereby is given further proof of his proper Deity, and divine Sonship. By this it appears, that he is the Lord God Almighty, who could and did raise himself from the dead!

This declares him to be the Son of God with power. [It] shows that he is the Lord of all, both of the dead and of the living; that he has the keys of hell and death, and can and will unlock the graves of his people, and set them free, as he has himself.

Romans 1:4 And declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead:

Romans 14:9 For to this end Christ both died, and rose, and revived, that he might be Lord both of the dead and living.

Revelation 1:18 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.

2. By this it is a clear case, that Christ has done his work as the Surety of his people; that he has paid all their debts, finished transgression, made an end of sin, made reconciliation for iniquity, and brought in everlasting righteousness; that he has fulfilled the law, satisfied justice, and obtained eternal redemption, having given a sufficient price for it; and, in short, has done everything he agreed to do, to the full satisfaction of his divine Father.

Therefore he is raised from the dead, received into glory, and set down at the right hand of God, having answered all his suretyship engagements.

3. This shows that he has got the victory over death and the grave; that he has not only destroyed him that had the power of death, the devil, but has abolished death itself, the last enemy, and has brought life and immortality to light; that he has done what he resolved to do.

II Timothy 1:10 But is now made manifest by the appearing of our Savior Jesus Christ, who hath abolished death, and hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel:

Hosea 13:14 I will ransom them from the power of the grave; I will redeem them from death: O death, I will be thy plagues; O grave, I will be thy destruction: repentance shall be hid from mine eyes.

I Corinthians 15:55 O death, where *is* thy sting? O grave, where *is* thy victory?

4. It was necessary that Christ should rise from the dead, in order to enter into the glory promised him, and he prayed for. The prophets not only spoke of the sufferings of Christ, but of the glory that should follow; which could not be enjoyed by him, unless after he had suffered death, he was raised again. Wherefore God raised him from the dead, and gave him the promised glory,

I Peter 1:11 Searching what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow.

I Peter 1:21 Who by him do believe in God, that raised him up from the dead, and gave him glory; that your faith and hope might be in God.

3rd. With respect to his people; the power of Christ's resurrection is great; the effects of it are many.

Philippians 3:10 That I may know him, and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his sufferings, being made conformable unto his death;

1. The blessings of the covenant of grace in general are enjoyed by the saints in virtue of it. Though reconciliation, and other blessings of grace, are by the death of Christ; yet the application and enjoyment of them are through his interceding life, in consequence of his resurrection from the dead; to which life the whole of salvation is ascribed.

Romans 5:10 For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life.

Hebrews 7:25 Wherefore he is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them.

2. Justification, in particular, is observed as one special end and effect of Christ's resurrection. "He was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification." And the triumph of faith, in the view of that blessing of grace, is rather, and more principally founded on Christ's resurrection, than on his sufferings and death.

Romans 4:25 Who was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification.

Romans 8:33-34 Who shall lay any thing to the charge of Gods elect? It is God that justifieth. Who *is* he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us.

3. The resurrection of the saints at the last day is the fruit and effect of Christ's resurrection, and which is ensured by it. Christ's glorious body is the exemplar, according to which the bodies of the saints will then be formed. His resurrection is the earnest and pledge of theirs. He is "the firstfruits of them that slept," that is, of the dead. The firstfruits are the sample, and what ensure a following harvest. So the resurrection of Christ is the sample, and gives assurance of the resurrection of the saints in time to come. So that Christ's resurrection being certain, the resurrection of the saints is also.

I Corinthians 15:20 But now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the firstfruits of them that slept.

I Corinthians 15:23 But every man in his own order: Christ the firstfruits; afterward they that are Christ's at his coming.

I Thessalonians 4:14 For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him.

Christ's Ascension to Heaven

The ascension of Christ to heaven was, at his death, burial, and resurrection, according to the scriptures.

John 6:62 What and if ye shall see the Son of man ascend up where he was before?

John 16:28 I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world: again, I leave the world, and go to the Father.

John 20:17 Jesus saith unto her, Touch me not; for I am not yet ascended to my Father: but go to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father, and your Father; and to my God, and your God.

It was pre-signified both by scripture prophecies, and by scripture types.

First, by scripture prophecies; of which there are many; some more obscurely, others more clearly point unto it. As,

1st. Psalms 47:5 God is gone up with a shout, the LORD with the sound of a trumpet.

The whole Psalm is applied, by some Jewish writers, to the times of the Messiah, and this verse particularly, who is the great King over all the earth, and more manifestly appeared so at his ascension, when he was made and declared Lord and Christ; and **who subdued the Gentile world, through the ministration of his gospel; by which, after his ascension, he went into it, conquering and to conquer; and caused his ministers to triumph in it.**

Psalms 47:2 For the LORD most high is terrible; he is a great King over all the earth.

Psalms 47:7 For God is the King of all the earth: sing ye praises with understanding.

Psalms 47:3 He shall subdue the people under us, and the nations under our feet.

And though it was in his human nature that he went up from earth to heaven; yet it was in that, as in union with his divine Person; so that it may be truly said, that God went up to heaven. In like sense as God is said to purchase the church with his blood; even God in our nature; God manifest in the flesh; Immanuel, God with us.

And though the circumstance of his ascension, being attended with a shout, and with the sound of a trumpet, is not mentioned in the New Testament, in the account of it; yet there is no doubt to be made of it, since the angels present at it, told the disciples on the spot, that this same Jesus should so come, in like manner as they saw him go into heaven.

Now it is certain, that Christ will descend from heaven with the voice of an archangel, and with the trump of God. Also, since he was attended in his ascension with the angels of God, and with some men who rose after his resurrection; **there is scarce any question to be made of it, that he ascended amidst their shouts and acclamations;** and the rather, since he went up as a triumphant conqueror, over all his and our enemies, leading captivity captive.

2nd. The words of the Psalmist.

Psalms 110:1 The LORD said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool.

Though they do not express, yet they plainly imply, the ascension of Christ to heaven; for unless he ascended to heaven, how could he sit down at the right hand of God there? Hence the apostle Peter thus argues and reasons upon them.

Acts 2:34-35 For David is not ascended into the heavens: but he saith himself, The LORD said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, Until I make thy foes thy footstool.

3rd. The vision Daniel had of the Son of man, is thought by some to have respect to the ascension of Christ to heaven.

Daniel 7:13-14 I saw in the night visions, and, behold, one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him. And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him: his dominion *is* an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed.

He is undoubtedly meant by “one like unto the Son of man,” that is, really and truly man; as he is said to be “in the likeness of men,” and to be “found in fashion as a man.”

The same “came in the clouds of heaven.” So a cloud received Christ, and conveyed him to heaven, at his ascension; and he was “brought near to the Ancient of days,” to God, who is from everlasting to everlasting; and was received with a welcome by him; and there were given him “dominion, glory, and a kingdom,” as Christ, at his ascension, was made, or made manifest, openly declared Lord and Christ, Head and King of his church.

Though this vision will have a farther accomplishment at the second coming of Christ, when his glorious kingdom will commence in the personal reign; who will deliver up the kingdom until that reign is ended. Once more,

4th. What most clearly foretold the ascension of Christ to heaven, is in Psalms 68:18.

Psalms 68:18 Thou hast ascended on high, thou hast led captivity captive: thou hast received gifts for men; yea, for the rebellious also, that the LORD God might dwell among them.

[This] is, by the apostle Paul, quoted and applied to the ascension of Christ, and all the parts of it agree with him.

Ephesians 4:8-10 Wherefore he saith, When he ascended up on high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men. (Now that he ascended, what is it but that he also descended first into the lower parts of the earth? He that descended is the same also that ascended up far above all heavens, that he might fill all things.)

And of him it may be truly said, that he “ascended on high,” far above all heavens, the visible heavens, the airy and starry heavens, and into the third heaven, the more glorious seat of the divine Majesty. He has led “captivity captive,” either such as had been prisoners in the grave, but freed by him, and who went with him to heaven; or the enemies of his people, who have led them captive, as Satan and his principalities.

The allusion is to leading captives in triumph for victories obtained. **Christ received, upon his ascension, “gifts for men,”** and, as the apostle expresses it, *gave* them to men. He received them in order to give them; and he gave them, in consequence of receiving them. He received them for, and gave them to, rebellious men, as all by nature are “foolish and disobedient,” and even those be to whom he gives gifts fitting for public usefulness.

Secondly, The ascension of Christ was presignified by scripture types; personal ones, as those of Enoch and Elijah. The one in the times of the patriarchs, before the flood, and before the law; the other in the times of the prophets, after the flood, and after the law was given. Enoch, a man that walked with God, and had communion with him, “was not.” He was not on earth, after he had been some time on it. “God took him” from thence up to heaven, soul and body. Genesis 5:24 And Enoch walked with God: and he *was* not; for God took him.

Elijah went up to heaven in a whirlwind, in a chariot, and horses of fire. [He] was carried up by angels, who appeared in such a form, when he and Elisha had been conversing together.

II Kings 2:11 And it came to pass, as they still went on, and talked, that, behold, there appeared a chariot of fire, and horses of fire, and parted them both asunder; and Elijah went up by a whirlwind into heaven.

So Christ was carried up to heaven, received by a cloud, attended by angels, while he was blessing his disciples.

More especially, the high priest was a type of Christ in this respect, when he entered into the holiest of all once a year, with blood and incense; which were figures of Christ's entering into heaven with his blood, and to make intercession for men.

Hebrews 9:23-24 It was therefore necessary that the patterns of things in the heavens should be purified with these; but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these. For 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:

The ark in which the two tables were, was a type of Christ, who is the fulfilling end of the law for righteousness; and the bringing up of the ark from the place where it was to mount Zion, which some think was the occasion of penning the twenty fourth Psalm, in which are these words, "Be ye lift up, ye everlasting doors, and the King of Glory shall come in." and of the forty seventh Psalm, where are the above words, "God is gone up with a shout," etc. the bringing up of which ark to Zion, may be considered as an emblem of Christ's ascension to heaven, sometimes signified by mount Zion.

Now as it was foretold by prophecies and types, that Christ should ascend to heaven, so it is matter of fact, that he has ascended thither; concerning which may be observed,

First, The evidence of it; as the angels of God, who were witnesses of it; for as Christ went up to heaven in the sight of his apostles, "two men stood by them in white apparel" [These] were angels, that appeared in an human form, and thus arrayed, to denote their innocence and purity. Other angels attended him in his ascent, when it was that he was seen "of angels," who were eyewitnesses of his ascension.

Acts 1:10 And while they looked steadfastly toward heaven as he went up, behold, two men stood by them in white apparel.

I Timothy 3:16 And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory.

The eleven apostles were together, and others with them, when this great event was. And while he was pronouncing a blessing on them, he was parted from them, and carried up to heaven. They beheld him, and looked steadfastly towards heaven, as he went up, until a cloud received him out of their sight.

Luke 24:33 And they rose up the same hour, and returned to Jerusalem, and found the eleven gathered together, and them that were with them,

Luke 24:50-51 And he led them out as far as to Bethany, and he lifted up his hands, and blessed them. And it came to pass, while he blessed them, he was parted from them, and carried up into heaven.

Acts 1:9-10 And when he had spoken these things, while they beheld, he was taken up; and a cloud received him out of their sight. And while they looked steadfastly toward heaven as he went up, behold, two men stood by them in white apparel.

Yea, after this, when he had ascended to heaven, and had entered into it, and was set down on the right hand of God, he was seen by Stephen the proto-martyr, and by the apostle Paul.

While Stephen was suffering, looking steadfastly to heaven, he saw the glory of God, and Jesus standing at the right hand of God. At the same time [he] declared it to the Jews, that he saw the heavens opened, and the Son of man standing on the right hand of God.

Acts 7:55-56 But he, being full of the Holy Ghost, looked up steadfastly into heaven, and saw the glory of God, and Jesus standing on the right hand of God, And said, Behold, I see the heavens opened, and the Son of man standing on the right hand of God.

Christ appeared to the apostle Paul at his conversion, when he was caught up into the third heaven, and heard and saw things not to be uttered. Afterwards, when in a trance in the temple, he says, "I saw him."

Acts 26:16 But rise, and stand upon thy feet: for I have appeared unto thee for this purpose, to make thee a minister and a witness both of these things which thou hast seen, and of those things in the which I will appear unto thee.

Acts 22:18 And saw him saying unto me, Make haste, and get thee quickly out of Jerusalem: for they will not receive thy testimony concerning me.

I Corinthians 15:8 And last of all he was seen of me also, as of one born out of due time.

Acts 2:33 Therefore being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath shed forth this, which ye now see and hear.

Moreover, the extraordinary effusion of the Spirit, on the day of Pentecost, is a proof of Christ's ascension to heaven, for before this time, the Spirit was not given in an extraordinary manner; "Because Jesus was not yet glorified." But when he was glorified, and having ascended to heaven, and being at the right hand of God, then the Spirit was given; and the gift of him was a proof of his ascension and glorification.

John 7:39 (But this spake he 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.)

Secondly, The time of Christ's ascension, which was forty days from his resurrection; which time he continued on earth that his disciples might have full proof, and be at a

certainty of the truth of his resurrection; “to whom he showed himself alive after his passion, by many infallible proofs, being seen of them forty days,” not that he was with them all that forty days, but at several times in that interval.

[1] On the first day he appeared to many, and on that day week again to his disciples; [2] at another time at the sea of Tiberias; [3] and again on a mountain in Galilee. Now by these various interviews the apostles had opportunities of making strict and close observation, of looking wisely at him, of handling him, of conversing with him, of eating and drinking with him, of reasoning upon things in their own minds, and of having their doubts resolved, if they entertained any; and had upon the whole infallible proofs of the truth of his resurrection.

In this space of time also he renewed their commission and enlarged it, and sent them into the whole world to preach and baptize, and further to instruct those that were taught and baptized by them. Now it was he opened the understandings of his apostles, that they might more clearly understand the scriptures concerning himself, which he explained unto them, that so they might be the more fitted for their ministerial work.

Thirdly, The place from whence, and the place whither Christ ascended, may next be considered.

1. The earth on which he was when he became incarnate, the world into which he came to save men, out of which he went when he had done his work.

John 16:28 I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world: again, I leave the world, and go to the Father.

The particular spot of ground from whence he ascended was mount Olivet, a place he frequented much in the latter part of his life. It was in a garden at the bottom of the mount where his sufferings began, where his soul was exceeding sorrowful, even unto death; and where he put up that prayer, “Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me.” **[It was] where he was in such an agony, that his sweat was as drops of blood falling to the ground; and from this very spot he ascended to his God and Father,** to enjoy his presence, and all the pleasures of it, and partake of the glory promised him.

Acts 1:12 Then returned they unto Jerusalem from the mount called Olivet, which is from Jerusalem a Sabbath day’s journey.

Luke 21:37 And in the day time he was teaching in the temple; and at night he went out, and abode in the mount that is called *the mount* of Olives.

Luke 22:39,44 And he came out, and went, as he was wont, to the mount of Olives; and his disciples also followed him.....And being in an agony he prayed more earnestly: and his sweat was as it were great drops of blood falling down to the ground.

One of the evangelists tells us, that he led his disciples as far as Bethany, and there blessed them, and was parted from them. [This] must not be understood of the town of Bethany, but of a part of mount Olivet near to Bethany, and which bore that name, and which signifies the house of affliction, from whence Christ went to heaven. As it was necessary he should suffer the things he did, and enter into his glory, so his people must through many tribulations enter the kingdom.

Luke 24:50-51 And he led them out as far as to Bethany, and he lifted up his hands, and blessed them.....And it came to pass, while he blessed them, he was parted from them, and carried up into heaven.

Luke 21:26 Men's hearts failing them for fear, and for looking after those things which are coming on the earth: for the powers of heaven shall be shaken.

Acts 14:22 Confirming the souls of the disciples, and exhorting them to continue in the faith, and that we must through much tribulation enter into the kingdom of God.

2. The place whither he ascended, heaven, even the third heaven; hence Christ is often said to be carried up into heaven, taken up into heaven, towards which the disciples were gazing as he went up; passed into heaven, and was received into heaven, where he remains.

He is gone to his Father there, and has taken his place at his right hand; who, though everywhere, being omnipresent, yet heaven is more especially the place where he displays his glory.

John 16:10 Of righteousness, because I go to my Father, and ye see me no more;

John 16:16-17 A little while, and ye shall not see me: and again, a little while, and ye shall see me, because I go to the Father. Then said some of his disciples among themselves, What is this that he saith unto us, A little while, and ye shall not see me: and again, a little while, and ye shall see me: and, Because I go to the Father?

John 16:28 I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world: again, I leave the world, and go to the Father.

John 20:17 Jesus saith unto her, Touch me not; for I am not yet ascended to my Father: but go to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father, and your Father; and to my God, and your God.

Fourthly, The manner of Christ's ascension, or in what sense he might be said to ascend; not figuratively, as God is sometimes said to go down and to go up.

Genesis 11:6,17 And the LORD said, Behold, the people is one, and they have all one language; and this they begin to do: and now nothing will be restrained from them,

which they have imagined to do. Go to, let us go down, and there confound their language, that they may not understand one another's speech.

Genesis 17:22 And he left off talking with him, and God went up from Abraham.

[This] must be understood consistent with the omnipresence of God; [1] not of any motion from place to place, but of some exertion of his power, or display of himself; [2] nor in *appearance* only, as it might seem to beholders, but in reality and truth; [3] nor was it a *disappearance* of him merely.

Luke 24:31 And their eyes were opened, and they knew him; and he vanished out of their sight.

He was seen going up, and was gazed at till a cloud received him out of sight; [4] nor was it in a *visionary* way, as the apostle Paul was caught up into the third heaven, not knowing whether in the body or out of the body; [5] nor in a *spiritual* manner, in mind and affections, in which sense saints ascend to heaven, when in spiritual frames of soul; but “really, visibly”, and “locally.”

This ascension of Christ was a real motion of his human nature, which was visible to the apostles, and was by change of place, even from earth to heaven; and was sudden, swift, and glorious, in a triumphant manner. He went up as he will come again, in a cloud, in a bright cloud, a symbol of his divine majesty, either literally taken.

So certain it is, the angels are the twenty thousand chariots of God among whom Christ was, and inclosed, as in a bright cloud when he ascended on high, which serves to set forth the grandeur and majesty in which Christ ascended.

Psalms 68:17-18 The chariots of God are twenty thousand, *even* thousands of angels: the Lord *is* among them, as in Sinai, in the holy place. Thou hast ascended on high, thou hast led captivity captive: thou hast received gifts for men; yea, for the rebellious also, that the LORD God might dwell among them.

Fifthly, The cause or causes of Christ's ascension. It was a work of almighty power to cause a body to move upwards with such swiftness, and to such a distance. It is ascribed to the right hand of God, that is, of God the Father; to the power of God, by which he is said to be lifted up and exalted.

Acts 2:33 Therefore being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath shed forth this, which ye now see and hear.

Acts 5:31 Him hath God exalted with his right hand to be a Prince and a Savior, for to give repentance to Israel, and forgiveness of sins.

Therefore it is sometimes passively expressed, that he was “carried up, taken up,” and “received up” into heaven; **and sometimes actively, as done by himself,** by his own

power. So it is said, “he went up.” He lifted up his own body through the union of it to his divine person, and carried it up to heaven. So “God went up with a shout.”

Acts 1:10 And while they looked steadfastly toward heaven as he went up, behold, two men stood by them in white apparel.

Often he speaks of it as his own act. “What if the son of man ascend,” etc. “I ascend to my God,” etc.

Therefore having done the work he engaged to do, it was but fit and just that he should be, not only raised from the dead, but ascend to heaven, and be received there. Hence it is said, “by his own blood,” through the virtue of it, and in consequence of what he had done by it, “he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us.”

Hebrews 9:12 Neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us.

Sixthly, The effects of Christ's Ascension, or the ends to be answered, and which have been answered, are,

1. To fulfil the prophecies and types concerning it, and particularly that of the high priest's entering into the holiest of all once a year, to officiate for the people. So Christ has entered into heaven itself, figured by the most holy place, there to make, and where he ever lives to make, intercession for the saints.

2. To take upon him more openly the exercise of his kingly office; to this purpose is the parable of the nobleman.

Luke 19:12 He said therefore, A certain nobleman went into a far country to receive for himself a kingdom, and to return.

By the nobleman is meant Christ himself. By the “far country” he went into, heaven, even the third heaven, which is far above the visible ones. His end in going there, was “to receive a kingdom for himself,” to take possession of it, and exercise kingly power; to be made and declared Lord and Christ, as he was upon his ascension.

Acts 2:36 Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ.

3. To receive gifts for men, both extraordinary and ordinary. This end has been answered; he has received them, and he has given them, [1] extraordinary gifts he received for, and bestowed upon the apostles on the day of Pentecost; and [2] ordinary ones, which he has given since, and still continues to give, to fit men for the work of the ministry, and for the good of his churches and interest in all succeeding ages.

Ephesians 4:8-13 Wherefore he saith, When he ascended up on high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men. (Now that he ascended, what is it but that he also descended first into the lower parts of the earth? He that descended is the same also that ascended up far above all heavens, that he might fill all things.) And he gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; For the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ: Till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ:

4. To open the way into heaven for his people, and to prepare a place for them there. He has by his blood entered into heaven himself, and made the way into the holiest of all manifest; and given boldness and liberty to his people through it to enter thither also, even by a new and living way, consecrated through the vail of his flesh.

Hebrews 9:8 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:

Hebrews 9:12 Neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us.

Hebrews 10:19-20 Having therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, By a new and living way, which he hath consecrated for us, through the veil, that is to say, his flesh.

He is the forerunner for them entered, and is gone beforehand to prepare by his presence and intercession mansions of glory for them in his Father's house.

Hebrews 6:20 Whither the forerunner is for us entered, even Jesus, made an high priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec.

John 14:2-3 In my Father's house are many mansions: if it were not *so*, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again, and receive you unto myself; that where I am, there ye may be also.

5. To assure the saints of their ascension also. It is to his God and their God, to his Father and their Father, that he is ascended. Therefore they shall ascend also, and be where he is, and be glorified together with him. All this is to draw up their minds to heaven, to seek things above, where Jesus is; and to set their affections, not on things on earth, but on things in heaven; and to have their conversation there; and to expect and believe that they shall be with Christ for evermore.

Christ's Session at the Right Hand of God

This follows upon the Resurrection and Ascension of Christ to heaven. It is in this order things stand according to the scriptures. Christ was first raised from the dead;

then he went to heaven, and was received up into it; and then sat down at the right hand of God.

Ephesians 1:20 Which he wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places.

I Peter 3:22 Who is gone into heaven, and is on the right hand of God; angels and authorities and powers being made subject unto him.

Mark 16:19 So then after the Lord had spoken unto them, he was received up into heaven, and sat on the right hand of God.

I shall treat this article much in the same manner as the former.

First, Show that it was foretold in prophecy that Christ should sit at the right hand of God. Hence it may be thought, that in prophetic language, and by anticipation, he is called “the man of God’s right hand.”

Psalms 80:17 Let thy hand be upon the man of thy right hand, upon the son of man whom thou madest strong for thyself.

[This is] not only because beloved of God, and dear to him as a man’s right hand is to him; so Jacob called his youngest son Benjamin, the son of the right hand, because of his great affection to him; nor because Christ would be held and sustained by the right hand of God in the discharge of his mediatorial office, but because when he had done his work on earth, he should be received to heaven, and placed at the right hand of God.

Isaiah 42:1 Behold my servant, whom I uphold; mine elect, in whom my soul delighteth; I have put my spirit upon him: he shall bring forth judgment to the Gentiles.

Psalms 110:1 The LORD said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool.

Hebrews 1:13 But to which of the angels said he at any time, Sit on my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool?

Angels, authorities, and powers, are subject to him who sits at the right hand of God,

I Peter 3:22 Who is gone into heaven, and is on the right hand of God; angels and authorities and powers being made subject unto him.

Matthew 22:42-45 Saying, What think ye of Christ? whose son is he? They say unto him, The Son of David. He saith unto them, How then doth David in spirit call him Lord, saying, The LORD said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footstool? If David then call him Lord, how is he his son?

Christ puts a question to which they could give no answer, but were nonplused and confounded.

Christ himself also foretold, that he should sit down at the right hand of God.

Matthew 26:64 Jesus saith unto him, Thou hast said: nevertheless I say unto you, Hereafter shall ye see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven.

Secondly, It is fact; Christ is set down at the right hand of God, and the above prophecies are fulfilled; the evidences of this fact are,

1. The effusion of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost, after Christ had ascended and took his place at the right hand of God. The Spirit was not given until he was glorified in heaven, by his session there at God's right hand; upon which, "having received of the Father, the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath shed forth this which ye now see and hear," says the apostle.

Acts 2:33 Therefore being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath shed forth this, which ye now see and hear.

Acts 5:31-32 Him hath God exalted with his right hand to be a Prince and a Savior, for to give repentance to Israel, and forgiveness of sins. And we are his witnesses of these things; and *so is* also the Holy Ghost, whom God hath given to them that obey him.

2. Stephen, the proto-martyr, while he was suffering, was an eyewitness of this. He saw Christ at the right hand of God; and declared to the Jews that stoned him, that he did see him; only with this difference, in all other places Christ is spoken of as sitting; but Stephen saw him standing, at the right hand of God; having risen up, as it were, from his seat, to show his resentment at the usage of his servant. But this circumstance makes no difference, nor creates any objection to the thing itself, which is, Christ's being exalted in human nature, at the right hand of God.

Acts 7:55-56 But he, being full of the Holy Ghost, looked up steadfastly into heaven, and saw the glory of God, and Jesus standing on the right hand of God, And said, Behold, I see the heavens opened, and the Son of man standing on the right hand of God.

Thirdly, I shall next endeavor to explain this article, and show what is meant by it; what by the right hand of God; and what by sitting at it; how long Christ will sit there; and what the use and benefits of his session there are to his people.

1st, What is meant by the right hand of God, at which Christ is said to sit. This is variously expressed; sometimes by the right hand of the throne of God; sometimes by

the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens; and elsewhere, by the right hand of the Majesty on high.

Hebrews 12:2 Looking unto Jesus the author and finisher of our faith; who for the joy that was set before him endured the cross, despising the shame, and is set down at the right hand of the throne of God.

Hebrews 8:1 Now of the things which we have spoken this is the sum: We have such an high priest, who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens;

Hebrews 1:3 Who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high;

By Majesty as it is in some of these places, is meant God himself; as is clear from others, to whom majesty, grandeur, and glory belong; with whom is terrible majesty. It is not only before him, but he is clothed with it. By his throne, heaven is sometimes meant, where he more especially displays his majesty and glory; and may be put for him that sits upon it.

And he, and that, are said to be on high, in the heavens, in heavenly places. Though God is everywhere, yet, as now observed, his majesty and glory are most conspicuous in heaven. Here the human nature of Christ is; who in it, is at God's right hand, being in a certain place, where he is, and will continue till his second coming, and from whence he is expected. And the right hand of God is not to be taken in a literal sense, but figuratively, and signifies the power of God, and the exertion of that.

Psalms 89:13 Thou hast a mighty arm: strong is thy hand, and high is thy right hand.

Psalms 118:16 The right hand of the LORD is exalted: the right hand of the LORD doeth valiantly.

[It] is such a glorious perfection of God, that it is sometimes put for God himself; and even when this article of Christ's session at his right hand is expressed

Matthew 26:64 Jesus saith unto him, Thou hast said: nevertheless I say unto you, Hereafter shall ye see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven.

2nd, What is meant by Christ's sitting at God's right hand.

1. It is expressive of great honor and dignity. The allusion is to kings and great personages, who, to their favorites, and to whom they would do an honor, when they come into their presence, place them at their right hand. So Bathsheba, the mother of Solomon, when she came with a petition to him, he caused her to sit on a seat on his right hand, in allusion to which, the queen, the church, is said to stand on the right hand of Christ.

I Kings 2:19 Bathsheba therefore went unto king Solomon, to speak unto him for Adonijah. And the king rose up to meet her, and bowed himself unto her, and sat down on his throne, and caused a seat to be set for the king's mother; and she sat on his right hand.

Psalms 45:9 Kings' daughters were among thy honorable women: upon thy right hand did stand the queen in gold of Ophir.

Matthew 20:21 And he said unto her, What wilt thou? She saith unto him, Grant that these my two sons may sit, the one on thy right hand, and the other on the left, in thy kingdom.

This supposes such a person, next in honor and dignity to the king; as Christ, under this consideration, is to the Majesty on high, on whose right hand he sits. [It] is not to be understood with respect to his divine nature, abstractly considered, or as a divine Person; for as such he is Jehovah's fellow, who thought it not robbery to be equal with God.

Nor [is it to be understood] with respect to his human nature merely, and of any communication of the divine perfections to it; for though the fulness of the Godhead dwells bodily in him, yet this is not communicated to, or transfused into his human nature, as to make that omnipotent, omniscient, and omnipresent, or equal to God, or give it a right to sit on his right hand.

But this is to be understood of him as Mediator, with respect to both natures; who, in that office capacity, is inferior to his Father, and his Father greater than he; since the power in heaven and in earth he has, is given to him by him, and received from him. He is made subject to him, that put all things under him, by placing him at his right hand; where he is next unto him, in his office as Mediator.

2. It is expressive of his government and dominion over all. This phrase of sitting at the right hand of God is explained by reigning or ruling; for it follows, in the original text, as explanative of it; "Rule thou in the midst of thine enemies."

Psalms 110:2 The LORD shall send the rod of thy strength out of Zion: rule thou in the midst of thine enemies.

I Corinthians 15:25 For he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet.

Now this government and dominion is not to be understood of what is natural to Christ, and common to him, with the other two divine Persons. The kingdom of nature and providence equally belongs to him, as to his divine Father, of whom he says, "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work," jointly with him, having the same power, operation, and influence in all things.

John 5:17 But Jesus answered them, My Father worketh hitherto, and I work.

Psalms 22:28 For the kingdom *is* the LORD'S: and he is the governor among the nations.

[But it is to be understood] of his mediatorial kingdom and government; which dominion, glory, and kingdom, were given to him, and received from the Ancient of days; a delegated kingdom, for the administration of which he is accountable to his Father, and will deliver it up to him, when completed; in respect of which he may be said to sit at the right hand of God, and to be next unto him in power and authority.

Daniel 7:14 And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed.

Luke 19:12 He said therefore, A certain nobleman went into a far country to receive for himself a kingdom, and to return.

I Corinthians 15:28 And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all.

Yet [he is] superior to all created beings, of the highest form, and of the greatest name, which are all subject to him.

Ephesians 1:20-21 Which he wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places, Far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come:

Philippians 2:9-10 Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name: That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth;

I Peter 3:22 Who is gone into heaven, and is on the right hand of God; angels and authorities and powers being made subject unto him.

3. Sitting at the right hand of God, supposes Christ has done his work, and that to satisfaction, and with acceptance, as the work of redemption, which was given him, and he undertook, and came to work out, and has finished; upon which he “entered in once into the holy place,” that is, into heaven, and the work of making atonement for sin, reconciliation for iniquity, and full satisfaction for it. [This] was cut out in council and covenant for him, and he agreed to do; and having done it, [he] “sat down on the right hand of God.”

Hebrews 9:12 Neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us.

Hebrews 1:3 Who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high;

Hebrews 10:12 But this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down on the right hand of God;

And also the work of bringing in an everlasting righteousness, for the justification of his people. This he engaged to do, and for this end came into the world, and is become the end of the law for righteousness, to everyone that believes. And being raised from the dead for our justification, and gone to heaven, “is at the right hand of God,” which the apostle observes for the strengthening of his own faith, and the faith of others, with respect to their full acquittance, and complete justification before God.

Romans 4:25 Who was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification.

Romans 8:33-34 Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth. Who *is* he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us.

All which, and more, he has done with acceptance. God is well pleased with his righteousness, because the law is by it magnified, and made honorable. His sacrifice is of a sweet smelling savor to God. And all being done he agreed to do, to entire satisfaction, he was received up into heaven with a welcome; and, as a token of it, placed at God's right hand.

4. Sitting at God's right hand, supposes ease and rest from labor. Christ, upon his resurrection, and ascension to heaven, came into the presence of God; in whose presence is fulness of joy, and at whose right hand are pleasures for evermore. When he was made glad with the light of his countenance; and when having entered into his rest, he ceased from his own works, as God did from his at creation.

Psalms 16:11 Thou wilt shew me the path of life: in thy presence *is* fulness of joy; at thy right hand there are pleasures for evermore.

Hebrews 4:10 For he that is entered into his rest, he also hath ceased from his own works, as God did from his.

Not that Christ ceased to act for his people in heaven, when set down at the right hand of God. He passed into the heavens for them, for their service and good. He entered as the forerunner for them, and appears in the presence of God for them. And, as their high priest, transacts all affairs for them, and ever lives to make intercession for them.

But he ceases now from his toilsome and laborious work; for though it was his Father's business, and which he voluntarily engaged in, and it was his meat and drink to do; yet

it was very fatiguing, not merely in going about continually to do good to the bodies and souls of men; but in the labor and travail of his soul, when he bore the wrath of God, and endured the curse of the law, in his sufferings and death.

Now, being freed and eased from all this, he sits down, and looks with pleasure on all that he has done. As God, when he had finished the works of creation, took a survey of them, and saw they were all very good, and then rested from his works; so Christ, with pleasure, sits and sees the travail of his soul, the blessings of grace, through his blood, applied to his people; and a continued succession of a seed to serve him, who, ere long, will be all with him where he is, and behold his glory; which is the joy that was set before him when he suffered for them.

5. Sitting denotes continuance. Christ sits as a priest upon his throne, and abides continually. The priests under the law did not abide continually, by reason of death. But Christ lives for ever, and has an unchangeable priesthood. They stood daily offering the same sacrifices, because sin was not effectually put away by them. But Christ, by one offering, has made full and perfect expiation for sin; and therefore is set down, and continues to do the other part of his priestly office as an intercessor; and to see the efficacy of his sacrifice take place.

He also sits King for ever; his throne is for ever and ever; and his kingdom an everlasting kingdom, of which, and the peace thereof, there shall be no end. Which leads,

3rd, To observe how long Christ will sit at the right hand of God; namely, “until all enemies are put under his feet, and made his footstool.” It began at his ascension to heaven, and not before. The Word and Son of God was with God in the beginning from all eternity; and was co-eternal with him, and had a glory with him before the world was; but he is never said to sit at the right hand of God till after his incarnation, death, resurrection from the dead, and ascension to heaven.

Then, and not before, he took his place at the right hand of God, where he will continue till his second coming, when all enemies shall be subdued under him. Some are subdued already; as sin, which is made an end of; the devil, who is destroyed; and the world, which is overcome by him. Others remain to be destroyed. All, as yet, are not put under him, as the man of sin, and son of perdition, who will be destroyed with the breath of his mouth. Now Christ sits and reigns till all these are vanquished, and the last enemy destroyed, which is death.

4th, The use of Christ’s session at the right hand of God to his people, and the benefits and blessings arising from thence to them, are,

1. Protection from all their enemies. Being raised, and set down at the right hand of God, he has a name, power, and authority, over all principalities and powers, might and dominion in this world and that to come. All things are put under his feet, and he is given to be an head over all things to the church. All are put into his hands, to subserve his own interest, and the interest of his people; he has all power in heaven and in earth

given him, and which he uses for their good, and for the protection of them from all evil.

Ephesians 1:20-22 Which he wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the dead, and set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places, Far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come: And hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be the head over all things to the church,

Matthew 28:18 And Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth.

2. In consequence of this is, freedom from fear of all enemies. Some are destroyed already; those that remain will be; so that there is nothing to be feared from them by those that believe in Jesus.

I Corinthians 15:25-27 For he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death. For he hath put all things under his feet. But when he saith all things are put under him, it is manifest that he is excepted, which did put all things under him.

3. The perpetual and prevalent intercession of Christ, on the behalf of his chosen ones, is another benefit arising from his session at the right hand of God. There he sits as their high priest. Being made higher than the heavens, [he] ever lives to make intercession for them, by representing their persons, presenting their petitions, and pleading their cause. Though Satan sometimes stands at their right hand to resist and accuse them; Christ sits at the right hand of God as their advocate with the Father, to rebuke him, and answer to, and remove his charges. In a view of which, every saint may say with the apostle; “Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect?” (Romans 8:3-34)

4. Hence great encouragement to come with boldness and freedom to the throne of grace; since we have such an high priest who is passed into the heavens for us, is our forerunner for us entered, appears in the presence of God for us, is on the throne of glory, and at the right hand of God, to speak a good word for us. This serves to draw up our hearts heavenwards, to seek things above, where Christ sitteth at the right hand of God; and to set our affections on things in heaven, and not on things on earth.

Hebrews 4:14 Seeing then that we have a great high priest, that is passed into the heavens, Jesus the Son of God, let us hold fast our profession.

Hebrews 4:16 Let us therefore come boldly unto the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need.

Colossians 3:1-2 If ye then be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God. Set your affection on things above, not on things on the earth.

5. This raises the expectation of the saints, with respect to Christ's second coming, and gives them assurance of it. Christ sits at the right hand of God, expecting till his enemies be made his footstool. They look for and expect him from heaven, who is gone thither to prepare a place for them; and has assured them, that he will come again, and take them to himself, that where he is they may be also, and sit upon the same throne, and be for ever with him.

Hebrews 10:12-13 But this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down on the right hand of God; From henceforth expecting till his enemies be made his footstool.

Philippians 3:20 For our conversation is in heaven; from whence also we look for the Savior, the Lord Jesus Christ:

John 14:2-3 In my Father's house are many mansions: if it were not *so*, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again, and receive you unto myself; that where I am, there ye may be also.

I Thessalonians 4:16 For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first.

I Thessalonians 4:18 Wherefore comfort one another with these words.

Christ, Jesus

Jesus CHRIST: *See the Person and Work of CHRIST in Volume Four.*

Christmas

CHRISTMAS Not even the year, much less the exact month and day when Christ was born, is stated in the Scriptures or known to mortals. For some wise purpose, it was, by chronologists, lost sight of. It most probably occurred a few months before the death of Herod the Great, four years before the common Christian era, in the year of Rome 750, and in the year of the world 4000. Learned men have investigated this point, but with all their research have not been able to fix the precise day, month, or year. The 6th of January, was in the second and third centuries thought to have been the day; but it was decided by

the Catholics in the fourth and fifth centuries that the 25th of December was the day. Even the early Christians were divided on this subject and, of course, it must be a matter of uncertainty to all succeeding generations. In view of this uncertainty, how groundless and puerile appears the custom of the Romish and English, as well as other communions, in holding sacred the twenty-fifth day of December (new style) as the day of Christ's nativity, and adorning their houses of worship with flowers and evergreens as a part of their religious devotion on that day. Fallen humanity is prone to the worship of "days, and months, and times, and years," and God has, no doubt, purposely hid the exact time of his Son's advent into the world. Let us worship God alone and esteem every day as a gift from the Lord." (*R.H. Pittman*)

Christ's Person and Work

Chrysostom, John

John CHRYSOSTOM: Sylvester Hassell: John Chrysostom (the *Golden-mouthed*—born in Antioch 347; died in banishment 407) is considered by the Greek Church its greatest expositor and preacher. He was a thorough-going synergist; and his pupil, **John Cassian** was the founder of Semi-Pelagianism. (*Hassell's History pg 407*)

Church Decorum, Rules of

Rules of Church DECORUM (*See under Rules of CHURCH*)

Church of England, The

The CHURCH OF ENGLAND: Sylvester Hassell: The birthday of "the **Lutheran Church**," when it began its existence as a distinct organization, was August 27th, 1526, the last day of the first Diet of Spire, when each German State was permitted by the emperor, Charles V., to act in religious matters according to its own convictions, and when the Lutheran territorial churches were thus legitimized.

The birthday of the "Church of England" (or Episcopalian Church), when it began its existence as a distinct organization, was November 3rd, 1534, the date

of the passage, by the British Parliament, of the “Act of Supremacy,” extirpating the jurisdiction of the Roman Catholic Pope in England, and making **King Henry VIII.** the “Supreme Head of the Church of England.”

And the birthday of the “**Church of Scotland**” (or Presbyterian Church), when it began its existence as a distinct organization, was August 17th, 1560, when the Scotch Confession of Faith, drawn by John Knox and his compeers, was formally adopted by the Scotch Parliament.

All these three bodies were born from the “Roman Catholic Church,” and therefore acknowledged that body to be a true church of Christ, and her ordinances to be valid.

The “Church of England,” as Macaulay, the best-informed English historian of the nineteenth century, himself an Episcopalian, tells us, was “the fruit of a union between Protestantism and the British government”—the result of “a compromise huddled up between the eager zeal of reformers and the selfishness of greedy, ambitious and time-serving politicians; from the first considered by a large body of Protestants as a scheme for serving two masters, as an attempt to unite the worship of the Lord and the worship of Baal.

As for the Church of England having the apostolical succession, the proofs of this for fifteen hundred years are buried in utter darkness; as for her having apostolical unity, she is a combination of a hundred sects battling within one organization.” The elder William Pitt, more than a hundred years ago, well described her as a body with “a Calvinistic creed, a popish liturgy, and an Arminian clergy.”

The able and accurate church historian, Prof. Philip Schaff, says:—“The despotic and licentious monarch (Henry VIII.), whom Pope Leo X. rewarded for his book against Luther with the title, “Defender of the Faith,” remained a Catholic in belief and sentiment till his death; he merely substituted king-worship for pope-worship, a domestic tyranny for a foreign one, by cutting off the papal tiara from the Episcopal hierarchy, and placing his own crown on the bleeding neck.”

Because the pope would not sanction his divorce from his wife **Catharine of Aragon**, he abolished the papal supremacy in England, and made himself virtual pope, assuming to decide all questions of doctrine and worship, and putting to death those who dared to differ from him. In 1543 he decreed that none under the rank of gentlemen and gentlewomen should be allowed to read the Scriptures.

Under Edward VI., Henry's son (1547-1554), the forty-two Articles of Religion, mostly written by *Archbishop Cranmer*, and after reduced to thirty-nine, were adopted. If the seventeenth Article is not predestinarian, the ablest historians are at fault, and language is meaningless.

Henry's oldest daughter, **Mary Tudor** (1553-8), revenging the injustice done her Spanish Catholic mother, the divorced Catharine, instituted a papal reaction. "Her short bloody reign was the period of Protestant martyrdom, which fertilized the soil of England, and of the exile of about eight hundred Englishmen, who were received with open arms on the Continent (especially at Geneva), and who brought back clearer and stronger views of the Reformation. The violent restoration of the old system intensified the hatred of popery, and forever connected it in the English mind with persecution and bloodshed, with national humiliation and disgrace.

John Foxe's "Book of Martyrs" is a pathetic account of these sufferings, the author himself having been an exile during the persecution. The Protestant Reformation was permanently established in England under **Elizabeth** (1558-1603), the masculine daughter of Henry VIII., and the Protestant **Anne Boleyn**. Declared illegitimate by the pope, who would not sanction the divorce of Henry and Catharine, and excommunicated by the pope, and continually plotted against by the Catholics, she ably and successfully maintained the Protestant cause.

Her motives were entirely political. She herself was "wholly unspiritual," says Mr. J.R. Green, "a brilliant, fanciful, unscrupulous child of earth and the Pagan renaissance," and yet the "Supreme Governor of the Church of England." She had the discretion to drop the blasphemous antichristian title of "Head of the Church."

The shipwreck and defeat of the great Spanish Armada, sent in 1588 by Philip the Second. of Spain for the conquest of England, transferred naval and commercial supremacy from Catholic Spain to Protestant England and Holland. The "Church of England" is at present boastfully declared to be "the strongest and richest national Church in Protestant Christendom"—very much then like the "Church of Rome," and to the same extent unlike the church of the New Testament." (*Hassell's History* ppg 500-502)

Sylvester Hassell: The "Church of England" for a long time imitated the tyrannical and persecuting spirit of her old mother Rome. "Created in the first instance by a court intrigue," says Mr. W.E.H. Lecky, "pervaded in all its parts by a spirit of the most intense Erastianism (representing the church to be a mere creature of the State, dependent upon the State for its existence and authority), and aspiring at the same time to a spiritual authority scarcely less absolute than

that of the (Romish) church which it had superseded, Anglicanism was from the beginning at once the most servile and the most efficient agent of tyranny.

Endeavoring by the assistance of temporal authority and by the display of worldly pomp to realize in England the same position as Catholicism had occupied in Europe, she naturally flung herself on every occasion into the arms of the civil power. No other church so uniformly betrayed and trampled on the liberties of her country. In all those fiery trials through which English liberty has passed since the Reformation, she invariably cast her influence into the scale of tyranny, supported and eulogized every attempt to violate the Constitution, and wrote the fearful sentence of eternal condemnation upon the tombs of martyrs of freedom.

When Charles I. attempted to convert the monarchy into a despotism, the English Church gave him its constant and enthusiastic support. When, in the gloomy period of vice and of reaction that followed the Restoration, the current of opinion set in against all liberal opinions, and the maxims of despotism were embodied even in the Oath of Allegiance, the Church of England directed the stream, allied herself in the closest union with a court whose vices were the scandal of Christendom, and exhausted her anathemas, not upon the hideous corruption that surrounded her, but upon the principles of Hampden and of Milton.

All through the long series of encroachments of the Stuarts she exhibited the same spirit. It was not till James the Second. had menaced her supremacy that the church was aroused to resistance. Then, indeed, for a brief but memorable period, she placed herself in opposition to the Crown, and contributed largely to one of the most glorious events in English history. But no sooner had William mounted the throne than her policy was reversed, her whole energies were directed to the subversion of the constitutional liberty that was then firmly established, and it is recorded by the great historian of the Revolution that at least nine-tenths of the clergy were opposed to the emancipator of England.

All through the reaction under Queen Anne, all through the still worse reaction under George III., the same spirit was displayed. In the first period the clergy, in their hatred of liberty, followed cordially the leadership of the infidel Bolingbroke; in the second they were the most ardent supporters of the wars against America and against the French Revolution, which have been the most disastrous in which England has ever engaged. From first to last their conduct was the same, and every triumph of liberty was their defeat.

The despotic and persecuting spirit of the "Church of England" was manifested against its own Puritan, or Non-conformist members; and against the

Independents (or stricter Puritans, who formed churches separate from the Established *Church*); still more against the Covenanters (or Covenanted Presbyterians who entered into a compact to resist the imposition of Episcopacy upon Scotland); and most of all against the Baptists and Quakers.

And this spirit was manifested both in the early part of the seventeenth century, when the leading clergy of the Establishment were Calvinistic, and in the later part, when they were Arminian; but the Arminian persecutions far surpassed the Calvinistic both in number and atrocity—persecution being more logically consistent with Arminianism, especially when, as in this case, the latter was blended with ritualism and sacerdotalism." (*Hassell's History* 517, 518)

Church of Scotland, The

The CHURCH OF SCOTLAND (*See under the CHURCH OF ENGLAND*)

Church, The

The Establishment of the CHURCH: S. A. Paine: I have written that I neither believe that the church was established on the mountain, when Jesus went there and appointed his apostles, [nor] on Pentecost, as our Campbellite friends claim.

We wish first to offer some of our objections to the idea that the church was established on the mountain. Isaiah 2:2 is relied on as a proof of that position by its advocates, which reads, "And it shall come to pass in the last days, that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills, and all nations shall flow into it." In Micah 4:1 we have almost the same words as in Isaiah 2:2.

This is only an emphatic way, by figure of speech, asserting the preeminence of Christ's kingdom over all other kingdoms, even from the lowest to the highest. You remember that the stone, in Daniel 2:34, that smote the image, "became a great mountain and filled the whole earth. The stone represented the power of the promised kingdom which Daniel 2:44 declared God would set up. The elements of gold, silver, iron, and brass represented the full extent of the powers of earthly kingdoms, and it "became a great mountain." Thus you can see that it

occupied a much higher plain than the elements in the image, hence was established in the top of them all— above them all. Remember that “mountain of the Lord’s house” is in the singular, just one mountain; but it was to be “established in the top of the mountains.” Here, mountains is in the plural, meaning more than one. Jesus did not go up into the mountain—just one mountain. Isaiah 2:2 and Micah 4:1 could not refer to that act of Jesus for the reason that the “mountain of the Lord’s house” was to be established in the top of the mountains, not “a mountain.”

The prophet was only, by the use of the figure, showing that God’s Kingdom should tower in glory and power above all other kingdoms.

His mountain was to be higher and possessed with more sublimity than any earthly hill or mountain.

Inspiration, in speaking of the Lord’s house, often refers to it as being *up*. After we have ascended the highest earthly pinnacle, we must yet look up to see the Lord’s house.

Isaiah 2:3, “And many people shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths.” Notice they go *up* to the house of God.

Isaiah says that those who walk righteously “shall dwell on high.” Then he says, “Look upon Zion, the city of our solemnities,” etc. Isaiah 33:16-20.

It is called “an highway” and declared to be the way of holiness, and that “the redeemed shall walk there,” Isaiah 35:8.

But we are met with this inquiry or objection: Did the Savior not ordain the twelve men, when he went up into the mountain? To this we answer, Yes. Mark 3:14.

I am then asked: Did he not call or name them, Apostles? To this I answer, Yes. Luke 16:13.

I am then referred to I Corinthians 12:28 as proof that there was no church until these twelve disciples were thus ordained, and named Apostles.

The text reads, "And God hath set some in the church first, apostles, secondly prophets," etc.

The argument is that there were no apostles until Jesus ordained them in the mountain, and as the apostles were the first to be "set in the church," there could not, therefore, have been any church before there were any apostles, as they were first to be set in the church.

If this "setting in the church" referred to getting membership in the church, or getting into the church, there would be a shade of argument. Paul was having no allusion, in I Corinthians 12 to the body, but was treating in the entire chapter upon the peculiar gifts that God set in the church to the office or function of apostles and ordained some to fill that office, etc.

So the idea of the church being established on the mountain, I think, is clearly proven to be a mistaken one; but instead of that, it was simply the office of apostleship established in the church.

But now we must turn our attention to the "Pentecost theory. Our Campbellite friends are the principles ones who advocate this lap-link system. Of course, they have a reason. They know they must do this, or land right into John's baptism, as genuine, and that would forever paralyze their water salvation slide.

We wish to notice some of the strongest objections or arguments they make against our claim of the church being established before Pentecost. Remember we do not say it was a church or kingdom in all its present relation, i.e. it did not possess all of the principles, laws, and ordinances, but was capable of exercising all the rites, observing all the commandments, and executing all the laws, as they were committed.

During Christ's ministry, while he as king, was teaching and committing to his subjects, "precept upon precept; line upon

line, here a little and there a little," of the principles, laws, and duties enjoined, which were indispensable elements in the process of completion of the kingdom, then, existed in its primary elements, and hence was spoken of as a kingdom or church in the present; but when its completion was referred to, it was spoken of as future. In Matthew 18, Christ is telling the disciples how to deal with certain transgressors. He says, "If thy brother trespass against thee, go and tell him his faults between thee and him alone." Then he tells them, "if he will not hear thee, then take with thee one or two more." Then in Matthew 18:17 he says, "And if he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the church; but if he neglect to hear the church, let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican."

The chapter begins with an inquiry from the disciples, "Who is the greatest in the Kingdom of Heaven?" This all goes to prove that there was at that time a kingdom or church, else the disciple's question would have been spurious. Neither would Christ have told the disciples to tell the matter of the trespass to the church, when there was no church. Our Campbellite friends tell us this command of the Savior was only prospective as it relates to the church. That there was no church then, but that the Savior was only telling them how to act after the church was established, which they say was then, in the future. They make the argument on the basis that Jesus put the act of trespassing in the future—"if thy brother shall trespass," etc. True, the verb "shall trespass" expresses a future act, but it is the act of trespassing and not the act of God in establishing the church. The idea of Church existence in the expression, and also the idea of probable future violation of church government, in the form of a trespass, and hence the command.

So we have proven, by this, that there was at the time a church, not complete in all its elements, but complete in all the elements given up to that time.

The church of Jesus Christ in its establishment began with the ministry of John, and was complete in all its functions, jaws,

and ordinances, as an organization, when the last ordinances were set in it, which was the communion and washing of the saints' feet—just before his (Jesus's) betrayal.

We will now give proof of our statement. We call your attention to Luke 16:16. "The law and the prophets were until John; since that time the kingdom of God is preached, and every man presseth into it."

Notice, the kingdom is preached since "until John," not since the close or after the close of John's ministry, but it was since "until John," the early part of his ministry. Not only was the kingdom preached, but men pressed into it. How men could press into something that has no existence is a problem too deep for me. John came preaching, "Repent for the kingdom is at hand." The time was near at his coming, when the church was to be established in its incipiency. So it is said that he was sent to "make ready a people prepared for the Lord." He was not to prepare (regenerate) anyone, but to make those, already prepared, ready for the eventful occurrence which was about to take place. He was to wean them from the law, and the ceremonies under it, and implant the principles of the anti-type (church) in their stead. While John was teaching and baptizing in Jordan, making people ready, he was then fulfilling the prophecy concerning him. Malachi 3:1, "Behold I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me." Here was John the messenger, sent to prepare the way before the Savior. He was not sent to prepare the people, but the way. This was done by making the people ready, and only those who were prepared for the Lord. God prepared the heart, and John "made them ready" by going before the Savior, and proclaiming his coming, and the coming of his Kingdom.

In Malachi 3:1, same verse referred to, it is said, "And the Lord whom ye seek shall suddenly come to his temple, even the messenger of the covenant, whom ye delight in; behold he shall come, saith the Lord of Hosts."

Who is this but the Savior coming to John on the bank of Jordan? And in coming to him he comes to, or confronts, those

whom John has made ready. He calls this, coming to his temple. Here is where the marriage occurs.

We hear John exclaiming, "Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world." Here is the midnight cry, "Behold the Bridegroom cometh, go ye out to meet him."

Those who were ready, who were prepared in heart, and had obeyed the teaching of John, were admitted to the marriage. Hence Christ suddenly came to his temple, even the messenger of the covenant "whom ye delight in." This was fulfilled in Jesus' approach to John and those whom he had baptized; here the union of the Bride and the Bridegroom was effected, and the church, there began in its incipiency—began to be builded. That is just how near the kingdom was, as expressed by John, when he says, "The kingdom is at hand." The chapter explains itself, and so our friends gain nothing there in support of the setting up of a Pentecost church.

Remember, we have not said that the Kingdom was then complete in all its functions, begun, and from that time on, Jesus is Builder until the house is complete.

Then next is Matthew 6:9-10. "Thy Kingdom come, thy will be done," etc. This is a part of what Jesus taught his disciples to pray. Our friends say: If here had, then, been a kingdom, Jesus would not have taught his disciples to pray, "Thy kingdom come." Hence, they say that the Kingdom was altogether in the future of that expression. Now, let's try their logic by the remainder of the prayer. Jesus also taught them to pray, "Thy will be done," "Give us this day our daily bread," "Forgive us our debts," "Lead us not into temptation," etc. Now, if the expression, "Thy kingdom come," puts the entirety of the kingdom in the future, and destroys any idea of its beginning or existence prior to the expression; then the following portion of the prayer destroys the fact that God's will was ever really done prior to the expression, or that our daily bread had ever been given, or that our debts (sins) had ever been forgiven, or that we had ever been delivered from evil; but that we had been led, by the Lord into temptation. The truth of the matter is, that all these things mentioned in the prayer had been truly shared by

the disciples as blessings from God, and the prayer is only a petition for the continuance of them. If the prayer locates the beginning of the church at Pentecost, it also locates the beginning of all the blessings asked for, at Pentecost.

I would say to our antagonists, here as Paul said to the sorcerer, "Wilt thou not cease to pervert the right ways of the Lord," Acts 13:10.

I read in *Campbellism—What is It* by J. V. Chism, the following: "In Matthew 11:11, we have another bearing mark. Jesus says, 'Verily I say unto you, among them that are born of woman there hath not risen a greater than John the Baptist; notwithstanding, he that is least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he.' From this it is plain that there was no one in the kingdom of heaven at that time, who had been born of women, hence no kingdom as yet." Poor deluded man! After all his long experience in debate, he publishes himself to the world in the above light. I wonder how he, as a scholar, overlooked the fact that Jesus said, "He that is least in the kingdom." He did not say, "He that shall be least in the kingdom, after it is established at Pentecost, but "He that is least in the kingdom." This shows that there was, then, a kingdom, and also "he that is least in it." Jesus is simply showing that the plane occupied by one in the church is, by far, higher or greater than the natural birth (of woman) can possibly place one. The natural birth entitles no one to church membership, but the new birth does prepare, and thus entitle one for the kingdom. If one is scripturally in the church, he is born again, and even though he be the very least in the kingdom, he is greater than the noblest of earth, who have only been born of woman—never born again. In the new birth and in the kingdom, the least is greater, (receives a higher, nobler standing) than John did by reason of his natural birth. The spiritual birth is greater and confers more than the natural. That is all any man can legitimately deduce from the text. Hence, there was then, a kingdom, and people in it, and the least of them was greater than John, restricting his qualifications to his nature and natural birth. What God did for John in his mother's womb was distinct from his natural

conception and birth, hence, that is not considered as any part conferred by the natural birth.

To show now, conclusively, there was at that time a kingdom, read the following verse. "And from the days of John the Baptist until now the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and the violent take it by force, Matthew 11:12.

When did the kingdom suffer violence? "From John the Baptist until now." NOW is used as an adverb of time, embracing the time Jesus used the language. The suffering of the kingdom began with the days of John the Baptist, and had continued up to the time Jesus used the language. Now we will ask our friends, if there was no kingdom during that period, we wish to know how that a thing could suffer and be taken by force that did not exist? Why did Chism, and why do they all skip that declaration of truth, uttered by the Savior: The reader knows it annihilates their Pentecost creed.

But they refer to Matthew 18:3, "Except you be converted and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven." They use this to prove the disciples were not in the kingdom, because the text says, "Except you be converted," etc., ye shall not enter into the kingdom. Now, remember we do not claim the kingdom to be complete as a building at that time. There were yet other ordinances or functions to be inserted that would require humility upon the disciples' part to enter into. This was the communion and washing the saints' feet. The disciples had not yet entered into that phase of the kingdom, hence, the language of the text. The disciples asked in verse 1, "Who is the greatest in the kingdom?" Does that sound like there was no kingdom? The disciples believed there was and wanted to know, "Who is greatest in it." Notice, "Who is," not who will be the greatest.

Jesus believed there was then a kingdom, for he says in Matthew 18:4, "Whosoever therefore shall humble himself as this little child, the same is greatest in the kingdom of heaven." Jesus says the one who shall humble himself is in the kingdom, and the greatest there. But if our friends had been there, they would have, I guess, challenged the Savior for a "de-bate" on

the church question. They would have said to the disciples, "Don't you know there is no kingdom yet? You are trying to take the last lesson first. You wait till Pentecost to ask, 'Who is the greatest' in the kingdom. If you ask now, say, 'Who shall be the greatest.'" But that is the difference between our friends and God's Word.

But it is argued that there was no kingdom prior to Pentecost, because Christ was not king, hence, no kingdom without a king. Now if it is true that Christ was not King before his ascension, then argument could be made. But we propose now to show that Christ was King while on earth. Please read Luke 19:37-38. We see that while Jesus was riding the colt upon which never man sat, on his journey to Jerusalem, that the whole multitude of disciples began to rejoice and praise God with a loud voice, for all the mighty works that they had seen; saying, "Blessed be the king that cometh in the name of the Lord; peace in heaven, and glory in the highest." Does that sound like there was no king till Pentecost? Our Campbellite representatives would rebuke one of their brethren, should they assert the truth declared in that text—that Christ was king.

So it was then; there were some self-righteous Pharisees there who said unto the Savior, "Master rebuke thy disciples." But Jesus said, "I tell you, that, if these should hold their peace, the stones would immediately cry out." The exalted truth, that Jesus was king, had to be published, and had the disciples not recognized him as such, the stones themselves would have uttered it. I know our friends had rather this fact had never been published, but inspiration hath published and those who deny it are only fighting against God.

Again, in Luke 23:2, we find his conspirators trying to convict him before Pilate for saying he was "Christ a King." If our antagonists had been there, and of the same opinion they are now, the conspirators would have been wonderfully strengthened, for their doctrines are identical. I would be ashamed to occupy the exact grounds, on this question, that the murderers of Jesus occupied. They denied that Jesus was King, so the Pentecost church people.

Again, we have in Zechariah 9:9, "Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion; behold, thy king cometh unto thee; he is just, and having salvation; lowly and riding upon an ass, and upon a colt the foal of an ass." Notice, the king was to come to Zion or Jerusalem as described. Now, if we can find the fulfillment of this, and it dates beyond Pentecost, then we will have proven that he was King before Pentecost, for it was their King that was to ride the colt unto them. Now turn to John 12:12-14, and see its fulfillment. "On the next day much people that were come to the feast, when they heard that Jesus was coming to Jerusalem, took branches of palm trees, and went forth to meet him, and cried, Hosanna! Blessed is the King of Israel that cometh in the name of the Lord. And Jesus, when he had found a young ass, sat thereon; as it is written, Fear not, daughter of Zion; behold thy King cometh, sitting on an ass's colt." Will any dare say this is not the fulfillment of that prophecy? If it is a fulfillment, we have Jesus coming to Jerusalem as King. Who in the face of all this could have the brazeny and hardihood to say Jesus was not king until after his resurrection?

Pilate said to the wicked Jews, who were conspiring against Jesus, "Behold your king," but they said, "Away with him, crucify him. We have no king but Caesar." Just what the Campbellites say of Jesus at that time.

We find, in Acts 17, where Paul came to Thessalonica and into the synagogue of the Jews, alleging that "this Jesus, whom I preach unto you, is Christ," that some of those disbelieving Jews, moved with envy, drew certain of those who believed unto the rulers, saying, "These that have turned the world upside down are come hither also; whom Jason hath received; and these all do contrary to the decrees of Caesar, saying that there is another King, one Jesus."

If our antagonists had been there, of course, they would have been Caesarites, and a part of the band to punish those who believed Paul's preaching, because they recognized that Jesus was Christ, and King.

If one would not believe, from this array of testimony in proof that Christ was King before his death, he has beyond question

an incurable case of “will-nots.” So we will leave this, believing that we have established, by the prophets, by Jesus’ disciples, by his enemies, and by Jesus himself, that he was king before his death. Then we have that objection out of the way.

But in reading on ppg. 33, 34, of *Campbellism—What is It*, by J. W. Chism, we find the following objects to a church before the death of Jesus.

1st. “If the church was established before Jesus was crucified, and he was the head, then the head was cut off when he was slain, and the church became headless, hence dead.” That is, indeed, a mammoth argument! The divinity of Christ never died. He was only “put to death in the flesh.” Jesus lost nothing in his death, except the life of his humanity, but in his God-character, he still had power over death. He says, “I and my Father are one.” He said, “I have power to lay down my life, and I have power to take it again.” So you see his power, as head, was never destroyed. Instead of the death of Jesus destroying the life of the church, it only preserved her life by putting away the cause of death, which was sin.

Again, he says, “If the church was established before the death of Jesus, then it had no blood in it, and hence, no remission of sins—“and without the shedding of blood there is no remission.”

Well, that’s where Campbellism is too short for the demands. According to Mr. Chism, there never was any sin remitted before Jesus’ death, and hence, none ever saved before Jesus died. The text does not say that no sin could be remitted before the blood was actually shed, but, “without shedding of blood there is no remission.” In the eye and purpose of God, the blood was shed from the time God purposed salvation of sinners, and upon the basis of the certainly of the atonement, sinners were saved from Abel down to and subsequent to the cross. If, as they claim, the blood is reached through water baptism, we are waiting to learn how those who died before baptism, or before the blood was shed, reached the blood, and their sins remitted by it. He also says that, if there was a church before Jesus’ death, it had no one made “both Lord and

Christ over it; that it had no 'High Priest to intercede for it;" and no "Holy Spirit to guide its members into all truth."

Well, we will see whether Jesus was Christ and Lord before his death. Read Luke 2:9, "And the angel said unto them, fear not; for behold I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people, for unto you is born this day, in the city of David, a Savior, which is Christ the Lord." Did the angel tell the truth? If so, it follows that Mr. Chism did not. The angel said the Savior was "Christ the Lord" at birth, but Mr. Chism said he was neither until after his ascension. Who will you believe? Of course, when he went to heaven he did not cease to be "Lord and Christ," but we have the message direct from heaven, to the shepherds, that he was "Christ and Lord" on earth also—even at his birth.

But what about his being an High Priest before his death and ascension? We refer you first to Hebrews 4:14, "Seeing then that we have a great high priest, that is passed into the heavens, Jesus the Son of God, let us hold fast our profession."

Question: Who was it that passed into heaven? The text says, "Our high Priest." If he was not priest until he reached heaven, it could not have been a priest that passed into heaven. For a priest to pass into heaven, he must, of necessity, be a priest before he reached heaven; hence, he was a priest before he ascended.

Again, in Hebrews 5:5, "And no man taketh this honor unto himself, but he that is called of God as Aaron was. So also Christ glorified not himself to be made an high priest; but he that said unto him, Thou art my Son, today have I begotten thee."

Our friends say that Christ was not an High Priest until he was glorified in heaven, but the text says, "He glorified not himself to be made an High Priest," i.e. He was priest before he was glorified—before he entered heaven.

"This day have I begotten thee." He was priest from birth.

Remember, it is said, "No man taketh this honor (priesthood) unto himself, but he that is called of God as was Aaron.

Of this High Priest, Paul says, in Hebrews 7:26, "For such a High Priest became us, who is holy, etc. **** Who needeth not daily, as those high priests, to offer up sacrifice, first for his own sins and then for the peoples', for this he did once when he offered up himself." This shows that Christ was priest, when he offered himself a sacrifice for sin; and as that was done on earth, it follows that he was Priest on earth. But we are always encountered with the text, "For if he were on earth, he should not be a priest, seeing that there are priests that offer gifts according to the law; who serve unto the example and shadow of heavenly things," etc.

This shows that he could not remain on earth and fill the priesthood unto which he was ordained, for he, as priest, was not to enter, with his own blood, into the tabernacle made with hands (which was on earth), but into heaven itself, there to appear in the presence of God for us," Hebrews 9:12. Hence, he could not fill the priesthood on earth, [which] in its continuance, was under the law (Hebrews 8:4), and hence, a shadow of the true or heavenly. Hebrews 9:24.

But remember, that as under the law, men were ordained unto the priesthood before they entered into the "holy place" (which was a figure of heaven), so also Christ was ordained unto his priesthood before he entered heaven (the holy place), which was the true or anti-type. Christ could not have remained on earth and filled his office of priesthood, for there is where the priests serve under the law, "But the priesthood is changed, hence a change of the law. Hebrews 7:2. Christ did not, as other priests, inherit his priesthood by natural descent for, "It is evident that our Lord sprang out of Judah, of which tribe Moses spoke nothing concerning priesthood. And it is yet far more evident, for that after the similitude of Melchisedec there ariseth another priest, who is made, not after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an endless life," Hebrews 7:12-17.

This high priest make but one offering. Hebrews 9:12,25,28; Hebrews 7:27; Hebrews 10:10,12,14. This offering was on earth, and "perfected forever them that are sanctified," Hebrews 9:4.

This offering "obtained eternal redemption" for those for whom it was offered. Hebrews 9:12. "With the blood of this offering, Jesus enters into the holy place (heaven)." Hebrews 9:12. He will make no more sacrifice, "but this man, after he had made one sacrifice for sins forever, sat down on the right hand of God; henceforth expecting till his enemies be made his footstool." Hebrews 10:2. So he, as priest, made the one sacrifice on earth, and from his throne in heaven, is appropriating the blood of the sacrifice to the hearts of those for whom it was made. So this objection of "no priest until Pentecost" is subverted.

But about "no Holy Spirit to guide them into all truth." The disciples did not need the "guiding or comforting" influence of the Spirit while Jesus was with them, but that does not prove that the Spirit was not there in any of its benefits. This is all a presumption.

Now, we propose to prove by the Bible, that there was not only a King, a Christ, a Lord, and Priest; but that there was a kingdom (church) before the death of Jesus.

We refer you first to Matthew 11:12. "And from the days of John the Baptist until now the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and the violent take it by force." Did Jesus utter this before Pentecost? If so, there was a kingdom before Pentecost, for there was kingdom when Jesus thus spoke, for he said it "suffereth violence until now." We want our objectors to tell us how that which has no existence could suffer. Here, they have Jesus' own words condemning them—a wall of adamant they will never get over, through, under, nor around. They may foam, rage, and theorize all they please, but we have Jesus arrayed against them, and he must prevail.

Again in Matthew 12:24-29.

When Jesus was casting out devils, the Pharisees said, "This fellow doth not cast out devils, but by Beelzebub the prince of devils."

"Jesus knew their thoughts and said unto the, every kingdom divided against itself is brought to desolation **** but if I cast out devils by the Spirit of God, then the kingdom of God is come unto you." There are the two positions. Which will you take? Jesus either cast out devils by the Spirit of God, or by the spirit of the devil. If you say, by the spirit of Satan, then you are a full grown Pharisee.

If you say "by the Spirit of God," then Jesus says, "The kingdom of God is come unto you." Jesus did cast out devils by the Spirit of God. Therefore, the kingdom of God had, at that time, come. Just here our friends must take backwater, or trace his ancient identity to the Pharisees, instead of to Christ.

When Christ was on his journey to Jerusalem, "They that went before and they that followed, cried, saying, Blessed be the kingdom of our father David, that cometh in the name of the Lord; Hosanna in the highest," Mark 11:10.

Luke 19:38 says, "Blessed be the King that cometh in the name of the Lord." So we have plainly declared both King and Kingdom at that time. This was before Pentecost; so we have Christ the King and his Kingdom seen and declared to be such before Pentecost.

In Matthew 6, beginning at verse 25 (Matthew 6:25), Jesus teaches his disciples the great lesson of making their Christian duties first of all duties. He says, "Take no thought, saying, What shall we eat? Or what shall we drink?" In Matthew 6:33 he says, "But seek ye first (Don't wait until after Pentecost) the Kingdom of God and his righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you."

If these people had done without eating until after Pentecost, they would have starved. (*From Writings of S. A. Paine, ppg 77-87*).

1st Mark. The apostolic church consisted only of those persons who had been convicted of sin by the Holy Ghost, and who had given signs of repentance towards God, and faith in The Lord Jesus Christ as the Son of God.

2nd Mark. True baptism, the immersion of believers in water, in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

3rd Mark. The members being baptized believers, came frequently around the Lord's Table, to commemorate the sufferings and death of their precious Redeemer, by partaking of the common bread to represent his broken body, and common wine to represent his shed blood for them.

4th Mark. The maintenance of strict discipline.

5th Mark. The independent or congregational polity or government of each local church, subject only to the headship of Christ.

6th Mark. The religious liberty, soul-freedom, a complete separation of church and state, the entire independence of each church from all state control, so far as regards the membership, ministry, organization, faith, worship, and discipline of the church.

7th Mark. With few exceptions, the members were generally poor, obscure, unlearned, afflicted, despised and persecuted.

8th Mark. The fraternal equality, the essential priesthood, of all the members, in accordance with which fact they choose to office among them those of their number whom they perceive to be already qualified thereunto by the Spirit of God, there being but two classes of officers, bishops, or elders, or pastors, and deacons; the fraternal equality of all the members involving the eternal equality of the ministry.

9th Mark. Possession of an humble, God-called and God-qualified ministry.

10th Mark. That while the ministry received voluntary help from the churches, they were not salaried, but labored themselves, more or less, for their own support.

11th Mark. The sending out of the divinely called and qualified ministry by the Holy Spirit in themselves and in the churches, their going forth, withersoever the Lord directed them, in simple dependence upon him, and their preaching the gospel to every creature, whether Jew or Gentile, and especially shepherding the lambs and sheep of Christ.

12th Mark. That it, the church, was absolutely the only divinely recognized religious organization in the world.

Question: Is there a church today that bears these marks? Measure the denominations around you and answer the question in your own conscience, and if you should conclude that there is such a church and that the Primitive or Old School Baptist is that visible church, then may you walk with us, choose rather to suffer affliction with the people of God than to enjoy the pleasure of sin for a season. Better to be like Noah, and his family, a few with the Lord and dwell in the Ark of Safety, than run with the world and perish with the wicked.
(*R.H. Pittman, quoting Sylvester Hassell*)

The Historical Identity of the CHURCH: *Sylvester Hassell:* These persecuted people of God have had, since the first century, a variety of names, generally given them by their enemies, and derived from their location, or from some of their leading ministers, or from some doctrine or practice of theirs which distinguished them from worldly religionists. Until the Protestant Reformation in the sixteenth century, they were known as Montanists, Tertullianists, Novatians, Donatists, Paulicians, Petrobrusians, Henricians, Arnoldists, Waldenses, Albigenses, United Brethren of Bohemia, and Lollards; many of these were called by the general name of Ana-Baptists (or Rebaptizers), because they did not acknowledge the scripturalness or validity of infant baptism, and therefore baptized (Pedobaptists said they baptized *again*) those who joined them on a profession of faith.

While these various classes of people differed in minor particulars, and while some of them were in much darkness and error on certain points of truth, they yet held substantially to the same general doctrine and practice—insisting, above all, upon the spirituality of the church of God and her heavenly obligation to walk in humble and loving obedience to all his holy commandments, both in an individual and a church capacity, and not in obedience to the unscriptural traditions and commandments of men.

For the last 365 years (since A.D. 1520) they have been called Baptists (for about the first 100 years of this period, also Ana-Baptists), because they baptized (that is immersed in water, in the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost) all who, upon a credible profession of their repentance towards God and faith in Christ, desired to unite with them in a church capacity.

The cardinal tenets of Bible Baptists—being also those held by the apostolic churches, as set forth in the New Testament, and those held, in the main, by the people in former times, are: The exclusive and supreme authority of the Holy Scriptures; the exclusive headship of Christ over his church; the three-oneness of God as Father, Son and Spirit; the total depravity of all mankind since the fall of Adam; the special and effectual electing love of God the Father, redeeming love of God the Son, and regenerating love of God the Spirit, manifested, in due time, to all the vessels of mercy; the baptism of believers, and the partaking of the Lord's supper by those properly baptized and in gospel order; salvation by grace and faith alone; a regenerated and orderly-walking church membership; the universal priesthood and brotherhood of believers; the divine call and divine qualification and equality of the ministry, who feed and care for the flock of God among them, not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind, nor as being lords over God's heritage, but as ensamples to the flock; the independence and yet cordial brotherly association of gospel churches; the separation of the church from the world, and the non-alliance of the former with the latter in any kinds of religious institutions—such corrupting associations being pointedly forbidden in both the Old and New Testament Scriptures (Exodus 12:38 with Numbers 11:4-6; Exodus 34:12-16; Deuteronomy 7:1-11; II

Chronicles 18:1-3 with II Chronicles 19:2; Ezra 9; Nehemiah 13:1-3,23-31; Psalms 26:4-5; 56:13; Isaiah 8:12; Acts 8:20-21; II Corinthians 6:14-18) the separation of church and state; the liberty of every human being, so far as other people are concerned, to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience; the resurrection of the bodies both of the just and the unjust; the final and general judgment of the world by the Lord Jesus Christ; the everlasting blessedness of the righteous, and the everlasting punishment of the wicked." (*Hassell's History* ppg 19, 20)

CHURCH Succession: Sylvester Hassell As for a nominal, natural, outward, or mechanical succession, the God of providence and grace, eighteen centuries ago, forever buried all such claims in the dark, impenetrable gulf of the *seculum obscurum*, or obscure age, immediately succeeding the death of the leading apostles and the destruction of Jerusalem, A.D. 70, and extending to A.D. 100, as freely acknowledged by the ablest scholars of Europe; the irreconcilable inconsistencies and contradictions of the leading Roman Catholic authorities in regard to the pretended Romish succession during this period furnish a sufficient illustration of this fact. According to the entire tenor of the New Testament Scriptures, what we are to look for is, not such outward succession, but a spiritual succession of principles, of inward, vital, heartfelt religion. Names are nothing; principles are everything, in the true kingdom of God. In all ages and countries, that people, who in all spiritual matters, acknowledge Christ as their only head and King, form a part of the true church of God." (*Hassell's History* pg 18)

Proof texts for the Perpetuity of the CHURCH

Daniel 2:44, "And 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."

Matthew 16:18, "And I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."

Ephesians 3:21, "Unto him be glory in the church by Christ Jesus throughout all ages, world without end. Amen."

The Lord could not very well be glorified in the church *throughout all ages*, if the church did not continue to exist throughout all ages. The world may blaspheme the Lord, and despise the truth, but the Lord will be glorified in the church, and that *world without end*.

Proof Texts for The One CHURCH:

Song of Solomon 6:9, "My dove, my undefiled is **but one**; she is **the only one** of her mother (covenant of grace Ed.), she is **the choice one** of her that bare her. The daughters saw her, and blessed her; yea, the queens and the concubines and they praised her."

Isaiah 54:5, "For thy Maker is thy husband; the Lord of hosts is his name; and thy Redeemer the Holy one of Israel, the God of the whole earth shall he be called."

John 10:16, "And other sheep I have, which are not of this fold; them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice; and there shall be **one fold** and one shepherd."

Romans 7:4-5, "For as we have many members in one body, and all members have not the same office; so we, being many, are **one body** in Christ, and every one members of another."

Ephesians 4:4, "For there is **one body** and one spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling."

Daniel 2:44, "And 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."

Matthew 16:18, "And I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church [just one], and the gates of hell shall not prevail against **it**."

Isaiah 2:2, "And it shall come to pass in the last days, that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills, and all nations shall flow into **it**."

Forms of CHURCH GOVERNMENT: Sylvester Hassell The so-called Christian churches, both Catholics and Protestants, are governed by three principal, or general forms of church government, viz;

Bishops; [Episcopal]---The Catholic, Episcopal, Greek Church, and Methodists are governed by Bishops.

Presbyteries, Synods, or General Assemblies—The Presbyterians hold to this form of government; while the Lutherans are governed by a combination of the Presbyterian and the Episcopal form.

Congregational---Congregationalist, Baptist, and many other sects hold to this form. They maintain that each congregation or society of Christians is, and should be, independent of all others in its ecclesiastical power, and should be bound to each other only by the cords of love and fellowship." (*R.H. Pittman*)

CHURCH Conference Question: Is it lawful for any member of the Old Baptist Church to moderate a conference where they have no preacher?

Answer: The church has the right to select whom she pleases to serve as moderator during the sitting of the church in conference, just so they select an Old Baptist who is in order. The church has the right to select any of her own members to serve that she sees proper to select to serve as moderator during conference meeting. We never have heard this called in question. Suppose the church had no minister or deacon—

would that deprive her of the right to hold conference? Most certainly not." (CAYCE vol. 4, ppg 209, 210)

CHURCH Covenant: *Sylvester Hassell:* The following is about the form of a Church Covenant and Rules of Decorum as adopted by the early churches that afterwards composed the Kehukee Association.

Church Covenant

Forasmuch as Almighty God by his grace, has been pleased to call us (whose names are underneath subscribed) out of darkness into his marvelous light, and all of us have been regularly baptized upon a profession of our faith in Christ Jesus, and by his assistance, covenant and agree to keep up the discipline, agreeable to the word of God: We do therefore in the name of our Lord Jesus, and by his assistance, covenant and agree to keep up the discipline of the church we are members of, in the most brotherly affection towards each other, while we endeavor particularly to observe the following rules viz:

In brotherly love to pray for each other, to watch over one another, and, if need be, in the most tender and affectionate manner, to reprove one another. That is, if we discover anything amiss in a brother, to go and tell him his fault, according to the direction given by our Lord in the eighteenth chapter of Matthew, and not to be whispering and backbiting. We also agree, with God's assistance, to pray in our families, attend our church meetings, observe the Lord's day and keep it holy, and not absent ourselves from the communion of the Lord's Supper without a lawful excuse; to be ready to communicate to the defraying of the church's expenses, and for the support of the ministry; not irregularly depart from the fellowship of the church, nor to remove to distant churches without a regular dismissal.

These things we do covenant and agree to observe and keep sacred in the name of and by the assistance of God, the Father, Son and Holy Ghost. Amen.

Signed by the mutual consent of the members whose names are underneath subscribed. (*Hassell's History pg. 695*)

Rules of CHURCH Decorum PREAMBLE. From a long series of experiences we (who hope we are the Church of Christ at _____), are convinced of the necessity of coming together as often as may be in order to hold Conference, and to discharge our duty in watching over each other as Christ hath commanded.

Ordered therefore that the following Decorum be a rule for the church to conduct herself by in her future Conferences. We will not forsake the house of God, or the assembling of ourselves together. Nehemiah 10:39; Hebrews 10:25.

ARTICLE I. The Conference shall be composed of the members of this church, together with any members of sister churches, that are present in fellowship, of the same faith and order, who have liberty to seats with us. Acts 4:23; 15:6.

ARTICLE II. Conference shall be shall be opened and closed with prayer to Almighty God. I Timothy 2:1; I Thessalonians 5:17-18.

ARTICLE III. One shall be chosen to preside, who shall be addressed under the appellation of Brother Moderator; and to whom every speech shall be particularly directed. I Corinthians 14:26-40.

ARTICLE IV. The members' names, being regularly enrolled, shall by the Clerk be distinctly called over, and a significant mark put to the names of all absent members. Acts 1:15; Nehemiah 2:18; 4:20; 5:16.

ARTICLE V. A door shall be opened (when thought necessary) for the admission of new members into this church; but none shall be admitted but by unanimous consent, and who shall first verbally relate their experience, give an account of the work of God on their souls; and secondly, of their faith and principles (if the church shall require it); and thirdly, the church shall make diligent inquiry respecting their moral conduct, and when full

satisfaction shall be obtained, the Pastor, Deacon or Moderator shall manifest the same by giving them the right hand of fellowship, thereby receiving them in form. I Peter 3:15; Galatians 2:19.

ARTICLE VI. No complaint shall be brought into Conference against transgressing brethren respecting crimes of a private nature, until the aggrieved party has complied with the directions given by our Lord in Matthew 18:15-17.

ARTICLE VII. Every motion made and seconded shall come under the consideration of the Conference unless withdrawn by the member who made it. I Corinthians 14:40.

ARTICLE VIII. Every query presented shall be thrice read; and, before it is received, the Moderator shall take a vote, and accordingly as there is a majority for or against debating it, it shall be answered or not. But the querist may withdraw it at any time—provided also that no intricate query shall be imposed or asked.

ARTICLE IX. If the minority shall be grieved, at any time, at the determination of the majority, they are hereby directed to make the same known immediately to the church; and, if satisfaction cannot be obtained, it may be necessary in that case to call for helps from sister churches.

ARTICLE X. All the business of Conference shall be recorded by the Clerk, and, before Conference rises, the same shall be distinctly read and corrected, if need be.

SECTION 1. Any member refusing to attend Conference, the same is Disorder.

SECTION 2. Any member absenting him or herself from Conference, without leave, the same is Disorder.

SECTION 3. Any member whispering or laughing in time of public speech, the same is Disorder.

SECTION 4. If two or more shall speak at one time, or any member speak without rising up and addressing the Moderator, the same is Disorder.

SECTION 5. Any member speaking more than three times to one subject, without leave obtained, the same is Disorder.

SECTION 6. Any member being grieved at anything done in Conference, and shall hold his or her peace, and shall not let the same be known until Conference rises, and shall afterward speak of the same, as it manifestly tends to confusion, it is hereby deemed Disorder.

SECTION 7. Any member speaking or acting in wrath or anger, or in a threatening, degrading manner, as it shames religion, wounds the cause of Christ, and grieves true Christians, it is hereby deemed Disorder.

SECTION 8. If the Moderator shall neglect to plainly and timely reprove any member transgressing any of these rules, or in behaving in any manner irreverently in time of Conference, the same is Disorder in him, and himself is for the same liable to be reprov'd.

SECTION 9. The woman hath not a right by the laws of Christ to usurp authority over the man, and therefore ought not to speak in the church, only in cases of conscience, or in such particular circumstances that the nature of the thing may require it.

SECTION 10. Amendments to these rules may be made at any time when Conference shall deem it necessary.

(Hassell's History ppg 696,697)

Relationships between CHURCHES: S.A. Paine: The visible, local organic church is composed of men and women coming together in covenant to keep house for God upon the doctrine of unconditional election, limited predestination, special atonement, and the final resurrection of the just and unjust; in other words, to make it plain, those who hold to the doctrine of salvation by grace.

Each of these bodies are little republics, having the Bible as their man of counsel, and are independent in government from all outside jurisdiction. The seven churches of Asia were seven separate, distinct, independent churches, accountable only to Christ for their conduct. We do not find one word recorded by John for one church to decide the affairs of any of the other churches; but the admonition was from God to the churches, to each church. See Hassell's History, also the book of Revelations.

Churches of the second century were democratic in their government; they were Baptist churches, because composed of baptized believers, and because each church was independent of other churches in government.—Hassell, page 374.

During the first three centuries, Christian congregations all over the East continued separate, independent bodies, unsupported by governments and consequently without any secular power over each other.—Hassell, page 379.

In A.D. 315, the church was known as Donatists, having one by the name of Donatus as their leader. These people have the following statement: These churches were independent of each other in government.—Hassell, page 390.

Menno Simons was a great leader of the Baptists in the 14th century. This man taught his churches that churches were independent of each other in church government, and united only by a bond of love.—Hassell, page 505.

In the year 1620, at Plymouth, Massachusetts, the Pilgrim brethren advocated the self government of each local church.—Hassell, page 518.

Each gospel church is a separate, independent republic, having Christ as its only head and lawgiver, and not subject in ecclesiastical matters to any outside jurisdiction. Such, according to the ablest scholars and historians, was not only every apostolic church in the first century, but also of the second century.—Hassell, page 292.

It cannot be repeated too often that each gospel church is, according to Christ and the apostles, the highest ecclesiastical authority on earth.—Hassell, page 293.

A visible church in Scripture is always a local body, and every local church acting by majority of its members, is invested by Christ with the exclusive and final power of receiving, disciplining, excluding and restoring its members, electing officers, and transacting all other necessary business. —Hassell, page 291.

The New Testament contains not a single example or intimation of the subordination of a church to any ecclesiastical authority outside of itself, whether popes, bishops, synods, presbyteries, general associations, councils, or conventions.—Hassell, page 293.

I could now follow up with quotations from such writers as Jones, Armitage, Orchard, Benedict, the Trial of Mt. Carmel Church, then such men as Gregg Thompson, J.R. Daily, S.F. Cayce, A.V. Adkins, J.G. Webb, J.W. Herriage, Dr. J.A. Paine, C.H. Cayce; then later, other men such as W.H. Richards, S.N. Redford, S.L. Rives, E.P. McNeill, and many others who stood firm for the above quotations in the defense of church rights and independence.

The little church in Dallas is constituted upon the above facts, and we feel we have the backing of the great majority of Baptists over the United States. This little church holds to four things, and will not be moved from them: 1. Salvation by grace; 2. Baptism by immersion; 3. Communion of like faith; 4. Church independence.

We have church fellowship for all who hold to our acknowledged articles of faith, and we reserve the right to make any rule we as a church deem good for ourselves, and we grant every church the like privilege.

We do not have bars of fellowship to place against any church that does not meet our approval on some of the following things.

Time of meeting or length of your meetings—let it be once a day or once a year; the kind of song book you use—let it be your choice; if you want the Lloyd book that is your business, and not ours; if you do not care for a song book, that is your business; support of the ministry—you may pay your preacher or you may not, that is your business; and you may pay him in the way you wish; you may take collections or leave them alone, or in the way you desire; you may have associations or not; your members may carry insurance or they may not, that is for you to work out, and not for us to decide for you; you may demand your members to wash feet, or you may not—that is for you to decide; then, if you have a divorce case, that is for you to solve to the satisfaction of your own church; then, comes the matter of secret orders, and surely this is a matter for each church to solve—you are the only ones to solve it. When a church passes on the qualifications of a person, as to whether he is worthy for membership, that act is final, and no church or churches, according to the witnesses I have given, have any right to call her in question and declare against her. Yours in love. (*S.A. Paine, Messenger of Peace June, 1941*)

Clark, John

CLARK, John (*See under Persecution in MASSACHUSETTS*)

Clement

CLEMENT (*See the article on The School at ALEXANDRIA*)

Colossians, The Book of

The Book of COLOSSIANS (*See under The Book of EPHESIANS*)

Communion

COMMUNION: J. H. Oliphant: The Passover was instituted to commemorate God's passing over the dwellings of the Jews, when he slew the first born of the Egyptians. The Lord's last judgment upon the Egyptians was the slaying of their first born. The blood on the lintels of the doors and the door posts of the Hebrews secured them from this curse, and while the whole nation of the Egyptians were in mourning they left the land of their captivity.

In Exodus 12, we have a detailed account of this whole affair; Exodus 12:24 reads, "And ye shall observe this thing for an ordinance forever." It was to be kept up to refresh their memory of their great deliverance from the destroying angel. The observance of this annually called their minds to God's wonderful mercy to them, and no doubt it was intended to set forth in type the Lord Jesus, who, as our Passover, was sacrificed for us, I Corinthians 5:7. By whose death, as a lamb without spot, a far greater deliverance was obtained.

God, no doubt, saw that it would be good for his people to have a service among them that would regularly call their minds to their great delivery, and keep fresh in their memory their former captivity. Besides, this, to them, was a *telescope* through which they saw our great Redeemer as *our Passover* crucified for us. It was to them what the Lord's Supper is to us. Its great object was to point to Christ Jesus.

Christ, on the night in which he was betrayed, ate the last Passover with his disciples. Matthew 26:17-25, And as they were eating the Passover, he took bread and wine and introduced the gospel service of the Lord's Supper; and after this they went out into the Mount of Olives, where he was betrayed, and on the succeeding day was crucified. We will consider this subject under different heads:

1st. The elements used, bread and wine, were employed by Christ. "He took bread and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the disciples, and said, Take, eat, this is my body." Some have urged that the bread really became the flesh of Christ, but

the plain meaning is that this broken bread is intended to represent his body which was broken for sin. It is but natural bread, but it signifies that you must spiritually eat of him. Bread is the staff of life naturally, but it is no more necessary to our natural being than Christ is to our spiritual being.

We take bread to supply the wants of our body each day, and still our nature craves continued supplies; and so we have been feasting on the spiritual comforts of Christ for years, and still we can say, "I need thee precious Jesus." Bread, in order to be adapted to our wants, must be crushed and broken. The heavy pressure of the millstone is necessary to prepare the grain for our use, naturally; and so the thorns, the buffeting, scourging, spitting, and the awful agonies of the cross, are but necessary to prepare food for our souls. Our Savior must be a crucified Savior; his body must be broken, and in the wisdom of God broken bread is best adapted to represent the body of our Savior.

He also gave them wine, saying, "This is my blood of the New Testament which is shed for many for the remission of sins." Christ made choice of wine; why he did he has not revealed. We know that wine is obtained by crushing the grape and pressing the juice out of it, and so the blood of Christ must run from his body to be capable of washing away sins.

By considering how these two elements are prepared, we may be called to review the whole scene of Christ's suffering. When wine is old, it retains its strength, and the blood of Christ is today as capable of washing away sin as when it ran fresh and warm from his side and hands and feet.

"Dear dying lamb, thy precious blood
Shall never lose its power
Till all the ransomed church of God
Be saved to sin no more."

Though it were many centuries since that blood was shed, and many thousand miles from here, yet it cleanses us from all sin; it assuages our griefs, and wipes the tears from our lamenting

eyes; untold millions have felt its power to comfort the comfortless.

2nd. It was the same night in which he was betrayed that he took bread and wine and administered the Lord's Supper, I Corinthians 11:23. From this it would appear that it was first introduced in the night. Also Matthew 26:20, and Mark 14:17. Also the fact that it was eaten in connection with the Passover, which was eaten in the night, shows that our Savior introduced this service after night. I have known brethren who thought it should be attended to after night in imitation of the first example.

I remember once to have participated with the brethren at a night meeting, but I do not conclude that the time of day or night is a matter of so much importance as some other things connected with it. Acts 20:7, "And upon the first day of the week when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them, and continued his speech until midnight." From this we would infer that they took the Lord's Supper after night. But if we were to take it every night and every day, we would not sin in that particular; we might sin in our manner or design, but the sin would not lie in the hour of taking it.

It was first introduced in a large upper room—Luke 22:12. There may be instruction to us in the fact that an upper room was selected. Some have thought that it was intended to teach us that we should leave all earthly matters behind and rise in our thoughts above all worldly things. No doubt, we should regard the service of God as infinitely above all earthly pursuits, but still we would not infer that we should go into an upper room for that purpose, nor do we think that the time of day is a matter of great importance. We have sometimes taken it in the grove, in private houses, and at the church house. The matter of greatest importance is the manner of taking it.

3rd. It has been thought by some that the real object of the Lord's Supper was to express our love and Christian confidence one for another. In I Corinthians 5:11, "But now I have written unto you not to keep company, if any man that is called a brother be a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolater, or a railer,

or a drunkard, or an extortioner; with such an one, no, not to eat." It appears from this passage that a church is not in a suitable condition to commune while a member of known bad character is in her body. In this case she should not go into this solemn service. But I would not infer from this that each member should have the utmost confidence in every other member, for if that be true, we would seldom find a church in condition to attend to this service.

The real object of the communion was to show forth his death till he come—I Corinthians 11:26; also I Corinthians 11:25. "This do ye as oft as ye do it in remembrance of me." Also I Corinthians 11:24, "This do in remembrance of me." Brethren sometimes think they cannot take the communion with the church, if there is any brother or sister who has gone astray in some particular, or done them an injury. Sometimes they will get up and vacate their seats till it is over, or stay away from meeting on that account, and yet refuse to obey the gospel rule in Matthew 18, and thus commit a greater sin against God than their brother has against them.

Reader, if you have been guilty of this, don't do so any more. It is this service in which you recall to your own mind and others the price of redemption; by this you review the whole scene of Christ's suffering in the garden, through his trial, and on the cross. You are not in this showing your Christian love or confidence in any one, else you must needs invite all Christians to your table, whether they be in the kingdom or not; but you recall the history of Christ.

It is an emblem of his suffering, and it is good for us often to think of him. We sometimes look at the garments worn by our departed friends, and it brings fresh to our memory many events of their lives. It tenders our hearts, and we drink in the spirit of loved ones who are gone from us. So this is intended to call us back to Christ, his examples of humility, love and patience; it prepares us to bear with patience the trials of life. It causes us to loathe sin, since it cost the life and blood of Christ, and we are caused to shun every appearance of evil.

We see in his death God's awful abhorrence of sin, and we should feel a great desire to shun it. It is a way of preaching to others. This bread and wine represents Christ crucified as our only hope. We are great and vile sinners, but the blood of Christ is our plea. We owe to our neighbors and to the world that we are wretched sinners, but Jesus died for us.

Oh! see in this wine an emblem of his flowing blood; it has quenched the flames of hell; it has washed me as white as snow; it has silenced Sinai's awful roar; it has brought life and immortality to light; and though we are so vile, yet we have redemption through his blood. His blood has sealed the covenant in which eternal life is secured to every heir of God. This is to be kept up in Zion till he comes again. It is to be perpetual.

4th. Hypocrisy is to avoided on all occasions; but in this service how desirable that we should in heart be impressed with the real importance of the matter. If it is to "show forth his death," how desirable that we should be duly impressed with that event! It is a fearful thought that we should engage in that service without "discerning the Lord's body," I Corinthians 11:29.

In contemplating the scene of Calvary, we are but reviewing the cost of our pardon. When our friend is dying we feel that it is no place for vain, light thoughts, no place to entertain unkind feelings for any. We are possessed with a spirit of forbearance and a forgiving temper; and, if the witnessing of a friend's death so humbles us, and banishes our evil tempers, what effect should a visit to Calvary have upon us?

In this bread I see the body of Jesus which was beaten and mangled for me. My sins helped to make up his ponderous load that crushed him in the garden and on the cross. Oh! for grace to live without sin, to live faithfully to him, to own him aright.

We should seek the same patient temper that he exhibited on the cross, and all through his life. We are often so petulant that if our brother does a wrong we forsake the church, with all its service, on that account. This was not the temper of Christ.

Though Peter denied him, he still loved him; and though the wicked ones nailed him to the cross, he prayed for them. And so we should earnestly seek that same temper and faithfulness that he had.

Often, in taking these elements, we feel such a sense of our own vileness that we tremble to break the bread or eat it after it is broken. I have seen brethren refuse on account of their own unworthiness, but it is encouraging to such persons to know that this service is suited to their condition. We have no merit of our own, but these emblems point us to the fountain of all true goodness among men. Our sins are great, but this flesh and blood have been given as a ransom for me.

If I were not unworthy, I would not need them; but I am, and therefore I venture on *him*; I freely own to all the world that I am evil; but here is my hope set forth in type in this bread and wine. I would urge on our brethren and sisters that they do not refuse this service, or shun it, and that you seek for the true spirit of service in engaging in it. Lay aside all your malice one for another, and all envy, and every feeling of revenge. Your conduct should not be vain and light. How gently we handle the bodies of the dead, and how lightly we walk about them. So we should be deeply impressed with solemnity on this occasion.

5th. We are not told in the Bible just how often we should engage in this service, but we are told that as "often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till he come,"—Acts 20:7. Some denominations take it every Sabbath. Most of our churches take it twice a year, and some three times per year. I would not object to it every Sabbath, if it could be done in "spirit and in truth."

6th. This sacrament was first given to the twelve, or rather to the eleven, who had been previously baptized. Baptism, in the order of time, precedes the privilege of the Lord's Supper. This, I believe, is the opinion of all denominations. From John 3:23, we learn that the apostles were baptized prior to the Lord's Supper. Also, Acts 2:41-42. The people appear to have been baptized prior to "breaking of bread."

The first step in gospel service by Paul was to be baptized. Acts 9:18, and Romans 6:3-4, goes to show that baptism is the first step in the "walk in newness of life." I do not know that any deny that baptism should precede all other church privileges. If this be true, then baptized believers are alone required to engage in this service. Sometimes persons have applied to our church for membership, and before they were baptized the church has taken the sacrament. It is thought prudent and scriptural that he should not participate in this service until he be baptized.

These positions being true, we cannot in consistency invite any to the Lord's table who have been sprinkled or poured on for baptism. Much complaint has been laid against us on account of our close communion practice, which, I am satisfied, originates in part from a misunderstanding of our position, and from a desire to weaken our influence, and from a spirit of strife. All admit that baptism precedes this ordinance, and if we are correct in our views of that subject, we must be correct in denying communion with all who have not been immersed.

How any people who practice *immersion alone* can invite those who are sprinkled to their table I cannot see. They may thereby show a great respect for the feelings of their fellow creatures, but very little regard for the Word of God. We feel sure that it is a glaring inconsistency to claim that immersion alone is baptism, and yet in this solemn way recognize sprinkling or pouring.

And further, this is a church ordinance. It was not first given to all the saints, but to the eleven, not simply because they were saints, and that they might express love to each other, but that they, in their organized capacity, might solemnly show forth the Lord's death till he come. On this occasion he said to them, Luke 22:29, "I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me;" Luke 22:30, "That ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom." Agreeably to this, the table was placed in the organized church, and of course in order to eat at that table, we must go into the church. We are not at liberty to take these emblems out of the church to give them to those who are unwilling to come in.

The Savior's words were, "I *appoint* unto you a kingdom." The word *appoint* here indicates that I make over to you a kingdom. I will presently leave the world; while I have been with you I have kept you; I have ordained such as I saw fit to go into my service as ministers, etc.; but now I shall leave you, hence I make over to you the control of the church; henceforth you are to administer its ordinances, ordain its elders and deacons, etc.

This, I think was the church of Christ, and the Lord's Supper was administered to it *and in it*; they were instructed to eat and drink "at his table in his kingdom." Upon this ground our practice of close communion rests. We believe that the church organized by Christ continues to this time, and that her history can be traced back to the apostles without passing through the Catholics. Some of our brethren have written on this subject, and we think they have shown that our history can be traced back to the apostolic age; that we never have had any connection with the "mother of harlots."

I am aware that many ridicule this claim, and urge that every denomination under heaven owe their existence to the Catholics. In Matthew 16:18, the Savior says, speaking of this church, "The gates of hell shall not prevail against it." This passage indicates the perpetuity of the church. The word *gates* is put for military strength, and indicates that hell's mighty hosts, who rush out of her gates to the attack shall never vanquish and destroy this church.

If this prediction is true she has existed in all ages of the world, despite the persecutions through which she has passed. She is older and a million times stronger than the Catholic Church today. She has never received her mark, nor been connected with her, save in the relation of a martyr to the persecutor. She has never received her practices from the Catholic fraternity.

Some have illustrated the church by what they call the *branch system*; that all the different churches are so many branches of the same tree, and all together make up the church of Christ visible. Of course Presbyterians, Lutherans, Episcopalians,

Methodists, etc., can afford to adopt this sentiment, because it is well known that they all sprang from the Catholics, and that whatever legal authority they have to administer, baptism, etc., they received from the Catholics.

It is consistent for them to practice open communion, and mix and unite as churches, for they all, as branches, have grown out of the same trunk. But I appeal to the candid reader, can the Baptists consistently recognize these institutions of men as the church of Christ? Is it not far more consistent for us to continue, as our fathers have done, to be a separate people?

When A. Campbell was expelled from the Baptist Church he was vehement in denouncing the Catholics, as the "mother of harlots," and other denominations as her daughters. But in order to find a good apology for organizing a new institution, he necessarily urged that the true church had been lost and overcome by Catholicism, ignoring the prediction of Christ that it should never be destroyed, thus forming a pretext to set up a new sect of human origin, whose history can be traced, from memory, by men now living, to human authority.

We want to be kind and social. We want to manifest a gentle Christian spirit to all, but we do not want, by word or deed, to recognize these institutions of men, as having any claim upon us, or as being of divine authority. This is the real foundation of our close communion practice.

Many have used this as a club, to beat us with. Some who believe in immersion alone, have been so inconsistent as to invite persons sprinkled to their table, and then complained of us, because we would not indulge in the same inconsistencies. Are we not consistent in our practice? I am sure that any other course would be yielding up the most vital principles of our denomination. We render ourselves unworthy the name of *Baptist* when we yield this position. We will never do it, although it makes us unpopular and contemptible in the eyes of the masses. We will still maintain our principles. Our great concern should be to maintain the "ordinances as they were delivered unto us." Reasonable men and women will see that

we are consistent in this practice, and will admire us for our consistency.

From what has been said, I think it clear that we must be a separate people. We can consistently believe there are Christians in other denominations, and also some who have never joined any. We should love them dearly, be kind to them, and allow them the privilege of their own opinions freely. I hope what I have written on this subject will excite the reader to investigate the same. (*J.H. Oliphant, Principles and Practices of the Regular Baptists 1885*)

COMMUNION: Wine or grape juice: C. H. Cayce: In reply to the above will say that no well informed person would say that grape juice was used in the old Jewish Passover supper. Several different articles were used in that supper, among them being wine and unleavened bread. They also had in that supper what we now call gravy, and what was then called sop. See John 13:26. In eating this they dipped into the dish. See Matthew 26:23. Although there were a number of different articles in the Jewish Passover supper, yet the bread and wine were the substance of that supper. In the institution of the sacramental supper the Savior took the substance (the bread and wine) from the Passover supper, and used that substance in the same. The orthodox Jew would not give a farthing for the Passover supper without the bread and wine, because that was the real substance of it.

Any man who knows anything at all about the meaning of words knows that wine is the fermented juice, and not the unfermented. Unfermented grape juice is not wine. Hence, for any man to say that the Savior did not use wine is to say that the Bible lies about it. But the Bible does not lie.

Hence, the man who says the Savior did not use wine misrepresents the matter, either ignorantly or otherwise.

The Corinthians used fermented juice, or wine, in the supper. They abused the supper, and made it a drunken feast. See I Corinthians 11:21. In partaking of the Lord's supper some of them drank to excess and were drunken. The apostle rebuked

them sharply for this, but he did not reprove nor rebuke them for using the wine in the supper. He approved the use of wine in the sacramental supper, but he did not approve drunkenness, or drinking to excess, or making a drunken feast of the Lord's supper. Wine, then, is the proper thing to use in that supper.

Again: If we substitute grape juice, or anything else, for the wine in the sacramental supper, we say by this that the Lord of glory did not know what was best to use. This would be no less than presumption, and we know that some men are very presumptuous.

Again: If we have the right to substitute grape juice for wine in the sacramental supper, we have the same right to substitute water, or anything else. We have as much right to substitute buttermilk for the wine as we do to substitute grape juice. We could more consistently substitute gravy for the wine than we could grape juice, because gravy was used in the Passover supper and grape juice was not. (*Cayce's Editorials vol. 2, ppg 271-273*)

C. H. Cayce: When the element that is used to represent the blood of the Saviour is mentioned in the New Testament it is called the fruit of the vine. It should be remembered that the Lord instituted the sacramental supper at the time of the eating of the last Passover supper with His disciples. Grape juice was not used in the Passover supper. Wine was used in that supper. Wine is the fermented juice of the grape. Grape juice has to be adulterated to keep it from fermenting. It is a flagrant violation to use adulterated things in any service of God. Unfermented juice cannot, in any way, typify the agony of the Lord. Fermented juice would fittingly typify His agony.

In the Passover unleavened bread and wine were used. These things were the substance of the Passover. Without them the Passover supper was worthless. Other articles might be omitted from that supper without question, but if the bread or the wine were omitted, the supper was valueless. The lord took the substance of the supper—the unleavened bread and the wine—and instituted the sacramental supper. As these things were the articles He used, it would be the height of presumption to

substitute something else. We simply would not administer the communion when grape juice is used instead of wine, nor would we engage in that service when such substitute is used.
(*Cayce's Editorials vol. 4, ppg 481, 482*)

Close COMMUNION: *C.H. Cayce:* We have often remarked that our people do not practice close communion. We are aware that our practice on the communion question is called that; but it is not communion that we are *close* on—it is baptism upon which we are *close*. We will commune with any member of our church who is in good standing and good order at home, no matter where his home is. But we do not commune with those who are not members of our own order. In order to become a member of the Primitive Baptist Church, one must be baptized by a Primitive Baptist minister—one who has been authorized to administer baptism for the Primitive Baptist. Those thus baptized break bread (communed) together. See Acts 2:41-42. Only those who had been baptized broke bread. Those who had been baptized did not break bread with those who had not been baptized. We practice that yet. This one text is enough to show that our people are right on the communion question. Much could be written on the question, but our space is limited, and we have to be brief.
(*CAYCE'S EDITORIALS vol. 2, ppg 386*)

Lemuel Potter on CLOSE COMMUNION

The following is a series of four lectures delivered by Elder Lemuel Potter in response to those who had accused his people of being unfriendly, because they practiced *close communion*.

I hope, dear reader, you will not think me to be egotistic in putting this little work before the public, for I am truly sensible of my inability to do anything like justice to so grave a subject. As there has been a great deal said in and around Owensville, on the subject of the communion, that made it seem necessary to lecture there on the question, and as there were likely to be remarks made about the lectures after they were delivered, I concluded to give the public the privilege of reading, for themselves, the arguments used. I know this is a very imperfect synopsis of the speeches made, but the substance of

the whole thing will be found here. It has been my aim not to defend close communion for all who practice it, but for the Regular Baptists. If it should meet the approbation of others, I have no objection whatever, but I have given our reasons, some of them at least, for our practice of close communion. I hope that it will be a blessing to the church, and that the reader will be his own judge as to whether our reasons are good or not for the course of our church—Eld Lemuel Potter.

Lecture 1

I wish to state that it is not my intention, in the course of these lectures, to be understood to be simply gratifying an ambition to spite some one, neither do I wish to wound the feelings of any.

But as we feel we have been assailed, we simply wish the people, if they will hear us, to know whether we have any reason for our practice of strict communion or not; or, if we think we have any reasons, to know if they are good ones. We do not wish to be understood as bigots, or egotists, or schismatics, or that we are not sincere in our pretensions, religiously. Neither do I undertake it simply because I feel able to do justice to the subject, or that I am better capable of investigating this matter than others. Neither do I undertake it voluntarily, but at the request of my brethren here, who feel they are assailed in this community, both in conversation on the subject and through the General Baptist Messenger, published in this town. I will read:

“Listen to the following. A brother close communion Baptist asks his editor this question: What should be done with a deacon who intentionally passes the bread and wine to a Methodist preacher, said preacher dipping in the dish?”

Answer: “A deacon should have great boldness in faith. He did that either through cowardice or heretical notions. If the latter, he usurped authority over the church and forced the church against her will, and deserves prompt attention. If he did it through lack of courage, then excuse him from further service in that line. In any event let the church diligently inquire into the matter and ascertain whether his treachery was from weakness or heresy, and punish him accordingly. In any event let him

never serve in that capacity again. Let the church keep the ordinances as delivered. His is not service, as the name deacon implies, but it is treachery and usurpation. He despises the church of God, which has control of the ordinances instead of himself. If the church submits to such prostitution of the holy ordinances by one of her servants, then is she unworthy of the high trust committed to her by her glorified Head. Let her see to it that repentance and confession, and fruits meet for repentance, are brought forth by the erring servant; and let her see to it also that for the present, at least, he be no longer deacon."

"Another Baptist editor comments as follows: Had that church observed the supper as a church ordinance, which all Baptists admit it is, and requested her membership to come together in one place, as the middle seats of the house, this cowardly, treasonous act of that deacon would not have occurred. The deacons of a prominent church of our association refused to serve unless the church did this; and they refused to offer the emblems to any scattered over the house. They rightly refused to take the responsibility of deciding who might and who might not eat the supper. Will not all deacons follow their example?"

"Do we not almost shudder at the thought of following a self-imposed rule with such dogmatism as to call forth such language on the head of a good deacon, whom the church has chosen to serve her? Peter denied his Lord, and cursed and swore, yet for that awful offense Jesus had only a tender look of compassion. Yet here is a leader and teacher of the people speaking, doubtless, by authority of what claims to be a church of the same Jesus, using the words Treason, Coward, Heresy and Usurpation, and finally expelling one of Christ's servants—all for what? Denying his Lord? No. Cursing and swearing? No. Getting drunk? No. Living in adultery? No. Why, then, have they disgraced this good man? For the grave and unpardonable offense of passing the bread and wine of communion to a Methodist preacher! Is that the spirit of Christ, brethren? We repeat: before we allow a rule to control us in which there can be no possible good, and which may lead to such awful wrongs—would it not be wise to let it go?"

Who those editors were this editor has left us to guess, and I am such a poor guesser that I shall not undertake it. It is generally common for editors, when they quote from another paper anything of importance, to give the name of the paper, and I think that it is about as easy for a man to know the name of a paper as for him to know what is in it. But I do not know what paper this was in. I think if a brother deacon should be guilty of an offense of the sort mentioned in this paper, the brethren should have some forbearance with him, and try to inform him what they require him to do in cases of that kind, and not be quite so unmerciful as is represented in this paper. I think such treatment too severe for offenses, as it is not brotherly, nor Christian-like. Whoever is, or has been guilty of such, would by no means have my approval.

“What is the difference in authority assumed by a Baptist church that forbids other Christians the Lord’s Supper and the Roman Catholic Church that excommunicates its members as a punishment for some disobedience? The former is a penalty imposed on a Christian for not being a Baptist; the latter is a penalty imposed for violation of the discipline of the church. The one is denying Christ’s people a right he gave them. The other is enforcing church discipline. Judge ye.” (General Baptist Messenger, March 20, 1886.)

I confess I do not see the force of this article, though it may be very convincing to those who do see it. So far as denying the people of God a right He gave them, I do not know of any rights they are entitled to, only such as they enjoy. If God gave his people a right to commune with us, it must have been on the gospel terms of communion, and when they come to us that way we will receive them. But let us read another in the same paper of March 20, 1886:

“I know full well what the failure to produce a divine precept for, or example to support a long standing religious tradition can cost a conscientious Christian. The failure of my religious teacher to find a precept in God’s word for infant sprinkling once cost me the severance, religiously, from the mother that bear me, from the dearest, most tender of all earthly ties, and made me a Baptist, who, I was assured, rejected from their faith and

practice everything for which they could not produce a precept in God's word.'" "

"Now if this brother is as conscientious now as he was then, why does he not again sever the ties that bind him, for we most candidly assure him there is no precept in God's word for close communion. It is exactly the same kind of argument used by them to sustain their practices in communion that is used by Pedobaptists to prove infant sprinkling, viz: The most remote, far-fetched inference; and there is fully as much scripture for the one as for the other. He further says to Pedobaptists:

"Show me one precept for infant sprinkling and I will offer myself to my family church next Sabbath, and carry my children to the sacred font, and by the holy sacrament secure and seal their eternal salvation.'" And so we say to our close communion friends. Show us one precept in God's word for your practices in this sacred ordinance, and it will be more convincing than all your tracts, books and articles that have ever been written in advocacy of your practices."

We take all these, as well as remarks that have been frequently made in this community, to be thrust at us, as we are the only people here that practice close communion. So we will see if we have any scriptural authority for our practice.

Terms of Communion

Argument 1. I argue, first, that the Lord's Supper is a commemorative rite. The apostle says: "For I have received of the Lord that which I also delivered unto you. That the Lord Jesus, the same night in which He was betrayed, took bread. And when he had given thanks He brake it and said, take, eat. This is My body which is broken for you. This do in remembrance of Me. After the same manner, also, he took the cup, when he had supped, saying: This cup is the New Testament in My blood. This do ye, as oft as ye drink of it, in remembrance of Me," I Corinthians 11:23-25. "And he took bread and gave thanks, and brake it and gave it unto them, saying: This is my body, which is given for you. This do in remembrance of Me," Luke 22:19.

Argument 2. My second argument is that, while this ordinance is to be observed in remembrance of our Lord, the particular thing that it is commemorative of is His death. "For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come," I Corinthians 11:26. This commemorative rite is the solemn act by which the disciples call to mind the fact that Christ died for them. This ordinance, then, is to be observed by such only as can truly and solemnly say, "I believe Christ died for me," or, in other words, have faith to discern the Lord's body.

Argument 3. It is an ordinance of Jesus Christ appointed in the church. This argument is so universally agreed to that it seems unnecessary to spend time to prove it. I do not mean by the term church in this argument, the entire body of all the saved, as in Ephesians 5:22-23, "And hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be head over all things to the church, which is his body, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all." The term church in this text must mean all the saved, and cannot apply simply to any one congregation of Christians in any one place, nor living in any one age, for it could not be truly said that such is the fulness of Christ. Again: Ephesians 5:25, "Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave Himself for it," etc. This text, and others like it, must mean all that will ever be congregated in heaven, from Abel down to the last one that will ever be regenerated and saved. To the church taken in this sense there can belong no ordinances, because, as a congregation, it will never be in existence until the great day.

So it is not the church taken in this sense that has ordinances, but we find the church frequently used in the New Testament to designate a congregation of visible disciples, baptized believers, meeting in one place for the worship of God, the observance of the ordinances of Jesus and the execution of his laws. For instance, "Likewise greet the church that is in their house," Romans 16:5. "Unto the church of God which is at Corinth," 1 Cor. 1:2. "Aquila and Priscilla salute you much in the Lord, with the church that is in their house," I Corinthians 16:19. "Unto the church of God which is at Corinth," II Corinthians 1:1. "Salute the brethren which are in Laodicia and Nymphas,

and the church which is in his house," Colossians 4:15. "And when this epistle is read among you, cause that it be read also in the church of the Laodicians," Colossians 4:15. "Paul and Sylvanus and Timotheus unto the church of the Thessalonians," I Thessalonians 1:1. "And the church in thy house," Philippians 2. "To the angel of the church of the Ephesians," Rev. 2:1. "Then had the churches rest throughout Judea and Galilee and Samaria, and were edified," Acts 9:31. "And he went through Syria and Cilicia confirming the churches," Acts 15:41. "And so were the churches established in the faith, and increased in number daily," Acts 16:5.

Argument 4. As it is appointed in the church, it necessarily follows that it belongs to the church collectively, and not to members individually. Acts 20:7, "And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread," etc. I Corinthians 11:17. In this connection the church is spoken of as coming together to partake of the Lord's Supper.

Now, as I have shown that it is a church ordinance, I shall proceed to show that baptism is a condition, or prerequisite to communion.

Argument 5. I argue that as it is a church ordinance, it necessarily follows that baptism is as truly a prerequisite to the Lord's Supper as that the ordinance of baptism is essential to a gospel church.

Argument 6. I argue that from the design, nature and use of baptism, and the scriptural use of baptism, it is necessarily a prerequisite to the communion. A learned writer has said:

"The principal and most comprehensive design of this ordinance appears, from the scriptures, to be a solemn public and practical profession of Christianity. Thus Paul sums up the baptism of John, Acts 19:4, 'John verily baptized with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people that they should believe on Him which should come after him, that is, on Jesus Christ!' And thus he describes his own Galatians 3:27. 'As many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ.' To the same purpose are the words of Peter on the day of Pentecost: 'Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ.'

Hence also a rejection of baptism is by our Lord called a rejection of the counsel of God, that is, of Christianity. Luke 7:30. And the reception of baptism is represented as the act by which we justify God; that is, practically approve his method of salvation by faith in the Messiah. Luke 7:29. Hence, whatever may be said of baptism as it is now generally understood and practiced, and of the personal religion of those who practice it, it is certain that it was originally appointed to be the boundary of visible Christianity. But this general design of baptism comprehends many particulars. Christianity consists partly of truths to be believed, partly of precepts to be obeyed and partly of promises to be hoped for, and this, its initiatory ordinance, is rich in significancy in relation to them all. We are taught to regard it: 1. As a solemn profession of our faith in the Trinity, and particularly of our adoption by the Father, of our union to the Son, of our sanctification by the spirit. 2. As a public pledge of the renunciation of sins. 3. As the expression of our hope of a future and glorious resurrection. 4. As a visible bond of union among Christians."

Baptism, therefore, is designed to give a sort of visible epitome to Christianity. I will then begin with the statement that no unbaptized person is, according to the order of the gospel, to be admitted to the Lord's table. The reason I begin with this argument is because I have already seen a challenge for the proof of that position, and how well I shall succeed in the establishment of this point you will be left to judge.

The first text that I will introduce in support of my position is the commission, as recorded by Matthew: "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you, and lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world. Amen." From this text the first thing commanded is to teach; second, to baptize, and afterwards teach them to do all other things that Jesus had commanded them. If he had commanded them to observe the communion at all, which will not be denied, then it is plain that the communion is embraced in "all things whatsoever I have commanded you," and, if so, then baptism is given by the Lord, himself, before the communion.

The best way for Christians to prove their loyalty and fidelity to the Savior and His word is to obey him. If He, in the commission, gave the order in which the ordinances are to be observed, it seems to me it would be bold and defiant presumption on the part of His people to reverse that order. If you say it makes no difference, we have a right to invite un-baptized persons to the Lord's table, instead of submitting to the authority of Christ, you rebel against it, and, instead of obeying his law, you set it aside and legislate a law of your own and obey it. If this is your course, do not ask us to recognize you as a true servant of Christ and complain at us if we do not commune with you. If you do not reverse the order, then baptism is before the communion, as taught in the commission. The Savior taught the disciples about this: "After you have taught and baptized them, then you are to teach them to observe all things, communion among others, whatsoever I have commanded you during the three years of My ministry with you." If this is not the teaching of Jesus in the commission, then I do not know the meaning of His language.

On the day of Pentecost Peter commanded the people to repent and be baptized. There can be no doubt that Peter, on this memorable occasion, was laboring under the authority of the commission that I have already quoted, and the first thing he did was to teach, and then require them to be baptized. He said nothing about the communion to them at that time, and, as he did not, it is very evident he followed the order of the commission, teaching that the gospel requires baptism before the communion. That is the way he understood and taught the commission. We might as well reverse the order of teaching and baptizing, so as to have baptism go before teaching, as to reverse the order of baptism and communion and have communion before baptism. There is not a single instance given in the New Testament, that I have ever seen, where the bread and wine were offered to an un-baptized person.

With this glaring fact before us, what are we to conclude, only that the apostles taught that baptism was a prerequisite to the Lord's Supper? We read: "Then they that gladly received his word were baptized, and the same day there were added unto

them about three thousand souls. And they continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread and in prayers," Acts 2:41-42. We learn from this text that they were first taught, and then baptized, and then followed the other things that the Lord had commanded, and among them was the breaking of the bread. It seems strange that the apostles were with Jesus three years during his ministry, and then, after his resurrection, they would hear him utter the words of the commission and fail to understand it, and in the very introduction of their work make a wrong start and lead so many astray on the question of baptism being required before the communion.

Why so much stress on the arrangement of the commission by the Savior, and then in its fulfillment by the apostles, if persons may be admitted to the communion without being baptized? It is by baptism that the believer puts on Christ, practically, and I insist that no man that has not put on Christ is entitled to the sacrament of the Lord's Supper.

While it is evident that believers are the children of God, it is also evident that God's children are required to put Christ on in baptism, and, until they do so, they disobey, and I cannot agree that disobedient children are entitled to the supper. "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ," Galatians 3:26-27. If, as Mr. Campbell and others have taught, none are the children of God until they are baptized, which I deny, then they certainly are not entitled to communion before they are the children of God; but if believers are his children, but have not put on Christ by baptism, then they are not in Christ practically. What right have they to the communion?

Whatever is meant in this text by being baptized into Christ, in that sense none are in Him until they are baptized, and, if they are not in Him, they are out of Him, that is all, and so they are not entitled to the Lord's Supper while they are out of Christ practically. We are, in some way, baptized into Christ, and in that sense we are not in Him without baptism, but we should be before we claim to be entitled to His supper. It is by baptism and not by communion that we get into Him in the sense of this

text. I take the meaning of the text to be that the believer puts on Christ, practically, by baptism. If I am correct, then the unbaptized person has not put Him on practically. If not, he is not entitled to the communion, unless a person is entitled to the communion who is not a practical Christian.

Audience, what do you say? Is a man entitled to partake of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper who refuses, or fails, or neglects to put on Christ by baptism? The plea that he may not have the opportunity to be baptized will not do in this case, for no one has the opportunity to the communion that has no opportunity to be baptized. Baptism is the first step of the saint in the new life. "Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life," Romans 6:4.

Is it right to admit persons to the Lord's table before they begin the new life? Have they any claim upon the church for the communion while they still refuse to walk in newness of life? It is by the action of baptism that they pledge themselves to renounce sin, and to obey the Lord, and to be his enemy no longer.

"And now why tarriest thou? Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord," Acts 22:16. In some sense we are taught by this text that in the act of baptism sins are washed away. I know of none, except those who believe in baptismal regeneration, who claim that baptism, itself, literally and physically, washes away sin, but to say the least of it, it is a solemn pledge, on the part of the candidate, to renounce sin, and this he does not, in the sense of this text, only by being baptized. The text calls it washing away sins. Sins are not washed away, in the sense of this text, only in baptism; so a person cannot rightly and justly be admitted to the Lord's Supper until his sins are washed away. Then baptism is required before the communion is admissible. To reject baptism is to reject the counsel of God, and the man that rejects the counsel of God rejects Christianity, and that such a man is not worthy of the communion, it seems to me, needs no argument. "But the Pharisees and lawyers rejected the counsel

of God against themselves, being not baptized of him," Luke 8:30.

In conclusion of this part of the subject I charge those who say that baptism is not an essential qualification for the Lord's table, with the crime of encouraging persons to disobey the gospel and to think they can do as well without baptism as with it. If they are to be entitled to the communion without baptism, what other privileges may they not enjoy without being baptized? If they can be admitted to the most sacred and the most important without baptism, then we might get along very well and dispense with baptism entirely. We have as much authority for repealing the laws and ordinances of Christ as we have for making new ones. Either is treason against his government. I think we should be careful. I am not in favor of communing with those who are willing to set aside the Savior's laws.

Argument 7. I argue that baptism is a prerequisite to the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, from the fact that it has been so universally understood by all churches to be so.

Mosheim, in his ecclesiastical history, London edition, pg. 78, century 3, says, "Those, also, who had not received the sacrament of baptism were not admitted to this holy supper."

Again, on page 110, century 4, he says, "The institution of catechumens, and this discipline through which they passed, suffered no variation in this century, but continued still upon the ancient footing." Mr. Hall, the great advocate for open communion, says, "The apostles, it is acknowledged, admitted none to the Lord's Supper but such as were previously baptized." (Works, vol. 2, p. 213, 214, quoted by Howell, p. 77).

Neander's History of the Christian Church, vol. 1, pg. 327, says, "At this celebration (the Lord's Supper), as may be easily concluded, no one could be present who was not a member of the Christian Church, and incorporated into it by the rite of baptism."

Abraham Booth says, "Before the grand Romish apostasy, in the very depths of that apostasy, and since the reformation, both at home and abroad, the general practice has been to receive none but baptized persons to communion at the Lord's table." (Booth wrote in the seventeenth century. Howell, pp. 51,52.)

Justin Martyr wrote about A. D. 150, not more than fifty years after the death of John the apostle. He says, "This food is called by us the Eucharist, of which it is not lawful for any to partake, but such as believe the things that are taught by us to be true, and have been baptized." (2nd Apology, pg. 162, Howell, pg. 52.)

Jerome, who wrote about A. D. 400, says, "Catechumens cannot communicate at the Lord's table, being un-baptized." (Howell, pg. 58.)

Austin, who wrote about A. D. 500, on the question of administering the Lord's Supper to infants, says, "Of which certainly they cannot partake, unless they are baptized." (Howell, pg. 53.)

Theophylact, in a work published A. D. 1100, remarks, "No unbaptized person partakes of the Lord's Supper." (Howell, pg. 53.)

Bonaventure, who wrote about A. D. 1200, observes, "Faith, indeed is necessary to all sacraments, but especially to the reception of baptism, because baptism is the first among the sacraments and the door to the sacraments." (Howell.)

Spanheim, who flourished about A. D. 1600, says, "None but baptized persons are admitted to the Lord's table." (Howell.)

Lord Chancellor King wrote about A. D. 1700. He says, "Baptism was always precedent to the Lord's Supper, and none were admitted to receive the Eucharist till they were baptized. This is so obvious to every man that it needs no proof." (Howell.)

Dr. Wall avers, "No church ever gave the communion to any persons before they were baptized. Among all the absurdities that were ever held, none ever maintained that any person should partake of the communion before they were baptized." (History Infant Baptism, part 2, chapter 9, Howell.)

Dr. Doddridge says, "It is certain that Christians in general have always been spoken of as baptized persons. And it is also certain that, as far as our knowledge of primitive antiquity extends, no unbaptized person received the Lord's Supper." (Lectures, page 410, Howell.)

Dr. Dwight says, "It is an indispensable qualification for this ordinance that the candidate for communion be a member of the visible church of Christ, in full standing. By this I intend that he should be a person of piety; that he should have made a public profession of religion, and that he should have been baptized." (Systematic Theology, Serm. 160, Howell.)

Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, page 35, says, "The general opinion and practice in all ages has been that something more than conversion and Christian character was necessary to this ordinance; that baptism, soundness in faith, and a regular walk of holy obedience, were scriptural and indispensable terms of communion."

Even Robert Hall, who denied that baptism should be a prerequisite to communion, says, "It has been inferred, too hastily in my opinion, that we are bound to abstain from their communion—that of un-baptized persons—whatever judgment we may form of their sincerity and piety. Baptism, it is alleged, is, under all possible circumstances, an indispensable term of communion; and, however highly we may esteem many of our Pedobaptist brethren, yet, as we cannot but deem them un-baptized, we must of necessity consider them as unqualified for an approach to the Lord's table. It is evident that this reasoning rests entirely on the assumption that baptism is invariably a necessary condition of communion—an opinion which, it is not surprising, the Baptists should have embraced, since it has long passed current in the Christian world and been received by nearly all denominations of Christians." (Works, vol. 2, p. 212.)

I wish to add to this long list of witnesses a Methodist writer. A. A. Jameson, in his note on the twenty-five articles, p. 297, says: "The nature of these two ordinances teaches most clearly that baptism must necessarily precede the Lord's Supper."

But I must notice one argument that has been urged against the doctrine that baptism must precede the Lord's Supper. It has been argued that John's baptism was not Christian baptism, and therefore the disciples of Jesus, when he instituted the supper, had not received the rite of Christian baptism, and, if it was first given to those who had not been baptized, why make baptism precede the communion now? If John's baptism was not Christian baptism, and the apostles had not received baptism, in the Christian sense of the word, when the supper was instituted, then they never did receive Christian baptism at all, for they evidently did not perform that duty afterward. Not only this, but the great mass of the first Christians baptized by John were in precisely the same predicament. They never received Christian baptism.

If John's baptism was not Christian, it should be distinguished by some mark, phrase or epithet, so that we might know the two baptisms apart. Is one baptism styled John's baptism, and the other Christian baptism, in the New Testament? No such distinctions are known in the New Testament, and, therefore, I do not feel willing to recognize such a distinction until I have better authority for it. John does contrast his baptism with one that is different; that is, the baptism of the Holy Ghost, but if afterwards the baptism of Christians was to be different from his baptism, it is singular that he said nothing about it.

Bunyan says, "The Lord's Supper, not baptism, is for the church as a church; therefore, as we will maintain the church's edifying, that must be maintained in it; yea, used oft to show the Lord's death till he come." (Complete Works, pg. 856.)

What is a church? Is it an assembly of un-baptized persons? Is there any people, who believe in baptism at all, that would recognize anything as a church without baptism? Then, if the sacrament of the Lord's Supper is for the church as a church, it

must necessarily be for baptized persons, unless the church is made up in part, or in whole, of un-baptized persons. As it is a church ordinance, therefore it must be for baptized persons. The reason I have taken such pains to establish the point that baptism is a condition of the communion, is that Rev. W. P. Hale, Pastor of the General Baptist Church in this town, and editor of the General Baptist Messenger, said he would be obliged to the man that would show him one thus saith the Lord that taught that baptism is required before the communion. I think I have established that fact by the plain unmistakable teachings of the scriptures, and also by the history of the opinion of men on the terms of communion in all ages of the church. Mr. Hale also stated to me, in conversation on the subject that if I could prove that point, he would admit that we are correct in our practice of strict communion.

It is sometimes said that we set a Baptist table instead of the Lord's table. To such a saying as this I ask then, why are you so anxious to eat at it? Another answer: If it was our own table we could invite whom we chose to eat at it, but, if it is the Lord's table, He has not only given it to us, but with it he has given us the laws by which it shall be governed, and for us to set aside those laws would be for us to betray the trust committed to us.

Again, we are often accused of selfishness because we refuse to invite others to our communion, and that it is the cause of our not working with them in other services. To this we ask why does not the same thing keep other close communionists from working with you? It is not our views of the communion that hinders us from working with other denominations in their effort meetings to evangelize the world, but we cannot conscientiously endorse the efforts, measures and means employed at these effort meetings. The Missionary Baptists do believe in such efforts, and, although they are close communionists, they mix with other denominations in their revival meetings. So it is not the communion that keeps us apart.

But it is sometimes said that if we were friendly we would certainly commune with other denominations. I do not understand that the sacramental communion is a test of

friendship. I understand it to be an ordinance of the Lord, and, if it is, for us to make it a test of friendship is to misuse it, which would be worse than not to take the sacrament at all. Besides, I expect, as a general rule, there is about as good state of feeling between us and other denominations as there is between those denominations that commune together. If there is not, we think we had better incur the ill-will of our religious neighbors than to sin. We prefer to have the approbation of God, above the approbation of even good men. This thing of setting aside the law of the church, in order to look well in the eyes of others, does not honor God much.

If the church is not to care for and preserve the ordinances that God has given to it, who will do it better? If it should be said by any that we are not the church, or a church, then, if we are not, we have no right to the ordinances of the church. If we are, we are under obligation to God to observe the ordinances in His appointed way, and for us to deviate from that way would be treason.

But are there no inconsistencies about open communion? Mosheim, in speaking of the General Baptists in the seventeenth century, says, "There is much latitude in their system of religious doctrine, which consists in such vague and general principles, as render their communion accessible to Christians of almost all denominations. And accordingly they tolerate, in fact, and receive among them persons of every sect, even Socinians and Arians: nor do they reject any from their communion, who profess themselves Christians, and receive the Holy Scriptures as the source of truth and the rule of faith." (pg. 528.) Note 4, at the bottom of the same page, says, "This appears evidently from their confession of faith, which appeared first in the year 1660, was republished by Mr. Whiston in the memoirs of his life, vol. 2, pg. 561, and is drawn up with such latitude that, with the removal and alteration of a few points, it may be adopted by Christians of all denominations. Mr. Whiston, though an Arian, became a member of this Baptist community, which, as he thought, came nearest to the simplicity of the primitive and apostolic age. The famous Mr. Emlyn, who was persecuted on account of his Socinian principles, joined himself also to this society, and died in their

communion. It seems, then, that for us to commune with the General Baptists is to also commune with Arians and Socinians. Indeed, what would we not commune with if we were open communionists?

The Apostle Paul said, "He that is an heretic after the first and second admonition, reject." But how are we to do that? Are we to deprive him of all the privileges except the supper? It would be very inconsistent in us to exclude from our fellowship a man for heresy, and at the same time receive heretics into our communion. "The doctrine of the Socinians respecting the atonement is that God requires no consideration or condition of pardon, but the repentance of the offender; and that, consequently, the death of Christ was no real sacrifice for sin; and, though, it be so called in scripture, it is merely, in a figurative sense, by way of allusion to the Jewish sin offering, just as our praises and other good works are called sacrifices, because they are something offered up to God." (Religious Encyclopedia, pg. 1081.)

Suppose there is an organization of Socinians in the town of Owensville, and we were to attend the sacramental services of the General Baptist church and commune with them, would we not be likely to have to sit at the Lord's table with a people who deny that the death of Christ was a sacrifice for sin? We certainly would have no right to request the General Baptists to debar them from their table. They should have full control of that themselves. The way for us not to commune with those with whom we would prefer not to affiliate, is for us not to commune with the General Baptists. We may be ever so willing to commune with our General Baptist brethren, but their liberality to Arians and Socinians would shut us out. But let us notice the Methodist discipline a moment.

Our Methodist brethren are close communionists, if they live up to their discipline, and they cannot invite me to their communion unless they violate their discipline. Listen, "No person shall be admitted to the Lord's Supper among us who is guilty of any practice for which we would exclude a member from our church." (Discipline, pg. 37, sec. 42.) Now, if I am guilty of any practice for which they would exclude one of their

own members, I am not to be admitted to their communion. That is our rule, only we do not have it written out. We would not commune with a man if he is guilty of what we would exclude one of our own members for. But let us see what the Methodists would exclude their members for, and see whether or not I am guilty of such a practice. If I am, I am debarred from their table. "If a member of our church shall be accused of endeavoring to sow dissension in any of our societies by inveighing against either our doctrines or our discipline, the person so offending shall first be reprov'd by the preacher in charge, and, if he persists in such pernicious practice, he shall be brought to trial, and, if found guilty, expelled." (Dis. pg. 136, sec. 341.) I speak out against the Methodist doctrine and discipline, and I presume if I was a member of that church, and would preach as I do and oppose infant baptism and sprinkling and pouring as the mode of baptism, general atonement and conditional salvation, they would exclude me. Would you not, Brother Clippinger?

Brother Clippinger (Methodist minister, the preacher in charge at Owensville), "Yes, we would turn you out."

I thought so, and I am guilty of a practice for which you would exclude a member, then. So I am debarred from the communion of the Methodists, if they live up to their rule. They are close communionists, as well as we, yet they do not practice it, and, although they would exclude me from their church, yet, if I would go and join the General Baptists, they would invite me to their communion.

That is one of the inconsistencies of open communion. The apostle tells us, "The man that is an heretic, after the first and second admonition, reject." How are we to reject a heretic? Exclude him from our church and let him go to some other church and join, and then, because he is a member in good standing, invite him to our communion? Is that the way to reject a heretic? Is that the order of God's house? We do not wish to commune with heretics. We exclude men from us for heresy, and, when we do, we do not wish to invite them to our communion the next meeting we have. Is there heresy in this country under the name of Christianity? All will admit there is.

We do not have to go to the Jews or pagans to find heresy, for it may be found among Christians. If there is heresy among Christians, and we all practice free communion, how are we going to reject heretics? There is no way to do it, only to refuse to commune with others.

The apostle said to the Galatians, "Though we or an angel from heaven preach any other gospel to you than that we have preached, let him be accursed." Not commune with him. The apostle instructs us to let him be accursed, instead of to think that a little difference in doctrine will make no difference, we will commune with him, let him come to the Lord's table. I think it is heresy to say that the death of Christ was not a sacrifice for sin, but, if we commune with Socinians, we must commune with heretics who believe that doctrine. I do not wish to sit down at the Lord's table, side by side with a man to commemorate the death of Christ, and that man say the death of Christ is not a sacrifice for sin, but I am liable to have it to do if I commune with the General Baptists, according to their history.

Now here is Brother Clippinger, a Methodist minister. He and I often meet and strike hands, and I love him, and, perhaps, we could preach in the same community for years and have no hard feelings, for I am one of the most willing men you ever saw for people to do as they please religiously, so they do not interfere with my rights. If I should be at your meeting and you invited me to commune with you, I would not think hard of you, and, if you did not, I would not feel slighted, so long as I have the liberty to accept or reject the invitation, as I chose to do. I do not care whom other denominations commune with. It is none of my business to dictate to them, neither do I wish to be dictated to by them.

Lecture 2

As we have already observed that baptism is essential to the communion, we now wish to know what baptism is, and, in case we find anything practiced for baptism that is not baptism, we will not admit such to the communion. As to the mode of baptism, three modes are advocated among Christian people,

immersion, sprinkling, and pouring, and, while some admit either of these to be baptism, there are others who cannot conscientiously make the admission.

The Baptists honestly believe immersion to be the only mode, and that, so far as the action of baptism is concerned, there is no baptism without immersion. This being true, and baptism being a prerequisite to the communion, how can we consistently commune with those who have never been immersed? If we hold that immersion is essential to baptism, and the whole Pedobaptist world says that sprinkling and pouring are as truly baptism as immersion is, do we not differ? If we differ so materially as that, can we commune together? "Can two walk together except they be agreed?" Amos 3:3.

1st. I argue that immersion is baptism, because the whole Christian world says it is. There are none who deny immersion being baptism, and gospel baptism at that. While many claim that sprinkling and pouring are baptism, yet they say immersion is baptism. So, for our doctrine that our baptism is gospel baptism, we have the testimony of all.

2nd. I argue that immersion is the only scriptural mode of baptism, because everything that is said in the New Testament pertaining to mode favors immersion. But as it is not my intention to argue, at any great length, the mode of baptism, I will briefly call to mind a few things. 1st. "And were baptized of Him in Jordan, confessing their sins," Matthew 3:6. It is not necessary to go into the river to sprinkle or pour, and it is not always done. It is necessary to go into the water to immerse, and it is always done. I presume that John had business in the water, or they would not have gone into it. If they did have business there, it was to immerse, and not to sprinkle or pour. 2nd. "And Jesus, when he was baptized, went straightway up out of the water," Matthew 3:16. He evidently went into the water before he could have gone out of it. When you were sprinkled, did you go up out of the water? If you did not, you did not do as the Savior did.

What do you suppose He went into the water for, if it was not necessary?

Is it necessary for a person to go up out of the water after being sprinkled? If it is, then, of course, when a person is sprinkled he will certainly, in every case, go up out of the water. If any one is sprinkled, and does not go up out of the water afterwards, then, in case of sprinkling, it is not necessary to go up out of the water; but it is necessary in case of immersion, and in all cases of immersion the person goes up out of the water. 3rd. "And John, also, was baptizing in Enon, near to Salim, because there was much water there." John 3:23. Is much water necessary to sprinkle or pour with? It is not necessary to have much water to sprinkle or pour with. If it was, you would always see our Pedobaptist friends going to some place where there was much water. Do we always see that? Do they not often baptize, as they call it, with very little water? If a little water will do, much is not necessary. Then why did John select a place where there was much water? It is evident that for his purpose much water was necessary, and the text says he baptized there because there was much water there. It is necessary to have much water to immerse, and therefore he must have gone there to immerse.

You will always see people who immerse go to where there is much water. 4th. "And they both went down into the water, both Philip and the eunuch, and he baptized him," Acts 8:38. This is always necessary in immersion, but it is never necessary in sprinkling or pouring. 5th. "And when they came up out of the water," Acts 8:39. 6th. "Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death," Romans 6:4. A burial is absolutely essential to immersion, while such a thing never does take place in sprinkling or pouring. 7th. "Buried with him by baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead," Colossians 2:12. Now put all these together and you have a complete immersion - no more and no less. What is ever said on the subject of baptism that reminds us of sprinkling or pouring? Simply nothing.

4th. I argue that immersion, alone, is gospel baptism, because the Greek word from which we get the word baptize means

primarily to dip, according to all the lexicons I have ever noticed.

5th. I argue that immersion is the only gospel mode of baptism from the practice of the early Christians. Mosheim, in speaking of John, says, "The exhortations of this respectable messenger were not without effect; and those who, moved by his solemn admonitions, had formed the resolution of correcting their evil dispositions and amending their lives, were initiated into the kingdom of the Redeemer by the ceremony of immersion or baptism. Christ, himself, before he began his ministry, desired to be solemnly baptized in the waters of Jordan, that he might not, in any point, neglect to answer the demands of the Jewish law." (London edition, pg. 16.)

It should be remembered that the learned historian that we have quoted was not a Baptist, but that he was a Lutheran, and, notwithstanding the practice of the Lutherans relative to baptism, our historian calls the sacrament of baptism the ceremony of immersion. But we wish to hear him again. He says, "The sacrament of baptism was administered in this (first) century, without the public assemblies, in places appointed and prepared for that purpose, and was performed by immersion of the whole body in the baptismal font." (pg. 36.)

It seems very clear that if baptism was performed by immersion in the first century, and that John immersed, that immersion certainly was the apostolic mode. Such a thing as sprinkling had never been mentioned in history yet. But we wish to see what he says about it in the second century. "The sacrament of baptism was administered publicly twice a year, at the festivals of Easter and Pentecost, or Whitsuntide, either by the bishop or the presbyters, in consequence of his authorization and appointment. The persons that were to be baptized, after they had repeated the Creed, confessed and renounced their sins, and particularly the devil and his pompous allurements, were immersed under water, and received into Christ's kingdom by a solemn invocation of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, according to the express command of our blessed Lord." (pg. 58.)

You will please bear in mind that this is the way our historian tells us baptism was administered in the second century. But I also have another historian that I wish to introduce, who, by the way, is not a Baptist. In fact, while we have plenty of Baptist historians, it is not our intention, in these lectures, to introduce any of them on these questions. We intend to make our opponents our witnesses.

Neander, in his history of the Christian religion and church, says, "In respect to the form of baptism, it was in conformity with the original institution and the original import of the symbol, performed by immersion, as a sign of entire baptism of the Holy Spirit, of being entirely penetrated by the same." (Vol. 1, pg. 310.)

The historian says it was performed by immersion in conformity with the original institution and original import of the symbol. It occurs to me that whatever the original import of the symbol of baptism required is still required, and if immersion was the act by which the original institution and original import of the symbol is represented, we should continue to immerse so long as we wish to represent, by the action of baptism, its original meaning.

I shall not take time to discuss the act of baptism any farther by quoting history. As we have so learned the mode of baptism, so we believe it, and so we practice it. Neither do we believe anything else is baptism. So as we Baptists claim that baptism is a prerequisite to the communion, and we are not alone in that doctrine, for we quoted to you on last evening a Methodist author that teaches the same thing, how can we consistently commune with those who have not been immersed, if we recognize immersion as essential to baptism.

I charge our General Baptist brethren of being Pedobaptists. They say, in their confession of faith, that the "Lord's Supper is an ordinance of Jesus Christ appointed in the church," and, if it is, and as the apostles taught, the church must come together to partake of it, then it must necessarily follow that when an assembly of saints meet for that purpose, such an assembly

must be a church. Then suppose we see about ten General Baptists and about twenty Methodists and about fifteen Presbyterians, all sitting in a congregation together, engaged in taking the Lord's Supper, is such an assembly a church? If it is not, they have no right to the ordinances of the church. But, if it is, what sort of a church is it? It certainly is not a Baptist church, for only about ten of the whole company have ever been immersed.

Now bear in mind the church has come together to break bread. Has any a right to participate who do not belong to the church? This whole assembly make up a church. So this church is composed of members of all the different denominations that I have mentioned. What sort of a church is it? It is a Pedobaptist church, and about a dozen of its members are General Baptists, yet they, for the time being, are members of a Pedobaptist body. In this transaction they have compromised every feature of anything that entitles them to the name of Baptists. When they make such a compromise as that they become, in the fullest sense of the term, Pedobaptists.

A Pedobaptist church can have immersed members in their body, but Baptist churches cannot have un-immersed members in their body. Hence, so long as we cannot commune with the Pedobaptists, we cannot commune with the General Baptists, for that is what they are. But as the General Baptists do not recognize anything as baptism but immersion, and at the same time say that baptism is not a prerequisite to the communion, then it must be an un-baptized church. It is certainly not a baptized church, when only about ten of its members have been baptized, and about forty of them have not. I suppose our Methodist and Presbyterian brethren feel first rate to see their General Baptist brethren come to their communion. Let us see what such actions say.

While the Methodists say they think that baptism must precede communion, the General Baptist brother says, no, you Methodists are wrong in your notion that baptism is necessary to communion, for, if you were correct in that, we could not commune with you, for we do not believe you are baptized, but then we can commune with you as we look at it, for we do not

think baptism essential to the communion. O, how such a course as that must make our Pedobaptist brethren love the General Baptists!

But a word to our Pedobaptist brethren. You all believe that immersion is baptism, and we do not believe that sprinkling and pouring is. Now, if you wish to commune with us, or have us commune with you, why can you not all be immersed? You would have to make no compromise in that, for you believe immersion is baptism. If we commune with you as you are, and as we are, holding that baptism is essential to the communion, then we must admit that sprinkling and pouring is baptism.

On the mode of baptism, you have put up the barriers between us, in your practice of sprinkling and pouring, and to take your view of it, you have done so unnecessarily, for you could be immersed without any violation of your conscience, and, by so doing, you could get to us on the mode of baptism. Why not do it, only that you do not wish to commune with us?

You go where you know we cannot conscientiously go, and then complain at us because we will not go there and commune with you, when you could just as well not go. That is asking too much of us, for us to admit what you could do without, when we cannot conscientiously make the admission. We do not believe you are baptized, and we believe you could be and will not, and we believe baptism should precede the communion, therefore we will not commune with you. Your actions indicate very clearly that you do not wish us to.

So this is one reason we have for close communion. We do not commune with Pedobaptist because they are not baptized, and, to be consistent, we cannot commune with the General Baptists because they commune with un-baptized persons. But, leaving the mode of baptism, we wish to notice another feature of baptism.

I believe it is admitted by all that no adult person should be baptized unless he is a believer, but it is claimed by some that infants, also, are gospel subjects of baptism. Baptists say, that none but believers are to be baptized.

1st. I argue that none but believers should be baptized from the following scriptures: Let us pay a little attention to Acts 2:41: "Then they that gladly received his word were baptized, and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls." It occurs to me that this would be a better place to look for infants, with a probability of finding them, than at the house of the Philippian jailer, for certainly among three thousand people, there is a great probability that some of them would be fathers and mothers. If there were any infants, the children of any of the three thousand, and the apostles intended to baptize infants, it seems to me there would most certainly have been infants baptized on the day of Pentecost. But as it is so probable that there were infants among them, and yet none were baptized only such as received the word gladly, it is an absolute certainty that the apostles did not baptize infants.

But as our Pedobaptist brethren claim that there were infants at the jailer's house, it is their place to prove it, as we deny it; but as they cannot, I say there were no infants there, and now I will try to prove it. The text says, "And they spake unto him the word of the Lord, and to all that were in his house." It is not common for ministers to preach to infants, so all that were in his house were capable of being spoken to. "And was baptized, he and all his, straightway." The same people that they spake to were baptized. "And rejoiced, believing in God with all his house." So it seems they all believed. They all heard the apostles preach, and they were all baptized. No; there were no infants in that company.

While our Pedobaptist brethren can only infer a case of infant baptism here, the strongest inference is against them. Where it is probable there were no infants, as on the day of Pentecost, it is not even claimed by them that infants were baptized. So, away with the idea of infant baptism. There must be better grounds of inference than at the jailer's house, or the household of Stephanus, or the household of Lydia, who was in all probability an unmarried woman.

In discussion once with a Pedobaptist brother, I told him if he would find just one text in the Bible that even mentioned water

baptism, and infants, both in the same text, I would give up the proposition, and we would proceed at once to the next question. He said he would accept that proposition, and we would soon be on the next proposition. He then quoted the commission: "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them, etc." He said the pronoun *them* had for its antecedent, *nations*; that there were no such thing as nations without infants; that infants were a part of nations. Hence, "teach all nations, baptizing them," meant to baptize men, women and children. Then, he said: "Now, will Brother Potter give up the proposition? He said he would, and I claim that he is under obligation to do so."

I replied, that from his definition of nations, he had gotten me into trouble. If there are no such things as nations without infants, I want him to explain the text: "The wicked shall be turned into hell, with all the nations that forget God," and keep infants out of hell. He said that meant the wicked of all nations. I told him the other meant the taught of all nations. So none of them have yet showed the text that mentions water baptism and infants.

1st. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Mark 16:16. 2nd. "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them," etc. Matthew 28:10. From this text we learn that teaching is before baptism. 3rd. "Then they that gladly received his word were baptized." Acts 2:41. 4th. "And they were baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sins." Matthew 3:6. Infants do not confess their sins. 5th. "But when they believed Philip preaching the Kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both men and women." Acts 8:12. If infants were also baptized, the text should have read: Men, women and their children. It is about as evident, that among the men and women that were baptized, that some of them had children—that is infants, as that the jailer had, or that Lydia had, or Stephanus, or any other household. But if any of them did have infants with them, it is evident that they did not have them baptized. 6th. There is not a text in the New Testament where water baptism and infants are both mentioned.

7th. I argue against infant baptism, on the ground that it was not practiced by the Primitive Christians. Let us read: "Baptism was administered at first only to adults, as men were accustomed to conceive baptism and faith as strictly connected. We have all reason for not deriving infant baptism from apostolic institution, and the recognition of it which followed somewhat later, as an apostolical tradition serves to confirm this hypothesis." Neander, vol. 1, pg. 311.

Again: "Origen, whose system of infant baptism could readily find its place, though not in the same connection as in the system of the North African Church, declares it to be an apostolic tradition, an expression, by the way, which cannot be regarded as of much weight in this age, when the inclination was so strong to trace every institution which was considered of special importance to the apostles, and where so many walls of separation, hindering the freedom of prospect, had already arisen between this and the apostolic age. Also in the Persian Church, infant baptism was, in the course of the third century, so generally recognized that the sect founder Mani thought he could draw an argument from it in favor of a doctrine which seemed to him necessarily pre-supposed by this application of the rite." Neander, vol. 1, pg. 314. This historian does not admit the assertion of Origen, that infant baptism is apostolic, is of much force.

But let us hear him once more: "Iraeneus is the first church teacher in whom we find any allusion to infant baptism." Neander, vol. 1, pg. 311. If Iraeneus was the first church teacher that taught infant baptism, it was not taught until the latter part of the second century. According to Robinson, Pedobaptism originated with the Montanists, if we are allowed to rely on Brown's Religious Encyclopedia (pg. 386), and we have never heard it questioned as being good authority.

Again: "According to the North African scheme of doctrine, which taught all men were from their birth, in consequence of guilt and sin transmitted from Adam, subjected to the same condemnation; that they bore within them the principles of all sin, deliverance from original sin and inherited guilt would be made particularly prominent in the case of infant baptism, as in

the case of the baptism of adults; and this was proved by the ancient formula of baptism, which, however, originated in a period when infant baptism had as yet no existence, and had been afterwards supplied without alteration to children, because men shrank from undertaking to introduce any change in the consecrated formulas established by apostolic authority, though Christians were by no means agreed as to the sense in which they applied this formula." Neander, vol. 2, pg. 665.

From this quotation the doctrine of baptismal regeneration is older than the practice of infant baptism. But another witness says: "There were twice a year, stated times when baptism was administered to such as after a long course of trial and preparation, offered themselves as candidates for the profession of Christianity." Mosheim, p. 78. This was in the third century, and it is very clear that infant baptism was not taught in the baptism mentioned here.

It has been argued that if infants are to be baptized, that they are also members of the church, and if they are members of the church, I cannot see why one member of the church does not have as much right to the communion as another. But let us see if they are considered as members of the church by our Pedobaptist brethren. "The visible church consists of those who hold to the fundamental doctrines in Christianity in respect to matters of faith and morals, and have entered into formal covenant with God and some organized body of Christians for the maintenance of religious worship. The children of such are included in the covenant relations of their parents, and are properly under the special care of the church." Cumberland Presbyterian Confession of Faith, pg. 52, Sec. 94.

It is a plain case that one branch of Pedobaptists recognize their children as church members. But let us hear another one of them speak. "Does not our Savior explicitly say, in regard to young children, 'Of such is the kingdom of heaven?' The kingdom of heaven must mean either the kingdom of glory, the work of grace in the heart, or the church of Christ on earth. Now in whatever sense it is used in the text, it must include the idea of church membership. Is a young child fit for the kingdom of glory? Then why not for the kingdom of grace? If fit for the

church triumphant, why not for the church on earth? And was not the promise of God given to Christian parents, and to their children, and to 'all that are afar off?' If so, and there can be no reasonable doubt of it, then are infants entitled to the initiatory rite which will formally admit them into the visible church of Christ, and to debar them that privilege, is not only unwise, but unjust to the children, whom God has given us." History, M. E. Church, pg. 174.

According to this Methodist writer, the children of their churches are members of their churches. But let us see further: "We regard all children who have been baptized, as placed in visible covenant relation to God, and under the special care and supervision of the church." Discipline, pg. 41, sec. 54.

But we wish to give one more witness to this point: "These 'partake of the root and fatness of the olive tree,' and of course they have the right of placing their infant children in a covenant relation with God, as well as with the believing Jews, or the natural branches that have been cut off. But it is expressly said that children are members of the visible church, in Mark 10:14, "For of such is the kingdom of heaven." Jameson, on the 25 Articles, pg. 278.

We have now shown that Methodists and Presbyterians recognize their children as members of their churches, and we wish to show you what a predicament good men sometimes get themselves into by saying too much. We will now read to you from the General Baptist Messenger, of March 13, 1886: "We will be much obliged to any individual who will point us to the scriptural authority which says the members of one Christian church are forbidden to take communion with those of another; or that will show us one, thus saith the Lord, that you must be baptized before you show forth the Lord's death in sacred communion."

Now, whether our editor believes it or not, our Pedobaptist brethren, with whom he communes, hold their children as members of the church, and if one of them should come to Brother Hale's communion, he cannot, according to his own statement, debar him. If one of those infant members should

come to your church, by what rule are you going to withhold the communion from it? You call on us— challenge us—to show any scriptural authority which says members of one Christian church are forbidden to take communion with those of another. How are you going to debar those infant members of Christian churches from your communion. You say you cannot do it. Then you must commune with them, for you have no authority to debar them.

But you may say that you meant adult members. All right; if he will give me the scriptural authority for debarring infant members, I will show him how we will debar adults from the communion. But then he did not make any exceptions in his paper. He said members of one denomination, and made no distinction between infants and adults. I would as soon, so far as I am concerned, take the communion with the infant members of a Pedobaptist church as the adults, for they are all members.

I fancy I see a General Baptist minister, at his own communion, officiating, and just before him sits his wife and about three little children, and by her side sits a good Methodist sister with about the same number of little fellows, all members of the Methodist church, and while the minister speaks of the communion, he makes the challenge that Elder Hale made in his paper, that he would be much obliged to any man that would show him any scriptural authority for saying that the members of one Christian church are forbidden to commune with those of another. Then he starts around with the emblems, and when he comes to those little Methodist members, he gives the bread and wine to them, for he knows of no scriptural authority for not doing so, and then gives it to his wife and passes her children by. I should suppose his wife and himself would feel very comfortable under those circumstances. Why did he not give the bread and wine to his own children? Why, they are not members of the church, is the reason he did not give it to them. But why are they not members of the church? Because their papa does not believe little children like they are should be members of the church. He might as well take them in and commune with them as to recognize the children of others as members and commune with them.

But we have not come to the worst of it yet. Let us read more.

“As unregenerate persons are not excluded from baptism and hearing the word of God preached, neither should they be from partaking of the sacrament, for one and all of these are ordained means of grace, whereby may be edified and comforted in the Christian life.” (Jimeson, pg. 298.)

The people he speaks of here are seekers, or, as he calls them, penitent believers, who have not obtained a hope yet. He calls them unregenerate, and says they should be admitted to baptism and the supper. As a qualification for membership, we ask that the applicant already has a hope before he comes into the church, but, if we commune with the Methodists, we are liable to have to commune with persons that we would not receive into our church if they are to come and offer themselves. That is one reason we cannot commune with the Methodists. How will the General Baptists get along with that? Hence, we cannot commune with the Pedobaptists, because their terms of membership and ours differ.

Let us suppose a case. Mr. A comes to our church today and makes application for membership with us, and he tells us that he has been a mourner for quite a while, that is, what is usually called a seeker, but he has not professed a hope yet. We tell him we cannot receive him until he professes a hope. He then goes to the Methodist church, where they will receive him, and then tomorrow he attends our communion, and we are open communionists, would we not be obliged to commune with him? To be consistent, we had better received him into our own church than to reject him, and then commune with a member of another church that we would not have in our own. We do not commune with our own members until they are baptized, but if we commune with Pedobaptists that we deem un-baptized, why not commune with our own un-baptized members.

The whole truth of the matter is this: If we wish to be consistent, we cannot afford to commune with others, or else we might as well dissolve at once. For our open communion brethren to ask us to commune with them is equal to asking us

to disband. We certainly have a right to an existence as a church, and, if we have, we are not under obligations to commune with others. If we are under obligations to commune with others, we have no right then to exist, as a distinct organization, on the principles of faith and practice as we now hold them, for we must compromise our principles if we commune with other denominations.

We exclude a man today for heresy, and he goes and joins another denomination, which he could do somewhere, and such a thing often takes place, and on tomorrow he comes back to our communion services, and we are open communionists, do we not have to commune with him? We obeyed the divine word when we excluded him, for the apostle says: "The man that is an heretic, after the first and second admonition, reject." Then do we obey the Lord when we afterwards invite him to our communion? Is that the order of God's house? I cannot think it is made up of such inconsistencies as that.

But I wish to say another word to my free communion brethren before I conclude. That is this: You do not treat us justly on the subject of communion, for, while you censure us for refusing to commune with you, you will receive our excluded members, who have, from some cause or another, offended us to such an extent that we cannot tolerate their course, and when you receive them without any satisfaction whatever, if we were to invite you and your members to our communion, we would be compelled to commune with that member we had excluded. We might as well not have excluded him from our fellowship, if we must commune with him, and that is just what we must do if we open our communion to all. If we exclude him for heresy, we must still commune with him. We do not treat you that way. If you exclude one of your members, and he comes to us, we require him to sit down here and give us a reason of his hope, as though he had never been a member of any church, and when we receive him we do not ask you to invite him to your communion, and, if you do invite him, we propose that he should not go.

How are you going to debar persons from your table that you do not want, if you practice open communion? You must invite all,

or else you must have a boundary somewhere. If you have a boundary, that is close communion. I care not how far you set the boundary away, when you make a boundary, you limit your communion to that line, and that far your communion is limited. It is the same principle that it would be if your boundary extended no farther than your own church.

But one good brother wanted to hear me on the text, "Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat." Did you ever hear open communionists quote that text? I have, and I have thought that it was about all the text some of them could quote on the subject. It is often used in a manner to accuse us of examining other people at our communion service. That is a grand mistake. That text is not to the church to examine those outside or in, but to the individual members, to each one to examine himself and to eat. I presume no one denies the rights of the church to examine the standing and soundness of her members.

Did you ever hear an open communionist quote the text, "With such an one no not to eat." I never have, and I have wondered if some of them knew there was such a text. I tell you there is, but I do not know how it is to be observed by the church if she throws her doors open to commune with every person, letting each one examine himself.

Lecture 3

This is the third time we arise to address you on the communion question, and, as I have previously remarked, I say now that I do not wish to be understood to intentionally wound the feelings of any, for I regard the feelings of all religious people, no matter how much they may differ from me on the subject of religion. What I say on the subject now before us is purely in self-defense. We have been assailed by our opponents on the communion question, which we think makes it necessary, in justice to ourselves, to try to give our reasons for our practice. I do not undertake the work simply because I think myself able to champion the issue, neither do I wish to be understood as a schismatic.

I should have been better pleased to have heard the other side represented, so the people could have heard both sides, but I could not have it so, and so I am here to give my own side as well as I am capable of doing. I entertain no opinions or sentiments on the subject of religion that I am ashamed of, or that I am afraid to tell.

As we have seen that baptism is a prerequisite to the Lord's Supper, and that immersion is the only mode, and that adults on a public profession of their faith, are the only gospel subjects, I now wish to notice the design of baptism for a moment. The intention for which we are baptized may be as important to the validity of our baptism as anything else. As Dr. Owen observes: "There is nothing in religion that has any efficacy for compassing an end, but it hath it from God's appointment of it for that purpose. God may, in his wisdom, appoint and accept ordinances and duties unto one end, which he will refuse and reject when applied to another. To do anything appointed unto one end, without aiming at the end, is no better than not doing it at all, and in some cases much worse."

The design of baptism, therefore, as taught in the New Testament, ought to be thoroughly investigated by both ministers and people, in order that they may know and comply with the revealed intention of God in its appointment. The Primitive Baptists do not believe that baptism is essential to regeneration, and, if that is its appointed and scriptural intention, then we baptize for another purpose than that intended by the Lord in its appointment, and in that case our baptism is invalid. Even if we were immersed, and that on a profession of our faith, we have still missed a gospel baptism, for our intention was not what God appointed the ordinance for. But if we are correct as to the design, then those who are baptized in order to be born of God are not correct, and their baptism is not valid. The object we have in view certainly has something to do with the acceptability of our action.

As there is much said on the subject of infant baptism, I wish, first, to pay some attention to that subject. I have already argued, and I think proved, that it was not an apostolical

practice; but, as our Pedobaptist brethren think that the apostles taught and practiced infant baptism, I wish to notice their arguments to some extent. I will notice a Methodist writer or two—not because I have a great antipathy to the Methodist people, but because I have the authors present, and quote them as representatives of the Pedobaptists. In order to learn how they prove that infant baptism was practiced by the apostles, I will read the following:

“Infant baptism has been practiced in the church from the apostles to the present time. If so, then baptism must have taken the place of the old Jewish token of the covenant. To see the truth of what is here alleged, we have but to examine the commission given to the disciples in Matthew 28:19. Here baptism takes the place of circumcision by the express appointment of God. The disciples were, therefore, authorized to extend the right of baptism to all who believe in Christ, everywhere, and also to their children.

Jesus, kind inviting Lord,
We with joy obey Thy word,
And in earliest infancy,
Bring our little ones to Thee.

But to see the truth of our proposition, in the light of the history of the church, we consult the testimony of the early Christian fathers.”

“The first that we shall name is Origen, who flourished about A. D. 300. He says: ‘Infants are baptized for the remission of sins,’ and, again, he says, ‘The church hath received the tradition from the apostles, that baptism ought to be administered to infants.’ Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, who was contemporary with Origen, says that ‘sixty-six bishops being convened in Carthage in a council, having the question referred to them, ‘Whether infants might be baptized before they were eight days old,’ unanimously decided that no infant is to be forbidden from the benefit of baptism, although just newly born.’ Mark the testimony of sixty-six bishops. It ought to go very far in settling the question of the right of infants to baptism, and, especially, when it was given in so short a time

after the apostles, and when every practice in the church was proved by Apostolic usage.”

“Gregory Nazianzen, who died in A. D. 389, testified in his discourse on baptism: ‘That infants are to be baptized.’ In the fifth council of Carthage, held A. D. 401, it is declared in canon 72 that children ought to be baptized, when there is no proof or testimony that they have been already baptized.’ And Saint Augustine, who flourished A. D. 410, says: ‘Infant baptism the whole world practices; it was not instituted by councils, but was ever in use.’”

“Thus we see that certainly four hundred years after Christ there was a universal consent that infant baptism should be practiced. True, Tertullian advises the delay of infant baptism, but this was because of his peculiar notion of baptismal regeneration. And there was one Gregory who practiced such delay in the baptism of his own children; but there was no society of men nor church that entertained any doubt as to the propriety of infant baptism.” Jameson’s notes on the 25 articles, pp. 180-182.

Now if the witnesses quoted by this writer do not establish the apostolic authority for infant baptism, then they cannot prove it at all. All Pedobaptist authors prove infant baptism by the early Christian fathers, as this one has done, and argue that, if the apostles had not practiced it, it would not have been so universally practiced so soon afterwards.

But to show you that this is their method of proving it, I wish to quote another one or two. Listen: “‘Testimony of the early Christian fathers.’ We allude not to their testimony for the purpose of proving a point of doctrine, but for the purpose of showing what was the practice of the early Christians in regard to infant baptism, and we consider this testimony valuable, so far only as it proves that infant baptism was the practice of the Christian church from the time of the apostles, and, if so, it is morally impossible that it should not have been practiced during the time of the apostles. ‘Tertullian, born A. D. 150 - but a few years after the death of the apostle John - speaks of infant baptism as being the practice of the church. Justin Martyr, born

near the close of the first century, speaks of those who were members of the church, sixty years old, who were made disciples to Christ in their infancy. Iraeneus, Origen, Cyprian, and others, in their writings, all prove the practice of infant baptism in the earliest age of the church; and can it be supposed that a practice should become so general in the course of a single century after the apostles? If so, it was something entirely new and unscriptural. The supposition is perfectly unreasonable. From these and other considerations it appears that the 'baptism of young children ought to be retained in the church,' according to the article." - History M. E. Church, by Douglas Gorrie, ppg. 175,176.

You see how satisfactorily he convinces himself that infant baptism was the practice of the apostles, by quoting, not the apostles, but the early Christian fathers. But, to show you that they all prove the practice in the same manner, I will give you one more witness. Listen to Mr. Wesley:

"What I apprehend very much strengthens the truth of infant baptism, that it is of a divine original, is this: About one hundred and fifty years after the death of Saint John the Apostle, there was an assembly of sixty-bishops, who spoke of infant baptism as a known, established and uncontested practice. One Fidus questioned whether infants were to be baptized so soon as two or three days after their birth, and whether it would not be better to defer their baptism till they were eight days old, as was observed in circumcision, which scruples he proposed to this assembly, and in which he desired their resolution, which they sent in a letter to him, part of which I shall transcribe. 'Cyprian, and the rest of the bishops who were present at the council, sixty-six in number, to Fidus, our brother, greeting: We read your letter, most dear brother, but as to the case of infants, whereas you judge that they must not be baptized within two or three days after they are born, and that the rule of circumcision is to be observed, so that none should be baptized and sanctified before the eighth day after he is born, we were all in our assembly of the contrary opinion. We judge that no person is to be hindered from obtaining the grace of God by the law that is now appointed, and that the spiritual circumcision ought not to be restrained by the

circumcision that was according to the flesh; but that all are to be admitted to the grace of Christ, since Peter, speaking of the acts of the apostles, says: 'The Lord has shown me that no person is to be called common or unclean.' This, therefore, dear brother, was our opinion in the assembly: that it is not for us to hinder any person from baptism and the grace of God, who is merciful and benign, and affectionate to all; which rule, as it holds for all, so we think it is more especially to be observed in reference to infants newly born, to whom our help and the divine mercy is rather to be granted, because by their cries and tears at their first entrance into the world they do imitate nothing so much as that they implore compassion.'" - Doctrinal Tracts, ppg. 279,280.

I have now given you three distinguished authors who advocate infant baptism, and by this time I presume you are able to see the sort of evidence they rely on for the proof of their position, that infant baptism was practiced by the apostles. All of them make the same point, by the same course of reasoning, and from the same early Christian fathers. I have taken the pains to quote all of them, so you can see how infant baptism is sustained by them.

As regards those sixty-six bishops, they, according to Mr. Wesley, not only taught that infants were to be baptized, but that their baptism was essential to their salvation. The doctrine of baptismal regeneration is as easily proved by the same early Christian fathers as the practice of infant baptism is. About the same account of the council of Carthage is given by Wesley as is given by Neander, vol. 1, pg. 313, and it is unmistakably true that the fathers quoted by our authors taught baptismal regeneration.

Mr. Campbell, in his *Christianity Restored*, quotes the very same early Christian fathers to prove his design of baptism, and he argues that for four hundred years after the apostles, baptism was taught as he teaches it, and that it must, therefore, have been taught by the apostles. Pedobaptists say now that Mr. Campbell is wrong in his notion that baptism is essential to salvation, but yet he proves it by the same witnesses that you prove infant baptism by, and if you will tell me how to get

around his argument for baptismal regeneration, I will tell you how I will get around your argument for infant baptism. I tell you the very same witnesses and arguments that are used to establish one will establish the other just as well.

If those witnesses do not prove that baptism is essential to salvation, neither do they prove infant baptism, and if they do prove baptismal regeneration, as Mr. Campbell says they do, then they also prove infant baptism. Mr. Campbell says Pedobaptists are wrong on infant baptism, and they say he is wrong on his design of baptism, and I say you are both wrong, for if one is wrong so is the other. They both go together, and were always understood so until recently; let us see what Mr. Wesley says baptism is for:

“As to the grounds of it: If infants are guilty of original sin, then they are proper subjects of baptism, seeing, in the ordinary way, they cannot be saved unless this be washed away by baptism. It has been already proved that this original stain cleaves to every child of man, and that hereby they are children of wrath and liable to eternal damnation. It is true the second Adam has found a remedy for the disease which came upon all by the offense of the first. But the benefit of this is to be received through the means which he hath appointed; through baptism in particular, which is the ordinary means he hath appointed for that purpose; and to which he hath tied us, though he may not have tied himself. Indeed, where it cannot be had, the case is different, but extraordinary cases do not make void a standing rule. This, therefore, is our first ground. Infants need to be washed from original sin, therefore they are proper subjects of baptism.” - Doctrinal Tracts, pg. 251.

This was the original design of infant baptism, and the doctrine of baptismal regeneration is older than the practice of infant baptism. The North African churches first began to teach that baptism is essential to salvation, and soon after that infant baptism began to be practiced. But our Pedobaptist brethren now say they do not believe that baptism is essential to the salvation of infants.

Then why baptize them? I want to hear some good reason for baptizing infants if it does nothing for them. If it does not effect their salvation, nor change their nature, nor make them any better, and they would be saved as well without it as with it, why baptize them at all? I say infant baptism is an evil. Only a few days ago I was in conversation with a young man and he told me he was baptized in infancy. I asked him if he felt like he had ever been baptized, and he said he did not. I said to him, you do not feel, then, that you have obeyed the command of the Savior that says "be baptized." He said he did not. I will say to you, my friends, this young man is not a Baptist, and he is not inclined to be a Baptist that I know of. If he ever satisfied his conscience on the subject of baptism, he will have to leave his church and join some other, or else his church must violate her rules.

I find many such cases in my travels over the country, and I set it down, on that ground, that infant baptism is an evil. It is not necessary to their salvation, so it does them no good, and yet it deprives them the liberty of their own conscience when they become adults. But let us hear what Mr. Wesley says of the baptism of adults. Suppose a stranger would come into this country and begin to preach, and you did not know what denomination he belonged to and he would say, "By baptism we, who were by nature the children of wrath, are made the children of God." What would you call him? Do you not think he would be branded as a Campbellite? I will say to you this doctrine was taught long before Mr. Campbell was born. He was not the originator of that doctrine; it is too old for that.

It was Mr. Wesley that said, "By baptism we, who were by nature the children of wrath, are made the children of God. And this regeneration which our (Episcopal) church, in so many places ascribes to baptism, is more than barely being admitted into the church, though commonly connected therewith, being grafted into the body of Christ's church, we are made the children of God by adoption and grace. This is grounded on the plain words of our Lord, "Except a man be born again of water and of the spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." John 3:5. By water then as a means, the water of baptism, we are regenerated or born again, whence it is also called by the

apostle, 'the washing of regeneration.' Our church, therefore, ascribes no greater virtue to baptism than Christ himself has done. Nor does she ascribe it to the outward washing, but to the inward grace, which, added thereto, makes it a sacrament. Herein a principle of grace is infused, which will not be wholly taken away, unless we quench the Holy Spirit of God by long continued wickedness. In consequence of our being made children of God, we are heirs of the kingdom of heaven. If children, as the apostle observes, then heirs, heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ. Herein we receive a title to, and an earnest of, a kingdom which cannot be moved. Baptism doth now save us, if we live answerable thereto, if we repent, believe and obey the gospel, supposing this, as it admits us into the church here, so into glory hereafter." Doctrinal Tracts, ppg. 248, 249.

While this book was published by order of the General Conference, it is due to the Methodists that I should state that I see a footnote here exonerating them from the charge of endorsing Mr. Wesley in the foregoing quotation. It reads as follows: "That Mr. Wesley, as a clergyman of the Church of England, was originally a high churchman, in the fullest sense, is well known. When he wrote this treatise in the year 1756 he seems to have used some expressions, in relation to the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, which we, at this day, should not prefer. Some such, in the judgment of the reader, may be found under this second head. This last sentence, however, contains a guarded corrective. It explains also the sense in which we believe Mr. Wesley intended much of what goes before to be understood."

I leave you to judge, from what I have now read from Mr. Wesley and others, what they understood baptism to be for. It is a plain case that they understood baptism to be essential to salvation, and that this was their grounds for infant baptism. I will give you one more witness on this subject.

"The Council of Carthage, A. D. 418, finally condemned, in its second canon, the doctrine concerning such an intermediate state for children, that none could enter into the kingdom of heaven without baptism; that unbaptized infants would be

exempt from punishment on the ground that nothing could be conceived as existing between the Kingdom of God and perdition. But, then, too, according to the doctrine of this council, the eternal perdition of all unbaptized infants was expressly affirmed, a consistency of error revolting to the natural sentiments of humanity." - Neander, vol. 2, pg. 669.

We now have proved that the design of baptism, as essential to eternal salvation, has been advocated by Pedobaptists - not only in the case of adults, but infants as well; and, while our Pedobaptist brethren say they do not endorse that doctrine now, we say they cannot give an intelligent reason for baptizing infants. Mr. Campbell and his brethren still teach the same design of baptism, but deny the doctrine of infant baptism. I claim that he has the same proof for his design of baptism that Pedobaptists have for infant baptism, for he proves it by the very same witnesses. I repeat, that if that is the design of baptism, then I and my brethren have not the right baptism, and, if we have, then they who baptize in order to be born of God have not, even if they have been immersed on a public profession of faith.

To have a gospel baptism we must be baptized for the same purpose for which the Lord appointed baptism. It will not do to say that our intention in the act of baptism has nothing to do with its validity, for, if it has not, then a man may be baptized with no intention, and his baptism would be just as good. So while we teach that gospel baptism is a prerequisite to the Lord's Supper, we cannot receive to our communion those who have been baptized in order to the remission of sins, for we do not believe such baptism to be valid.

Now, as we have seen that baptism is a prerequisite to the communion, and that the mode of baptism is immersion, we claim that all unimmersed people are unbaptized, and, therefore, we cannot commune with them. We have also seen that no person is a gospel subject of baptism but adult believers, so if persons have been even immersed in their infancy, we do not regard it as gospel baptism, and therefore we could not commune with them. We have also seen that there are more intentions than one for which persons are

baptized, and we hold that the design of baptism has to do with the validity of baptism.

But there is one thing more essential to the validity of baptism, and that I wish to notice next. It is the administrator. Who has a right to administer the ordinance of baptism? In answer to this question I will call on a good Methodist brother, simply because I have him before me, and he gives the answer just to suit me. He says: "The sacrament of baptism and the sacrament of the Lord's Supper are duly administered, not by any and every person choosing to administer the same, but by those who are called by God and His church to the sacred work of the ministry." - History M. E. Church, pg. 164.

I presume this to be the position of all churches in this age of the world, and it is just what we Baptists claim, that baptism is to be administered by those who are called of God, and ordained by the church to perform the functions of a gospel minister. To this point let us pay some respect for a few moments. I wish, first, to notice the General Baptists on their authority to baptize. I hold in my hand a book, entitled General Baptist History, by D. B. Montgomery, of Owensville, Indiana, and I presume you all know him. I do not, but I presume this book is good General Baptist authority. Let us read:

"They evidently fail to present the object of Crosby in making this statement. Thomas Wall had charged John Smith with having baptized himself, and that he afterwards baptized Mr. John Spillsbury, the first minister of the Particular Baptist Church, and that he (Spillsbury) transmitted this same baptism to the English Baptists by succession of baptism. This Crosby was endeavoring to show was false, and that the English Baptists did not receive their baptism by succession from any minister, either General or Particular, from John Smith or John Spillsbury. That while most or all of John Spillsbury's church had received baptism from a church in the Netherlands, through Mr. Richard Blount, the greatest number and the more judicious English Baptists had received their baptism just as John Smith had received his, received it through an unbaptized person." (ppg. 45,46.)

Had received it how? Through an unbaptized person, this writer says. But who was this John Smith? He was the founder of the General Baptist Church, that is so overly anxious that we should commune with her. John Smith had been an Episcopalian minister in England, but he laid down his salary in that church and went over into Holland among the Brownists, and began to preach among them and divided them, and with his party of them he started the General Baptist Church. As he had never been baptized, he received baptism by an unbaptized person. This is the origin of the General Baptist church, and this is their authority for baptizing. What is their authority for baptizing? Simply none at all. Hence they are not entitled to the communion. It is the case, sometimes, that men will make a greater noise about what they are not entitled to than they would if it really belonged to them. But let us read again:

“Now, as Ivey and Crosby, who were members of the Particular Baptist churches, and were unprejudiced and faithful historians, they, as English Baptists, are as well qualified to tell their origin as any others. We will let them speak. We will hereafter see, from Crosby, particularly, that while most or all of the members of the first Particular Baptist church, which came out of the Independent Pedobaptist church, that the greatest number and the more judicious of the English Baptists received their baptism just as John Smith and his church, the Baptists in Leicestershire, the Tunkers or German Baptists, and Roger Williams and his church did, by an unbaptized person baptizing and so beginning a reformation.” (pg. 48.)

It is very common when people are in trouble, and feel unable to show good reasons for it, to console themselves by saying others are just as bad. This historian, having to admit that the founder of the General Baptist church was not regularly baptized, would have us believe that we are also in the same predicament. This, however, we deny, but he admits it in the case of the General Baptists, and tries to argue that baptism is valid when administered by an unbaptized person, and undertakes to prove that that is the doctrine of the Baptists, by showing that such was Benedict's opinion. The Baptist doctrine is not simply the opinion of any one man - it is not the opinion of men at all.

Even if it was the opinion of Benedict, he is not the Baptist church. It is evident that the General Baptists, and the Tunkers, and Roger Williams' church all originated by an unbaptized person administering the ordinance of baptism, and Benedict thinks Williams' church would have been classed with the General Baptists of England. We deny the right of an unbaptized person to administer baptism, and, while we do, we claim that the General Baptists have no valid baptism.

If baptism is valid when administered by an unbaptized person, why ordain a minister to do that work? Why call on a number of presbyters, and arraign a candidate before them, and require him to give them an evidence of his call to the ministry, and then lay hands on him and solemnly invoke the blessing of God upon him, if, when it is all done, he has no more authority than a man who has never been baptized.

We cannot commune with the General Baptists, because they are not baptized, and we claim that baptism precedes the communion. We now wish to notice the Freewill Baptists and see what sort of baptism they have.

"The founder of this denomination (Freewill Baptists) was the Rev. Benjamin Randall. He was originally a preacher connected with the Calvinistic Baptists. Having embraced Arminian views, and being disowned by his brethren as being unsound in the faith, he organized a church in New Durham, N. H., on the 30th day of June, 1780. Soon after this other churches were formed on the same plan, and these churches united together and constituted the New Durham quarterly meeting." Religious Denominations of the World, pg. 144.

Thus we see that the Freewill Baptists were founded by a man that we had excluded from us. If he had ever been authorized to administer baptism, that authority was taken from him when we excluded him.

So the Freewill Baptists have no baptism. We excluded him from us for heresy, and in obedience to the apostles' advice, and we certainly did right to exclude him for heresy, for Paul

says: "The man that is an heretic after the first and second admonition, reject." Now for us to practice open communion would force us to commune with him, and recognize his baptism, after we had excluded him and taken his authority from him. I charge that open communionists cannot be consistent, for they will exclude their members for heresy and then commune with them afterwards. If I was a member of Brother Yates' church, and would preach as I do, and fight him on the "Foreign Mission" question, and oppose his infant baptism, and his sprinkling and pouring for baptism, he would exclude me for heresy.

Mr. Yates, "Yes, sir, I would exclude you for heresy." (Mr. Yates is the Cumberland Presbyterian minister in charge at Owensville, Indiana.)

But then after you had excluded me, you would commune with me if I would join some other church, or get up one of my own, as Randall did. If that is the order of God's house, I see no consistency in the whole thing. But as we have quoted from a Methodist and found that they do not believe that the ordinances are to be administered except by those who are called of God and His church to the work of the ministry, let us take a view of the Methodist church, and see if they have any authority, according to their own doctrine, to administer the ordinances.

It is said, I believe, that Wesley ordained Coke, and Coke ordained Asbury; but who ordained Wesley? If he was not called by God and His church to the work of the ministry, he could not administer the ordinances. If he was ordained, he must have been ordained by the Episcopalians; but where did the Episcopalians get their authority? If they had any authority, they must have gotten it from the Roman Catholics. The Roman Catholics, then, are a church of Christ, or the Methodists have no authority to administer the ordinances, according to their own doctrine. The Presbyterians, Lutherans, and all other Pedobaptists are in the same predicament.

What right had Calvin, Luther, or Henry VIII, or Wesley, to start up a church? Who ever read of Jesus Christ giving any man

authority to start a church? If I were to leave the Baptist church, and they were to exclude me from their fellowship, would I not be out of the church? Suppose, then, I go out and begin a new enterprise, and soon have a congregation organized, and call it a church, would I have a right to claim to be recognized as a church? Deny me that right, and then tell me what is the Methodist church, or the Lutheran, Presbyterian, or any other that asks us to commune with them?

I tell you it is a body that feels as if their claim to the name of a church of Christ is somewhat doubtful, that, as a rule, makes so much ado about the communion question. They wish to be recognized as a church is about what the trouble is. I am aware of the fact that Regular Baptists are called selfish, and bigoted, because we do not commune and mingle with others, but we have made our character here, and I feel it is a credit to me to be called an old Baptist, for I have never seen the time, and I presume these old fathers in the ministry, Elders Hume and Strickland, can say as much, that the Old Baptists were so low down in the estimation of the religious world that all others would not have gladly married us if we would have had them. But, after they court us awhile, and find that we will not marry, then they seem to get angry with us, and want to kill us, and, being unable to do that, they do not know what to do with us.

But now let us look for a people that have existed from the apostles to the present. It cannot be expected that in a few minutes we could do justice to such a subject, but let us try for a few moments. Let us read: "There was no difference in point of doctrine between the Novatianists and other Christians. What peculiarly distinguished them was their refusing to readmit to the communion of the church those who, after baptism, had fallen into the commission of heinous crimes, though they did not pretend that even such were excluded from all possibility or hopes of salvation. They consider the Christian church as a society where virtue and innocence reigned universally, and none of whose members, from their entrance into it, had defiled themselves with any enormous crime; and, of consequence, they looked upon every society which readmitted heinous offenders to its communion as unworthy of the title of a true Christian church.

It was from hence, also, that they assumed the title of Cathari, that is, the pure; and what showed still a more extravagant degree of vanity and arrogance, they obliged such as come over to them from the general body of Christians to submit to be baptized a second time, as a necessary preparation for entering into their society." Mosheim, century 3, part 2, chapter 5, sec. 18.

The people mentioned in this quotation separated from the Catholic party A. D. 251, and while Novatian was the most conspicuous among their ministers, and the people were called after his name, it is often the case that he is said to be the founder of his sect, and that it started up at the time before mentioned, but the fact that when he withdrew there were churches and ministers scattered over the whole country at the same time, it is evident that he was not the founder of the sect called Novatianists, but these churches which had kept the ordinances and the doctrine pure from the apostles until the time of the separation, simply refused to follow the Catholic party into the thousand and one new things she was beginning to indulge.

We are not dependent on Novatian or any other one minister for a succession of baptism, for, at the time of the separation, there were many ministers and churches for baptism to have come through to us. But let us hear the same historian again, who, by the way, is not a Baptist, but a Lutheran. He says: "Among the sects that troubled the Latin church during this (12th) century, the principal place is due to the Catharists, whom we already had occasion to mention. (Then he refers us to the same we have just read.)

This numerous faction, leaving their first residence, which was in Bulgaria, spread themselves throughout almost all the European provinces, where they occasioned much tumult and disorder; but their fate was unhappy, for, wherever they were caught, they were put to death with the most unrelenting cruelty." Mosheim, century 12, part 2, sec. 4.

He says these were the same people he had already mentioned, and then refers us back to the quotation we first made, so that we cannot be mistaken if we say they have come down from the third to the twelfth century, and are known by our historian as the same people. Their doctrine was that no persons, whatever, were to be admitted to baptism before they were come to the full use of their reason. We also find them in the eleventh century under the name of Paulicians. They reject infant baptism. But again: "The true origin of that sect which acquired the name of Anabaptists, by their administering anew the rite of baptism to those who came over to their communion, and derived that of Mennonites from the famous man, to whom they owe the greatest part of their present felicity, is hid in the remote depths of antiquity, and is, of consequence, extremely difficult to be ascertained. This uncertainty will not appear surprising, when it is considered that this sect started up all of a sudden, under leaders of different talents and different intentions, and at the very period when the first contests of the Reformers with the Roman pontiffs drew the attention of the world and employed the pens of the learned in such a manner as to render all other objects and incidents almost matters of indifference. The modern Mennonites not only consider themselves as the descendants of the Waldenses, who were so grievously oppressed and persecuted by the despotic heads of the Roman church, but pretend, moreover, to be the purest offspring of these respectable sufferers, being equally averse to all principles of rebellion on the one hand, and all suggestions of fanaticism on the other." Mosheim, century 16, part 2, chapter 3, sec. 1.

If this witness was a Baptist, he might be accused of being partial; but as he is not, he is not very likely to be anxious to show that the Baptists have existed ever since the apostles. I wish to hear him again and will read from the same chapter.

"For it must be carefully observed that, though all those projectors of a new, unspotted and perfect church, were comprehended under the general name of Anabaptists, on account of their opposing the baptism of infants, and their rebaptizing such as had received the sacrament in a state of childhood in other churches, yet they were, from their very

origin, subdivided into various sects, which differed from each other in points of no small moment."

From this we are to learn that there were other sects during the dark ages that opposed the Roman Catholic church that differed very materially from our people, yet they were frequently classed with them on account of their opposition to the Catholic church. It is in this way, no doubt, that our people have been often misrepresented as being guilty of all the doctrines and practices that were entertained during their history, when, as Dr. Mosheim observes, they differed from others on those points.

I now introduce another witness, who is by no means a Baptist, and his testimony must be good. It is Bishop Newton, and he, in his work, is not writing a history, but is proving the authenticity of the scriptures by the fulfillment of the prophecies. He says: "But the true witnesses, and, as I may say, the Protestants of this age (12th century) were the Waldenses and Albigenses, who began to be famous at this time, and, being dispersed into various places, were distinguished by various appellations. Their first and proper name seemeth to have been Vallenses, or inhabitants of the valleys; and so one of the oldest writers, Ebrad, of Bethune, who wrote in the year 1212. They call themselves Vallenses, because they abide in the valley of tears, alluding to their situation in the valleys of Piedmont. They were called Albigenses from Alby, a city in the southern part of France, where also great numbers of them were situated. They were afterwards denominated Valdenses, or Waldenses, from Peter Valdo or Waldo, a rich citizen of Lyons, and a considerable leader of the sect. From Lyons, too, they were called Leonists, and Cathari from the professed purity of their life and doctrine, as others since have had the name of Puritans. As there were a variety of names, so there might be some diversity of opinion among them; but that they were not guilty of Manicheism and other abominable heresies, which have been charged upon them, is certain and evident from all the remains of their creeds, confessions and writings." (ppg. 513,514.)

I am glad Bishop Newton said this, for if he had been a Baptist, he might have been partial, but, being a Pedobaptist, he cannot be accused of being prejudiced in favor of the Waldenses. It is sometimes said by our opponents that the Waldenses were not free from some very grievous errors, but this writer exonerates them. But let us read from him again: "Much hath been written in censure and condemnation of this sect, both by enemies and friends, by Papists and Protestants. If they have been grossly misrepresented and vilified on one side, they have been amply justified and vindicated on the other; but I will only produce the testimony of three witnesses concerning them, whom both sides must allow to be unexceptionable, Reinerious, Thuanus, and Mezeray.

Reinerious flourished about the year 1254, and his testimony is the more remarkable, as he was a Dominican, and inquisitor general. "Among all the sects, which still are or ever have been, there is not any more pernicious to the church than that of the Leonists. And this for three reasons. The first is, because it is older, for some say that it hath endured from the time of Pope Sylvester; others from the time of the apostles. The second, because it is more general, for there is scarce any country wherein this sect is not. The third, because when all other sects beget horror in the hearers by the outrageousness of their blasphemies against God, this of the Leonists hath a great show of piety, because they live justly before men, and believe all things rightly concerning God, and all the articles which are contained in the creed; only they blaspheme the church of Rome and the clergy, whom the multitude of the laity is easy to believe." (ppg. 515,516.)

The witness just quoted was once a member of the Waldensian church, and apostatized from it, and became one of their most violent persecutors. His testimony is good, as he is an enemy, and from what he says, no doubt this people have existed from the apostles to the present time, and that they were what is now denominated *Hardshell* Baptists.

If this be true, then we have had no founder of our church but Christ and the apostles, and we have had a connection of baptism all through the dark ages until now. They have been

known by many different names, at different times and in different localities, but it is very evident that they were the same people all the time. Let us see if history will bear us out in that idea.

"These Puritans, being exposed to severe and sanguinary persecutions for dissent, from age to age, were compelled to shelter themselves from the desolating storm in retirement; and when at intervals they reappear on the page of contemporary history, and their principles are propagated with new boldness and success, they are styled a new sect, and receive a new name, though in reality they are the same people." Religious Encyclopedia, pg. 1147.

This is, no doubt, a correct statement concerning them, and it corroborates other historians on the same subject. But I wish to read again from this same writer. On the next page he says: "Hence it is hardly to be wondered at that the Waldenses, like the scriptures, have been resorted to by all parties of Protestants in defense of their peculiar sentiments. The Papists accused the Protestants of being a new sect, whose principles had no existence till the days of Luther. This charge they all denied, and each party sought to find predecessors, and to trace a line of succession up to the apostles. The perversions of heresy on the one hand, and the corruptions of popery on the other, left no alternative but to find that succession among the Waldenses."

It seems from this statement that all Protestants, until recently, claimed that the Waldenses were their predecessors, and were willing to claim that they had an existence from the apostles. I now wish to introduce Bishop Newton again on this subject. He says: "Here only some of the principle instances are selected; but this deduction, short and defective as it is, evidently demonstrates, however, that there hath not been that uninterrupted union and harmony which the members of the church of Rome pretend to boast to have been before the Reformation, and at the same time it plainly evinces that they betray great ignorance, as well as impertinence, in asking the question, 'Where was your religion before Luther?' Our religion, we see, was in the hearts and lives of many faithful witnesses;

but it is sufficient if it was nowhere else, that it was always in the Bible." (pg. 526.)

You see how the Bishop agrees with our former witness, that Protestants claimed that their religion, before Luther, was among the Waldenses. And he says the members of the church of Rome betray great ignorance and impertinence when they ask where our religion was before Luther. It is very evident that Bishop Newton, although a High Churchman, believed that the Waldenses have existed from the apostles.

But we are often told that those people were not Baptists, for among all the names they had, they were not called Baptists before the Reformation. Let us see if that is true. Listen at us read: "But here again it was a Roman Bishop, Stephanus, who, instigated by the spirit of ecclesiastical arrogance, domination and zeal without knowledge, attached to this point of dispute a paramount importance. Hence, toward the close of the year 253, he issued a sentence of excommunication against the bishops of Asia Minor, Cappadocia, Galatia, and Cilicia, stigmatizing them as Anabaptists, a name, however, which they could justly affirm they did not deserve by their principles, for it was not their wish to administer a second baptism to those who had already been baptized, but they contended that the previous baptism, given by heretics, could not be recognized as a true one." Neander, vol. 1, pg. 318.

You see, then, that they were called Anabaptists long before the Reformation. Now, from the sketches I have quoted to you, and many others that I might refer to, I claim that there has been a people all along, from the apostles, that have preserved the ordinances of the church. I claim that they are our people, and that it is easy to trace them through the dark ages by their blood. I know the Lord did set up a church on earth, and I know, if his word is true, it still exists, for the prophet said it should never be destroyed, but it should stand forever. They have always baptized those who came to them from other sects. We do the same yet, for the same reasons that they did. I have now shown you that baptism, in the order of the gospel, must precede the Lord's Supper; and that immersion is the only gospel mode of baptism; and that believers are the only gospel

subjects; and that, having all these, it is necessary to valid baptism that we have the gospel design; and that we may have all these and yet, for want of a proper administrator, we may not have gospel baptism.

I believe that Christ has a church in the world, but I do not believe he has forty-seven different churches. I do not believe any man has the right to start up a church and call it the church of Christ. If he has not, then, if he should set up an institution and call it a church, it is not, and, if it is not, it has no right to administer baptism. Therefore we do not receive the baptism of any.

If any other church on earth has the right to baptize, we have not, for Christ only has one church. As no other has the right to baptize, we cannot commune with others, while we think none but baptized persons have a right to the communion.

Lecture 4

In the course of my remarks this evening, I shall speak more especially on the real nature of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, from the light of a few texts of scripture, that I shall read and talk about. I have, I think, shown that baptism must precede the Lord's Supper, but it may be that my points are not as strong as I think they are. Nothing would have pleased me better, on that account, than to have an opponent in the discussion, so that the strength of my arguments might have been tested; but this we could not have, and I feel satisfied that I have established my points.

As it is my calculation, now, to publish a synopsis of my discourses, you will all have the opportunity of reading them, and of being your own judges as to our reasons for our practice of close communion. I wish to state again, that all I have said, or shall say, is in defense. We do not care how other people do in reference to this or any other service. When they commune with others, we do not fall out with them, and say they ought not, for we think it none of our affair. As I told Brother Hale, one day at Brother Mangum's house, I am one of the most willing souls in the world for people to do as they please

religiously, so they did not try to make me do as they please, too. When it comes to that I object.

On that account I am here this week to defend, if I can, our position on the Communion question. We have been spoken of as not having any reasons for our course. We may not have good reasons, but they satisfy us, and we are willing to give them and let you consider them. We have said that we are often accused of being selfish because we do not admit others to our communion, and that it does not look friendly on our part. I have shown you that the Lord's Supper is not a test of friendship. Whoever read in the New Testament that the Supper is a test of friendship? It is a commemorative rite; it commemorates the death of Christ. We are not unfriendly to others because we do not commune with them, neither do we unchristianize them. But if we must either offend them or God, we prefer to please the Lord. We do not wish to be so friendly with any one that we will incur the disapprobation of God, in order to please them.

We read: "Then they that gladly received his word were baptized; and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls. And they continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers." Acts 2:41-42. From this text of scripture, we get the course of the first Christians after the ascension of our Savior. They continued in the apostles' doctrine, as though doctrine is a very essential feature in the Christian system.

We have heard men say, that our doctrinal differences do not amount to anything; we are all aiming at the same thing. But we never hear a man talk that way, that is ready to give any of his notions up. A man at Grayville said to me once, that he would like for me to come and hear his preacher, who was there holding a series of meetings. He told me he thought I would like him, he was a good preacher, and said he, "He says he is not here to preach the Baptist doctrine, or the Methodist doctrine, or the Campbellite doctrine, or the Presbyterian doctrine, but that he is here to save souls."

I said, is he not a Presbyterian? Yes, he said, he was. Well, then why does he not preach his doctrine? "Well," said the man, "he thinks it would be so much better for all of us to come together and unite our influences, as we could do so much more good in the world." Well, said I, perhaps I am the very man he wants to see.

If he is a compromise man, as he makes the proposition, the rules of propriety require him to make the first move. What is he willing to lay aside for the sake of uniting with me?

Will he lay aside his notion of infant baptism? He is aware that I do not believe in that. "No," said he, "he would not do that." Well, then, I will have to, if we come together. Will he lay down his views of general atonement? He knows that Baptists do not believe in general atonement. "No, he would not do that," said he. Well, then, I would have to give up my ideas on that subject if we ever come together. Now, tell me just what he will give up in order to unite with us. "Well," said he, "he would not give up anything that he holds."

Then, if he wishes to unite with me, he means he wants me to give up all and go to him. That is the way with those fellows that want us to affiliate with them; they wish us to simply dissolve and go to them. We are as friendly as they are, for if they will come to us on our terms, we will commune with any of them. We do not make the terms, but we find them in the Bible.

We frequently hear it said, that it does not matter what a man believes, if he is honest in it. I object to that idea, for that puts falsehood upon a par with truth, provided a man believes it and is honest in it. Saul of Tarsus was just as good a saint while persecuting the church as he was after his conversion, if that is true, for he was honest in it. He said, "I verily thought I ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus, which things I also did."

If it does not matter what a man believes, so he is honest in it, Colonel Ingersoll is all right, provided he is honest in what he says he believes. Doctrine was so essential to the church that

the apostles and first Christians continued steadfastly in the doctrine. We learn from this text that an agreement in doctrine must be essential to the communion. I am of the opinion that those who are willing to not mention doctrinal differences, do not care to have their doctrinal positions investigated.

The apostle Jude said: "It was needful for me to write unto you, and exhort you that ye should earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the Saints." Such a thing being needful, reminds us of two things: that the faith is likely to be opposed, and that such opposition is dangerous to the welfare of the church. If it was needful in the days of the apostles, it is certainly still needful. How are we going to heed this exhortation of Jude, if we do not let doctrinal differences make any difference with us? If doctrinal differences amount to nothing, why did the Apostle John write as he did? "Whosoever transgresseth and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God. He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, 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." I John 2:9-11.

Now, this is the plain, unmistakable word of God, and no Christian, that wishes the Lord to approbate his course, as an obedient servant, should be willing to set at naught the plain injunctions of God's word, to gratify his sympathy for his Christian neighbor. This word says, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed, for if you do, you are partaker of his evil deeds.

Do you wish to become a partner with all the religious world, in all the heresies that are taught among men, and that are called the doctrine of Christ? When you commune with one whose doctrine is false, you then become a partner with him. God forbids you to do so, and you cannot disobey God and do right. It does not matter if you have personal friends there, you had better not go there. But you say you see the Lord there, and you feel like going. But you are mistaken, according to the text, for he says, he "hath not God." With such plain teaching of the scriptures as this, let it bring upon our heads all the anathemas

and opprobriums that Jews or Pagans may see fit to inflict, or that ministers of other denominations may hurl at us, and heap upon us; it is our duty to bear it, and still do our homage to the Lord.

The Apostle Paul exhorted Timothy to "Take heed unto thyself, and to the doctrine, continue in them; for in doing this, thou shalt both save thyself and them that hear thee." I Timothy 4:16. Are we to obey the instructions given in these texts of scripture? What are they for, only for our good? What good will they do us if we commune with all the religious world? We cannot practice open communion and obey these exhortations.

Are there now, or have there ever been, heresies among the great number of sects in the world, which claim to be churches or branches of the Church of Christ? How are we to commune with those errorists and not partake of the evil effects of their doctrine? We divide character with the people we affiliate with, not only morally, but doctrinally and practically, and we thus become responsible for the bad effects of their errors. The salvation of the church, in some way, depends on the maintenance of the doctrine, if the text means anything.

Some seem to think, when the scripture speaks of saving, eternal salvation is meant, and if it is, then doctrine is essential to the eternal salvation of those to whom we preach. Then it becomes highly necessary that we take heed to the doctrine. But while I do not believe it to be necessary to our eternal salvation, yet I do believe it is essential to the glory of God, and the welfare of his church. For this purpose the ministry was given to the church, as the apostle observes, "That we henceforth be no more children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men, and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive." Ephesians 4:14.

We cannot be saved from every wind of doctrine, unless we take heed unto the doctrine. How are we to do that, and yet say doctrinal differences should not make any difference with us? I do not know. Paul tells the church to reject the man that is an heretic, after the first and second admonition; but how can

we do that, if, after we have excluded him, as we did Randall, he sets up another church as Randall did—the Freewill Baptist Church—and then we commune with him, on the grounds that we are open communionists, and our doctrinal differences should not hinder us from communing together?

An agreement on doctrine seems to be necessary to fellowship. The prophet said, “Can two walk together, except they be agreed?” Amos 3:3. Hence, it seems that if we do not agree we cannot walk together, and if we cannot walk together, we cannot be in fellowship, and if we are not in fellowship, we cannot commune together. But the practice of open communion would force us to commune with those for whom we have no fellowship. We do not exclude from our fellowship those for whom we have fellowship, and after we exclude a member for want of fellowship, and he goes away and joins another denomination, if he should come to our communion we have either to practice close communion, or commune with him.

There is no doubt in my mind but that the members of the church must be in fellowship, in order to take the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper. It was intended, in the very nature of the organization of the church, that fellowship should prevail. A church is not in order to take the supper if her members are not in fellowship with each other. As an evidence of this fact, I think the apostle speaks of it in his first letter to the Corinthians. “For first of all when ye come together in the church, I hear that there be divisions (or schisms) among you, and I partly believe it. For there must be also heresies (or sects) among you, that they which are approved may be made manifest among you. When ye come together, therefore, into one place, this is not to (or ye cannot) eat the Lord's Supper. For in eating (or if ye eat under these circumstances) every one taketh before other his own supper, and one is hungry and another is drunken.”

I Corinthians 11:18-20. I understand from this that if the church is not agreed they cannot partake of the Lord's Supper, for the ordinance of the supper is not to be observed by individual members of the church, as individuals, but all the

church collectively. Hence they are to partake of the supper together, that is, all of them eat the supper that belongs to all, and not each one eat his own.

But Paul seems to argue the necessity of all being united to do so. There must be no schisms or sects in the church when they commune, or else they cannot partake. One will eat before the other his own supper, and not one wait for another as the apostle advises. If the church cannot partake of the supper when there are divisions in her body, how can she commune with those of other churches when they are not united?

I hear men talk of branches of the church as though the church of Christ had been divided up into branches, and that each denomination was a branch of the church of Christ. Who divided the Lord's church up into so many different branches? I once heard a minister say that he thanked God that his church had been divided and subdivided, so that if a man did not like this branch of the church, he could go to one that he did like and join it, and thereby get to heaven.

Did God divide His own church up to suit the different tastes of men, and then require men to join in order to get to heaven? He only established one at first, and if he has divided His church Himself, he must have found out, after He set up the church, that it did not suit at all, and then he went to work and divided it up so as to have a branch suited to all. It occurs to me, if that be true, He should still get up more, for some people are not exactly suited yet. If he did not make the division, he need not be thanked for it. But if he did, and all are simply branches of the same church, it occurs to me there should be an affinity among them. I see many branches of a tree, but all take their substance from the root and sap of the tree, and the fruit of all the branches is the same. I do not believe that the church has been divided up in such a manner as that, and that each denomination is a branch of the church. There seems to be a lack of fellowship among them, and the members of the church should be in fellowship with one another, as the apostle said: "Ye are, therefore, no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow citizens with the saints, and of the household of God."

To be fellow citizens, is to be citizens together. We are all citizens of the state, and our interests are all the same, so that what is best for me as a citizen of Indiana is best for all others in the state. In the church of Christ the members are so united together as to make their interests all the same. We are not each one independent of all the rest, but the apostle says: "As we have many members in one body, and all the members have not the same office, so we being many, are one body in Christ, and every one members one of another."

How important that such a body of members should be in fellowship with one another in order to glorify the Lord. And if there is any one service more than another, when those who serve should be in fellowship, it must be the communion, for the church must come together in order to participate in the supper, and not one take it himself alone. One person may go into his closet and pray, and no one else present, and so with many other duties, but when the death of Christ is to be commemorated, it is not to be by one individual alone, but by the whole church, collectively.

"Wherefore, my brethren, when ye come together to eat, tarry one for another." I understand all are to eat together, and not one to himself, and on this account fellowship should necessarily prevail. But it is often the case that we exclude from our fellowship members of our church, and let it be understood that we do not exclude a member if we can fellowship him, and when we exclude him we do not wish to commune with him, and if we practice free or open communion, we are compelled to commune with those we have excluded for want of fellowship. It is not only true with us, for those who do open their communion to all, are often compelled to commune with members they have excluded from their fellowship.

We often hear the text quoted, "But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread and drink of that cup." This is universally quoted to prove open communion, but I understand it to be simply an exhortation to self-examination of each member of the church. Each member is to examine himself and eat. That text does not forbid the church to examine the standing of her own members. If the church is not allowed the

privilege of judging the moral standing of her own members, and their worthiness to eat, how is she going to be able to obey the admonition of the apostle when he says, "with such an one no not to eat."

There is no doubt that the apostle here intended to exhort the church to see to the moral standing of her own members, and with certain characters they were forbidden to eat. He says: "I wrote unto you an epistle not to keep company with fornicators. Yet not altogether with the fornicators of this world, or with the covetous, or extortioners, or with idolaters, for then must ye needs go out of the world. But now I have written unto you not to keep company, if any man that is called a brother be a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolater, or a railer, or a drunkard, or an extortioner, with such an one no not to eat." I Corinthians 5:9-11.

I understand from this language of the apostle that the church must certainly judge the standing of her members, and if they are not worthy, she is not to allow them to eat. She is not judging the world in this case, but she is simply judging her members. The apostle continues: "For what have I to do to judge them also that are without." I think he means by them that are without, those who do not belong to the church. We are not to judge any but our own members. "Do not ye judge them that are within?" That is in the church. "But them that are without God judgeth. Therefore put away from among yourselves that wicked person." I Corinthians 5:12-13. Now, suppose a church excludes one such member that the apostle has told us to put away, and not to eat with, and he goes and joins another denomination, and we practice open communion, and he comes to our communion meeting, how are we going to refuse to eat with him? I do not remember that I have ever heard an open communionist quote the text, "With such a one no not to eat." When they quote, "but let a man examine himself, and so let him eat," they seem to use it to prove that if a man thinks himself to be worthy, the church should not debar him. If that is the correct interpretation of it, I do not see how they are to refuse to eat with such a one as the apostle mentions.

The order of God's house has no inconsistencies in it, and the apostle has not been inconsistent in saying in one text, "With such a one, no not to eat," and in another, "But let a man examine himself and so let him eat." I have now briefly given the main reasons we have for our practice of close communion, and you will be permitted to study them and be your own judges as to their validity.

I am sure no one feels more friendly to Christians of other denominations than we do, but we do not believe in violating the plain injunctions of God's word to show our friendship to the people. I now leave the matter with you, feeling thankful to God that we can think for ourselves on these subjects. (*Lemuel Potter*)

Conservatism vs Liberalism

CONSERVATISM vs. Liberalism: Harold Hunt: Primitive Baptists are, by definition, conservative. To refer to a *liberal* Primitive Baptist is a contradiction in terms. It is like saying *dry* water, or *frozen* fire. To the extent any person is *liberal* he is no longer a Primitive Baptist.

Webster defines *conservative* as "desiring to preserve existing institutions; resisting radical change." With our people even that definition is somewhat weak. We do not simply *desire* to preserve existing institutions; we are rather *determined* to preserve those institutions God provided for the church. We are convinced that God set the church up the way he wanted it, and we have no desire to change any fundamental principle he has provided. That is what *radical change* means—changing any fundamental principle. That was God's instruction to Israel, and it is his instruction to the New Testament church.

Joshua 1:7 Only be thou strong and very courageous, that thou mayest observe to do according to all the law, which Moses my servant commanded thee: *turn not from it to the right hand or to the left*, that thou mayest prosper whithersoever thou goest.

Revelation 22:18-19 For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book: And if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take

away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book.

To any person with the fear of God in his heart, those instructions should be a sober warning. It is a dangerous matter to add anything—or take away anything—God has provided for the church.

Nadab and Abihu, the sons of Aaron, offered strange fire on the altar, and lost their lives in the process.

Leviticus 10:1-3 And Nadab and Abihu, the sons of Aaron, took either of them his censer, and put fire therein, and put incense thereon, and offered strange fire before the Lord, which he commanded them not. And there went out fire from the Lord, and devoured them, and they died before the Lord.

The altar of incense stood just before the inner veil. That veil separated between the Holy Place and the Most Holy. It was behind that veil that God said to Moses, “And there will I meet with thee from above the mercy seat, from between the cherubim.” It took some kind of audacity for those two men to carry *strange fire* virtually into the presence of the Almighty himself. It takes the same audacity to add anything to the order of the Lord’s house.

He set the church up exactly the way he wanted it. To add anything he has not provided is to question the wisdom of God. It implies the church needs something God either did not think of, or something he just did not provide. Either way, it challenges the wisdom and judgment of God.

Years ago, there were those who decided the gospel was insufficient for instructing little children; so they added the Sunday School. They found the Sunday School was not sufficient, and they added the Training Union. That did not get the job done; so they added the Vacation Bible School.

They decided the church and the gospel ministry were not sufficient for the conversion of sinners; so they added Mission Boards. They decided the Holy Spirit was not a dependable instructor for ministers; so they added theological seminaries. Once you decide God’s provision is not enough, there is no end to the new projects you can come up with.

Jeremiah 2:13, For my people have committed two evils; they have forsaken me the fountain of living waters, and hewed them out cisterns, broken cisterns, that can hold no water.

Liberalism is not limited to the denominational *churches*. Our Primitive Baptists have been afflicted as well. In the Revelation John insists we must not add anything God has not provided, and we must not take anything away. It is liberalism to do either. One liberal practice that has afflicted us has to do with the neglect of the discipline of the church. I notice more and more of a tendency among some of our churches to neglect discipline. God does not expect perfection in the church—else he would have required the Jerusalem church to exclude Peter when he cursed and swore he did not know the Lord. But you can be sure that the surest way to change a church into a social club is to forget that God requires an adequate and proper discipline.

Another has to do with mimicking the methods of the denominational world. In recent years, some of our ministers seem determined to mimic the methods of denominational pastors and secular psychologists. Any faithful pastor will give the best advice—the best counsel—to any member who asks. But it is a mistake to copy the denominational pastors with their long drawn out, highly structured counseling programs. That kind of counseling is an innovation—even in the secular world. It was totally unknown until Sigmund Freud and his friends came along.

We do not need any practice for which God does not provide instruction in the Bible. It is a good rule, that if you do not know how to go about any practice without consulting some book you found at the book store, you should leave it severely alone. Those men and their manuals are not our examples; Paul the apostle is. For my thoughts on *counseling*, we have an article on the subject of counseling in this volume.

Another liberal practice is the failure to emphasize the sanctity of the marriage union. At this time the moral fabric of our nation is being torn apart by that neglect. If ever there was a question our people need to be clear about, it is that. More than any other people, our Primitive Baptists have spoken out on that subject, even to the point of refusing to receive members we perceive to be involved in adulterous marriages.

But strange to say, some of those who talk the most about conservatism are *the most liberal* on that point. I notice that the *Pitts Resolution*—which makes ever so much claim to being a conservative document—*very timidly tip-toes past the question of divorce and remarriage*. It is noteworthy that as loudly as they protest other problems, they can only muster an ambiguous three word reference to *living in adultery*, with nary a word of explanation as to what that expression means.

I am convinced the conservative stand our people have taken for generations is the proper stand—regardless of the timidity of our *Pitts Brethren* with respect to that question. For my own view on the question, I would refer you to our article on *Adultery* in Volume One of this *Anthology*.

Another liberal problem is receiving members who have been excluded from another Primitive Baptist church. Liberals and conservatives seem to be agreed on that principle, but, again, I notice that while the *Pitts Resolution* cautions against receiving excluded members, two of the very loudest voices in that movement are ministers, who, themselves, stand excluded from other Primitive Baptist churches. We might take that resolution more seriously, if they made some effort to abide by their own principles.

Another example of liberalism that has recently disturbed our people is the reception of alien baptism. Over a period of time, some of our brethren, have advocated the notion that we can receive alien baptism—so long as we receive an entire church. We are told it would be receiving alien baptism if we received a single member from that church, but their baptism becomes acceptable, if we can receive the entire church. Twice, in recent years, the forcing of that doctrine caused devastating divisions among the Primitive Baptists in our area.

Brethren, you cannot pile alien baptism high enough to turn it into valid gospel baptism. During the Protestant Reform-ation the Protestants took over entire Roman Catholic churches—and they took them on their baptism. The Baptists refused to receive alien baptism, either on an individual basis or otherwise. That is how they came to be called *Anabaptists* (re-baptizers). That refusal to receive alien baptism brought on them the wrath of both the Protestants and the Catholics. The Lutherans said, “They love water; we will give them water.” The Protestants drowned them; the Catholics burned them at the stake.

The only text in the Bible dealing with alien baptism is Acts 19, and that passage teaches that we cannot receive alien baptism—not even when it involves an entire church. This receiving alien baptism is another form of liberalism we do not need.

Liberalism is simply the opposite of conservatism. Webster defines *liberal* as “not going by the rule; not sticking to the letter.” That is exactly the opposite of what Primitive Baptists have always stood for. We believe in going strictly by the *rule* God has laid down in his word. We have more than we can do if we spend our time doing what God requires. We do not need any practice in the church for which we do not have explicit instructions in the Bible.

We need to keep in mind that any innovation in religion usually goes through three stages. When the innovation is first introduced, those who are opposed to change, oppose it with all their might. After one or two generations have passed, those who oppose such innovations are still opposed, but they have given up on trying to get rid of it. It has been around too long, and it is too well entrenched. Then after the passing of one or two more generations, the innovation becomes a tradition. It has been around so long nobody can remember when it was any different, and those who oppose change, fight just as hard to defend the innovation as their forefathers fought to keep it out.

I remember when, over fifty years ago, the denominational churches in our area first introduced the Training Union. The older members opposed it vigorously. They did not want any *man-made organization* in their church. I was barely a teenager; but I could not understand why they were so opposed to the Training Union, when they did not see anything wrong with the Sunday School. I could not find any scriptural authority for either one. This was long before I knew anything about the Primitive Baptists.

That principle applies to our people as surely as it does to others. Once an innovation has been around long enough that nobody remembers when it was any different, the innovation becomes a tradition and—unscriptural though it may be—those who love *the old ways* fight to the death to maintain the status quo.

Years ago some of our ancestors worried that the church might not be able to maintain its identity in the face of the Fullerite mission onslaught, so, in order to better control the churches, they added a business session to their associations. Then, to control the associations, they added lines of *direct formal correspondence*.

To add a business session to an association changes it from a meeting to an organization. It changes it from an effort to worship God into an effort to organize and regiment the Lord's people. It places a third party between the Lord and his bride the church.

Nothing but confusion can result when we add man-made programs and organizations to the Lord's church. Some of us have seen *up close and personal* what devastation results when, good and honorable men tell us, "We know they are wrong; but what can we do; we are *in direct correspondence*."

Sound Primitive Baptists believe in the Infallibility of the Holy Scriptures; we do not believe in the Infallibility of our Forefathers. Our forefathers were not infallible; they did make mistakes, and one of their most serious mistakes was

when they added a business session to their associations. The business session at associations, and direct correspondence between associations are innovations that have been around long enough to become traditions. They are examples of *old fashioned liberalism* as opposed to the *new-fangled liberalism* we have seen developing in recent years. It does not make any difference how long anything has been around. The passage of time does not sanctify any innovation in the Lord's house.

In recent years, more and more of our people have come to recognize the liberal and unscriptural nature of the business session at associations and lines of formal correspondence between associations, and they have returned to the more conservative practice of having associations for the purpose they were originally intended—meetings to worship God, and enjoy the fellowship, the *association* if you will, of the saints.

For my part, I love associations. I wish there were twice as many associations, and they met twice as often, and they were twice as well attended. We can never meet too often for the purpose of worshipping God, and enjoying fellowship—association—with his people. That is why our tiny church goes to great effort and expense to put on two general meetings every year. We believe we need to gather in these kinds of meetings as often as possible.

It is a source of grief to me that we have allowed such unscriptural and liberal practices as business sessions at associations, and direct correspondence, to virtually destroy our associations.

The time was when, every weekend, in the fall of the year, you could choose between several different associations. That is no longer the case. One by one our associations are going out of existence. And make no mistake; it is those two unscriptural practices that are destroying our associations. Our people love to assemble from over the country and visit and worship with people we never see at any other time. But when an association is turned into a battleground, our people just stay away.

We should have nothing—absolutely nothing—in the church for which we do not have a clear *thus saith the Lord*. It is becomingly increasingly obvious that much of the recent fuss over liberalism comes from old-fashioned liberals who are simply upset that the new-fangled forms of liberalism do not correspond with their old-fashioned liberalism. But, brethren we should firmly reject liberalism in all its forms—in the old

forms we are more familiar with, and in all its newer forms.
Hlh

Constantine

CONSTANTINE: *Sylvester Hassell:* Constantius Chlorus died in 306, nominating his son Constantine as successor, who was proclaimed emperor by the army, and finally made his way to the throne of the Caesars, and held it undisputedly for many years.

He did not profess conversion; he was not baptized until a few days before his death, but simply declared himself in favor of Christianity, at the outset, adopting the sign of the cross as his army flag; and, when fairly installed emperor, gave liberty of conscience to all his subjects to worship their deities as they thought proper. This announcement was hailed throughout his empire with rapture and delight by all his professed Christian subjects; and had he gone no further than this, he would have proved, in many respects, a benefactor to his subjects.

As time progressed he became, professedly more attached to Christianity, though he never ceased to reverence the heathen gods; and he set up Christianity by law as the religion of his empire, and for a while offered a white robe and twenty pieces of gold to each person who would join the Catholic *Church*. Not only so, but he assumed to be at the head of the church, even “the Bishop of Bishops,” and pretended to write and deliver sermons to his courtiers, who loudly applauded him; and, when he could not reconcile the differences between those who adhered to the church in Rome, he called a council of Bishops to settle the difficulty, and presided as their chairman or chief moderator; and, when the council arrived at a conclusion, he anathematized those who did not subscribe to its decisions—deprived them of their positions, and banished them the country.

Not only so, but when he found he could not conciliate the Donatists and other dissenters by having them adhere to the church of Rome and endorse all her monstrosities, he laid the hand of persecution upon them, sought to obtain possession of their books, forbade their assembling together, and destroyed their places of worship. These “oppressive measures prompted many to leave the scene of sufferings and retire into more sequestered spots. Claudius Seyssel, the popish Archbishop, traces the rise of the Waldensian heresy to a pastor named Leo leaving Rome at this period for the valleys.”—Orchard.

The gladness manifested by the genuine Baptists of that day, upon the ascension of Constantine to the throne, was therefore soon turned into sorrow, when they

found he had become their enemy, and persecuted them as the heathen rulers had persecuted Christians before.

A similar scene appeared in after ages, when the voice of Martin Luther and his colleagues shook the thrones of popes and emperors, and proclaimed liberty of conscience to all mankind. The poor persecuted Baptists rallied to his support, and rejoiced to think that the day of their deliverance had come. But they soon went away sorrowful when they discovered that the anathemas of Luther were as violently hurled at them as those of Leo had been against him, and eventually both Catholics and Lutherans joined hands in persecuting Baptists.

During the reign of Constantine many troubles and divisions arose among those who adhered to the Roman Catholic party—none greater perhaps than that which was called the “**Arian** controversy.”

In an assembly of the presbyters of Alexandria, the Bishop of that city, whose name was **Alexander**, expressed his sentiments on this subject (the persons of the Godhead, and the Divinity of Christ, etc.) with a great degree of freedom and confidence, maintaining among other things that the Son was not only of the same eminence and dignity, but also of the same essence with the Father. This assertion was opposed by **Arius**, one of the presbyters, a man of subtle turn, and remarkable for his eloquence. Whether his zeal for his own opinions or personal resentment against his Bishop was the motive that influenced him, is not very certain. Be that as it may, he first treated as false the assertion of **Alexander**, on account of his affinity to the Sabellian errors, which had been condemned by the church, and then, rushing into the opposite extreme, he maintained that the Son was totally and essentially distinct from the Father; that he was the first and noblest of those beings whom God had created out of nothing, the instrument by whose subordinate operation the Almighty Father formed the universe, and therefore inferior to the Father, both in nature and in dignity.

His opinions concerning the Holy Ghost are not so well known. It is, however, certain that his notion concerning the Son of God was accompanied and connected with other sentiments that were very different from those commonly received among Christians, though none of the ancient writers have given us a complete and coherent system of those religious tenets which **Arius** and his followers really held.

The opinions of Arius were no sooner divulged than they found, in Egypt and the neighboring provinces, a multitude of abettors, and, among these, many who were distinguished as much by the superiority of their learning and genius as by the eminence of their rank and station. Alexander, on the other hand, in two councils assembled at Alexandria, accused Arius of impiety, and caused him to

be expelled from the communion of the church. Arius received this severe and ignominious shock with great firmness and constancy of mind, retired into Palestine, and thence wrote several letters to the most eminent men of those times, in which he endeavored to demonstrate the truth of his opinions, and that with such surprising success that vast numbers were drawn over to his party; and, among these, Eusebius, Bishop of Nicomedia, a man distinguished in the church by his influence and authority.”

“The Emperor Constantine, looking upon the subject of this controversy as a matter of small importance, and as little connected with the fundamental and essential doctrines of religion, contented himself at first with addressing a letter to the contending parties, in which he admonished them to put an end to their disputes. But when the prince saw that his admonitions were without effect, and that the troubles and commotions which the passions of men too often mingle with religious disputes were spreading and increasing daily throughout the empire, he convoked, in the year 325, a great **Council at Nice** in Bithynia, hoping and desiring that the deputies of the church universal (as it was called) would put an end to this controversy. In this general assembly, after many keen debates and violent efforts of the two parties, the doctrine of Arius was condemned; Christ was declared *consubstantial*, or of the same essence, with the Father; the vanquished presbyter was banished among the Illyrians, and his followers were compelled to give their assent to the Creed, or Confession of Faith, which was composed on this occasion.

“The council assembled by Constantine at Nice is one of the most famous and interesting events that are presented to us in ecclesiastical history, and yet, what is most surprising, scarcely any part of the history of the church (Romish) has been unfolded with such negligence, or rather passed over with such rapidity. The ancient writers are agreed with respect neither to the time nor the place in which it was assembled, the number of those who sat in the council, nor the Bishop who presided in it, and no authentic acts of its famous sentence are now extant.”—Mosheim.

It is now generally agreed that the council was held at Nice; that it convened on the 14th of June, A.D. 325, and ended on the 25th of July following; that it was composed of three hundred and eighteen Bishops, besides a multitude of presbyters, Deacons, acolythists, and others, amounting in the whole to about two thousand and forty-eight persons. This is what is termed the first general council. It decided the question of Arianism, and also the time for the celebration of Easter.

“Letters were now written to all the churches in Egypt, Lydia and Pentapolis, announcing their decrees and informing them that the holy synod had condemned

the opinions of Arius, and had fully decided the time for the celebration of Easter; exhorting them to rejoice for the good deed they had done, for that they had cut off all manner of heresy. When these things were ended Constantine splendidly treated the Bishops, filled their pockets and sent them honorably home, exhorting them at parting to maintain peace among themselves, and that none of them should envy another who might excel the rest in wisdom and eloquence; that they should not carry themselves haughtily towards their inferiors, but condescend to and bear with their weakness—a convincing proof that he saw into their tempers, and was no stranger to the haughtiness and pride that influenced some, and the envy and hatred that prevailed in others.”

“It requires not the spirit of prophecy to anticipate the effects which must flow from the disgraceful proceedings of this general Council, though Constantine himself wrote letters enjoining universal conformity to its decrees, and urged, as a reason for it, that ‘what they had decreed was the will of God, and the agreement of so great a number of such Bishops was by inspiration of the Holy Ghost.’ This Council laid the foundation for a system of persecution altogether new—professing Christians tyrannizing over the consciences of each other, and inflicting torture and cruelties upon each other far greater than they had ever sustained from their heathen persecutors.”

“The emperor’s first letters were mild and gentle, but he was soon persuaded into more violent measures; for, out of his great zeal to extinguish heresy, he issued edicts against all such as his favorite Bishops persuaded him were the authors or abettors of it; and particularly against the Novations, Donatists, Valentinians, Marcionists and others, whom, after reproaching with being ‘enemies of truth, destructive counselors,’ etc., he deprived of the liberty of meeting for worship either in public or private places; and gave all their oratories to the orthodox church. And, with respect to the discomfited party, he banished Arius himself; commanded that all his followers should be called Porphyrians (from Porphyry, the heathen philosopher who wrote against Christianity); ordained that the books written by them should be burnt, that there might remain to posterity no vestiges of their doctrine; and, to complete the climax, enacted that if any should dare to keep in his possession any book written by Arius, and should not immediately burn it, he should no sooner be convicted of the crime than he should suffer death. Such were the acts of the last days of Constantine.”—W. Jones.

How unreasonable for the Emperor Constantine to suppose that he could keep down pride, envy and jealousy among his Bishops, when at the same time he was enriching them and elevating them to the highest distinctions in *Church* and State!

Constantine's leading motive was evidently one of political expediency and personal aggrandizement. When he undertook to unite *Church* and State, and constitute the kingdom of Christ into a kingdom of this world, he made a great mistake, and was found pandering to Antichrist rather than serving Christ, who most emphatically declared before Pontius Pilate, "*My kingdom is not of this world.*"

For the first three centuries the ministry were *unsalaried*, and received only irregular voluntary contributions from the private members, who were themselves comparatively few and poor. But Constantine instituted the worldly and corrupting practice of paying the Catholic ministry a fixed salary from *church* funds and from imperial and municipal treasuries. This custom, says Prof. Schaff, "favored ease and luxury, allured a host of unworthy persons into the service of the *church*, and checked the exercise of free-giving among the people."

The Arians, so far from being silenced, continued their agitations during the fourth century, and, while persecuted by some emperors, were favored by others, and when in the ascendancy would persecute the Trinitarians or orthodox party, just as that party when in power persecuted them. And, although Arius was sadly in error in denying divinity to Christ, yet, so far as the acrimony of the controversy was concerned, he was no more to blame than Alexander and Athanasius, the leaders of the opposite party. Each side abounded with language unbecoming the profession they had made of belief in the Savior of sinners; and their bitterness and foul denunciations of each other rose to such a pitch and were so wide-spread throughout the empire that the very heathen mocked them and rebuked them in their theatrical performances. This one instance goes to show that mankind are prone to make the greater noise about those things they least understand; and that there are scarcely any bounds to the presumption and arrogance of those theologians who, disregarding the limits of scriptural phraseology, make a language of their own, pretend to know as much about the mode of God's existence as God does himself, and hurl anathemas against all those who do not agree with them in everything they say.

The Scriptures sufficiently prove that the Father, Word and Holy Ghost are each divine, and that these three are but one, and constitute the one eternal God. Secret things belong to God, but such as are revealed belong to us and to our children. Human knowledge goes no further. No finite intelligence can fathom the infinite depths of the Godhead.

Arianism, or a denial of Christ's divinity, continued to exist in the bosom of the Roman Catholic Church (so-called) for centuries, and has never entirely left it to this day. It has shown itself under many forms from the days of Arius to the

present time, and particularly under those of Mohammedanism and Unitarianism. (*Hassell's History* ppg 380-385)

The ecclesiastical historian, Eusebius, says that, in A.D. 312, while Constantine was marching against the pagan Emperor Maxentius, Constantine and his army saw in the Heavens, just after noon, a bright cross above the sun, and near it the words, *Touto Nika (By this Conquer)*; and that the same night Christ appeared to Constantine while he slept, and directed him to prepare a standard in the form of a cross, and told him that thus he would conquer his enemies. Lactantius, an earlier and more credible witness, speaks only of the night-dream, and nothing of the day-vision, which is thought by the best historians either not to have occurred, or to have been some natural phenomenon, as a parhelion, or solar halo, or a cloud, somewhat in the form of a cross, the letters being invented or imagined. Christ does not direct to carnal warfare, but is the Prince of Peace. As Constantine had in 310 slain his father-in-law, Maximian, so in 324 he slew his brother-in-law, Licinius, and his nephew, Licinius, and in 326 his own eldest son, Crispus, and it is thought by many, his own wife Fausta, with whom he had lived twenty years." (*Hassell's History* pg 380)

Consubstantiation

CONSUBSTANTIATION (*See under SCHOLASTIC THEOLOGY*)

Conversion

CONVERSION And as regards conversion, men need often to be converted. The word *converted* is never used in the Scripture to denote regeneration, but simply shows a changing from one position to another, or from error to truth as James says, "Brethren, if any of you do err from the truth and another *convert* him, (turn him from that error) let him know that he that converteth the sinner from their error of his way shall save a soul from death, and hide a multitude of sin." (*T.S. Dalton Zion's Advocate July 1897*)

CONVERSION: Tom Hagler: Conversion is a process in which the regenerate child of God (already saved eternally) turns from sinning against Christ to

attempting to follow Christ. This conversion has to do with the child of God becoming a disciple of Christ by being obedient to the gospel message. Conversion also involves the form of worship he must follow. The child of God has much work and many actions to perform. He must repent of his sins:

Acts 3:19 “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.”

The child of God must confess Christ. The reader should be aware that to confess Christ is not the same thing as to accept Christ. Notice the following verse:

Romans 10:9 “That if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved.”

The child of God, as a believer, must submit to baptism, as below:

Mark 16:16 “He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned.”

Notice that our belief of the gospel unto baptism by following Christ as a disciple into his church yields salvation as stated in the above verses. This salvation is not eternal, because the child of God already possesses eternal life, but rather is an aspect of salvation that can be enjoyed in this life, so it is called *conditional time salvation*. This aspect of salvation is from this *untoward* (stubborn or unruly) generation, and is one that a person can achieve for himself, as Peter preached in Acts:

Acts 2:38 “Then Peter said unto 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.”

Acts 2:40 “And with many other words did he testify and exhort, saying, Save yourselves from this untoward generation.”

The number of Bible verses already quoted obviously demonstrate that we cannot save ourselves eternally. Also, considering all the righteous works a person must perform in the conversion process, as given above, the verses show that conversion is not the same thing as regeneration or the spiritual birth. We remember the following Bible verses already quoted above:

Titus 3:5 “Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to this mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost.”

II Timothy 1:9 “Who hath saved us, and called us with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began.”

Clearly, the value of religious conversion and the method of worship have to do with benefits or suffering in this life of God’s born again children. For this reason, it is called *conditional time salvation*. We learn from scripture that as children of God, we have set before us the opportunity of obeying God’s commandments and enjoying a life with blessings from God. On the other hand, if we rebel against God and do not obey his commandments, we will suffer in this life. This suffering will not be eternal in hell, but temporal in this life, possibly resulting in death. Notice the warning given below:

Hebrews 10:26-31 “For if we sin wilfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins, But a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries. He that despised Moses’ law died without mercy under two or three witnesses: Of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace? For we know him that hath said, Vengeance *belongeth* unto me, I will recompense, saith the Lord. And again, The Lord shall judge his people. It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God.”

The above warning for God’s children in the New Testament was nothing new, because God’s people in the Old Testament (the children of Israel), were given a similar warning. This warning was given to Moses before the children of Israel crossed over the river Jordan to possess the Promised Land. To see this fact stated clearly by God, notice the following:

Deuteronomy 30:15-19 “See, I have set before thee this day life and good, and death and evil; In that I command thee this day to love the LORD thy God, to walk in his ways, and to keep his commandments and his statutes and his judgments, that thou mayest live and multiply: and the LORD thy God shall bless thee in the land whither thou goest to possess it. But if thine heart turn away, so that thou wilt not hear, but shalt be drawn away, and worship other gods, and serve them; I denounce unto you this day, that ye shall surely perish, *and that ye shall not prolong your days upon the land, whither thou passest over Jordan to go to possess it.* I call heaven and earth to record this day against you,

that I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing: therefore choose life, that both thou and thy seed may live.” (Verse 31: says, “And Moses went and spake these words unto all Israel.”)

God is not telling His people they will suffer eternal damnation. God’s people already have spiritual life or eternal life. *Eternal* means it is non-ending. God makes it clear He is referring to things in this life by saying “*ye shall not prolong your days upon the land,*” as opposed to eternal damnation. This refers to *time* by living a longer life. When God begins a work in the heart of one of his elect children, He will finish it to the end, as stated below:

Philippians 1:6 “Being confident of this very thing, that he which hath begun a good work in you will perform *it* until the day of Jesus Christ:” (*Tom Hagler: Rightly Dividing the Word of Truth: ppg 144-148*).

Tom Hagler The aspect of salvation for a born again person called **conversion** requires a considerable amount of **works**. **Conversion is conditional**, based on **if** the child of God ever hears the gospel. After hearing, **if** they believe...and **if** the child of God will **repent of his sins** (Acts 3:19), **confess Christ** (Romans 10:9) and submit to **baptism** (Mark 16:16), only then is the conversion complete. As follows: (**Many, many works!** How could anyone suggest these acts for conversion could yield eternal salvation? **Conversion and regeneration are obviously not the same thing.**)

“**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. And it shall come to pass that every soul, which will not hear that prophet, shall be **destroyed** from among the people.” (Acts 3:19-20,23). Notice the action or **works** required by the sinner.

“Brethren, if any of you do err from the truth, and one **convert** him; let him know, that he which **converteth** the sinner from the error of his way shall save a soul from death, and shall hide a multitude of sins.” (James 5:19-20)

“And that every tongue should **confess** that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father. Wherefore, my beloved, as ye have always obeyed, not in my presence only, but now much more in my absence, **work out your own salvation** with fear and trembling. For it is God which worketh in you both to will and to do of His good pleasure.” (Philippians 2:11-13)

“That if thou shalt **confess** with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt **believe** in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved.”
(Romans 10:9)

“He that **believeth** and is **baptized** shall be saved; but he that **believeth not** shall be **damned.**” (Mark 16:16) If this salvation is eternal, then baptism is necessary for eternal salvation. We know this is not true, as proven by I Peter 3:20-21.

The last scripture reference above, Mark 16:16, states that a **child of God** who rejects God in unbelief, and does not submit to baptism **will suffer damnation in this life.** This was also implied in Acts 3:23, by stating “*destroyed from among the people.*” Even so, we know these rebellious people will finally be in heaven. Some of God’s **converted** children will **later** conduct themselves in such a bad way that they **lose** this *time salvation*, gained by conversion. As in Revelation 3:14-22, converted members of the Laodicean church, could lose this *time salvation* of being in fellowship with Jesus Christ, as follows:

“And unto the angel of the church of the Laodiceans write; These things saith the Amen, the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God; I know thy works, that thou art neither cold nor hot; I would thou wert 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. To him that overcometh, **will I grant to sit with me in my throne,** even I also overcome, and am set down with my Father in His throne. **He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches.**”

(Revelation 3:14-22) This passage was addressed to the **Laodicean church**, not to dead alien and unregenerate sinners. Continued fellowship with Christ in this life for church members is the subject under consideration, **not eternal salvation.** If there is no repentance, then chastisement and loss of the aspect of salvation called conversion is possible.

God’s children cannot lose eternal salvation, but they can lose the salvation gained during their life by **conversion.** The loss of *time salvation* means suffering what the Bible calls chastisement or damnation.

Damnation in this life.

The above mentions God's children suffer damnation (Mark 16:16) and being destroyed (Acts 3:23). This cannot be eternal damnation or eternal destruction. However, this is a **threat**, which is one very good reason why God's people should obey God's laws. **The reason God's children should obey God's laws is to avoid God's chastisement and damnation during their life.** Consider the following additional verses:

“For if we sin wilfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, **there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins**, But a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries. He that despised Moses' law **died without mercy** under two or three witnesses: **Of how much sorer punishment**, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith **he was sanctified**, an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace? For we know him that hath said, **Vengeance belongeth unto me**, I will recompense, saith the Lord. And again, **The Lord shall judge His people**. It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God.” (Hebrews 10:26-31) **This is a warning for God's born again children.**

“**As many as I love, I rebuke and chasten**: be zealous therefore, and repent.” (Revelation 3:19)

“Enter ye in at the strait gate: for wide *is* the gate, and broad is the way, **that leadeth to destruction**, and many there be which go in thereat: Because strait *is* the gate, and narrow is the way, which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it.” (Matthew 7:13-14) If this verse refers to eternal life or eternal destruction, then our “walk of life,” or works, have eternal consequences. This is not the case as in Titus 3:5 and many other verses.

Born again, but not converted

We should now consider three good examples of God's people who believe (they are **born again**), but **who are not converted** so as to be **a disciple of Christ**. These people run the risk of God's chastisement. Consider the following:

“King Agrippa, believest thou the prophets? **I know that thou believest**. Then Agrippa said unto Paul, Almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian.” (Acts 26:27-28) Since Paul said he knew Agrippa believed, Agrippa was born again. (I John 5:1; Acts 13:48, and John 5:24) Even so, Agrippa **chose not to become a disciple of Christ** through baptism. He was born again, but not converted. He was born again, but did **not choose to become a Christian**, as in Acts 11:26, “And the disciples were **called Christians** first in Antioch.”

“And the Lord said, Simon, Simon, behold, Satan hath desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat: But I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not: and **when thou art converted**, strengthen thy brethren.” (Luke 22:31-32) We know Simon Peter was already born again as proven in Matthew 16:17. None of the disciples were entirely **converted** to a knowledge of the truth until after the death and resurrection of Jesus. Jesus prophesied this in John 14:26 stating that the Holy Spirit would, “...bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you.”

“Nevertheless among the chief rulers also **many believed** on him; but because of the Pharisees **they did not confess him**, lest they should be put out of the synagogue: For **they loved the praise of men more than the praise of God.**” (John 12:42-43) The chief rulers believed (they were born again), but they would not “**confess Christ**,” To receive *time salvation* (conversion), as offered in Romans 10:9.

Eternal security

While the above eternally saved King Agrippa and the chief rulers will be in heaven (believers are born again), **they were not converted** because they would not confess Christ as in Romans 10:9, and submit to baptism as in Mark 16:16, and become disciples of Christ in His church. They ran the risk of being chastened by God. It may mean physical suffering, or loss of physical life, **but it could never cost them their eternal life.**

Verses that confirm **eternal security** for God’s rebellious, unbelieving children are as follows:

“For what if some did not believe? shall their unbelief make the faith of God without effect? God forbid: yea, let God be true, but every man a liar.” (Romans 3:3-4)

Jesus said, “And I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish, neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand. My Father, which gave them me, is greater than all; and no man is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand. I and my Father are one.” (John 10:28-30) **That is eternal security.**

“For I am persuaded, that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, Nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.” (Romans 8:38-39) **That is truly eternal security!**

The above seems very clear. It is only God given salvation (Romans 8:28-39) that matters regarding eternal salvation and eternal security. This fact is clearly prophesied in Jeremiah 31:31-34, which was declared as fulfilled in Hebrews as follows:

“For this *is* the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, **saith the Lord; I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts:** and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people: **And they shall not teach** every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, **Know the Lord:** for **all shall know me**, from the least to the greatest.” (Hebrews 8:11)

If God is to put his laws directly into the minds and hearts of His people, **and it need not be said**, “...we must know the Lord...,” then this clearly rules out the gospel, gospel preaching, and “our acceptance” for one to be born again. **God the father chose (Ephesians 1:4 - 6); Jesus the Son redeemed (Romans 4:25; 5:9 and Ephesians 1:7); Jesus through the Holy Spirit calls to spiritual life (John 6:63); therefore, God’s elect children are eternally secure (Romans 8:28 - 39).** Also, how God deals with His people in this life who **do not have God’s law**, (the gospel or Bible) is given in Romans, as follows:

“For as many as have sinned without law shall also perish without law: and as many as have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law; (For not the hearers of the law are just before God, but **the doers of the law shall be justified.** For when the Gentiles, which **have not the law**, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, **are a law unto themselves:** Which shew the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the mean while accusing or else excusing one another;) In the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ according to my gospel.” (Romans 2:12-16)

The gospel is for conversion

Hopefully, it has been shown how God uses the gospel for **conversion** of His obedient children to give them *time salvation* (during this life). Also, we know many of God’s children will reject the gospel when they hear it presented, as above in Romans 3:3-4. Some of God’s elect will live a full life and die without ever having heard the gospel...or even the name of Jesus. During their life, these will be dealt with by God as given above in Romans 2:12-16. Even so, these will be in heaven along with those aborted before birth and the mentally afflicted. It is only the **faith of God** in honoring Ephesians 1:4-6 and Romans 8:28-39 that matters regarding heaven. This should settle this issue. (*Tom Hagler: Resolving Bible Dilemmas: ppg 38-46*)

Corinthians, The Books of 1st and 2nd

The Books of 1ST and 2ND CORINTHIANS: Sylvester Hassell: The epistles to the Corinthians are addressed to the Greeks who seek after wisdom; and these epistles condemn a spirit of self-confident freedom both in thought and conduct—in other words, the essential spirit of the world, and they assert the Divine and indefeasible authority of the gospel, which claims the subjection of the mind and the regulation of the life of the church. These epistles abound in a variety of topics, and show the extraordinary versatility of the mind of the writer, and his inspired practical wisdom in dealing with delicate and complicated questions and unscrupulous opponents. For every aberration he has a word of severe censure, for every danger a word of warning, for every weakness a word of cheer and sympathy, for every returning offender a word of pardon and encouragement.

The first epistle contains the unrivaled description of the chief Christian grace, Charity or Love; the second epistle gives us almost an autobiography of the Apostle, and is a mine of pastoral wisdom. (*Hassell's History* ppg 207, 208)

Cornelius

CORNELIUS: Sylvester Hassell: The conversion of Cornelius, like that of Saul, occupies a large space in the Acts (chapters ten and eleven), far more than that devoted to the conversion of thousands in Jerusalem. It was the opening of the door of faith to the uncircumcised Gentiles, without their passing through the intermediate state of Judaism.

The disciples scattered abroad by the persecution after Stephen's death went everywhere preaching the word, and Philip had preached and baptized believers in Samaria, as well as the Ethiopian eunuch. But there was to be a Gentile Pentecost at Caesarea, as there had been a Jewish Pentecost at Jerusalem, and the Apostle of the circumcision was, by the plainest indication of the Divine will, to admit Gentile converts into the church.

By visions, or Divine communications, Cornelius and Peter were both prepared for the solemn scene (Acts 2:17; 10:3,10-17), Cornelius being assured of God's merciful purpose towards him, and being directed to go with the men, sent to him by Cornelius.

As Peter was entering the house of Cornelius, where the latter had assembled his kinsmen and near friends, Cornelius met him, and, with a deep feeling of reverence for the personage whom God had sent him, such as John felt for the angel (Revelation 19:10; 22:8-9), he prostrated himself at Peter's feet; but Peter

at once raised him up and said to him, "I myself also am a man." Those who falsely claim to be the successors of Peter totally differ from him in allowing and requiring such homage (contrast I Peter 5:1-6, with II Thessalonians 2:6).

After Peter and Cornelius had told each other their visions, Peter said, in the beginning of his discourse; "Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons; but in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him." By saying that God is no respecter of persons, Peter means, as is proved by the original Greek, and by the thirty-third verse, and by II Chronicles 19:7; Ephesians 6:9 and James 2:1-9, that God, does not regard external distinctions; or, as Samuel said, "Man looketh on the outward appearance, but the Lord looketh on the heart" (I Samuel 16:7).

Other Scriptures inform us that God does have especial respect for his lowly, spiritual, covenant people (Genesis 4:4; Exodus 2:25; Leviticus 26:9; II Kings 13:23; Psalms 138:6). "Fearing God;" and "working righteousness" are the most usual Old Testament descriptions of the true spiritual worshipers of God; and these are not the meritorious conditions or prerequisites of Divine grace, but the fruits and evidences of that grace already in the heart, proving that these characters are God's covenant people (Jeremiah 32:38-41; Hebrews 12:28; Psalms 25:14; 33:18; 103:13-17; 147:11; Isaiah 45:24; 54:17; 61:3,10-11; Jeremiah 23:6; 33:16; 24:5; Romans 5:19; Galatians 2:21; I John 2:29; John 3:3-8).

According to the testimony of Luke, the historian, and of the Angel, and of Peter (Acts 10:2,4,34-35), Cornelius was already a praying man, accepted with God; and Peter was only to instruct him more fully in the way of God. God had already cleansed him, as he had shown Peter in the vision (Acts 10:15). The very fact of his having the spirit of prayer, like Saul of Tarsus, after he was divinely arrested, proved that he was a child of grace (Jeremiah 31:1-9; 50:4-20; Zechariah 12:10; Romans 8:15-16,26-27; Ephesians 6:18; Jude 1:20).

Even the Anglican "Speaker's Commentary," which will not be suspected of undue spirituality, admits that Cornelius not only "had the honest and good heart for the reception of the good seed," but also a genuine though "limited faith, which was the basis of prayer and alms-giving."

While Peter was preaching Jesus to Cornelius and his company, the miracle-working power of the Holy Ghost, as well as his internal efficacy, fell upon the hearers, and they spoke with various tongues and magnified God, just as the Jewish disciples had done on the day of Pentecost (Acts 2:4; Acts 10:44-46).

They were thus partakers of God's eternal salvation (I Peter 1:1-5; John 1:12-13; I John 5:4-5) even before they were baptized in water; and Peter then appropriately asked, "Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, who have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?" Only after they became spiritual believers in Christ does Peter think of baptizing them in water; and such is the case with *every baptism in the New Testament---spiritual belief in Christ first, and then the burial in water; first the thing signified, and afterwards the sign, which, under such circumstances only, is not a mockery and a delusion.*

Though the believer should be baptized, in obedience to Christ, and for the answer of a good conscience (I Peter 3:21), yet Christ, and not water, is his only God and Savior (Isaiah 45:21-22; Acts 4:12)." (*Hassell's History ppg 201,202*)

Councils

COUNCILS: Sylvester Hassell: The council held by the Apostles and Elders in Jerusalem sanctioned the authority of Paul's Apostolate, his doctrine preached unto the Gentiles, and their release from the burdens of the Jewish ritual. Of this council it may be said that it was purely democratic. It was no autocratic college of Apostles, assembling by themselves and sending forth their infallible decrees as their *pretended successors* presume to do, but it was an assembly in which all present had a voice—Peter no more than any other, and the one who spoke last and to whom all gave heed was not an Apostle, for he was James the Lord's brother. James, the brother of John, had been slain by Herod before this time. This council, after all, appeared to be only a compromise in the interest of the peace of the church at that time. It was not a final settlement as to the relation of the two covenants. Jewish Christians were required or allowed to observe the law for a season, and Gentile Christians, in the course of time, ate of meats offered to idols and things strangled.

Not the slightest authority was given by this council, either in precept or example, to those held under the authority of Constantine the Great, and all those held subsequently under the influence of Romish authority. The decrees of the council in Jerusalem were passed in a free conference of Christians in the behalf of Christian freedom. Those of Rome were held in behalf of worldly interests, human passions, and pride, tyranny and oppression.

After the council of Jerusalem the Apostles and brethren separate, never to meet again in council upon the shores of time. Paul goes off to his labors among the Gentiles, and some in one direction and some in another. If we inquire into the peculiar character of the work, labors and preaching of the Apostles to the

Gentiles, we shall find them to differ somewhat from those of the foregoing period. (*Hassell's History* ppg 237,238)

The Seven Ecumenical COUNCILS (of the Roman Catholic Church) The seven so-called Ecumenical or Universal Councils were held as follows: 1st Nicaea, 325; 2nd. Constantinople, 381; 3rd. Ephesus, 431; 4th. Chalcedon, 451; 5th. Constantinople, 553; 6th. Constantinople, 680; and 7th. Nicaea, 787. Their doctrinal decisions are regarded as infallible by both the Greek and Latin Catholics; and Protestants generally receive the creeds of the first four councils as scriptural, these four creeds affirming the divinity and personality of Christ and the Holy Ghost; and the twofold nature of Christ, that he is perfect man and perfect God. The 7th council sanctioned the worship of images. All these seven councils were summoned by the Roman Emperor, and generally presided over by him, and their decisions were ratified by him. Instead of the Elders and brethren taking part (as in Acts 15.), only "Bishops," the pretended successors of the Apostles, were allowed to vote in them." (*Hassell's History* pg 383)

The COUNCIL of Trent (*See under The IMMACULATE CONCEPTION*)

Counseling

COUNSELING: Harold Hunt: For several years now the subject of *counseling* has been a bone of contention among our people. By counseling, I am not talking about simply giving the best advice we can give, when we are asked for it. Any pastor, or any good friend, can and should do that. Solomon tells us, "In the multitude of counselors there is safety," Proverbs 11:14. That word *multitude* is the key. There is a wealth of counseling available, if we will only listen. Paul encourages the aged women to teach (counsel) the younger women (Titus 2:3-4). What a source of counsel those older mothers can be to a young mother struggling with her new role in life. Older ministers can be a great strength to young ministers. If they will only listen, children can learn ever so much from their parents.

And sometimes, the one thing somebody needs is a sympathetic shoulder to cry on. You do not need to pay a psychologist \$100 dollars an hour to listen to your troubles. A good friend can do that, and provide genuine sympathy in the process. We all need that kind of counsel from time to time—and God has provided us with a variety of sources of such counseling.

In this article I am talking about those highly structured, tightly controlled, counseling sessions that go on for weeks, where probing questions are asked and discussed, and highly personal subjects are discussed at length. Many of our

people have complained that that kind of counseling is an innovation, and indeed it is.

That kind of counseling is an innovation even in the secular world. That sort of counseling was unheard of until Sigmund Freud and his friends came along. Since Freud's day there has been a flood of psychologists, psychiatrists, counselors, therapists, and experts inundating the land.

But, even as strongly as I feel about the question, I want to be very careful about criticizing others. Far too many times in the past I have had to apologize for my rough manner. I have no doubt there are many secular counselors who are genuinely and sincerely wearing themselves out trying to help others. But I am just as sure there are some, whose motives and methods are suspect.

Some of our own ministers seem to have copied the methods of secular counselors. I have no doubt that some of them have accomplished much good, and if they are helping people, I have no desire to hinder them.

What I do deny is that God made such methods the responsibility of the gospel ministry. I deny that he requires his ministers to master those manuals written by secular counselors in order to know how to advise our people.

If the Bible does not provide the necessary instructions for any endeavor—that endeavor is not our responsibility.

Paul tells us, "Be ye therefore followers of me, even as I am of Christ," I Corinthians 11:1. He is our example; the secular psychologist down the street is not.

If those of our ministers who are engaged in that kind of counseling are accomplishing some good, I will not hinder them. **But I insist they have no right to put those brethren down, who do not feel so inclined.** It is evident that much harm has been done by a few people implying that those who are not involved in that kind of intensive counseling are somehow not doing our job. And those who are not involved in that work do not need to be constantly taking potshots at those who are.

If those long, drawn out counseling sessions are what God calls preachers to do, I must confess that I have missed my calling. I have never felt the need.

There is only a tiny, tiny percentage of our ministers who are engaged in that work. If that is what God calls preachers to do, then only a tiny, tiny percentage of our ministers are being faithful to their calling, and I am not willing to

acknowledge that. Also, if that is what God calls preachers to do, then virtually none of our most faithful brethren from years gone by were faithful to their calling, and again, I am not willing to say that.

Those dedicated, self-sacrificing ministers wore themselves out in the Lord's service; they spent their very lives in seeing to it that we would still have the church in our day. Who among us would have the audacity to say, or even to think, that they were unfaithful to their calling, because they were not involved in counseling, as we have come to know it.

It has always been a rule with our people, that if God requires anything of us, he will provide us in the Bible with all the information we need as to how to go about that work. **The Bible is a thorough furnisher to every good work** (I Timothy 3:15-16); **it needs no supplement**. If this is what God requires of his ministers, we do not need to go to the local bookstore to buy a book of instructions as to how to proceed.

One problem with that work is that **it puts an unbearable burden on our ministers**. It has often been said that, "Every hour of counseling requires, at least, two hours of preparation." **Brethren, very few of our ministers have such time available.**

The first deacons were ordained to take care of the financial affairs of the church at Jerusalem (Acts 6:1-4). That is still the deacon's job. It does not take a lot of time to take care of the financial affairs of most of our churches. If our ministers do not have the time to "leave the word of God, and serve tables," considering how very little time that requires among our people, we certainly do not have the time to spend hours and hours in these long, drawn out counseling sessions. Some very few of our most faithful brethren are able to do that, and I commend them for it, but that is not the case with most of us. There are only twenty-four hours in a day, and there is only so much energy in a man. Most of our ministers have to spend a large portion of their time in earning a livelihood; their churches are too small to fully support them and their families.

We need to keep in mind that the preacher is just a man; he is not a super-man. He has the same interests, and the same needs, as others do. **He needs to spend some time with his family**. For my part, I can say that the only real regret I have ever had in life is that I have always been so involved with the church, and with the ministry, that I spent very little time with my wife and with my children when they were growing up. If I had it to do over, I do not know that I could do any better than I did, but it is certainly a source of grief to me. That is the only real regret I have, but that fact eats away at me every day of my life. I have talked with a lot of preachers of my generation, and most of them tell me the

same thing. With the pastor already suffering such constraints on his time, the very last thing he needs is for the church to put this extra burden on him.

The preacher must spend a substantial amount of time with his Bible. If he does not, the congregation will know it, and they will suffer for it. Our ministers are not supermen. Sometimes we act like we think we are—by all we try to do—but we are not supermen; we wear out. If we do not run out of time, we run out of energy.

Far too many of our preachers, and far too many of our members, are watching the denominational world to determine what the preacher's job is. We do not need to look to the denominational pastor to find a gauge to measure our pastor, and see how well he is doing his job. The fact that the pastor of the denominational church down the road has taken on this job does not mean that our preachers must do the same.

We are living in an age when evading responsibility is the order of the day. We look to the government to take care of our parents. We look to it to take care of us in our old days. We look to the schools to see after our children. And we look to the pastor to solve all our problems. But, brethren that is not the preacher's job.

God calls preachers to preach; he does not call us to intervene, and solve all the problems that arise in all the families in our churches. He certainly did not call us to solve all the family problems, and all the emotional problems in the community. We are always willing to give the best advice we can give, when we are asked, but we do not have the time, the ability, nor the calling to solve all the world's problems.

This life is a life of conflict. The very best we can do, we are going to have problems in our own lives, and in our families. There is going to be conflict between husbands and wives, between parents and children, and between workers and employers. The poor pastor cannot carry the load for us; he probably has problems of his own that are all he can handle. Let the husband face up to his responsibility as the head of the house; let the wife shoulder her own load, and they will be better equipped to face the problems of the day. The pastor can help; but he cannot do your job for you, and it is unfair to blame him when things go wrong.

Having said all of that, there is still another side to the question. We are living in an age when people do expect the kind of counseling we are talking about. We are living in a time of uncertainty, and anxiety, "men's hearts failing

them for fear” Luke 21:26. The moral and emotional anchors of our society are being swept away, and people are going to go somewhere for help.

When disaster strikes, our own people are going to go somewhere for advice. Some of them are going to secular counselors, and psychologists, and psychiatrists, **and some of them are getting some mighty poor advice**. If the opinions we read in publications like *Psychology Today* are any indication of what is believed by their practitioners, many of them do not believe in the simplest moral principles of the Bible, and some of them are bitterly opposed to those moral principles by which we hope our people are govern-ing their lives.

We could not deny that there are untold numbers of good, decent, self-sacrificing people in that profession, who are giving the very best advice they know how to give, and they are helping people to the best of their ability. Some of our pastors have managed to locate and identify secular counselors, who are much more faithful than others, and they have had encouraging results. That is not always the case, but we have to appreciate help where it can be found.

Others are going to those who like to be referred to as *Christian counselors*, and there can be no doubt that some of them are doing a commendable job, but some of the advice given out by some, even of these *Christian counselors*, is little different than that given out by others. We need to be very careful about referring our members for advice, whether it is to a *Christian counselor* or to an admittedly secular counselor.

Think about it for a moment. Virtually all *Christian counselors* subscribe to the religious philosophies of the various denominations. There is no way to really understand the workings of the human psyche without knowing something about the doctrine of human depravity. Most denominational churches do not believe, nor understand, the doctrine of total depravity. Can you imagine that any counselor can understand why man is the way he is, and why he acts the way he does, if he does not understand that man is, by nature, dead in trespasses and sins? Can you imagine that he can understand the conflict that goes on in our lives, if he does not know something about the miraculous nature of the work of regeneration, and the change that takes place in that work?

Very few in the denominational churches understand, or appreciate, what the Bible has to say about the institution of marriage. At least, they have long since lost sight of the Bible standard with regard to divorce and remarriage. For that matter, many of our own people are no longer as certain as they once were on that important subject. Much of counseling revolves around problems between husbands and wives. Can you imagine that those denominational *Christian*

counselors are likely to give the best advice on that subject. Our own preachers do not always give the best advice in that regard.

In times of great distress, people do not always know where they are going to get the best—or the worst—advice. It can be a very bewildering situation. But, if any person is looking for help, I am convinced that he will get better advice from a sincere and godly Primitive Baptist minister than he is likely to get anywhere else. Some of our brethren are deeply involved in that work, and, from all reports, they are proving to be a great benefit. If we are not involved in the work, we should be very careful about criticizing those who are.

I have talked to those who have been enormously helped by some of our own brethren, and I can thank the Lord for what was accomplished. I said it before: I do not believe that these long, drawn out, highly structured, tightly controlled, counseling sessions is what God calls preachers to do, but if someone is able to help others in that way, I for one, have no desire to hinder him.

When our people are faced with emotional problems, they are faced with a choice. Will they go to a secular counselor, who quite possibly does not accept the moral values of the Bible? Will they go to a so-called *Christian counselor*, who may be little, if any, different from the secular counselor? Or will they take him to one of our own brethren, who are involved in that work?

Some of our brethren are doing a good work in that regard, and I cannot—I will not—criticize them. They are doing the best they can in a very difficult situation. Those of us who are not so involved should leave them alone, and let them do what they can. But, by the same token, those who are involved in that work do not need to lay any kind of guilt trip on those of us who do not feel so inclined.

There are, indeed, some precautions which those who are involved in that work need to take. I read an article recently that pointed out that one leading evangelist will not allow any man on his staff to counsel any female subject, unless there is a third party present. That preacher is not the pattern for our people, but I believe he is using good judgment. Our own brethren would do well to take heed. No matter how careful the counselor may be, we are living in a dangerous age. There are those who would not mind to set the preacher up, and then lie about all that took place.

Brethren, let us exercise as much forbearance in this matter as God will give us grace to use. Let those of us who are not involved in this work be careful about criticizing those who are, and let those who are involved in the work be just as careful not

to put down those who are not so involved. Just a little Christian charity can go a long way. Hlh

Covenanters, The

The COVENANTERS The Scottish Covenanters made a bold stand for civil and religious freedom especially from 1660 to 1688, during the reigns of Charles II. and James the Second. The persecutions that they suffered from the “Church of England” were very numerous, and in many cases most harrowing. It is computed that, during these twenty-eight years, eighteen thousand of them were either banished or put to death. (*Hassell’s History pg 519*)

Covenants, The

The COVENANTS: J.H. Oliphant: “Behold the days come, saith the Lord, when I will make **a new covenant** with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah,” Hebrews 8:8.

The New Covenant

The real nature of this covenant, it is my object in this article to inquire after. I am aware that it is the foundation of the gospel system. In approaching it I realize the need of wisdom from above to rightly understand and present this subject.

The Savior refers to this covenant, Matthew 26:28, “For this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins.” (The words *testament* and *covenant* are from the same word in the original, “*diatheeke*.”) Also Mark 14:24, “This is my blood of the new testament which is shed for many.” Also Luke 22:20, and many other places, the blood of Christ is mentioned as the “blood of the everlasting covenant.” The blessings secured to us by an interest in this covenant are of an eternal kind. In the covenant made with the fathers, eternal life was not promised.

The Conditional Covenant with Adam

God made a covenant with Adam which was conditional; life was secured to Adam, and, I may say, to us all in him, on one condition. From God’s infinite superiority over Adam he had a right to name the terms of life and death. The terms were, “For

in the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die," Genesis 2:17.

God laid no restraint on him to disobey, but by the publication to him of the result of disobedience he rather bound him to obedience. I will not undertake to vindicate God's justice in this transaction, but have referred to it as an instance in which God dealt with man on a conditional plan. The condition was easy of performance. God himself was the preacher by whom the terms of life and death were made known. Adam was free from any innate bias to evil, for "he was good." The blessing resulting from obedience was full of encouragement to obedience, and the result of transgression was sufficiently fearful to deter from disobedience.

"And Adam was not deceived;" with a perfect knowledge of all this he sinned and involved all his posterity in ruin. I wish you, dear reader, to bear in mind that *that* was a conditional covenant; the publication of it to Adam was a *giving of law*, not a *publication of gospel*.

Under the new covenant we read, "And their sins and iniquities will I remember no more." Under this [with Adam] it is: I will mark your sin and regard the day, and certainly inflict the penalty; and God faithfully kept that covenant with Adam and his posterity.

Had God unconditionally given Adam the security of life, "kept him," "worked in him to will and do of his good pleasure;" had God said to him, "For the mountains shall depart and the hills be removed, but my kindness shall not depart from thee, neither shall the covenant of my peace be removed, saith the Lord;" I say, had God used this language to him, it would have resulted differently. This last is the language of the gospel, while Adam was under law. I hope we shall be able to distinguish between law and gospel as we pass along.

An Unconditional Covenant with Noah

We have now seen the fearful result of one conditional covenant. The next covenant that God has made, in which the

happiness or safety of man is involved, was an unconditional one. Genesis 9:8-9, "And God spake unto Noah and to his sons with him, saying, And I, behold, I establish my covenant with you and with your seed after you," * * Genesis 9:13, I do set my bow in the cloud, and it shall be for a token of a covenant between me and the earth."

The blessing of this covenant is secured to us *unconditionally*; every time we look at the bow in the cloud we see the token of this unconditional covenant, and we are reminded that the destruction of the earth by water is not to occur on certain conditions by man, not is its preservation the result of the performance of certain conditions. God's promise secures all.

Had he said to Noah, I will not send a flood upon the earth if the people will do right, or if they will do any *specified* thing, then we would have had another conditional covenant, and doubtless the world would have long since been destroyed by a second flood. But still the earth exists and is kept; seed time and harvest succeed each other, and will till time ends. Although the earth is filled with sin and violence, yet the bow of promise is seen in the dark cloud (a fit emblem of the wrath we deserve) and the faithful fulfillment of God's words to Noah and his sons is manifest.

Isaiah Makes it Clear Enough

Isaiah makes a beautiful application of this covenant in a gospel sense, and forcibly impresses the mind that the gospel covenant, or the "new covenant," is like it in this particular, Isaiah 54:7, etc. "For a small moment have I forsaken thee, but with great mercies will I gather thee; in a little wrath I hid my face from thee for a moment, but with everlasting kindness will I have mercy on thee, saith the Lord, thy Redeemer." "For this is as the waters of Noah unto me, for as I have sworn that the waters of Noah should no more go over the earth, so have I sworn that I would not be wroth with thee nor rebuke thee."

He says, "*So have I sworn.*" His oath to Noah was unconditional, and so it is immutable and sure in its results; and

his oath mentioned here is unconditional, and therefore surer than the "mountains or the hills."

I wish you, dear reader, to mark the difference in these two covenants as to their results. The one brought ruin to all men; the other preserves a sinful world from just destruction by a flood; the one was attended with a curse, and under the other there is no curse, the oath and promise of God is remembered and the world preserved. In a gospel sense we need the same unconditional promise of God to secure us from the just claims of law and the just deserts of our sins. Our daily cry is, "When I would do good, evil is present with me."

An Unconditional Covenant with Abraham

The next covenant I propose to your attention to is mentioned in Genesis 12:3, "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." This covenant was made to Abraham; *it was unconditional*. And the history of Abraham and his family for 2,056 years prove that God most faithfully fulfilled this covenant.

Paul calls the last words of this covenant the gospel—Galatians 3:8. "And the scriptures * * * preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, in thee shall all nations be blessed." This declaration contains an unconditional promise of the Messiah, and God, with a view to the certain fulfillment of this promise, takes Abraham and his seed into, and under a special providence, made an unconditional promise to Abraham that his seed should be as the sand of the sea shore and the stars of heaven for number. He also gave the land of promise unconditionally to Abraham.

It should be remembered that Abraham is the great antitype of the faithful; and the promised land was a type; Sarah, the mother, is made a type of the new covenant—Hagar of the old; the birth of Isaac was the fulfillment of an unconditional promise, and his birth, from a natural view of things, was an impossibility. And Paul affirms that we, as Isaac was, are the children of promise. As before seen, the birth of Isaac was

unconditional. And Paul affirms that we are likewise the children of promise.

I have said that the promised land was given to Abraham unconditionally; it is true Abraham said, "Lord God, whereby shall I know that I shall inherit it;" but this expression does not involve a condition. Abraham only asks for an evidence of his heirship; and so the seed of Abraham, by faith, desire an evidence that they are the heirs of God.

"And we know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren." This is an evidence that we have passed from death unto life. Paul in [Galatians 3:18](#), "For if the inheritance be of the law, it is no more of promise; but God gave it to Abraham by promise." This circumstance is used to illustrate the gospel to the great apostle.

God's covenant to Abraham was unconditional; and in this covenant he secured to Abraham the promised land unconditionally; Abraham is the heir and he received the inheritance as property secured to him by a will. If it had been conditional, it would not have been by promise, and it would have been uncertain; but being by promise of God secured to him, it was sure of fulfillment. And God remembered this covenant over 400 years afterward when Abraham's seed was groaning under Egyptian bondage, and led them to the land of promise.

Circumcision was given to Abraham, not as a condition upon which he should have the promised land, but "as a token of the covenant." The covenant had been made three years or more before circumcision was introduced, therefore circumcision was not introduced as a condition upon which these promises were to be fulfilled.

The Land Given Conditionally to Israel

In Deuteronomy 28 we have a covenant that is conditional. It is unnecessary here to copy the whole of it, as the reader can turn to it and read it, and I would request the reader to do so. The chapter is headed "Blessings for obedience and curses for

disobedience.” By noticing the curses named here you will find that they are all of a temporal kind, not a threat of eternal punishment, not a single promise of eternal life.

This is not the covenant of which Jesus is the mediator. It is not like the gospel, for it has *curses* in it. The gospel is good news, glad tidings, pardon, redemption, salvation, etc.; this is a purely conditional affair, with curses and blessings alternately promised for disobedience and obedience. Many have mistaken this for gospel, preached it for gospel, and urged it upon the people as a gospel system. The history of the seed of Abraham, according to the flesh, proves that this covenant on God’s part was literally carried out, their sins were remembered, and the curses named in this chapter were faithfully visited upon them.

The Unconditional Covenant with Aaron’s Family

I wish now to invite the reader to the covenant in which the priesthood was conferred upon Aaron and his sons. Exodus 40:13, “And thou shalt put upon Aaron the holy garments and anoint him, and sanctify him that he may minister unto me in the priest’s office.” Also in Exodus 40:15, “For their anointing shall surely be an everlasting priesthood throughout their generations.”

This transaction secured to Aaron and his sons throughout their generations the priesthood. It was unconditional; Aaron had not sought it, that we are informed he did not desire it, but it was a pure gift to him secured to his long line of posterity reaching through a period of 1,500 years, unconditionally secured to him; his children after him did not take the office by choice, but they were born to it.

Now get the thought that this was secured to Aaron’s family by the will of God, not for any desert on their part, and then turn to I Peter 2:5, where he makes a gospel application of the subject, “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.” The priesthood of Aaron is referred to here as a type and figure of the true Israel of God. In I Peter 2:9, he says, “But ye are a chosen generation, a royal

priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people, that ye should show forth the praises of him who hath called you out of darkness into his marvelous light."

Aaron was a chosen generation and a priesthood. The Lord chose Aaron to his office. So the saints are "a chosen generation." *They* were born to the priesthood. So the family of God is born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God. And, indeed, in all our near approaches to God we should remember that it is of God's divine mercy that we have ever been called out of the dark night of nature into his marvelous light.

The holy garments were put upon them as the type of the righteousness of saints to show that we must have the imputed righteousness of Christ to prepare us to engage in God's holy service; and Christ is made unto us wisdom, righteousness, sanctification and redemption. And the anointing oil is a type of the anointing which is mentioned in I John 2:27, "And the anointing which ye have received of him abideth in you, and ye need not that any man teach you; but as the same anointing teacheth you of all things, and is truth, and is no lie, and even as it hath taught you, ye shall abide in him." This is the Spirit of God given to us "to bring all things to our remembrance," and to "take the things of Christ and show them to us."

The oil was a rich and sweet perfume which not only beautified the countenance and made the limbs supple, but it produced a rich perfume that was pleasant to all that were near. So the Spirit of God softens our hearts and temper, and puts upon the saint such improvement that his company is sweet, and his presence delightful, to the church of God. But bear in mind this covenant provided that the garments should be *put upon* them and that they should be *anointed* with the anointing oil; this was a work to be done *not by them*, but these should *be put* upon them.

Mark the unconditionality of this thing, and look for its fulfillment in the gospel covenant. Hebrews 8:10, "I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts; and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people." And

so the experience of God's people witness. "I was found of them that sought me not, and I was made manifest unto them that asked not after me."

-

The Unconditional Covenant with David

There is one more unconditional covenant mentioned that I wish to refer to, to wit: That by which the scepter was secured to the tribe of Judah. The first reference we have of this is mentioned in Genesis 49:10, "The scepter shall not depart from Judah, nor a law giver from between his feet, until Shiloh come; and unto him shall the gathering of the people be."

We have the kingdom established in David, I Samuel 15:28, "The Lord hath rent the kingdom of Israel from thee this day, and hath given it to a neighbor of thine, that is better than thou." * * * "The Strength of Israel will not lie nor repent, for he is not a man that he should repent." 2Sam. 3:9, "So do God to Abner, and more also, except, as the Lord hath sworn to David, even so I do to him; to translate the kingdom from the house of Saul, and to set up the throne of David over Israel and over Judah, from Dan even to Beersheba."

Here the oath of God is mentioned as fixing David upon the throne and securing it to him, not on conditions to be performed by him, but *unalterably* and *unfrustrably* setting the crown upon his head and that of his posterity to all generations. Psalms 89, "I have made a covenant with my chosen, I have sworn unto David my servant, thy seed will I establish forever and build up thy throne to all generations." "Once have I sworn by my holiness that I will not lie unto David; his seed shall endure forever, and his throne as the sun before me."

-

Durability and permanence attend such transactions. God chose David, and sent after him, where he was tending the sheep, and anointed him as his chosen. David had not sought it. His words were, "Who am I" that this should be done unto me? The Lord chose him, anointed him, and filled him with his Spirit—I Samuel 16.

God made an oath to him that he and his seed after him should occupy the throne to all generations—Psalms 89; and David in Psalms 65:13, says, “Blessed is the man whom thou chooseth and causeth to approach unto thee, that he may dwell in thy courts; we shall be satisfied with the goodness of thy house, even of thy holy temple.” Here the blessed one is chosen before he approaches the Lord, and, as a result of that choice he is *caused* to approach the Lord and dwell in his courts. Unconditionality is seen in this whole transaction.

And the history of Israel for over 1,000 years shows that this covenant with David was faithfully kept. Of all these covenants we find two conditional: the first was with Adam, which resulted in ruin to him and his seed; the other referred to in Deuteronomy 28 is mentioned by Paul, Hebrews 8:9, “Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers when I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt, because they continued not in my covenant, and I regarded them not, saith the Lord.”

The Weakness of the Old Covenant

The point of defect in this covenant is understood by the words, “*They continued not in my covenant.*” This was a conditional one and obedience upon their part was the condition upon which they were to be blessed. Paul in Romans 8:3, mentioned the same difficulty, “For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh.” “That the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the spirit.”

Here we see that the first covenant was too weak to deliver us, but its weakness to save grew out of the fact that we “continued not in it,” and it was weak “*through the flesh.*”

The Perfection of the New Covenant

Therefore God sent his Son to fulfill the *law in us*. This great mediator then in performing the will of God, fulfills the law in us. In order, then, that the new covenant remedy this fault in

the old, it must be one that can not fail "because we continue not in it." Therefore *it must be an unconditional one.*

The words *covenant*, *will*, and *testament*, are synonymous in meaning. The Greek word rendered covenant in Hebrews 8 and Hebrews 6:7-9, etc., is *diatheke*, which signifies "the disposition of property by a will, testament," etc. This is the covenant of which Christ is mediator. Hebrews 8:6, "Therefore Christ came to execute the *will* of his father. This was his business in this world. It was his "meat and drink to do his father's will. He said, "Wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business?—Luke 2:49. Also John 6:37, "All that the Father giveth me shall come unto me, and him that cometh unto me I will in no wise cast out." "For I came down from heaven not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me."

Nothing is clearer than that Christ's errand was one fully matured in all its parts before he came. Hebrews 10:9, "Then said he, Lo, I come to do thy will, O God. He taketh away the first (covenant), that he may establish the second. By the which will (or covenant) we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all." (*J.H. Principles and Practices of the Regular Baptists, Oliphant 1883*)

The Everlasting COVENANT: Harold Hunt If you were to ask one hundred of the most religious people you know, "Do you believe in salvation by grace?" what do you believe their answer would be? Do you have an idea that almost every one of them would agree that salvation is by grace? Suppose you were to ask that same one hundred people, "What do you believe about **the covenant of grace**? What do you believe about the everlasting covenant?" What do you suppose their answer would be? Do you think you might get a lot of blank expressions?

Almost everybody claims to believe in salvation by grace, but you can never understand very much about salvation by grace, if do not know something about the covenant of grace. Trying to understand salvation by grace without knowing something about the covenant of grace is like trying to figure out the

mysteries of an automobile without first discovering that there is an engine under the hood that makes it go.

The covenant of grace, or the everlasting covenant, is the driving force behind salvation by grace.

A covenant defined

By the same token, you will never understand much about the covenant of grace unless you know what a covenant is.

Webster defines a covenant as "binding agreement between two or more individuals or parties to do or keep from doing a specified thing."

Let me ask you: if you wanted to refer to a covenant, but you could not call it a covenant, what would you call it? Now bear in mind that a covenant is "binding agreement between two or more individuals or parties to do or keep from doing a specified thing." What would you call that? I would call that a contract, wouldn't you? Now I do not feel entirely comfortable in referring to it as a contract. That sounds so commercial, but that is exactly what it is. This covenant is a binding agreement; God has bound himself by his own word to do all that is involved in this everlasting covenant.

God cannot lie, and as surely as God has promised to do anything, you can be sure that he will do all he has promised to do. No agreement that has ever been made between men is so firm, and sure, and binding as this agreement, this covenant between God the Father and God the Son. The salvation of untold millions of the children of God is the most important matter that has ever transpired in this world, and you can be sure that God has provided the most firm and sure foundation for their salvation.

The sure promises of God

The promises of God are much more sure and dependable than most religious people have ever imagined them to be. For that matter, they are absolutely sure, and absolutely dependable. God will do all he has promised to do. The majority of people

seem to have a strange view of God and his promises. They seem to imagine that God's promises are changeable and tenuous, that they are conditioned on so many propositions and possibilities that we can never know for sure what he is going to do. But God is not fickle and changeable.

Listen to what he said to Isaiah, "Remember the former things of old: for I am God, and there is none else; I am God, and there is none like me, declaring the end from the beginning, and from ancient times the things that are not yet done, saying, **My counsel shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure**" Isaiah 46:9-10. If God has purposed to do anything, he will do it.

This failure to realize that God is faithful to his promises has left people with an uneasiness about their own salvation, and the salvation of others. Because they do not believe they can be sure about God and his promises, they are uneasy about the salvation of sinners, and that uneasiness leads them into some of the most unreasonable notions.

Such strange conclusions

When I was just a boy, I attended a seminar on *soul winning*. We were taught the importance of soul winning, and we were instructed on how to approach people we hoped to convert. The instructor was very careful to point out the importance of personal grooming. She told us how very important it was that our clothes be clean, that our shoes be shined, and that we had brushed our teeth and used a mouthwash. After all, it would be a terrible thing if our bad breath might so offend the person we were trying to talk to that he would not listen to us. This might be the only chance that he would ever have to hear the gospel message, and would it not be a terrible thing if he missed this one and only chance to hear the gospel and repent and be born again?

I tried to believe the lessons I was being taught, but it seemed so strange to think that some poor sinner might burn in the flames of eternal damnation—because I had forgotten to brush my teeth and use a mouthwash. There is no end to the strange

conclusions that people reach, when they forget that God is faithful to all his promises.

Some simple lessons

On the next few pages I want us to look at some of the very simple lessons the Bible teaches us about this grand covenant. And these lessons are simple. This is one of the most fascinating things about the Bible. I have discovered that if you go through the Bible looking for simple lessons, the Bible is just filled with very simple lessons that you and I can understand. On the other hand, if you go through the Bible looking for deep, dark mysteries, the Bible is just filled with mysteries no man on earth can entirely unravel.

I have discovered that it makes this job of preaching a lot easier if we spend our time looking for the simple lessons. It is easier for the preacher to explain simple lessons, and it is easier for the congregation to understand. And there is another lesson I have learned. Sometimes those very simple lessons explain some of the most profound truths. For that matter, I am convinced that, if our minds are able to understand the lesson in the first place, the lesson can generally be explained in very simple language. Admittedly, there some questions, such as some of the how's and why's of the Bible that we cannot begin to unravel.

Man is not a party to the Covenant

The first lesson the Bible teaches us about this covenant— his binding agreement—is that **man is not a party to this covenant**. This is a point that most religious people have failed to realize. If they could learn this one fact, it would eliminate very much of the confusion that presently plagues the religious world. We who have a hope in Christ Jesus are the beneficiaries of this covenant, but we are not parties to it. We did not make the covenant; rather the covenant was made on our behalf.

Listen to what the Bible says. II Samuel 23:5, "Although my house be not so with God; **yet hath he made with me an everlasting covenant**, ordered in all things, and sure: for this

is all my salvation, and all my desire, although he make it not to grow." The chapter begins by saying "these be the last words of David." This is David speaking, and in this text David personifies the Lord. He speaks as if it is the Lord speaking. Lest there should be any doubt that David is here personifying the Lord, in verse one, the Holy Spirit refers to David as "the **anointed** of the God of Jacob."

In the original language the word that is translated *anointed* is the Hebrew word *Messiah*. *Messiah* is one of the titles of Jesus Christ. He was the expected Messiah. *Messiah* (*Mashiyach*) in the Hebrew, and *Christ* (*Christos*) in the Greek are the same word, and they mean *anointed*. So to remove all doubt as to whether David personified the Lord, **the Spirit literally calls him the messiah.**

Now David was *anointed of the God of Jacob* in a different way than Christ was, but he was anointed in such a way as to represent Christ Jesus. David the son of Jesse represented the Greater David, the son of God.

This covenant, this binding agreement, was made between the Father and the Son on behalf of his people. God the Father and God the Son entered into a binding agreement with each other with regard to the salvation of his people. In a few minutes we will see just how binding that agreement is.

An everlasting covenant

The next lesson we notice about this covenant is that it is **an everlasting covenant**; it has no expiry date. "Yet hath he made with me an everlasting covenant." Most of our agreements have an expiration date, and sometimes that can be a problem. Almost one hundred years ago the United States finished building the Panama Canal. The French tried to build it and failed, and then the United States took over and finished the job. We took out a hundred year lease on the canal. We made a mistake. With individuals a hundred years is a very long time, but with nations one hundred years is not very long. Several years ago we gave the canal back to Panama. That looked like a mistake at the time, but our lease was running out

anyway. But this covenant, this binding agreement, will never run out; it has no expiry date.

The love of God for his people is not so fickle, and tenuous, and changeable, as some people have imagined it to be. If God ever loved you, he will always love you. He is an unchangeable God, and his love is as unchangeable as he is. Jeremiah said, "The Lord hath appeared of old unto me, saying, Yea, I have loved thee with **an everlasting love**; therefore with lovingkindness have I drawn thee."

The love we have for our own children is only a faint illustration of the love God has for his children. I learned long ago that there is nothing my children could ever do that would cause me to quit loving them. They have not always pleased me. Sometimes I have been very upset with one or another of them, but it seems to have been at those times when I was the most displeased that I was the most fully aware that there was nothing any one of them could ever do that would cause me to cease loving them. No doubt, you have had the same experience, but you can be sure that as unwavering and as unconditional as your love is for your children, your love is very fickle compared to the constancy of God's everlasting love for his own. The love of God is one of the attributes of God, and his love is as unchangeable as he is.

A comprehensive covenant

The next lesson the Bible teaches us about this covenant is that it is comprehensive. It leaves nothing to chance. It is "ordered in all things and sure." "Although my house be not so with God; yet hath he made with me an everlasting covenant, **ordered in all things and sure.**"

God's salvation of his people is not such a stopgap, plan-as-you-go, back up and start again, arrangement as some people seem to imagine. God knows exactly what he is doing, and he knew what he was going to do before he started.

Keep it always in mind that a covenant is "a binding agreement between two or more individuals or parties to do or keep from

doing a specified thing.” God the Father entered into an agreement with his Son with regard to the salvation of his people, and this agreement fixed and secured every provision that was necessary for the salvation of his people.

Compare it to a contract

Suppose you were about to build a new house. You have found a contractor willing to do the work, and he is having the contract drawn up. One day he brings the contract for you to sign. You think it might be a good idea to read the contract before you sign it, and here is the way it reads: “We agree to build a right nice house, on a fair sized lot, somewhere south of town; we agree to start before very long, and to charge a reasonable amount for our services.” Would you sign the contract? No, of course not.

I believe that before I entered into any kind of contract I would want every detail spelled out in very clear language. Do you believe that God would enter into any such agreement with regard to the salvation of his people? The salvation of untold millions of poor sinners from eternal damnation is the most important matter man knows anything about, and you can be sure that God would never leave any part of that work to chance. God knows exactly what he is doing. God the Father and God the Son agreed on every aspect of this grand work before he called this world into existence.

Compare it to a will or testament

Paul referred to this great work as a will or testament. Hebrews 9:16-17, “For where a testament is, there must also of necessity be the death of the testator. For a testament is of force after men are dead: otherwise it is of no strength at all while the testator liveth.” It is in the nature of wills that wills name names, and this will, this testament, names every one of the heirs of promise. It is a very poorly drawn will that fails to name the beneficiaries of the will.

The greatest benefit of time and eternity is salvation from sin by the shed blood of the Lord Jesus Christ, and God would not

engage in that great work without knowing exactly what he was doing, and who was going to be benefitted by it. Before God created the universe he chose his people; he recorded their names in his book, and he determined all that he was going to do on their behalf.

Revelation 13:8, "And all that dwell upon the earth shall worship him, whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world." The lamb was not slain from the foundation of the world; that happened at Calvary. He says that their names were written in his book "from the foundation of the world." Ephesians 1:4, "According as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love."

God knew exactly what the outcome was going to be before he began; he knew who he was sending his Son to die for, and who he was going to save. He suffered and died for all those whom the Father gave him in the covenant of grace, and he will save everyone he died for.

Not all mankind chosen and redeemed

If the redeemed family was chosen out of the race of mankind, it follows that not all of mankind was so chosen and redeemed. Lest anybody might get the idea that some injustice was done to those who were not chosen, we need to remember that the elect family of God was not chosen out of a race of kind, innocent people who were in every way deserving of the kindness of God. The entire race of mankind is by nature dead in trespasses and sins. Fallen man is by his very nature a wicked, depraved sinner, who lusts and pants after sin. He is totally alienated to all good, and totally inclined to all evil. In actual practice no man is as evil as he might be, but it is only because of the restraining power of God that he does not act out in actual practice the corruption that is in his own heart.

If it was not for the restraining power of God, every man would be proven to be the depraved sinner that he is. The earth would become a slaughterhouse, and there would be no place any person could hide from the danger raging all around him.

Perhaps the most fundamental mistake of modern religion is the failure to realize how desperately sinful man is, and how desperately he stands in need of a Saviour. Genesis 6:5, "And God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that **every imagination** of the thoughts of his heart was **only evil continually**." Jeremiah 17:9, "The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked: who can know it?"

None righteous, no, not one

Romans 3:10-18, "As it is written, There is none righteous, no, not one: There is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God. They are all gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable; there is none that doeth good, no, not one. Their throat is an open sepulchre; with their tongues they have used deceit; the poison of asps is under their lips: Whose mouth is full of cursing and bitterness: Their feet are swift to shed blood: Destruction and misery are in their ways: And the way of peace have they not known: There is no fear of God before their eyes." In this text Paul is not describing what some men have become, but what all men are by nature.

None who would have chosen God

If all men were left to themselves, there is no man who would choose God and righteousness. When Paul said there is "none that seeketh after God," he was describing the condition of every man who is devoid of the Spirit of God. If we encounter any man who is seeking after God, we have found one who is already born of the Spirit. Those who object to the doctrine of election, and wish God had never made any such choice are really wishing that all men might perish eternally. If God had never chosen any man to salvation, and determined to do all things necessary to bring him home to eternal heaven, there would never have been the first person saved. If sinful man was left to himself, there is no man who would have repented of sin, no man who would have believed the gospel, no man who would have had the love of God in his heart. Those are all the outworking of the Spirit of God implanted in the heart in the work of regeneration.

Ordered in all things and sure

This covenant is "ordered in all things and sure." It is ordered and sure in that it names every person who will ever benefit from its provisions. It binds every face in secret. We are not able to look on God's book, and read the names that are recorded there; but God knows them every one. II Timothy 2:19, "Nevertheless the foundation of God standeth sure, having this seal, **the Lord knoweth them that are his.**"

Not only is this covenant "ordered in all things," it is also sure to be fulfilled. "Although my house be not so with God, yet hath he made with me an everlasting covenant, ordered in all things and **sure**. God is sure to do all he has purposed to do. Sometimes it happens that somebody enters into a agreement he does not intend to fulfill. Not every man can be depended on to do as he says. But you can be sure that God will do all he has promised to do. It is so certain that God will do all he has purposed to do that **he confirms it with an oath**. It is not necessary for God to swear that he will fulfill his promise; a simple statement is enough. It is not possible for God to lie, but **for our benefit** God confirms his promise with an oath. Isaiah 14:24,27, "The Lord of hosts hath **sworn**, saying, Surely as I have thought, so shall it come to pass; and as I have purposed, so shall it stand.....For the Lord of hosts hath purposed, and who shall disannul it? and his hand is stretched out, and who can turn it back."

Every consideration provided for

Consider for a moment, if you will, how firm and secure this covenant is. It is a binding agreement between God the Father and God the Son. It is "ordered in all things." There is not one consideration that is not completely provided for. God is so determined that every item of the agreement will be fulfilled that he confirms with an oath that he will do everything he has purposed to do. It is impossible to imagine anything more dependable than this covenant is.

In Psalms 89 David talks about this covenant. He is still referring to the Greater David, the Son of God. Psalms 89:3, "I have made a covenant with my chosen, I have sworn unto David my servant." Again, notice that this covenant was made with David—with the greater David the Son of God. The language of this chapter is too clear to be misunderstood. Throughout the entire chapter he is talking about this covenant that God the Father made with his Son. This covenant was not made with his people; it was made with his Son on behalf of his people.

No possibility God will fail

There is no possibility that the Lord Jesus Christ will not be able to do what he has promised to do. In Psalms 89:19, "I have laid help upon **one that is mighty**." There are those who agree to do what they do not have the ability to perform. But the parties to this covenant have the power to do what they have agreed to do. There are those who talk about God as if he was a whimpering, whining, begging, pleading, trying and failing God, who tries to do ever so many things he is not able to do; but that is not the God of the Bible. The God of the Bible speaks and it is done; he commands and it stands fast [Psalms 33:9](#). He would never have entered into this agreement if he was not able to perform it. God is not so foolish as to promise what he cannot do.

This covenant, and the benefits of it, are not based on the goodness of men, nor on their own personal righteousness; they are based wholly and solely on the mercy of God. The entire Psalms 89 deals with this covenant. Psalms 89:1, "I will sing of the **mercies** of the Lord for ever: with my mouth will I make known my faithfulness to all generations. The first thing this chapter tells us about this covenant is that it is rooted in the mercy of God. There are those who think they can earn their way into heaven by their own accomplishments, but they have never seen themselves for the sinners they are, nor God for the righteous judge he is. No man who has seen himself for what

he is could imagine that he could ever stand justified before God on the basis of his own merit.

Isaiah said, "But we are all as an unclean thing, and all our righteousnesses are as filthy rags." When I was just a boy I remember hearing a preacher trying to preach on salvation by grace. He said, "I know that we are saved by grace, but when I stand before God in judgment, I hope I have enough good works to finish out the score." I was just a boy; I did not know much, and I still have a lot to learn—but I knew there was something wrong with that. Can you imagine somebody standing before God in judgment and saying, "Lord, I believe I have enough good works to finish out the score." And can you imagine that God might ask him to produce any claim he thinks he might have on eternal heaven, and he drags out an old dirty handkerchief he has been carrying around for two weeks with a cold, and dangling that filthy handkerchief before the throne, and saying, "Lord, here is my claim on eternal heaven." Now I know that is not a very pretty illustration, but that is the language the prophet uses. All of our righteousness is nothing more than *filthy rags* in the sight of a thrice holy God. Those who think they can work their way to heaven by their own merit have entirely too high an opinion of themselves.

There is nothing about any of us to commend us to God. If we received what we justly deserve, there is none of us who would live with God in heaven. We are a lot like the old boy who was caught stealing chickens. The day of his trial arrived, and he could not sit still. He was pacing back and forth, up and down the corridors of the court house. His lawyer was trying to calm him down, and he said, "Just be patient; I will present your case; you will get justice." The old boy said, "Yassuh, yassuh, I knows that, but, you see, it's that justice I'se so worried about."

The wonder of his grace

Simple justice demands that every sinner who ever lived must suffer eternally as the just punishment for sin, and yet, it is the wonder of God's grace that the same justice which, apart from the grace of God, demands our eternal punishment, now—

because of God's grace—demands the eternal salvation of everyone Christ died for. The shed blood of the Lord Jesus Christ has made eternal satisfaction for the sins of all the redeemed. Our sins are put away; there is not a charge that can be made against any person for whom Christ died, so that God can be both just and the justifier of every child of grace Romans 3:26; Psalms 89:14, "Justice and judgment are the habitation of thy throne: mercy and truth shall go before thy face." God does not sacrifice justice in order to be merciful; he is both merciful and just in all he does.

Grounded in the faithfulness of God

Another lesson this chapter teaches us about this covenant is that it is grounded in the faithfulness of God. The ground of our hope is not our faithfulness to God, but rather his faithfulness to his own promises. Psalms 89:2, "For I have said, Mercy shall be built up for ever; **thy faithfulness** shalt thou establish in the very heavens." As faithless and unbelieving as most of us sometimes are (in spite of our best efforts to the contrary), if our salvation was based on our faithfulness, we would every one be lost world without end. That person who is looking to his own faithfulness to God as the ground of his hope of heaven, and has lost sight of God's faithfulness to his promises has made a very poor trade.

It is amazing how simple the Bible becomes, when we just let it say what it says, without trying to read into it some-thing that is not there. Most of the problems in studying the Bible are caused when people bring their own preconceived notions to the Bible, and try to make it say what they want it to say. Then the Bible does really become mysterious; it just will not say what men want it to say.

It is very encouraging that the most effective of all methods of Bible study is also the easiest and most natural of all methods. If the humble, faithful, prayerful child of God would study and benefit from his Bible, let him simply read the Bible, and believe it for what it says. Let him lay aside his own agenda; let him forget his own notions and prejudices, and accept God at his word. "Yea, let God be true, but every man a liar, Romans 3:4.

Then it is amazing how simple the Bible becomes. Habakkuk said, "Write the vision, and **make it plain** upon tables, that he may run that readeth," Habakkuk 2:2. This book is as plain as it needs to be. The problem is not nearly so much that people cannot understand the Bible, as it is that they will not believe what they read. Isaiah said, "And an highway shall be there, and a way, and it shall be called the way of holiness; the unclean shall not pass over it; but it shall be for those; the wayfaring men, though fools, shall not err therein," Isaiah 35:8. Any humble, faithful, prayerful child of God can study it and understand it, if he will just let it say what it says. There will always be mysteries in the Bible that he will never entirely unravel, but he will be able to understand enough of it to satisfy his spiritual need.

The covenant of grace is the most profound of all principles. It lies at the foundation of everything God has done on behalf of his people. It is the motive force behind our salvation. And yet, as profound and as fundamental as this principle is, the Bible presents it in such simple language that there is no reason any person should have any trouble at all in understanding it.

We have pointed out several times that this covenant is a binding agreement between the Father and the Son—that it is literally a contract between them to perform all the provisions of the covenant. You may have trouble reading contracts. At one time or another you may have tried to read one of your insurance policies, and with all the legal language, and with the special provisions and exceptions, you wound up about as confused as you were before you started. I spent twenty-four years in the insurance business, and if I learned anything about insurance, I learned that those companies do not really care whether you understand those policies or not. But whether you understand legal language or not, there is no reason you should have any trouble understanding the provisions of this covenant. The provisions are clearly spelled out in the Bible.

God allows us to listen in

Not only does the Bible tell us everything we need to know about this covenant, it literally allows us to listen in as the Father and the Son—in eternity past—agreed on all the provisions of the covenant.

The Bible is written in a different manner than any other book that has ever been written. For the most part, the Bible simply records the acts and the speeches of its characters without a lot of comment. It simply records what they said and what they did. Taken purely for its literary style, the Bible provides a kind of record that is the **next best thing to being there**. The way the Bible is written, simply recording the acts and words of its characters, puts the reader in a position as if he was standing off to the side listening and watching what was going on.

Reading the Bible in this manner—almost feeling as if we were there—leaves us feeling as if we are acquainted with the characters we read about. The language of the Bible is so free and natural, and its characters are so true to life, that the speeches and the scenes of the Bible literally come to life.

Not only are the historical portions of the Bible written in this manner, but when the Bible talks about this covenant of grace, in the very same manner, it allows us to listen to the Father as he speaks to the Son, and it allows us to listen to the Son as he replies to the Father. So far as words and revelation can do it, the Bible transports the reader all the way back to eternity past and allows us to listen in on the very covenant of grace itself. Think about that. In the verses that we will examine in just a few moments we will be literally listening in on this covenant, this “counsel of peace” [Zechariah 6:13](#).

If that does not excite you, it ought to—to think that we poor mortals can listen in on the very making of the covenant of grace—to think that we can listen as God the Father and God the Son devise all that is necessary to be done to bring about the salvation of the entire family of God.

Not necessary for him to put it in writing

We need to point out one thing more, before we launch on this very interesting, and very uplifting study. We pointed out earlier that a covenant is simply another name for a contract, and it is in the nature of contracts that we put them in writing. It is not always necessary that a contract be put in writing. We can make a verbal contract, before witnesses, and seal it with a handshake, and that agreement can be legally binding. God certainly did not need for this covenant to be put in writing in order to bind him to do all he had promised to do. God the Father and God the Son both knew exactly what they had agreed to; they are faithful to their word, and there was no possibility that either of them would forget, or that either of them would ignore any part of the agreement. **But God has put this covenant in writing for our benefit.**

While God knows everything that is in this agreement, you and I did not—not until God revealed it. It was for our benefit that God put this agreement in writing. It was not put in writing in order to bind him to the agreement; it was put in writing in order to inform us of the benefits that are ours because of it. We are not parties to the covenant, but we are the beneficiaries of it, and because we are the beneficiaries of it, God has revealed it to us.

God has given us the written record of this everlasting covenant in the Bible, but he has not given all of the record in any one place. He has given us bits and pieces scattered all through the Bible. In some places, such as the eighty-ninth Psalm, he gives us very long sections of it. In other places he gives us very brief portions. That is the Bible pattern. Isaiah said that the pattern is “precept upon precept; line upon line, line upon line, here a little and there a little,” (Isaiah 28:10).

Literally reading from the document itself

Let me point out that when we read the verses we will be examining during the next few pages, **we will literally be reading from the document itself.** I must say it again: if that does not excite you, it ought to. These are the very words of God. These are the actual words of the promise God made to his Son, and the actual promise the Son made to his Father.

God has preserved those very words for our benefit. This is **the actual transcript** of that "counsel of peace," that took place between the Father and the Son in eternity past.

The will's and shall's of God

One more thing before we start: let me ask you, if you are reading a contract, what are the two words you will likely find most often in that contract? The two words most often found in contracts are the words *will* and *shall* are they not? "The party of the first part agrees that he **will** do thus and so," and "the party of the second part agrees that he **will** do thus and so." Those are the most common expressions in contracts, and it is no different in this covenant, this binding agreement between the Father and his Son with regard to the salvation of his people.

When you are reading your Bible, if you come across the words *will* or *shall*, especially as it relates to what God has promised to do, it is very possible that you have found an excerpt from the covenant of grace. You are reading directly from the record. **The will's and shall's of God** are some of the most exciting and the most reassuring passages in the Bible. If God has promised he will do something, you can be sure that he will do it.

The very first thing the Bible tells us about the covenant of grace is in the second Psalm. The Father says to the Son, "Ask of me, and **I shall** give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession," Psalms 2:8. Notice the word *shall*; **we are reading directly from the document, from the written record of this covenant.** Before God created the universe, the Father promised to give a people to his Son.

Paul talked about the same thing in his letter to the Hebrews. "And again, I will put my trust in him. And again, Behold I and the children which God hath given me," Hebrews 2:13. The very first provision of the covenant was that the Father promised to give a people to his Son. John 6:39, "And this is the Father's will which hath sent me, that of **all which thou**

hast given me I should lose nothing, but raise it up again at the last day.”

The Father gave them to his Son

When I was just a boy I heard a man talking about his efforts at “soul-winning.” He allowed that when he stood before God in eternity, he hoped he could carry along at least one hundred people, whom he had “led to the Lord.” He hoped that on that grand day he would be able to present those people to the Lord and say, “Lord, here are all these people I have led to you.” Well, I knew there was something wrong with that. First off, to me it sounded a lot like bragging. I did not know that verse in Hebrews was in the Bible, but I knew that the man's project just did not sound right. Do you see, it is not the job of poor mortal man to present the Lord with a people. That is too important a job to leave to sinful men. It would be the height of folly for God to leave anything so important as the eternal destiny of untold millions of poor sinners in the hands of other sinners. God took care of that in eternity past, and he took care of it in such manner that not one of those whom the Father gave to the Son can ever be lost.

The Father promised to give the Son a people, and the Son promised to redeem them from their sins, to pay their sin debt, and to secure them a home in heaven. God is a righteous and holy God. He will not approve of sin, and he will not allow sin to stand in his presence. There is no way any sinner could ever live with God in heaven, unless his sins had been removed, unless he could stand before God justified from his sins.

Isaiah 53:10-11, “Yet it pleased the Lord to bruise him; he hath put him to grief: when thou **shalt** make his soul an offering for sin, he **shall** see his seed, he **shall** prolong his days, and the pleasure of the Lord **shall** prosper in his hand. He **shall** see of the travail of his soul, and **shall** be satisfied: by his knowledge **shall** my righteous servant justify many for he **shall** bear their iniquities.”

Again notice the repeated use of the word *shall*. We are reading to you directly from the document, from the written record of

that agreement between the Father and his Son. I hope I do not bother anyone by my excitement over this matter, but it is the most exciting thought in the world to me to think that, not only has God made this firm and binding agreement with his Son on behalf of his people, but he has put it all in writing for our benefit, and **he has given us access to the very document itself**, if we are only willing to read our Bibles and to search it out.

The shall's of this text tell us what the Son has promised to do—what he has bound himself to do—on behalf of his people. Apart from the grace of God every one of us is helpless to justify himself before God. Apart from his grace every last one of us would suffer the wrath of God in all eternity. We had no power to help ourselves, and in spite of our helplessness, and of the fact that none of us deserved any good thing from God, the Son of God stepped forward and agreed to do everything necessary to remove our sin, and to secure us a home in eternal heaven.

Made sin for us

Notice first that God has promised to “make his soul an offering for sin.” II Corinthians 5:21, “For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.” God imputed our sin to his Son, charged our sin against his Son, in order that he might impute his righteousness to us. He carried our sins to the cross, and there on the cross he suffered the penalty that was rightly due us. On the cross the Lord suffered the penalty that was due us, in order that we might enjoy the blessedness that belonged to him. In eternity past he promised to do it; on the cross he did what he promised to do, and when he had accomplished all he had promised to do he cried out, “It is finished, John 19:30, and “he bowed his head, and gave up the ghost.” Isaiah went on to say, “He shall see of the travail of his soul, and shall be satisfied.” Every attribute of God is satisfied in the salvation of his people. God did not sacrifice justice in order to be merciful. God's love is satisfied, because every one he loved is redeemed and atoned for by the suffering and death of his Son. His mercy and his grace are satisfied, because every subject of grace,

every subject of mercy is redeemed; every one of them will be with him in eternal heaven. And his justice is satisfied, because he has borne our sins; every sin has been paid for and removed by his suffering and death.

He shall save his people

Another quote from this covenant is found in Matthew chapter one. "And she **shall** bring forth a son, and thou **shalt** call his name Jesus: for he **shall** save his people from their sins," Matthew 1:21. I never will forget the first time that verse caught my attention. For years I had heard about God's efforts to save sinners. I had heard how he needed help if he was going to save sinners, that he was doing the best he could, but without more assistance, untold millions of those he wanted ever so much to save were going to suffer eternally. That was a disturbing prospect, to say the least, to think that God was doing the best he could, and still failing in the effort. And then one day I read this verse, and it sounded like nothing I had ever heard before. It rang out with such confidence, such absolute certainty, that God was going to do exactly what he intended to do. It said in no uncertain terms, "He shall save his people from their sins." There were no if's, no and's, no but's, no conditions of any kind. It was a clear and simple statement of fact. He came into this world with a work to do, and that work was to "save his people from their sins," and this verse said he was going to do what he came to do.

I had always heard that the sinner had to be saved in order to become one of his people. But this verse indicated that they were already his people, and that because they were his people, he came to save them. At that time I had never heard of the covenant of grace. I had never heard that, before the foundation of the world, God gave a people to his Son, and I had never heard that before God created the universe he had already determined to do all things necessary to save those very people he had given to his Son. I had never heard about the everlasting and unchangeable love God has for his people, and I had no idea that his love for his people was so firm and unshakeable that nothing could cause him to cease to love them, or to allow them to suffer eternally. Jeremiah 31:3, "The

Lord hath appeared of old unto me, saying, Yea, I have loved thee with **an everlasting love**: therefore with lovingkindness have I drawn thee."

The work of the Spirit

The Holy Spirit also has its part in this grand work. Man is by nature dead in trespasses and sins. He inherited a sinful nature from his first ancestor Adam, and that sinful nature is seen in everything he says and does. It is seen both in his actions and in his thoughts. The Bible evidence is abundant and clear. Genesis 6:5, "And God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually." Jeremiah 17:9, "The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked: who can know it." If he was left to himself, there is no man who would turn to God. Those who have the idea they are persuading wicked sinners to repent of sin, and to learn to love the Lord are mistaken. Those who are dead in trespasses and sins cannot be taught by other men. Unless God performs a miracle of grace on the heart of the sinner, no man will ever be able to reach him with the gospel message. Those who believe they have taught someone to love the Lord were really dealing with somebody who had already been quickened by the Spirit of God. If God's Spirit had not already done its work, nothing they could say would have any effect.

Thy people shall be willing

The Holy Spirit is just as sure to do its work, and to quicken all those whom the Father gave to the Son, as the Son is to redeem them. God has never been unfaithful to any of his promises. Psalms 110:3, "Thy people **shall** be willing in the day of thy power." Here is another excerpt from that everlasting covenant. Just as surely as the Father chose his people, and the Son redeemed them, just that surely the Holy Spirit will quicken every one of the them, and make them willing. They are willing because the Spirit of God has made them willing. Again notice that there are no if's, no and's, no but's; it is the simple promise that they will be willing. In John chapter three, in that beautiful passage on the new birth, the Lord uses the

awesome power of the wind to show how effective and how powerful the Spirit is in the work of regeneration. "The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth; so is every one that is born of the Spirit." We are very often reminded of the awesome power of the wind. When the wind reaches hurricane force, it carries everything in its path. But the mightiest wind that ever blew is only the faintest reflection of the power of God. The Holy Spirit is God himself—God the Spirit—and just as surely as no human mind can comprehend the awesome power of God in the natural creation, no human mind can comprehend the awesome power of God's Spirit in the work of regeneration. God simply spoke and this entire universe became a reality, and God simply speaks and sinners are quickened by that same power. No man on earth can resist the powerful force of the wind, nor can he command the wind, and direct it to blow where he wants it to blow. And by the same token, God is sovereign; he sends the wind of his Spirit to blow where he chooses for it to blow, and quickens those whom he chooses to quicken.

-
God does not depend on us; he is not dependent on sinful men to teach other sinful men to know the Lord. We may teach those who are already born again what they ought to know about the Lord, and how they ought to live in order to please him, but the work of quickening those who are dead in sins, and bringing them into a personal relationship with God is the work of God himself. And just as surely as God has never failed at anything he ever intended to do, he has never failed at this job either. Everyone whom he has chosen in his Son will be taught to know him in the work of regeneration. Hebrews 8:11, "And they **shall not** teach every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord: for all **shall** know me, from the least to the greatest."

This is the covenant

Again notice the repetition of the word **shall**. We are reading to you directly from the covenant, and lest there should be any question in the mind of anybody that we are actually reading a word for word excerpt from that everlasting covenant, let us

take the time to go back and read the entire passage. Hebrews 8:10-11, "For **this is the covenant** that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord; I **will** put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts; and I **will** be to them a God, and they **shall** be to me a people. And they **shall not** teach every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord: for all **shall** know me, from the least to the greatest." The Holy Spirit makes the passage as clear as it needs to be. If there is any doubt in the mind of anybody as to where this language comes from, he points out that, "**This is the covenant.**" God will do all he has promised to do. He has promised to quicken all of his redeemed by his Spirit, and he will be faithful to that promise. Just as surely as one was redeemed by the shed blood of the Lord Jesus Christ, at his own appointed time, God will send his Spirit into his heart and quicken him by his grace.

Men have far too high an opinion of themselves. They seem to think God depends on them, and that he could not get his work done, if they do not pitch in and help him. They can wax ever so eloquent when they talk about the power of God in creation, and his power in the resurrection, but they seem to think God is helpless, or largely so, in the work of regeneration. They seem to think that if they do not help him, he will never get the job done. But God is not helpless; he will do all he has purposed to do. Isaiah 46:9-10, "Remember the former things of old, for I am God, and there is none else; I am God and there is none like me, declaring the end from the beginning, and from ancient times the things that are not yet done, saying **My counsel shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure.**"

The sinner does not have a part

The question always arises: but what if the sinner does not do his part. The fact is that the sinner does not have a part; he is not a party to this covenant. It is the duty of the sinner to repent of sin, and to turn from it. It is his duty to believe the truth, and, to the best of his ability, to keep the commandments of God, and after he is born of the Spirit, he does have the ability to do all of those things. Before he is born again, he is dead in trespasses and sins, and he does not have the ability

nor the desire to obey God. After he is born again he has both the ability and the desire, but by then the work is already done; it is too late for him to assist in the matter of his salvation.

In the eighty-ninth Psalm David deals with this question in the very clearest language. "If his children forsake my law, and walk not in my judgments; if they break my statutes, and keep not my commandments; then will I visit their transgressions with the rod, and their iniquity with stripes," Psalms 89:30,32. The language could not be any clearer. If the children of God transgress the commandments of God, they will suffer his chastening rod. God loves his own, and he chastises them when they sin. Hebrews 12:6-8, "For whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth. If ye endure chastening, God dealeth with you as with sons; for what son is he whom the father chasteneth not? But if ye be without chastisement, whereof all are partakers, then are bastards, and not sons." Every child of God can bear witness that God has been faithful to that promise. When we allow sin in our lives, God sends his chastening rod. It is a token of the love of God for his own that he chastises us when we sin. We can only imagine what a shambles we would make of our lives, if God allowed us to follow the lead of our old carnal nature, without chastising us, and bringing us to our knees in repentance before him.

-
The main theme in this Psalms 89 is the everlasting covenant. That theme runs all through the chapter, and that is what is under consideration in this passage. Notice how he continues, "Nevertheless my lovingkindness will I not utterly take from him, nor suffer my faithfulness to fail. **My covenant will I not break**, nor alter the thing that is gone out of my lips. **Once have I sworn by my holiness** that I will not lie unto David. His seed shall endure for ever, and his throne as the sun before me. It shall be established for ever as the moon, and as a faithful witness in heaven. Selah," (Psalms 89:33-37). The mercies of God for his people are based on his everlasting covenant—and if he does not break that covenant, it cannot be broken—he is the only party to the covenant. That covenant was made between God the Father and God the Son; man is not a party to it.

The redeemed are the beneficiaries of it, but they are not parties to it. The eternal salvation of all the redeemed family is far too important a work to be put in the hands of sinful men.

This is the Father's will

The last provision of that covenant is found in the sixth chapter of John's gospel. "**And this is the Father's will** which hath sent me, that of **all which he hath given me** I should lose nothing, but should raise it up at the last day. 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," John 6:39-40. Again notice his repeated use of the word *will*. Those whom the Father gave the Son were those whom he gave to him in this everlasting covenant.

The dead in Christ shall rise first

He is talking about the same thing in the fourth chapter of First Thessalonians. "But I would not have you ignorant, brethren, concerning them which are asleep, that ye sorrow not, even as others which have no hope. For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus **will** God bring with him. For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord **shall not** prevent them which are asleep. For the Lord himself **shall** descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ **shall** rise first: Then we which are alive and remain **shall** be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air: and so **shall** we ever be with the Lord. Wherefore comfort one another with these words," I Thessalonians 4:13-18.

The final act God has promised to perform on behalf of his redeemed is to raise them from the dead, and to carry them home to live with him eternally, and as surely as he will perform all of the other provisions of his promise he will perform this also.

One golden chain

The purpose and promise of God form one golden chain which began in eternity past and reaches all the way to eternity to come. God cannot lie; all his promises are sure. Whatever God purposed to do and promised to do, he will perform. Romans 8:28-30, "And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to his purpose. For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the firstborn among many brethren. Moreover whom he did predestinate, them he also called: and whom he called, them he also justified: and whom he justified, them he also glorified." Ephesians 1:6, "Being confident of this very thing, that he which hath begun a good work in you will perform it until the day of Jesus Christ."

Others may be alarmed, but we do not need to be uneasy about the faithfulness of God. He will do all he has purposed to do. He has purposed to redeem all of his elect family, and to carry them home to live with him in heaven, and you can be sure that he will save every one of them without the loss of so much as one. "Wherefore comfort one another with these words," I Thessalonians 4:18. hlh

Church COVENANT (See under CHURCH Covenant under The Church

Crandall, John

John CRANDALL (See under Persecution in MASSACHUSETTS)

Create

CREATE: Sylvester Hassell: To create signifies to form out of nothing. Man can form things out of material God has already created; but only God can create. The Hebrew word translated *created* is *Bara*, and occurs 45 times in the Old Testament; its Greek equivalent, *Ktizo*, occurs 35 times in the New Testament. *Bara* is the strongest word in the Hebrew language to express *making out of nothing* (Gesenius' Thesaurus), and it always conveys the idea of something new. The only subject of this verb in the Bible is God; he only can

create. Four times in the Old Testament (Psalms 51:10; Isaiah 5:17-18), and four times in the New Testament (Ephesians 2:10; 4:24; II Corinthians 5:17; Galatians 6:15), it denotes a spiritual creation, of which God is the author.

Bara occurs in three verses of the first chapter of Genesis (Genesis 1:1,21,27), in speaking of the creation of the universe, of animal life, and of man. Everywhere else in that chapter God is said to have simply made or formed (*asah* or *yatzar*) from an already created material.” (*Hassell’s History pg 35*) (See also under *EVOLUTION*)

Crusades, The

The CRUSADES: Sylvester Hassell: During the first century the profession of Christianity was so spiritual that there was no special reverence for any particular places, and pilgrimages to such places were unknown. This state of things also generally prevailed during the two succeeding centuries.

In the fourth century, however, as the profession of Christianity became more outward and formal, and less spiritual, particular places especially in Palestine, were revered, and pilgrimages to them inaugurated. These so-called pious journeys increased during the succeeding centuries, and continued, although Jerusalem was taken by the Saracens in 637.

The stream of pilgrims largely increased about the beginning of the eleventh century. It was thought that “a pilgrimage to Jerusalem expiated all sin; a bath in the Jordan was, as it were, a second baptism, and washed away all the evil of the former life; and the shirt worn by the pilgrim when he entered the Holy City was carefully laid by as his winding sheet, and possessed, it was supposed, the power of transporting him to Heaven.

In 1076 the Seljukian Turks conquered Palestine, and treated the pilgrims with great insult and cruelty. These outrages, especially under the impassioned appeals of **Peter the Hermit** and Pope Urban II., roused Latin *Christendom* to revenge, and during a period of about two hundred years (from 1096 to 1291), seven crusades, in which six millions of men were enlisted and two millions destroyed, were undertaken either to wrest Jerusalem from the hands of the Mohammedans or retain it in the hands of those called Christians.

They were a series of the most insane, criminal and disastrous expeditions ever undertaken in the history of the human race; instigated by the popes of Rome (who promised to all engaging in them the pardon of all sin and the assurance of everlasting life), and fitly illustrating the infernal glories of universal papal supremacy. They greatly increased the wealth of the Roman clergy, and the

power of the Pope of Rome; they greatly demoralized the nations of Europe, and degraded the profession of the Christian religion.

They taught men to believe in the justice and piety of so-called religious wars; they were accompanied with the exhibition of every circumstance of vice and crime, and with the diabolical massacres of Jews, Mohammedans and so-called heretics. The members of the First Crusade, in their march to Constantinople, slaughtered thousands of European Jews; and when on the 15th of July, 1099, they captured Jerusalem, they burned up all the Jews there alive in their synagogue, and massacred, during three days, seventy thousand Mohammedans, women and children, even infants, as well as men, so that the streets are said to have run with blood up to their horse's knees, and the Mosque of Omar up to the saddle girths.

The crusades infused into the mind of Catholic Europe a long indelible thirst for religious persecution. Among the benefits deduced by an overruling Providence from these great evils are recounted the deliverance of the Greek Catholic Empire from the Turks for three hundred and fifty years, the breaking up of the feudal system, the abolition of serfdom, the supremacy of common law, and an interchange of thought and learning which ultimately resulted in the revival of letters and the Protestant Reformation." (*Hassell ppg 432 433*)

The Second Crusade: Sylvester Hassell: In 1144 the principality of Edessa, in Mesopotamia, the bulwark of the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem, was taken by the Turks; and this led to the second crusade, preached by Bernard of France and by Pope Eugenius III. "The Koran," says Milman, "is tame to Bernard's fierce hymn of battle." The pope, like his predecessor Urban, promised the forgiveness of all sin to those embarking in the crusade. In 1147 twelve hundred thousand men are said to have precipitated themselves from Europe upon the plains of Western Asia, where nearly all miserably perished, the expedition proving a total failure. (*Hassell's History pg 434*)

The Third Crusade: Sylvester Hassell: In 1187 Saladin, Sultan of Egypt, conquered Jerusalem; and the third crusade was preached by Pope Gregory VIII. In 1189 **Frederick Barbarossa**, Emperor of Germany, and in 1190 Philip Augustus, King of France, and **Richard Coeur-le-Lion**, King of England, set out personally with powerful armies for Palestine. Frederick was drowned, and Philip and Richard quarreled, the former returning to France and the latter capturing Acre, with a loss of three hundred thousand lives, butchering three thousand Saracen prisoners, and obtaining from Saladin permission for *Christian* pilgrims to visit Jerusalem. (*Hassell's History pg 434*)

The Fourth CRUSADE was preached by Innocent III. And Fulk of Neuilly. The soldiers were chiefly French and Venetians; and, instead of going to Palestine, they contented themselves with capturing, with circumstances of horrible pillaging, debauchery and bloodshed, the city of Constantinople from the Greeks (in 1204), and founding there a Latin empire, which lasted till 1261. The dislike of the Greek for the Roman Catholics was converted into vehement and perpetual hatred. As it was concluded by many that none but *innocent* hands could effect the conquest of the Holy Land, it is said that, in A.D. 1212, thirty thousand French boys and girls under the peasant lad Stephen, and twenty thousand German boys and girls under the peasant lad Nicholas, set out for that purpose, but perished miserably by fatigue and starvation and shipwreck and in Mohammedan slavery. In what is called by some the fifth, and by others the sixth crusade (1215-1229), Damietta in Egypt was taken, and Frederick II. of Germany, by a treaty with the sultan of Egypt, was crowned King of Jerusalem, which was recaptured by the Turks in 1247, and has remained in their possession ever since.—The sixth and seventh crusades were both French; in the sixth, King Louis IX. lost his liberty in Egypt, in 1270. In 1291 Acre was taken by the Mameluke Turks, and a termination was put to Catholic dominion in Palestine.” (*Hassell’s History* pg 442)

The Catholic **CRUSADE against the Albigenses** in Southern France (from 1209-1229), under Popes Innocent III., Honorius III. And Gregory IX., was one of the bloodiest tragedies in human history. The crusade was much shorter, easier and safer than that to Palestine, and the temporal rewards were more certain. The popes promised the crusaders, as in the Mohammedan expeditions, the forgiveness of all their sins, and also the partition among them of the estates of the heretics. An army, variously estimated at from two to five hundred thousand men, assembled from Italy, Germany, France. The leader was the able, rapacious, unfeeling and unprincipled **Simon de Montfort**, of England. The heretic was regarded as worse than the robber, the traitor or the murderer—as a beast of prey, to be exterminated wherever found. “Never in the history of man,” says Milman, “were the great eternal principles of justice, the faith of treaties, common humanity, so trampled under foot as in the Albigensian war. Never was war waged in which ambition, the consciousness of strength, rapacity, implacable hatred and pitiless cruelty played a greater part. And although throughout the war it cannot be disguised that it was not merely the army of the (Catholic) *Church*, but the (Catholic) *Church* itself in arms. Papal legates and the greatest prelates headed the host and mingled in all the horrors of the battle and the seige. In no instance did they interfere to arrest the massacre, in some cases urged it on.” “At the taking of Beziers (July 22, 1209), the commander, the Abbott Arnold, legate of the pope, being asked how the heretics were to be distinguished from the faithful, made the infamous reply, ‘Slay all; God will know his own.’”

“The policy of persecution,” says Mr. J.H. Allen, “was adopted by the Roman Catholic *Church* deliberately and with open eyes in the Third Lateran Council of 1179, notwithstanding the opposition of a more wise and humane spirit. Nothing so disproves that infallibility to which she asserts so many fantastic, sentimental and rotten claims.”

As many as four hundred *heretics* were sometimes burned in one great pile, to the great rejoicing of the Catholics. Twenty thousand men, women and children were slain indiscriminately at the capture of Beziers, and two hundred thousand during that year (1209). The number of Albigenses that perished in the twenty years' war is estimated at from one to two millions. Whoever harbored a *heretic* was to lose his property and be reduced to slavery. Every house in which a *heretic* was found was to be destroyed. A wretched few sought concealment in caves and rocks and forests, or fled to other lands. (*Hassell's History ppg 443,444*)

Darkness at the Crucifixion of Christ, Three Hours

The Three Hours DARKNESS at the Crucifixion of Christ This darkness could not have been an ordinary eclipse of the sun, which is caused by the coming of the moon between the sun and earth, and never lasts, in its totality, more than eight minutes; because Christ was crucified at the Jewish Passover, which was always when the moon was full, and therefore on the opposite side of the earth from the sun, and the darkness lasted three hours.

The darkness at Christ's death was nature's sympathy with her suffering Lord. As the glory of the Lord shone around the scene of his birth (Luke 2:9), so a pall of darkness was fitly spread over his dying scene. Amos (Amos 8:9) predicted that the sun would go down at noon, and the earth be darkened in the clear day. The darkness might precede and accompany the earthquake that took place on the same occasion; for darkness almost nocturnal, arising from sulphurous vapors, often precedes an earthquake. Both the darkness and the earthquake at Christ's crucifixion were no doubt supernatural. (*Hassell*)

David

DAVID: Sylvester Hassell: David was first proclaimed king over the tribes of Judah and Benjamin at Hebron, B.C. 1055, and reigned there seven years. Ishbosheth, Saul's son, was proclaimed king over the ten tribes at Mahanaim, and seven years' war ensued between him and David. David finally prevailed, and was anointed king over all Israel, B.C. 1048. This was his third anointing. The year following he made Jerusalem the capital, and reigned there thirty and three years, making forty years in all. He shortly after removed the ark from Kirjath-jearim to Jerusalem, and purposed building a house in which to worship God; but, although this purpose was approved of God, yet he did not suffer David to carry it into execution, because he had been a man of war and had shed much blood. The work was reserved for his successor.

For fifteen years after he began to reign in Jerusalem (1048 to 1033) he was almost continually engaged in war with the old enemies of Israel, such as the Edomites, the Moabites, the Amalekites, the Ammonites, the Philistines and the Assyrians; and conquering and subduing all these nations, he pushed forward his dominion until it had included all that had been originally promised to Abraham and his seed (Genesis 15:18-21; Deuteronomy 11:23-24; Joshua 1:4, compared with I Kings 4:21-24; II Chronicles 9:26). Of all the kings that reigned over Israel, David and Solomon only extended their jurisdiction to the utmost borders of the vast country promised originally to the Hebrews, viz.: from Egypt to the Euphrates, about fifty thousand square miles—Palestine only occupying twelve thousand square miles; and their joint reigns lasted only eighty years. Nevertheless, these two reigns constituted the golden age of the temporal grandeur and spiritual enjoyment of the chosen people.

David was said to have been a man after God's own heart (I Samuel 13:14); his name signifies *beloved*; he was a type of Christ and of the church, and his experience is that of every child of grace, more or less. Even after his regeneration he committed great sins; but God gave him great grace, superabounding over his sins (Romans 5:20), and enabling him truly to repent (like Peter—Psalms 51; Luke 22:61-62); God forgave him, but, to vindicate his own holiness (Leviticus 10:3), and to give his servant the needed discipline (Hebrews 12:5-11), he declared that the sword should never depart from his house, and he afforded him recompense in kind for his transgression (II Samuel 12:7-14). His nature was exceedingly devotional—sometimes enthusiastic. The Psalms written by him reveal his character as a humble, penitent and devout worshiper of the Most High.

“The three most eminent men in the Hebrew annals—Moses, David, and Solomon—were three of the most distinguished poets. The hymns of David

excel no less in sublimity and tenderness of expression than in holiness and purity of religious sentiment. In comparison with them the sacred poetry of all other nations sinks into mediocrity. They have embodied so exquisitely the universal language of religious emotion, that (a few very fierce and vindictive passages excepted, natural in the warrior of a sterner age) they have entered with unquestioned propriety into the ritual of the holier and more perfect religion of Christ.”

‘The songs which cheered the solitude of the desert caves of Engedi, or resounded from the voice of the Hebrew people as they wound along the glens or the hillsides of Judea, have been repeated for ages in almost every part of the habitable world, in the remotest island of the ocean, among the forests of America and the sands of Africa. How many human hearts have they (under the application of the Spirit of God) softened, purified, exalted! Of how many wretched beings have they drawn down the blessings of Divine Providence, by bringing the affections into union with their devotional fervor.’—Milman.

And notwithstanding all that may be said in favor of this eminent servant of God, we should not forget that he was a man—a depraved mortal—a man of like passions with ourselves—at best a sinner saved by grace, and liable to err through the temptations of Satan, the seductions of the world and the deceitfulness of his own heart. He did err greatly; the Lord punished him for it severely; he repented deeply, and God in mercy forgave him freely. All these things are carefully set down for warning, admonition and encouragement to spiritual Israel thenceforth to the end of time. (*Hassell’s History* ppg 116, 117)

Deacon, The, And His Duties

The DEACON and his duties: J. H. Oliphant: 1st. The word *deacon* in scripture signifies one who serves, or ministers; it is sometimes applied to the civil officers of the country, as in Romans 13:3, “For rulers are not a terror unto good works, but to the evil.” * * Romans 13:4, “For he is the minister (*Diakonos*) of God to thee for good.” * * “For he is the minister of God,” etc., *deacon* of God. It is also applied to our Savior. Galatians 2:17, “Is therefore Christ the minister (deacon) of sin?” It is also in a great many places applied to the apostles. I Corinthians 3:5, “Who then is Paul, and who Apollos, but *ministers* (deacons) by whom ye believed,” etc. Also, II Corinthians 3:6, “Who hath also made us able ministers,” (deacons), etc. It is very commonly

applied to the office of the apostles. It is also very commonly used in connection with alms, as II Corinthians 8:4, “And take upon us the fellowship of the ministering to the saints.”

Denotes ministering, serving

The word *ministering* here is from *Diakonia*. Also II Corinthians 9:1, “Touching the ministering to the saints,” and very many other places, showing that the use of the word denotes *serving*, ministering, etc., either as a public officer or magistrate, etc., or as a preacher of the gospel, to express the work of Christ in our redemption, and also to express charitable acts, such as relieving the wants of the poor, contributing to the saints, or the ministers. We would, therefore, understand that the office-work of a deacon is to minister in some way to others. It is an office of benevolence and charity.

2nd. The first mention we have of persons being set apart to this office is in Acts 6. From a careful reading of this place, we notice that the apostles had not only been preaching the word to the people, but they also had the care of the public stock, created by the sale of their estates, and making “all things common.” The number of the disciples having greatly multiplied, it became a burden to them, and hindered them from preaching, etc.; besides there had a murmuring arisen among the people. The Grecians thought that their widows were neglected in the daily ministrations.

Of course, where such complaints were urged against the apostles, it was against their preaching, and tended to lessen their influence as preachers; besides, it claimed so much of their time as materially to interfere with their spiritual ministrations, therefore “the twelve called the multitude of the disciples unto them, and said, It is not reason that we should leave the word of God and serve tables,” (*deacon tables*). “Wherefore, brethren, look ye out among you seven men of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom, whom we may appoint over this matter.”

Heretofore it appears that they were endeavoring to minister in things both spiritual and temporal, but finding that these *two* offices were more than they had time to fill, they, therefore, determined to give their time entirely to spiritual things, and appoint others to minister in temporal things. A careful reading of the New Testament will show that the church is to bless the world, by ministering spiritual food to the poor in spirit, and temporal relief to those who are temporally needy. In the establishment of this office, it appears that the apostles designed to give their time to the spiritual wants of the people, and that the deacons should minister in temporal things.

This was the commencement of the office, which was to be perpetuated, as is seen from Paul's address to I Timothy 3rd chapter, where he mentions the offices of the bishop and deacon, gives the qualifications of each, showing that these two offices were to be perpetuated. "The bishop must be blameless; * * not given to wine; no striker; apt to teach." He must be of pure character, so that he will have influence, and he must be apt to teach." He is to be a teacher; he is to minister in spiritual things. His great business of life is to teach or preach; therefore, he must have a spotless character, and be of temperate habits, and not a novice. With these qualifications he will be prepared to minister in spiritual things. And the deacon, who is to minister in temporal things, must be "grave; not double-tongued; not given to much wine; not greedy of filthy lucre." Gravity is seriousness of mind, coupled with a suitable behavior; and this should adorn the office of deacon. To be double-tongued is to tell different stories about the same thing—to be one way in one company, and another way in another company; a person of this kind should not be put into the office; he is an officer in the house of God, and such defects in him would be disgraceful to the church of Christ. He should not be given to much wine, for a deacon to be seen drunk is a reproach, not only to him, but to the church that he serves; therefore it would be unwise to make a deacon of him who is likely to fall by this sin. He must not be greedy of filthy lucre; one who is so, is sure to make improper efforts to obtain money. He will betray his greed in his common business of life. The public mind will watch his daily course of life, and discover his undue thirst for *lucre*, which will give him a low place in the minds of the public, and make him a weight to the church; besides, it is his office-work to minister to the poor in such things as the church furnishes him with, and if he is *greedy* he is a very unfit man to have the care of *tables*.

Not every man is qualified

By comparing the qualifications mentioned here, with the qualifications mentioned in Acts 6:3, you will discover that it is the same office, with the same qualifications, etc.; *of honest report*; a man who is understood to be honest, safe to entrust with the care of these things. It is not every man nor every church member that would be safe to take the care of valuables. He must be full of the Holy Ghost, which will so control his actions and conversation as to make him an ornament to the church. *Wisdom* is a quality he should possess. It requires wisdom to determine what is proper under all circumstances. Sometimes persons become poor and needy by their own laziness, or sin, and it is certain that the charity of the church should not be used to nourish laziness, or sin of any kind. Wisdom is essential to determine what should be given and to whom given. Good counsel to the poor is often as valuable as money, and if he be wise and possesses the proper traits of a deacon he will be a good counselor, and his advice would be likely to prevail if he be of suitable character for a deacon. I

think it clear that the seven mentioned in Acts 6 were appointed to fill the same office that Paul mentioned in I Timothy 3:8-13, and that this office is to be maintained in the church.

3rd. I have before suggested that the church is to bless the world in two particulars: Ministering in spiritual things, and ministering in temporal things. The elder is to devote himself to the spiritual wants of the people. In Acts 4:32-34, we learn that they sold their goods and made a common stock of it; that none among them lacked, etc. I do not suppose it is necessary that this state of things should be continued, but I think we are to learn from this that all our goods are to be common to the extent that no one is to be allowed to suffer while any brother has plenty. “If a brother or sister be destitute of daily food and naked, and one of you say unto them depart in peace, be ye warmed and filled, and give them not those things which are needful to the body, what doth it profit?”

All things in common

And again, I John 3:17, “But whoso hath this world’s goods and seeth his brother have need and shutteth up his bowels from him, how dwelleth the love of God in him.” I think these passages show that we yet have all things in common in such a sense that no brother should see a brother or sister suffer while he has the means to supply their wants. If you will read the Bible to see how much is said with a view of inculcating habits of charity, you would be surprised to see in how many places the principle is taught. In Matthew 25:35-40, we are taught that acts of charity to the saints are esteemed as if done to Christ. Solomon says, “He that giveth to the poor shall not lack.”—Proverbs 22:9; also Proverbs 19:17, “He that hath pity on the poor lendeth unto the Lord.

I have not space or time to quote all that is said favoring habits of charity. Religion does not wholly consist in the mere forms of public service, but its brightest qualities are seen in visiting the fatherless and the widow, in giving of your worldly substance to the poor of this world.

Ministering to the saints

Ministering to the saints is urged upon the Corinthians, in II Corinthians 9, Paul urges it upon the whole church. I have ever regarded it as a shame that one of our number should be sent away to the poor-house. It is a principle of our religion that we should sustain our poor, and, as in the beginning, this is to be attended to by the deacon. He should distribute the public fund for the relief of the needy. Our brethren and sisters die, leaving children who are often subjects of charity that we should look after, giving them suitable counsel, etc.

Paul says, I Corinthians 16:2, “Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store as God hath prospered him, that there be no gathering when I come.” This simple direction was intended to raise a fund of charity; each one was to lay up as God had prospered him. The amount he was to give was to be determined by the amount of his prosperity. By the pursuit of this course there would be means gathered to relieve the needy. This arrangement was in strict harmony with the great principle of charity taught throughout the Bible. It would put means in the deacon’s hand to help the poor with. In a congregation of fifty members, let one-half of them give ten cents for each week, which would be forty cents per month; this would be the sum of ten dollars per month appropriated to benevolent purposes. [Bear in mind this was written in 1885. Ed.] This amount of money in the hands of a wise deacon would relieve much want. It would impress the world that we designed to be a blessing.

I am sorry to see that the practice of charity is so nearly ceased. The poor are not remembered by us; we never, or seldom ever, hear our deacons mention to the church that help is needed anywhere, and hence the church’s ministrations in temporal things has well nigh ceased. There are opportunities all around us, persons who would weep tears of joy to receive the kind attentions of our churches. Our churches could care for them without ever feeling the burden, and yet many of our brethren live years at a time without contributing anything to the wants of the needy. Many institutions of the world, as Masons, etc., manifest more charity than is often manifested by the church. Our deacons should study this subject, look around them for objects of charity, and call the attention of the church to them.

The brethren should be “ready to communicate.” A few cents spent in this way would be of more use to us as a people than we are aware of. We should ever be forward “to remember the poor.” Of course, our brethren should be well instructed in the doctrine of grace, etc., but we should not neglect nor forget the practice of our profession.

The necessity of the office

Now these plain duties make the office of a deacon necessary. It is not suitable for the elder to see after these things, for reasons above mentioned, and if we have no officer whose duty it is to see to these things it is certain to be neglected, and should our churches utterly neglect the poor, when the Bible so abundantly teaches that we should not? By no means; besides this there are many things connected with our church that need the personal attention of some one, as wood, light, repairs, and expenses of our pastor, which should be met, the keeping of our house in good order, sweeping, making fires, etc.; all this needs personal attention, and each member should be willing to bear his part of the burden, and

for this reason he should contribute as the case requires and as “God has prospered him,” giving his contribution into the hands of the deacon.

Wine and bread to be used at our communion meetings must be prepared. All these things come under the head of temporal things or *tables*, and are among the duties of the deacon.

No member should feel that he is not under some obligations to contribute. The Savior approved the widow who cast in two mites. Where brethren never invest anything in religion or its duties, they are not apt to set much store by it; at least such has been my observation. Where persons never give anything in a benevolent way, they seem to have but little interest in the things.

Chosen by the church

4th. The deacon should be chosen by the church. The apostles told the brethren to “look ye out among seven men.” In Acts 8:2, we learn that the elder is to be chosen by the church for ordination, and so the deacon. In making this choice, we are to look for the qualifications before named. Some have thought that I Timothy 3:12, teaches that he must have a wife; and others have thought that he should never have but one wife, though his first wife be dead. This is not the correct view of the subject, as may be seen by comparing Titus 1:6, with I Timothy 3:12. Here we learn that the elder must have one wife, *i. e.*, he must not be a polygamist.

No one imagines that the want of a wife disqualifies a man for the office of elder, nor does it disqualify a man for the office of deacon. The church may choose a man to that office who never was married, without violating the spirit of this text; or if his wife would die, he is not thereby disqualified for the office, and he may take another wife without being disqualified, provided he be married to a woman of a suitable character.- I Timothy 3:11.

The ordination of deacons

When the church is agreed in her choice of a deacon he should be ordained by prayer and the laying on of the hands of the elders. Acts 6:6. The course usually pursued among us in ordaining a deacon is as follows: The church makes her choice of as many as she deems proper by vote of the church; the minority, if any, acquiescing in the choice of the majority, and thus making the choice unanimous. It would be lawful for one elder to ordain, Titus 1:5, but usually it is more appropriate to request the help of others, and in order to do this, the church sends a written request to sister churches for help. A record of this is made in the

minutes of the church making the request; and the church receiving the request makes a record of her action and sends the aid desired.

The presbytery for ordination is formed by choosing a Clerk and Moderator. The qualifications for the office are duly considered, and such questions as would tend to develop his suitability for the office may be asked by the Moderator or any member of the council. Some brother intimately acquainted with the moral character of the candidate, should be taken into the council; and, after the necessary questions have been asked, the council usually retires for consultation; and, after becoming fully acquainted with his moral character, and being convinced of his suitability for the office, they return and ordain by prayer and the laying on of the hands of the elders.

On such occasions it is usual for the charge to be given in the form of a sermon, in which the duties of the office are considered and urged upon the deacon, and, I am satisfied, that the church should be fully instructed in her duty.

Giving to the poor

The office of deacon is a mere farce if the church never furnishes him with the means to supply the needs of the poor, or meet the expenses of the church. It is mere *child's play* to ordain a man to fill an office when the course of the church allows him nothing to do in his official capacity. Our brethren in the ministry should labor to impress upon the churches that charity becomes the house of God; that it was a principle taught by the Savior and his apostles. And if each one of our churches would every month put a small sum in the hands of our deacons, with instructions to buy such things for the poor as they have need of. It would be greatly to our honor as a people, it would be a step in the right direction that God would own and bless, and would tend greatly to our own comfort.

I would suggest that our brethren seriously consider these things, and that our deacons urge them upon the churches. Our duties in these things could be performed without burdening us, even in a conceivable degree.

I have seen tears of joy start in the eyes of poor people when they were presented with charities of others, and I have derived ten times more comfort from means given to the poor than I could have obtained in any other way. If we love our Savior, we should seek to make his children happy. He does not need our aid, but many of his dear children do, and we are informed in his word that our benevolence to the dear lambs of God are as important as if bestowed in him. Should we not rejoice at every opportunity to do good to his suffering children;

and should not our churches have officers whose duty it is to hunt them up and bear our liberality to them?

Had you a child in a strange land and any should kindly care for it, you would feel as grateful or more so, as if it were done to you. So our Savior informs us that a cup of water given to one of his little ones shall never be forgotten. Have you, dear reader, ever taken pains to perform these duties? If you have been blessed with the abundance of this world you should be grateful to God, and remember when you go to your table richly laden with good things, that there are others who are subjects of pity. When you see yourself or your children warmly clad, and often in excessive dress, remember there are others in rags, and persons, too, who are as near the heart of the Lord Jesus as yourself.

Read the case of the rich man and Lazarus. Remember the words of Paul: “Charge them that are rich in this world, that they be not high-minded, nor trust in uncertain riches, but in the living God, who giveth us richly all things to enjoy; that they do good, that they be rich in good works, ready to distribute, willing to communicate; laying up in store for themselves a good foundation against the time to come,” etc. I Timothy 6:17-19. Riches are a curse when they shut up our bowels of compassion or when our hearts are set upon them; better a thousand times be poor than be rich with no heart to remember and pity the poor. The office of deacon is the proper channel through which our charities are to reach the objects entitled to them, and if we would maintain the office at all we must do it by using it, and giving it employment. Let us all be faithful in the performance of our duties.

The church greatly multiplied immediately after the ordination of the seven; God blessed the church in the discharge of its duties, and we may expect divine approval in the discharge of our duty.

The case of Stephen

It appears that some of the deacons did exercise a public gift immediately after their ordination. Stephen is mentioned in Acts 7, as publicly speaking of Christ; and Philip, in Acts 8, is mentioned as preaching and baptizing. All this seems to have been done immediately after their ordination. I think it is hardly probable that Philip was ordained a second time. I do not believe that it is necessary to the office that one should be gifted to speak in public; yet if he has such a gift it does not disqualify him for the office.

Scott in his notes, says: “It appears plainly, from the foregoing history, that it was not as a deacon that he (Stephen) preached, * * and no doubt many Christians not stately devoted to the ministry and whose furniture was far

inferior to his, would be capable of declaring Christ and his gospel to strangers in an edifying manner, and would not fail accordingly to do so as providence gave them call and opportunity.” It is certain that the main design of ordaining the seven was to take the temporal oversight of the flock, that the apostles might have the more time to look after the spiritual welfare of the saints; and, I think it unquestionably true that there is still a ministration of temporal things needed on the part of the church, and the need of that same officer remains. I sincerely hope that what I have said may lead to a profitable investigation of this important subject.

Debates

DEBATES: Lemuel Potter: I have had now, thirty public discussions, and I doubt the propriety of such things except under very rare circumstances. If my brethren would let me alone, I would seldom ever accept any man’s challenge for a debate. I think many times that debates are gotten up more on the principle of a prize fight, or something of that sort, than a desire to know the truth of God’s word. If a man comes along that we think is able, and seems to be the premium preacher we have heard for some time, the brethren frequently suggest the idea of hearing him in a debate, and from that on, if our brethren do not challenge, they provoke a challenge from the other side, which is no better, but more cowardly. If we wish to have a debate with others, why not walk up like men and make the challenge? To challenge is one thing necessary to debates, and if we want them, let us ask for them.

I have been called on many times to debate, but have managed to keep out of every one that I possibly could. The brethren have misjudged me, in thinking that I was never better pleased than when I was engaged in a debate. I will debate when my brethren think, in their sober judgment that the cause of our people needs defending. That is the only way. (*Lemuel Potter*)

Note: This quote is worth noting, considering the fact that Elder Potter is considered to have been one of the most effective debaters the Primitive Baptists have ever had.

Depravity, Total

Total DEPRAVITY The doctrine of total depravity is the key to human government. Man is depraved beyond his comprehension; and he cannot know how to govern himself

without a divine revelation. It is the key to psychology. No psychologist can even begin to understand the human psyche, who does not know something about the depravity of the psyche, the depravity of the heart of man.

hlh

Total DEPRAVITY: J. H. Oliphant The *nature, extent* and *degree* of human depravity is a subject of the first importance. We can not have a correct understanding of the remedy unless we fully understand the disease. No effort is necessary to prove that sin exists among us, but the power it possesses to control men and women, the deep-seated hold it has in the human heart and affections, are what but few understand. For one to know the real evil of his own heart is sure to be attended with humility and distrust of self.

Many Were Made Sinners

Our first parent was made in the image of God—Genesis 1:26, but “by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin, so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned,” Romans 5:12. I suppose the one man here referred to is Adam. He was made in Gods image (morally), but we are informed that he sinned and death was the result of that sin, not only death to himself, but death “is passed upon all men for that all have sinned.”

In some way his sin affects us all. By reading Romans 5:15-19, it will be plain to you that all the long race of Adam was involved in his guilt and made subject to death by it. “For as by one man’s disobedience many were made sinners.” Here the disobedience of one had the effect to make many (persons) sinners.

The Justice of Imputed Sin

This is a deep subject and much controverted. The justice of God in entailing upon the unborn millions of Adam’s posterity the fatal results of his sin may not appear clear to all, but there are many passages of scripture that plainly teach the doctrine.

It becomes us to confess the justice of all his actions, whether we are able to understand it or not. Whether it would be safer to us and more merciful in God to leave our destiny in *our own* uprightness, or allow Adam to represent us all, is a question of some importance, and has been ably discussed by many; for my part, I feel sure that there is as much mercy in the system that allows one man to represent us all, and even more; he was good, with no bias to evil, and knew the Lord.

I say the probabilities for our safety were greater with our destiny suspended upon his action than if left suspended upon our own. If the scriptures teach that we all became sinners by his sin, we need not labor to show the justice of the affair. It is enough for us to know that we are involved in the sin and guilt of the great head of our species.

If we were not involved in the guilt we would not be in the penalty, which is death, but *we all*, from the unborn infant to the oldest man, are exposed to death, which at least is (if only temporal death) a part of the penalty, and if it be right to entail on us a part of the penalty, it would be equally right to entail the whole penalty upon us. So that when you find the principle upon which God is just in entailing temporal death (a part of the penalty) upon us, from the infant to the oldest, I am persuaded that you will be able to show his justice in passing the whole curse upon the entire race.

The Curse Includes Eternal Death

This curse includes eternal death, as appears from the words, "The wages of sin is death, but the gift of God is eternal life." Here *death* is set in pair with *eternal life* in such a way as to show that death and life are of equal duration. So, upon the whole, we are "by nature the children of wrath"—Ephesians 2:3. We are exposed to the wrath of God so that he may, in justice, at any time require our lives and consign us to eternal misery. In support of the above positions I will cite a few passages of scripture. "What is man that he should be clean, and he that is born of a woman that he should be righteous"—Job 15:14. From this text, to know that one is born of a woman is sufficient to prove that he is unholy. To this point the same

writer testifies again, "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean?" Again, "How can he be clean that is born of a woman?"

We Are Sinful From Birth

These passages do not trace our sins to our own evil actions, but to our birth, showing that we are unclean from birth. I know that these positions have been disputed, but how we can do justice to the scriptures cited, allow to them their fair meaning, and yet maintain that we are not unholy from birth, is what I *can't* see. "Behold I was shapen in iniquity and in sin did my mother conceive me." This certainly shows that we are sinful from birth; the birth of the flesh, even though it be of the highest parentage, confers upon us a sinful nature, exposes us to God's tremendous curse, and certainly entails upon us the whole train of evils incident to our species.

Our Corruption is Universal

In Romans 3:9-19, Paul gives a careful description of ourselves, "none righteous, no, not one." Also, see Isaiah 59:3-11,14, the same sentiment plainly set forth. This corruption of nature is universal, it has its seat in every human heart. Isaiah 64:6, "But we are all as an unclean thing, and all our righteousnesses are as filthy rags." The whole race is set down as an *unclean thing*. Galatians 3:22, "But the scripture hath concluded all under sin." No one of our species since Adam ever escaped death except Enoch and Elijah, nor has any one been found free from sin.

Now I ask why this universal corruption of nature unless we received it from Adam, our common head? No proposition can be demonstrated to my mind if the whole race of men, from Adam down, from the old man to the unborn infant, is not corrupt and sinful. We say that gravity draws every weighty object to the earth's center, and none deny it, although there are thousands of objects that have never been tested. Now, I say that all men are depraved, that all are sinful, and exposed to death. I appeal to the Bible, and it testifies to the truth of my assertion. I appeal to facts, and find that every human

being has been a witness to the truth of what I say, for "all have sinned and come short of the glory of God." "There is none righteous, no, not one." I think we have found this depravity to be universal, and to belong to every one of our species. I think we have seen that it seizes us in our conception and birth, gives shape to our lives and characters as a tree gives quality to its fruit.

Evil Springs From an Evil Heart

Our disease is not altogether in our actions, which are evil, but it consists in an evil heart," sinful *nature*, an *enmity against God*, our *tongues, lips, mouths, feet, hands*. Yea, from the sole of the feet even to the head, all is evil. It is not more certain that water runs down hill than it is that we by nature do evil. What parent has not seen this fixed tendency in his children? Who is so blind that they can't see this tendency in all classes, the rich and poor, the wise and simple?

You have but to open your eyes and you are confronted with evidences of the awful depravity of our nature. Yea, you may close your eyes and see in your own heart a sinfulness so deep, so uncontrollable that, unless you are born again, you never can enter the peaceful presence of God. The world's history is a commentary on human depravity; men in all ages have shown a ferocity to each other that exceeds the animal kingdom; how often have hundreds of thousands of our species met in battle array with weapons of death in hand, thirsting for each other's blood?

Wickedness has stained every step of our history; fraud and deceit are in our ways; civil government is established to control the corruptions of our nature; jails, penitentiaries and the gallows are aids to keep in check the headlong torrent; but how often does sin boil over in our legislators, who under its force, legalize fraud and theft? And how often are the judicial and executive departments overrun with sin, so that juries give in wicked decisions, judges are bribed, judgment perverted, and civil government proves a failure.

It may be asked, do not some sinners love their children, pay their debts, visit the sick, make good neighbors, etc., and if so, are they entirely corrupt and depraved? I grant there are some men, and even many men, who are unregenerate, whom we esteem as well-disposed people, but in determining how much their acts of kindness are worth before God, we, of course, must be governed by the word of the Lord.

The Savior, in Matthew 22:37, says, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment, and the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Here the whole duty of man is reduced to two propositions—duty to God and duty to man. All our right actions that are prompted by a pure love to God are good in his sight and fulfill the law's commandments, but all our actions that are prompted by other motives are evil.

We Are Tried by What We Would Do

We are not only tried by what we *do* but by what we *would do*. I have read Romans 3:10-19, and thought the case too bad to apply to all our race. The words "There is *no fear* of God before their eyes" seemed too strong; also, "Their throat is an open sepulcher," and "Their mouth is full of cursing and bitterness."

These words seem to deny the existence of anything good in man, and yet we see traits in the unregenerate that we admire. We see natural affections in some men to a very great degree. Some infidels have been men of great natural kindness. Also, some men have been great lovers of human liberty and justice among men that were, nevertheless destitute of love to God. Although these qualities are admirable to us, yet they are *natural* qualities, nor do they have God's glory for their object, nor are they prompted by love to God; hence they are worthless in God's sight.

It is difficult to determine the *degree* of depravity that we possess, but I think it safe to say that we are as guilty in God's sight of all sin, that we are hindered from committing by civil law, as if we had actually committed it. See Matthew 5:28.

Here our Lord charges guilt upon the man who looks upon a woman with lust. Also Romans 7:7, "I had not known lust except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet." These references show that God looks not so much on what we do as what we *would* do.

God Claims Our Affections

A little thought will make it plain that many things besides love to God lead men to uprightness of life, and yet no actions are truly valuable in God's sight except those prompted by love to God. God has a just right to the undivided affections of all our hearts, and to our constant and untiring service. For a mortal man to deny these to his Maker is rebellion. To have our hearts set on the creature, or self, or anything aside from God is treason, and it is no apology to say that we are honest among men, or that we are kind to the needy, or that we love anybody or thing.

God *claims as his* our affections. It is no excuse for thieves that they are honest among themselves, nor for traitors that they love each other; neither need we fancy that we have found something truly good in fallen man, when we find some that are financially honest, or some remains of human kindness among them. The thing required is pure love to God. Is there any of this in the unregenerate heart? If not he is **totally depraved**, totally destitute of the essential good that his Maker requires; he may speak with the tongue of men or angels, or give all his goods to feed the poor, or give his body to the flames, and yet he is *nothing*.

The One Thing God Values

God sets no value on any action of men except what arises from love to him, and has his glory for its object. Hence, if we knew what men would do if all civil law were abolished and every sense of danger of future punishment was removed, then we might see man as God sees him. If all those feelings of self respect in men that lift them above many *low, base* acts were destroyed; if his shame of being known as a liar, a thief, an adulterer, etc., were destroyed; if every restraint were removed

from our world save the one, "Love to God," and men were left to act out what is in them, and we could contemplate man in this condition, we would see him as God sees him, we would see that "there is none good," "they are all gone out of the way."

Paul's language would not be too hard for us—Total depravity would be a term sufficiently mild to describe our case. I confidently believe there is not a solitary human being on the face of the earth that has any goodness about him, save those who love God, and I as confidently believe that none love God, save those who have been born of him. "He that loveth is born of God"

No wonder our Lord taught the necessity of a new birth. The whole mass, the whole race, is ruined. Every imagination of the thoughts of the heart is only evil, and that continually. Every thought is wrong. "His heart is deceitful, and desperately wicked, above all things; who can know it."

Perhaps some reader will say, "I am not so bad as all this; I surely think I would not do so bad as some have done." So Peter thought when he said, "Though I should die with thee, yet will I not deny thee," Matthew 26:38, and when the temptation came, he fell under it as grass before the keen-edged scythe, and so would you and I, dear reader, were we left to ourselves, and hence our prayer is, "Lord keep me as the apple of thine eye" Our Lord teaches us to pray, "Lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil."

When the prophet made known to Hazael what he would do to Israel, that he would "set on fire their strongholds, and their young men wilt thou slay with the sword, and wilt dash their children, and rip up their women with child," Hazael replied, "Is thy servant a dog, that he would do this great thing?" II Kings 8:13-14. But so he did, as his subsequent history shows.

So perhaps, you would be astonished, if you knew what evil things you would do, if left to yourself. Hazael seemed to be insulted, when he was plainly told of what he would do; and if I tell you, that your own evil nature would ride you into the

basest of crime, if all restraints of grace and providence were removed, perhaps you will say it is not true.

No human being need *dare* temptation, for he will fall under it, as sure as it is presented to him, and he left to himself. This the Christian feels, and hence his prayer is, "Lead us not into temptation." God's word assures us that we are defiled in thought, in heart, in body, in mind—every faculty is against God, the whole man is undone. "His heels are where his heart should be, and his heart where his heels should be." His heart is on this earth, and his heels against God.

Oh, reader, hast thou ever seen thyself in this condition? If thou hast known the pollution of thine own nature, thou wilt not complain of what I have written as too hard. Many a man has groaned and cried for grief, when his true state was known to him. "God, be merciful to me a sinner." "Oh, wretched man that I am!" "Lord, save, I perish!

Such prayers are but expressions of what a truly sensible sinner feels and knows to be true; but have you ever wept over your own sins? Not only your sins, but have you not wept to see how prone you are to sin? It is hard to tell which grieves us most, our actual sins, or our awful *proneness to sin*. One said, "Come, see a man that told me all things that ever I did," and another smites upon his poor, guilty breast and says, "God be merciful to me a sinner."

At one time you are grieved over your actions, at another you mourn over a sinful nature; by closely observing your heart, you perceive there is a fountain of sin within, that spoils your devotion; your prayers are ruined, and every effort spoiled. Oh, to be stripped of all good and know it; to stand naked before God; to confess, that in me there is no good thing, is what we never can forget if we have been there, and yet this is the real condition of every one.

Reader, have you this knowledge of yourself? If so, you should ever bless and praise God, that you know what it is to be a sinner. You can bear to have your wounds probed to the bottom, and though it be painful, and grieves you to know how

vile you are, yet you love the man or book, that fairly tells you how bad, how corrupt, how rotten, and deceitful you are.

It is not a pleasant task, but a painful duty, to thus arraign our race before God, and so earnestly plead against mankind, as being destitute of any and everything that is good in God's sight; to contend that the whole mass is an unclean thing in the sight of the living God; that my own children, and near relatives, are by nature utterly void of any good quality; that "*dead in sins*" describes every unregenerate sinner.

I do not thus argue because I want to be singular, or because I want to be unpopular, but duty and sincerity demand that I deal plainly. If we are to do any good by preaching to the people, which I hope to do, it will certainly be by preaching truth. The doctrine of the total depravity of our nature I sincerely believe to be taught in the Bible, and to be sustained by the history of man, and to accord with Christian experience, and with sound reason. (*J.H. Oliphant Principles and Practices of the Regular Baptists ppg 26 - 41, 1883*) (See also Elder S. A. Paine's article on DEPRAVITY under Doctrines of CAMPBELLISM i.e. See CAMPBELLISM: S. A. Paine under) (Also see ADAM'S TRANSGRESSION: Harold Hunt

Dichotomy

DICHOTOMY (*See under SOUL*)

Dinosaurs

DINOSAURS: (*See under EVOLUTION*)

Discipline

DISCIPLINE: (*See article on FELLOWSHIP: J. H. Oliphant*)

Divorce and Remarriage

DIVORCE and Remarriage (*See under ADULTERY*)

Docetism

DOCETISM While the Judaizing **Ebionites** of the first century, like the modern Socinians and Unitarians, denied the Divinity of Christ, the pseudo-spiritualistic Docetae, a branch of the Gnostics, considering matter essentially evil, denied his real humanity, regarding his entire earthly life and death as a deceptive show or a mere vision.” (*Hassell’s History pg 242*)

Donation, The, of Pepin

The DONATION of Pepin (*See under CHARLEMAGNE*)

Donatists

see Donatus and the Donatists

Donatus and the Donatists

DONATUS and the DONATISTS: *Sylvester Hassell:* As the Decian persecution, A.D. 250, had produced many *lapsi*, or apostates, whom the Novatians, considering the church to be a communion of saints, were unwilling to admit again to membership, and were thus led to separate themselves from the Catholic or dominant party in the churches; so the Diocletian persecution, A.D. 303, produced many *traditores*, or betrayers, who gave up their Bibles for destruction, and whom the Donatists, being of like minds with the Novatians, were unwilling to fellowship, and were thus also led to form separate churches. The Donatists were so called from Donatus, a very learned, eloquent and upright minister, who was chosen pastor or Bishop of the church at Carthage, A.D. 315. These people were found mostly in North Africa, and were quite numerous. When Mensurius, Bishop of the church at Carthage, who was a loose disciplinarian, died in 311, the majority of the members of the church, being of the same principles of Mensurius, chose Caecilian, a like-minded man, their Bishop. On the ground that Caecilian was consecrated by a *traditor*, Felix, Bishop of Aptunga, the minority withdrew and formed a separate church, and chose Majorinus for their pastor, who, dying in 315, was succeeded by Donatus. The example of this church was followed all over North Africa, and, to some extent, in adjoining countries. In Constantine’s first edict (312), professing to give universal religious toleration, he especially excepted the Donatists. Suffering under the consequent persecution, they appealed to him to examine

their principles, which he professed to do by a council of twenty Bishops in the Lateran at Rome in 313, and afterwards by a council of two hundred Bishops at Arles, France, in 314, and in 316 by a personal hearing of the Donatist party at Milan. The Donatists were condemned every time, and from 316 to 321 they were treated as rebels resisting the authority of the emperor; and edicts were issued depriving them of their church edifices, and sentencing them to banishment, confiscation and death.

They should not in the beginning have appealed to the emperor, although they had been condemned by him without a hearing. It was the significant question of Donatus—'*What has the emperor to do with the church?*' The church of Christ should be a pure spiritual body, having no corrupting connection with the State. The Donatists were not accused of heresy; they, in general, led exemplary and even austere lives; they advocated the purity and unworldliness of the church and the necessity of strict discipline; like the Montanists and the Novatians, they baptized all whom they received into their churches, whether such had previously been professedly baptized or not. Their churches also were independent of each other in government. It is possible that infant baptism was, in the latter part of the fourth or in the fifth century, practiced by a few of them; but it was plainly inconsistent with their principles. In 321 Constantine gave them full liberty of faith and worship. His son and successor, Constans, first tried to bribe them, as they were very poor, but, having failed, he then severely persecuted them. So did the other emperors of the fourth century, except Julian the Apostate, who gave all his subjects free and equal religious toleration. In 411, during a three days' discussion at Carthage, where two hundred and eighty-six Catholic and two hundred and seventy-nine Donatist Bishops were present, the famous Latin theologian, Augustine, first tried in vain to argue the Donatists into submission, and then appealed to the closing command in the parable of the supper (Luke xiv 23) to "compel them to come in," as authority for the State to use force to bring them into the fellowship of the Catholic Church, out of which he, altogether inconsistently with his own principles of predestination, maintained that there was no salvation. The conquest of Africa by the Arian Vandals in 428 terminated the controversy; and a remnant of the Donatists survived until the

conquest of North Africa by the Saracens in the seventh century." (*Hassell's History* ppg 389, 390)

Dualism

DUALISM To account for the origin of evil, Plato imagined that evil was inherent in matter, and that matter was independent of God, and therefore eternal, and not created; the most of the false philosophical religions are thus dualistic. But the first verse of Genesis tells us that God created all things; and the third chapter of Genesis implies that evil or sin originated from the ungodly exercise of creaturely free-will. Sin is not an attribute of matter, but of spirit. The most holy God is not in any sense its cause or author (Genesis 18:25; Job 15:15; Psalms 145:17; Habakkuk 1:13; I John 1:5)—such a thought were most awful blasphemy. Man's body, as created, was very good (Genesis 1:31) and not sinful. Christ's body was never the seat of sin (Luke 1:35; Hebrews 7:26); and the glorified bodies of the saints shall be free from sin.—Romans 6:7; I Corinthians 15:42; Philippians 3:21; Revelation 21:4,27." (*Hassell's History* 31)

Duns Scotus

DUNS SCOTUS (*See under The IMMACULATE CONCEPTION*)

Ebionites

EBIONITES (*See under DOCETISM*)

Eck, John

John ECK (*See Under Martin LUTHER*)

Eckhart

ECKHART (*See under SCHOLASTIC THEOLOGY*)

Ecolampadius, John

John ECOLAMPADIUS (*See under Ulrich ZWINGLI*)

Election and Predestination

ELECTION and Predestination: J.H. Oliphant:

1st. It is not my purpose in this article to discuss at length the subjects named. I would be glad to define, rather than defend. I am satisfied that we have been shamefully misrepresented by some popular writers, and the result is, there is a great amount of prejudice against us on this ground. As a sample of the misrepresentations that have been made against us, I will quote from “Doctrinal Tracts,” written by Wesley, page 25: “The greater part of mankind God hath ordained to death, and it (grace) is not free for them; them God hateth, and therefore, before they were born, decreed they should die eternally. * * * accordingly they are born for this, to be destroyed, body and soul, in hell.”

Who wonders that there is a vast amount of prejudice against this doctrine, when such statements as this are believed to be a fair representation of the matter? We are as far from believing the sentiments in the above quotation as Mr. Wesley was. On page 27 he tries again, “By virtue of an eternal, unchangeable, irresistible decree of God, one part of mankind are infallibly saved and the rest infallibly damned.” Again, on page 32, “How uncomfortable a thought is this, that thousands and millions of men, without any preceding offense or fault of theirs, were unchangeably doomed to everlasting burnings.” Again, on page 39, he says, “To suppose him of his own mere motion of his pure will and pleasure, happy as he is, to doom his creatures, whether they will or no, to endless misery, is to impute such cruelty to him as we can not impute even to the great enemy of God and man; it is to represent the most high God as more cruel, false and unjust than the devil.”

This last form of expression seems to be a favorite method of his to express his great dislike of the doctrine, that it makes “*God worse than the devil.*” He repeats it no less than three times on one page (39). I am satisfied that the sentiment he here expresses was never entertained by anybody, or at least by those he tries to fasten them on.

Page 40, “I abhor the doctrine of predestination,” and a little on he shows that according to it, “God would be meaner than the devil.” Every Bible reader knows that the words *predestinate* and *predestination* frequently occur in the Bible, and it certainly is a very unguarded expression to say, “I *abhor* the doctrine of *predestination.*” It shows that his opposition was to a fever heat.

On pages 40-41, he three times represents the doctrine as *compelling* men to continue in sin. Now if the people have read these statements, and believe them to be fair, we can not wonder that they have heaped hard names upon us. This little book, called Doctrinal Tracts, has many misquotations of the scripture,

which is much worse than to misrepresent the views of men. On page 15, he quotes Paul to Titus, Titus 2:11, as saying, “The grace of God that bringeth salvation to all men,’ etc. Also Hebrews 2:9, “He by the grace of God tasted death for every man.”

These misquotations shamefully change the sense of the passages, which the reader can see by comparing these quotations with the texts in the Bible, and such blunders are common throughout the work.

On page 104, he closes his arguments on “final persever-ance” with the words, “Let him that standeth take heed lest he fall.” The scripture reading is, “Let him that *thinketh* he standeth take heed lest he fall!” For similar misrepresentations the reader is referred to “Porter’s History of Methodism,” pages 226, 227, 230, and 240, where you will find the doctrine of predestination and election misrepresented and the favorite charge repeated, that it “*makes God worse than the devil.*”

The doctrine of predestination, as we hold it, does not represent God as creating any person for hell, nor as *fitting* any person for hell. It does not make any man’s condition worse in any sense. It shuts heaven against no one. Those who oppose us claim that God will save all that love God, or who are born of the spirit, or who die in infancy. So do we.

“But God, thou art told, by his eternal decree fixed, before they had done good or evil, causes not only children of a span long, but the parents also, to pass through the fire of hell.” Who knows but this is where that stale charge that we preach “infants in hell not a span long” came from. I have never read after or heard a man preach who believed the sentiment.

We sincerely believe that all who hunger and thirst after righteousness, who labor and are heavy laden, and who thirst after the water of life, we think and teach that all these will be saved. We sing:

Can Jesus hear a sinner pray, yet suffer him to die?
No, he is full of grace; he never will permit
The soul that fain would see his face to perish at his feet.”
No sinner shall ever be empty sent back
Who comes seeking mercy for Jesus’ sake.

Instead of believing that a very small number will be saved, we believe a vast number, which no man can number, will be saved, and that God will be *just* in the final punishment of the wicked. They will justly perish for their sins, and realize that it is *wholly* their *own fault*.

It is argued that the doctrine tends to wickedness and carelessness of life. We do not believe it. We feel under obligations to do right in life, and feel in duty bound to preach the gospel to every creature, and many of us are spending much time in trying to preach the gospel to sinners. I have marked the arguments to those who oppose us, and I am persuaded that they, generally, misunderstand our position.

There is no dispute about the *number* saved, except they believe that some fall from grace. This we deny. So our view represents God as saving *more* than theirs by the number they think fall from grace. There is no dispute about whose fault it is that some are lost. We, with them, believe it is the sinner's fault; that God remains pure, and his throne as white as snow in their eternal banishment from him. We all agree that sinners of all classes are account-able; all "under the law," and are under just obligations to love and obey God. There is a *sense of this duty in all men*. We all agree that it is right to preach the gospel to every creature, and this we are trying to do.

The real point of difference is, first, about the condition of men in nature. We view them as being so under the power of sin that there is no hope of their salvation, save by a plan wholly of grace; that God "makes us meet for the Master's use;" that he begins and finishes the work in us, while they hold that it is effected partly by God's grace and partly by *their* works. The real issue is as to whether it is WHOLLY of grace that we are saved, or whether it is PARTLY of works. We believe the experience of God's people proves that their salvation is wholly of grace in every part.

Many Christians hate and oppose the doctrine of election who unwittingly oppose the real ground of the Christian hope. And secondly, as we differ about the condition of sinners, we differ about the plan necessary to their salvation. Where physicians differ about a disease, they will necessarily differ about the remedy. We should seriously consider God's dealing with us in our own cases, how it was that we were ever led to repentance; was it my own choice, or was my mind graciously turned to that subject under my exercise of mind; was I able to do anything I thought to be good, or did I view all my works as mere filthy rags? In these things we all must agree, and I am convinced that a calm, thoughtful consideration of the matter will lead every Christian to acknowledge that grace, and grace alone, has rescued him.

If I should try to defend the doctrine, which I have not space to do at length, I would urge:

1st. That by reason of the native enmity of the human heart there could be no salvation without it; that no sinner would “ever approach the Lord, if the Lord would leave him to follow his own inclinations.” Therefore election is “the chief corner stone of the amazing fabric of human redemption.” In the previous chapters I have shown that men in nature are so depraved that they never would seek the Lord, and hence God must seek them if there is ever any salvation for them.

2nd. Christian experience invariably bears testimony that God quickens sinners into a lively sense of their lost condition, and so every saint on earth has within himself the clearest evidences of the truth of this doctrine.

3rd. The Bible abundantly teaches that our salvation is “not of works,” “not by works of righteousness which we have done, etc. This being true, then the doctrine of election must be true.

4th. The Savior taught Nicodemus that sinners must be “born again” in order to see or enter the kingdom. Again, in speaking of this birth, John tells us that it “is not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.” Now, if it is not of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, *but of God*, then the doctrine of election must be true.

5th. The scripture in many places ascribes salvation to the previous *purpose* of God. Romans 8:28, “And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are called according to his purpose.” The Romans here are the *called* according to the *purpose* of God. Ephesians 1:11, “In whom also we have obtained an inheritance, being predestinated according to the purpose of him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will.” Here, as any sane mind may see, the fact that we have “obtained an inheritance” is the result of the previous purpose and predestination of God. II Thessalonians 2:13, “But we are bound to give thanks to God for you brethren, beloved of the Lord, because God hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation through sanctification of the spirit and belief of the truth.”

I Timothy 1:9, “Who hath saved us and called us with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace given us in Christ before the world began.” If the doctrine of election is not taught in this text, I confess I would not know what words would express it. “Purpose and grace” were given us in Christ “before the world began.” The late translation reads “from the ages eternal.” Our being saved is the result of God’s previous purpose, and, if so, the doctrine of election must be true. See, also, under this head, John 6:37-39.

6th. Many passages of scripture plainly teach the doctrine. John 5:21, “As the Father raiseth up the dead and quickeneth them, even so the Son quickeneth whom he will.” John 17:2, “As thou hast given him power over all flesh that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him.” These were given to him, not because they had eternal life, but that *he might give them* eternal life. “Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you,” etc. Acts 2:39, “For the promise is to you and your children, and to all that are far off, even unto as many as the Lord our God shall call.” Here the promise of the immutable God is to the *even number that are called*.

Acts 13:48, “And when the gentiles heard this they were glad and glorified the word of the Lord, and as many as were ordained to eternal life believed.” How we can believe these passages to be true and yet deny the doctrine, I *can't see*.

Acts 15:14, “Simeon hath declared how God at the first did visit the gentiles to take out of them a people for his name.” This language, fairly interpreted, is full of the doctrine. Acts 18:9-10, the Lord visits Paul in a vision and informs him that he has much people in that wicked city, and, if so, they were at that time unregenerate. Election is taught as clear as a sunbeam in this.

Read the connection, Acts 22:14, and Romans 8:29-30, “For whom he did foreknow he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, moreover, whom he did predestinate them he also called, and whom he called, them he also justified, and whom he justified, them he also glorified.”

Strange that Wesley should say, “*I abhor the doctrine of predestination.*” Any sound-minded man, not *prejudiced against* the sovereignty of God, who will read this connection to the close, will confess that it teaches the doctrine. See Romans 9:7-8,11; 2:15-16,18. Here the doctrine is as plainly taught as language can make it. I have often been amused to see the poor, pitiful efforts some writers have made to escape the force of these words. If we allow words in the Bible to be as *meaning* as they are in other books, there is no way to escape the doctrine.

Romans 11:5, “Even then at this time there is a remnant according to the election of grace, and if by grace, then is it no more of works?” etc. What, then, Israel hath not obtained that which he seeketh for, but the election hath obtained it, and the rest were blinded.” How can we doubt the truth of this doctrine, and believe our Bibles? These passages need no comment; they testify in as plain language as can be used. See Romans 11:28-29. Here we learn that the “gifts and calling of God are without repentance,” or “without change of purpose,” as the words imply, that God does not *change his purpose* to call or save a sinner, but he *executes or carries out* his purpose.

Galatians 4:28, “Now we brethren, as Isaac was, are the children of promise; when we were born (again) the promise was fulfilled in the womb of that promise; we all lay until we were born (again).

Ephesians 1:4-5, “According as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world that we should be holy and without blame before him in love,” “having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself.” How language could be plainer I can not see. Also, Ephesians 2:4-5; Philippians 1:29. In all these places the doctrine shines with a luster that can not be eclipsed.

Also, I Thessalonians 1:4-5, “Knowing, brethren beloved, your election of God,” “for our gospel came not unto you in word only, but in power and in the Holy Ghost, and in much assurance.” He affirms that he knows their election, and tells why; because his gospel had come to them in power and in the Holy Ghost, etc. This proved to him that they were the elect of God. Read these passages in a calm and unbiased manner, allow every word to have its fair meaning and you will have to admit the doctrine.

Also, I Thessalonians 5:9, “For God hath not appointed us to wrath, but to obtain salvation by our Lord Jesus Christ.” Here somebody was appointed to obtain salvation, which, if true, then the doctrine of election and predestination must be true. II Thessalonians 2:10,17,17, In all these places the doctrine is taught as plain as language can teach it.

I will cite one more passage. Psalms 64:5, Blessed is the man whom thou chooseth, and causeth to approach unto thee, that he may dwell in thy courts,” etc. Does God choose anybody and them to approach unto him? David says so, and pronounces them *blessed*. So the doctrine of election must be true.

There is but one way to escape it, and that is, just affirm that “it makes God meaner than the devil.” This was Wesley’s way of disproving the doctrine. “Doctrinal Tracts,” page 39. But you say, “I will prove it by the scripture.” Hold! Prove what by the scripture? That “God is worse than the devil?” It can not be. If you are fond of this kind of reasoning, you will have no trouble to disbelieve the doctrine, but if you believe the Bible, you will be compelled to believe the doctrine of election and predestination.

7th. The doctrine of election is full of comfort to God’s people. What saint would be unhappy to know that God’s love to me is older than the hills? that it was as strong for me, when I was a poor sinner, as it ever will be? That his great love to me, even when I was dead in sin, was such that he saved me from sin’s power?

No wife thinks less of her husband to know that he loved her years before she did him, and so no poor, tried saint need be unhappy when it is proved to him that the *eternal* Jehovah saw and loved him before the glittering orbs of heaven took up their eternal march, before our earth was fashioned from nothing, or before any part of the great universe was arranged. No saint should be alarmed at this; love so old and good, is more likely to last.

I know it is not particularly comforting to the unregenerate, but we are not to comfort those that never mourn; we are not to bind hearts that were never broken, nor to feed those that were never hungry, nor give drink to those that were never thirsty. Therefore, I am not concerned to comfort impenitent sinners; but to every mourner on earth, to every heavy laden soul on God's footstool, I can say that election will never wound nor bruise you; it will bind your wounds, heal your broken heart, wipe every tear from your poor, penitent eyes; it will one day chase away the gloomy cloud that now shuts out the light of God's countenance, and speak peace to your poor troubled mind.

Your Savior, yes, *your* Savior, says "Blessed are the poor in spirit." Why blessed? Because God has chosen you to approach unto him. 'Twas he that made your eyes overflow. Your burden of sin proves that God is now in mercy dealing with you, neither the world, the flesh, nor Satan ever taught you to know how vile you are. You are now receiving his richest mercy. Others have no heart to grieve for sin; others are now pursuing sin with delight without a tear or sigh. *This change in your case is from the Lord.*

This is comforting, I know, to poor mourners to be assured time and again by those who love them, and whom they love and regard, as able to instruct them, that God does love them; that his immutable love embraces them, and that their awful sins have no power to shut them out of heaven.

8th. But it is urged that the doctrine of election tends to impiety. To this I might reply that the *end* of election is piety. We are chosen "that we should be holy and without blame before God in love," etc. No person dare scripturally claim to be elected without he be disposed to serve the Lord. There is, therefore, now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus *who walk not after the flesh, but after the spirit.*"

Election is not to be used for a "cloak of maliciousness." We are not to use our "liberty for an occasion to the flesh," but "by well doing" we are to put to silence the "ignorance of foolish men." "Shall we continue in sin?" God forbid, how can they that are dead to sin live any longer therein? We have, if we can lay claim to the election of grace, been killed to the love of sin.

George Whitfield was a man of great piety and godliness, but a firm, uncompromising advocate of election and predestination. John Bunyan, whose writings will go down to the last generation, and who for piety was unexcelled by any of his day, was a strong believer in the doctrine and taught it in all his writings. Dr. Gill, the great commentator, most ably defended it. McHenry, who wrote the "Comprehensive Commentary," taught it. Scott, who wrote a commentary on every verse in the Bible, believed it. The humble John Flavel, whose writings are as sweet as honey, was a firm believer in it.

And I will mention the name of Andrew Fuller, whose works present it. Newton, Toplady, Milton, Booth, all believed and taught it. Spurgeon, whose writings have comforted millions of the people of God, glories in the doctrine of election and predestination. The men, who, under God, effected the great reformation, Calvin, Luther, and their contemporaries, almost universally believed it. It was the sentiment that animated their hearts and urged them on from victory to victory until religious liberty was established.

Take from our world the books written by predestinarians, and we would find the best and richest part destroyed. Let shame and confusion cover the face of that man who intimates that the doctrine tends to impiety.

The regular Baptists in all ages have believed it. The London Confession of Faith and the Philadelphia Confession have been regarded by the Baptists as sound. They who claim to be old Baptists and yet oppose these sentiments, do shamefully expose their own ignorance.

Mr. Wesley, Porter, and many others insist that the doctrine makes God *meaner than the devil*. We all believe God will be just in the final condemnation of the wicked. It is not election that has separated them from God, but "your sins and your iniquities have separated between you and your God." It seems that these men must think that if election were true, that, as a consequence God would be the cause of all the sin in the world; that it would necessarily follow that "infants not a span long, and parents, too," would be by the decree of God appointed first, to sin, and second, to hell for that sin. When the sun is withdrawn, ice and snow cover the earth," and yet the sun is not the cause of ice; and darkness pervades all parts excluded from the sun's rays, and yet the sun is not the cause of darkness. And so where men are allowed to pursue their own course and follow their own desires, sin and death is their overthrow; but God is not the cause of their misfortune. It is their own sin.

If we would know the grounds upon which Wesley thinks God will be just in the condemnation of sinners, we can find it on page 68, Doctrinal Tracts, "As it

makes the whole salvation of man to depend on God, so it makes his condemnation to be wholly of himself, in that he resisted the grace of God, and when he might have been saved, would not.” His whole condemnation rests on the grounds of resisted grace. If there had been no grace, there would have been no *resisting*; and if no resisting, then no condemnation. I will ask of what use the grace, when there could be no condemnation without it? It would be far better for there to be no grace, than for grace to be the cause of men’s eternal ruin; but if God would be unjust to condemn men without first offering them the gospel, they are not under the law until the gospel is preached to them, for if without the gospel the right of condemnation does not exist, they are not under the law of God until the gospel is sent to them, and if not under the law, they are exposed to no curse, “for where there is no law, there is no condemnation,” and if exposed to no curse, it would be hard to tell what they need to be saved from on his plan; not from condemnation, for God has no right to condemn them until the gospel is preached to them. Hence, if it is never preached to them, there could be no condemnation to them.

I should think Mr. Wesley did not intend what he said in this quotation, if he had not in other places committed the same blunder. On page 69, “We do not intend by this day of visitation to understand the whole time of a man’s life, though in some it may be extended to the very hour of death, but *such* a season at least as *sufficiently clears God of every man’s condemnation*, which to some may be sooner and to others later, as the Lord in his wisdom sees meet.”

The words I have emphasized were emphasized by him. In these words he tells us just why God gives a day of grace to the finally impenitent, *to sufficiently clear himself* of their condemnation. He would not be just without it.

Neither does he thus visit them with any view of saving them. On pages 8 and 9, he says, “We may consider this a little further. God from the foundation of the world foreknew all men’s believing or not believing, and according to this, his foreknowledge, he chose or elected all obedient believers as such to salvation, and refused or reprobated all disobedient unbelievers as such to damnation. Thus the scriptures teach us to consider election and reprobation.”

According to this, all disobedient unbelievers are foreknown, and as such he reprobated them to damnation; and yet he tells us that the Spirit strives with them. Certainly God does not strive with them with any design of saving them, for they, Mr. Wesley tells us, were reprobated from the beginning. Well, for what does he give them a day of grace? *To sufficiently clear himself in their condemnation.*”

Now, I ask the reader to decide whether this view of the subject does not make God's proceeding in reference to the finally impenitent appear in a worse light than the one we give. They boast about the Spirit *striving*, and *wooing*, and *beseeking* sinners that God "knew from the beginning would be lost, and then Mr. Wesley tells us that all this wooing is to "sufficiently clear God in their condemnation.

On page 37, "It can not be denied that the gracious words which came out of his mouth are full of invitations to all sinners; to say, then, he did not intend to save all sinners, is to represent him as a gross deceiver of the people." He then pretends to quote the language of Jesus, Matthew 11:28, "Come unto me all ye that are *weary* and heavy laden." First, he does not quote the text right, and secondly, I ask any sensible reader if it proves what he quoted it to prove. Does it invite *all sinners*? It does invite all of a certain class, but does it invite *all sinners*?

But in this quotation Mr. Wesley tells us that God intended to save all sinners, and on page 8, he tells us that some were reprobated to damnation, and that he knew that some never would be saved. Is it true that Christ "intended to save all sinners" when he knew that all sinners would not be saved? Do you, or any intelligent being, *intend* to do anything that you know never will be done?

And again, did Christ intend to save all sinners when he had from the beginning reprobated some to damnation? To save all when he had from the beginning determined not to save some? And why do our Arminian friends boast about the Spirit *striving* with sinners? Wesley's hank is badly tangled, and his followers will never be able to untangle it.

I have never understood the gospel to furnish the grounds of the condemnation of sinners. Sinners "are condemned already." Paul says, Romans 1:16, "For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ, for it is the power (authority) of God unto salvation (Wesley thinks it is his power to damnation) to every one that believeth, to the Jew first and also to the Greek."

The right of condemnation exists without any gospel or any *wooing and beseeching and striving*." If not, it were a great pity that there was ever a gospel given. Romans 1:17, "For therein is the righteousness of God revealed." It is this revealed righteousness that makes God's power or authority to be in the gospel. The gospel contains a description of that *righteousness*, and in this God's *authority* or *power* to save lost, guilty sinners lies; it is his warrant for taking them from under the law's tremendous curse and giving them a place at his own right hand in heaven, *from faith to faith*.

It is not revealed to the faithless sinner, but to faith. It is the man of faith that discovers that the gospel is not a modified law, or bundle of conditions. It is the man of faith that discovers that the gospel reveals a righteousness equal to the law's demand. The blind, unregenerate sinner will have it that the gospel requires a righteousness of man, but the man of faith will see that it reveals one to the poor, enlightened sinner, who is laboring to satisfy the law's claims, who is thirsting for righteousness; and when faith discovers that the gospel is *not a law*, that it reveals in Christ how God can be just in saving sinners, he "ceases from his own works and enters into rest," Hebrews 4:10; he "worketh not, but believeth," Romans 4:5.

The right of condemnation exists independent of, and prior to the gospel, in the order of nature, and he that thinks the preached gospel is the ground on which God is just in condemning sinners, would far better suppress his gospel, if he would be consistent. We repeat, that God is just in condemning sinners without a gospel, a Christ, or a sent Spirit; if not, far better withhold all these. All men by nature are under the law of God; it requires pure and unvarying love and obedience to God; every man feels in himself that he owes this to God.

The law does not require this of all men on the ground that Christ died, or that there is a gospel, or a merciful Spirit, for had there never been a crucified Savior these duties would have been required. Man feels and knows that his Creator has a just right to his heart; that he should love and obey God, but he willingly pursues sin, rebels against God, and lives on terms of peace with the great enemy of God. While his Maker sustains his being, he is physically able, and mentally he is able, to do the things God requires, but he still persists in sin, and finally for his *own sins*, and not the sins of others, he is shut out from God and heaven forever; he is responsible for the manner in which he treats the *word* as well as the *works* of God, as the law of God requires perpetual obedience, in all times and in all places, and at all seasons, and in all companies. He is adding to the list of his sins. His unbelief—may be the root sin—not his unbelief that Jesus is his Savior, but his unbelief of God's word, his threats, his promises, what he has said the end of sin shall be.

If we are to judge a tree by its fruit, he does not believe these. His view of God is such that he does not love him. Christ to him is "a root out of dry ground" without any comeliness, the law is a scarecrow, the gospel foolishness; he views God as approachable at any time, and so he procrastinates until almighty, all-glorious grace "opens his heart," works in him to will and to do, etc., or till death ends his mortal career.

God is not under obligations to make his creatures *willing* to obey him, for this is universalism at once; it claims salvation as a debt and destroys the very idea of

grace. Now, if he is not thus under obligation to all his creatures, he may act sovereignly in the matter. There were many widows in the prophet's day, but he was sent to but one. There were also many lepers, yet but one was healed.

When our Savior referred to these facts it filled the people with rage. The Savior taught his right to do as he will with his own by the laborers in his vineyard, to each of whom he gave a penny, whether he had labored long or short. We see his sovereignty in everything he has created, from the lowest worm to the tallest angel, from the atom in the sunbeam to the massive planet that rolls with splendor through its orbit, and in his works among the children of men.

Death, like lightning, respects no man's person; some live long, others die soon, some are born rich, others poor. In everything we see sovereignty, and so he will have mercy on whom he will have mercy, and shall mortal man call in question his acts? Shall the guilty criminal turn judge and decide his rights, and call in question the acts of the court? If criminals were allowed this liberty they would have an easy time.

And shall fallen man, who is declared to be the enemy of God, mark out God's rights in his case? We say no. God has a right to do as he will in the case, and he will do all his pleasure and none can stay his hand or justly criticize his action. I feel this moment that he has a sovereign right to dispose of me as he will. I have no claims upon him. I have forfeited all.

If my soul is sent to hell.
His righteous law approves it well.

But I have a humble hope that God for Christ's sake has delivered me from the curse of that law, but all I ever get better than hell is the mere mercy of God.

Thy mercy, my God, is the theme of my song,
The joy of my heart and the boast of my tongue.

Dear reader, may it be your lot and mine to realize God's sovereignty in the salvation of sinners.

Note.---We think the doctrine of the two seeds, as taught by Parker, and also the doctrine of eternal vital union, as held by others, are opposed to the doctrine of election as taught by the Bible, and that they are equally as objectionable as the doctrine of election as taught by Wesley. Each of these views finds the reasons of one's election in himself. Wesley ascribes our election to our *obedience*, which is at war with grace. Parker and others find a difference in the *origin* of men that accounts for the election of some and the reprobation of others, while the Bible puts it upon the *sovereignty* of God. (*J.H. Oliphant, The Principles and Practices of the Regular Baptists 1885*)

Eliakim

ELIAKIM (*See under Jehoahaz*)

England, The Church of

The Church of ENGLAND (*See under The CHURCH of England*)

Ephesians, The Book of

The Book of EPHESIANS: *Sylvester Hassell:* The succeeding epistles of Paul address those whose minds are now cleared, settled and secured. The Apostle ascends to a more calm and lofty stage of thought in his epistles to the Ephesians and **Colossians**, wherein, no longer in collision with human error, he expatiates in view of the eternal purposes of God, and of the ideal perfections of the church in Christ; if inspiration was asserted in the other epistles, here it is felt; yet, in both epistles, this high strain passes by the most natural transition into the plainest counsels; and, in the epistles to the **Philippians** and **Philemon**, the voice is that, not only of a prophet, but of an affectionate brother and friend.

These four epistles were written in captivity, probably during Paul's first imprisonment in Rome. He gloried in being a "prisoner of Christ." He experienced the blessedness of persecution for righteousness sake (Matthew 5:10), and "the peace of God which passeth all understanding," (Philippians 4:7). He was thus divinely enabled to turn the prison into a pulpit, to send comfort and joy to his distant churches, and render a greater service to future ages than he could have done by active labor.

Chained day and night by his right arm to the arm of a Roman soldier, he preached the gospel to his keepers, and many in the praetorian guard and in Caesar's household believed.

The epistle to the **Colossians** is the most Christly of Paul's epistles, the Christology approaching very closely to that of John; and the epistle to the Ephesians is the most *churchy*, as nothing can be further removed from the genius of Paul than that narrow, mechanical and pedantic *churchiness*, which sticks to the shell of outward forms and ceremonies, and mistakes them for the kernel within. The churchliness of the epistle to the Ephesians is rooted and grounded in Christliness, and has no sense whatever if separated from this root.

A *church* without Christ would be, at best, a prayer-saying corpse (and there are such so-called *churches*). Paul emphasizes the person of Christ in **Colossians**, and the person and work of the Holy Spirit in Ephesians. Ephesians is, in some respects, the most profound and difficult, as it is certainly the most spiritual and devout of Paul's epistles. It is the Epistle of the Heavens, an ode to Christ and his spotless bride, the Song of Songs of the New Testament.

Philippi was the first place in Europe where the gospel was preached. Here Paul was severely persecuted and marvelously delivered. Here were his most devoted brethren; for them he felt the strongest personal attachment; from them alone would he receive contributions for his support. The epistle to the **Philippians** is like Paul's midnight hymn of praise in the dungeon of Philippi. Its key-note is thankful joy. He had no doctrinal error, or practical vice to rebuke, as in Galatians and Corinthians." (*Hassell's History* ppg 208, 209)

Epistles, The

The EPISTLES: *Sylvester Hassell:* The epistles are addressed to baptized believers, and aim to strengthen them in their faith, and, by brotherly instruction,

exhortation, rebuke and consolation, to build up the church in all Christian graces on the historical foundation of the teaching and example of Christ. The prophets of the Old Testament delivered Divine oracles to the people with a “Thus saith the Lord;” the Apostles of the New Testament wrote letters to the brethren, who shared with them the same faith and hope as members of Christ—a more open, equal and hearty mode of communication, suited to the gospel day, showing rather companionship than dictation, reasoning out of the Old Testament Scriptures and teaching the brethren how so to reason, giving the individual experience of the writer, yet bearing lofty, authoritative, unwavering, sure testimony to the truth, and sometimes making definite additions to former revelations.

The epistles are the voice of the Spirit within the church to those who are within the church. The essential thought is “Of him are ye in Christ Jesus.” God is represented as the immediate and the still continuous author of our existence in Christ. In the epistles, we know, a Christ promised John 14:20, that he is in his Father, as well as his father is in him, and that we are in him and he is us. Believers are in Christ, and so are partakers in all that he does and has and is—they died in him, rose with him, and live with him; when the eye of God looks on them, they are found in Christ, and there is no condemnation to them; they are righteous in his righteousness, and loved with the love that rests on him, and are sons of God in his Sonship, and heirs with him in his inheritance, and are soon to be glorified with him in his glory; and this relationship was contemplated in eternal counsels, and predestinated before the foundation of the world.

So Christ is in those who believe by his indwelling Spirit, leading them to God and giving them the earnest of their eternal inheritance. Thus, by intertwined relations, the life of the believer is constituted a life in Christ and a life in God. This idea underlies all the epistles, both their doctrine and their exhortation. It is a new world of thought—a new element. All their relations and actions are in Christ.

And, finally, this character of existence is not changed by that which changes all besides—they die in the Lord, and sleep in Jesus, and, when he shall appear, they will appear; when he comes God shall bring them with him, and they shall reign in life by him. Men bid us live in truth and duty, in purity and love—they do well; but the gospel does better, calling and enabling us to live in Christ, and find in him the enjoyment of all that we would possess, and the realization of all that we would become.

The epistles of the New Testament are without parallel in ancient literature, and yield in importance only to the Gospels, which stand higher, as Christ himself rises above the Apostles. They presuppose throughout the Gospel history, and

often allude to the death and resurrection of Christ as the foundation of the church and the Christian hope. They compress more ideas in fewer words than any other writings, human or Divine, excepting the Gospels. They discuss the highest possible themes—God, Christ, the Holy Spirit, sin and redemption, incarnation, regeneration, repentance, faith, and good works, holy living, and dying, the conversion of the world, the general judgment, eternal glory. They are of more real value to the church than all the systems of theology and all the confessions of faith.

The appointed epistolary teachers of the church were Peter and John, the two chief of the original twelve Apostles; James and Jude, the brethren of the Lord; and Paul, the great Apostle of the Gentiles, who wrote five times as much as all the other four together.

The seven epistles of James, First and Second Peter, First, Second and Third John, and Jude, usually follow, in the old manuscripts, the Acts of the Apostles, and precede the Pauline epistles, perhaps as being the works of the older Apostles; they are now placed last, probably because they are supplementary and confirmatory to the more elaborate writings of Paul. The epistle of James was probably written before A.D. 50 (some think as early as A.D. 44), and is thought to be the oldest book in the New Testament; First Peter (probably also Second Peter and Jude) is believed to have been written before A.D. 67; and the epistles of John between A.D. 90 and 100.

Of the epistles of Paul, those to the Thessalonians were written first, A.D. 52 or 53; then Galatians, Corinthians, and Romans between 56 and 58; then the four epistles of the captivity, Colossians, Ephesians, Philemon, and Philippians, between 61 and 63; last, the pastoral epistles, but their date is uncertain, except that the second epistle to Timothy is his farewell letter on the eve of his martyrdom.

The epistle to the Hebrews was probably written about A.D. 63. Its author is unknown; but it has been generally thought that Paul was its author; on account of its uncertain authorship, it was placed after Paul's other epistles. From the fourth to the eighteenth century the Pauline authorship was the prevailing opinion; this was based upon the unanimous tradition of the Eastern church—the mention of Timothy and the reference to a release from captivity ([Hebrews 13:23](#))—and the agreement of the epistle with Paul's system of doctrine, the tone of apostolic authority, and the depth and unction of the epistle.

The non-Pauline authorship is argued on the following grounds: the decided opposition to the Pauline authorship by the Western tradition, both Roman and North African, down to the time of Augustine (about 350 A.D.); the absence of

the customary name and salutation; the phraseology in Hebrews 2:3, seeming to distinguish the author from the Apostles, and very different from the language of Paul in the first chapter of Galatians; the difference from Paul's writings, not in substance, but in the form and method of teaching and argument; the superior purity, correctness and rhetorical finish of style; the difference in the quotations from the Old Testament, the author always following the Septuagint, while Paul often quotes the Hebrew.

As to the real author, five of Paul's fellow-laborers have been proposed, either as sole or as joint authors with Paul—Barnabas, Luke, Clement, Apollos and Silas. The arguments for and the objections against them are equally strong, and we have no data to decide between them. Whoever may have been the writer, the inspiration and leading ideas are those of Paul. (*Hassell's History* ppg 205-207)

Erasmus, Desiderius

Desiderius ERASMUS: *Sylvester Hassell:* One of the most interesting events of the sixteenth century was the controversy between Desiderius Erasmus, of Rotterdam, and Luther, on the Freedom or the Bondage of the Will. Erasmus's book, *Deuteronomy Libero Arbitrio* (Of Free Will), was published Sept., 1524; and Luther's reply, *Deuteronomy Servo Arbitrio* (Of the Bondage of the Will), was published Dec. 1525. Erasmus (born 1466, died 1536) was the finest scholar and critic of his age, the chief of Humanists, the literary precursor and then the cowardly deserter of the Protestant Reformation.

He published, in 1516, the first complete edition of the Greek New Testament, from which Luther and Tyndall made their vernacular versions, which became the most powerful levers of the Reformation in Germany and England.

In his *Praise of Folly* (1510) he heavily satirized the superstitions, follies and vices of the monks and schoolmen; but, when the Beast of Rome showed his teeth, he sarcastically confessed that he was not of the stuff that martyrs are made of, and he said that he was willing to accept any doctrine that the *church* received. He seems to have been an utter stranger to a genuine spiritual experience; and he died at last in bitterness and darkness. His *Defense of Free Will*, which contains the usual arguments of conditionalism, is admitted to be the weakest of his writings, and is really *Pelagian* in its nature; as may be seen from his defining free will to be "a power in the human will, by which a man may apply himself to those things which lead unto eternal salvation, or turn away from the same." "In attacking Luther," says M.D'Aubigny, "Erasmus selected the point where Romanism is lost in Rationalism,—the doctrine of free will, or the natural power of man." "I must acknowledge," said Luther, "that in this

controversy you are the only man that has gone to the root of the matter; for I would rather be occupied with this subject than with all those secondary questions about the pope, purgatory, and indulgences, with which the enemies of the gospel have hitherto pestered me.”

Erasmus’s treatise was so weak that Luther hesitated at first to reply to it. “What! So much eloquence in so bad a cause!” said he; “it is as if a man were to serve up mud and filth in dishes of silver and gold. One can not lay hold of you. You are like an eel that slips through the fingers; or like the fabulous Proteus who changes his form in the very arms of those who wish to grasp him.” Luther’s book is one of the most powerful of his writings, and one of the two (the other being his catechism) that he never regretted. An English translation of it was published by Elder James Osbourn, at Baltimore, in 1837. In the preface of this edition, Elder Osbourn truly remarks: “From the early part of the sixteenth century, the church of Christ has derived manifold blessings from the pious labors of this disting-uished servant of the Lord.”

This work of Luther, and Jonathan Edwards’s “*Careful and Strict Inquiry into the Modern Prevailing Notions of the Freedom of the Will,*” present an array of solid arguments, from Scripture, reason and fact, in proof of the particularity and efficacy of Divine grace, and of the goodness and holiness of God, which no rationalist, either in or out of any religious organization, has ever been able to answer. Upon an unprejudiced man who admits the perfect inspiration of the Scriptures, or who even admits that there is a God, and that he is omniscient and omnipotent, the effect of these arguments is simply overwhelming.

Erasmus, both in his first and his second work (*Hyperaspistes*, published in 1526), “treats the dispute entirely from the outside,” says the Encyclopedia Britannica. The fact is that Arminian writers, as Luther said of Doctor Eck, “*skim over the Scripture almost without touching it, as a spider runs upon water.*” Erasmus’s second book, Luther never thought of sufficient force to call for a reply. (*Hassell’s History ppg 482,483*)

Eternal Children

ETERNAL CHILDREN (See under *TWO SEED doctrine*)

Eternal Vital Union

ETERNAL VITAL UNION (See under *TWO SEED doctrine*)

Eusebius

EUSEBIUS (*See under Constantine*)

Eutyches and Eutychianism

EUTYCHES and **EUTYCHIANISM** (*See under NESTORIUS*)

Evolution

The EVOLUTION Religion: *Harold Hunt*: In recent memory we have seen the introduction of a new religion—the religion of evolution. Evolution is a religion—and worships its own god as surely as any other religion does. The very existence of the universe proves there must, of necessity, be a God somewhere. **Whoever, or whatever has sufficient power to create a universe, and to keep it going, is God.** Either God created nature; or else nature created itself. Either nature is God; or there is a God who created nature. One or the other is God.

The evolution religion

Evolution is clearly a religion; it worships nature. Evolution credits nature with having the same power the Bible attributes to God. It credits nature, and the forces inherent in nature, with having the power to create itself, and in that sense it pays the same homage to nature, that others pay to the God of the Bible.

But then, evolution is not really a new religion; the **notion of evolution was the basis of all the old pagan religions.** Their various myths were allegories of how man evolved—how he came to be what he now is. Paul was talking about this evolutionary principle at the root of all the pagan religions when he said they, “worshiped and served the creature more than the creator” Romans 1:25. They paid homage to the creature—creation—and lost sight of the creator. That exactly describes the evolutionist.

In this short article we will not be able to give anything like a full presentation of what evolution is all about, but perhaps, we can show that evolution is religion—not science. Hopefully, we will show that Bible-believing children of God do not need to be intimidated by the evolutionist’s claims, and we do not need to be fooled by his forged evidence.

Were you there?

Evolutionists make their presentations and arguments with confidence that no one can challenge them, but God gave us the best challenge long ago. In Job's day, God wanted to know, "**How do you know so much about it; were you there?**" God clearly was there, and he provides all the answers we need.

Job 38:1-4, "Then the Lord answered Job out of the whirlwind, and said, Who is this that darkeneth counsel by words without knowledge? Gird up now thy loins like a man; for I will demand of thee, and answer thou me. **Where wast thou when I laid the foundations of the earth?** Declare if thou hast understanding."

The book of Job is one of the most fascinating of all books. It provides information not found anywhere else. Among other things, it provides an abundance of evidence regarding the creation of the universe. It provides enough evidence to put the evolutionist on the run.

The very first expression in this passage reminds me of a comment a denominational preacher made to me several years ago. We had been having a long running conversation about the way God saves his people. He seemed to think he was getting the short end of the conversation, and he said, "Harold, did you ever wish God would just speak from heaven and say, "Okay, everybody, listen up, I am going to tell you the way it is."

I said, "What do you think the Bible is?" That is exactly what God does in the Bible. He says, "Okay, listen up," and then he tells us everything we need to know.

Blowing smoke

"Then the Lord answered Job out of the whirlwind, and said, Who is this that darkeneth counsel by words without knowledge?"

Job's miserable comforters had been giving him all kinds of advice, more advice than he probably wanted. Sometimes they told the truth, and sometimes they didn't. They did not always know what they were talking about. After awhile, God spoke to Job out of the whirlwind, and said, "Who is this that darkeneth counsel by words without knowledge?" Nowadays, we might say they were *blowing smoke*. They were just confusing the issue.

God said they were *darkening counsel* by words without knowledge; they did not know what they were talking about. He said, "Gird up now thy loins like a man; for I will demand of thee, and answer thou me." They had been so quick in giving their opinions. God challenged them to talk to him; he would ask the

questions. He says, "Where wast thou when I laid the foundations of the earth? Declare if thou hast understanding." He wants to know, "Were you there; how do you know so much about it?"

Declining Morals

Our children are being taught in school that they are really the result of a grand accident; they just evolved. It is no coincidence that we are seeing such a moral decline among our people. The morals of Americans are worse every decade than they were the decade before. That is one thing the righteous and the wicked agree on. The righteous and the wicked agree that Americans are steadily becoming more immoral. The difference is that the righteous are grieved over it, and the wicked think it is a good thing. The wicked are glad to see the morals of Americans decline. I have not changed the subject; I will get back to it.

There are any number of causes of the moral decline that is going on in America, but one of the greatest problems is that you cannot tell children all their growing up years they are nothing more than highly evolved animals without expecting that after awhile they are going to start behaving like animals. You can count on it. If you drill it into their heads, that they are simply animals, they will begin to behave like animals.

You cannot, year after year, drill it into people's heads that God is not their creator without their eventually getting the idea it is none of God's business how they behave.

When I was in school, evolution was taught as a theory. Today it is taught as a proven fact. Evolution has not been proven; it cannot be proven. But the establishment is determined to have it taught as a proven fact.

The ACLU and freedom of speech

The ACLU has been one of the leaders in this campaign. They call themselves the American Civil Liberties Union, but they are not interested in anybody's liberties except their own. Just a few weeks ago the ACLU sued the school district in Amite, Louisiana. The school district put a disclaimer in their science books. It said something like this: "We present this material as the scientific theory of evolution. We do not endorse or deny any theory of the origin of matter and energy. We are aware there is more than one theory of the origin of matter. There is the theory of evolution, and the theory of creation, etc. We encourage the student to consider the various theories and make up his own mind."

The ACLU sued the school district to stop them from telling those students they had the right to consider various theories and make up their own minds. As of this time, that suit is still pending.

What about all that evidence?

But somebody is forever asking, “What about all the evidence the evolutionists have produced.” The fact is there are three kinds of evidence of evolution. There is the evidence that has nothing to do with the question. For instance, the fact there were once great dinosaurs has nothing to do with evolution. That just proves that some creatures have become extinct. We already knew that. There is evidence that has been misunderstood; and there is evidence that has simply been falsified.

I want to notice just a few examples of the evidence that has been deliberately falsified. When you believe God is not your creator, it is easy to conclude it is none of his business what you do, or what you tell. It is easy to get the idea it is alright to falsify the facts to prove your argument. If you are not answerable to God for anything you do, there is nobody to call you to account for your conduct. There is nothing to stop you from forging your evidence.

A seminary drop-out

In 1859, an apostate ministerial student by the name of Charles Darwin wrote a book entitled, *The Origin of the Species*. It was that book that gave the greatest impetus to the modern version of evolution. There is nothing new about the idea of evolution. The notion of evolution has been around from before the dawn of recorded history. But Darwin gave the greatest emphasis to the modern form of evolutionism in *The Origin of the Species*. He insisted that all of life evolved from lower life forms, and they had in turn evolved from non-living matter.

But people began to ask him for his evidence. He said the evidence would be found in the fossils. Then they wanted to know, “Where are the fossils?” He did not know.

Falsified evidence

Then in 1912, an English school teacher by the name of Charles Dawson found an old skull in a gravel pit in Piltdown, England. It was the skull of a man, and the jawbone of an ape. They were sure they had found *the missing link* between humans and animals, the missing link between man and ape. It was part human and part ape, or so they insisted. They put it in their textbooks. It came to be

called *Piltdown Man*, because it was found near Piltdown, England. The story stayed in the textbooks for forty years.

I very well remember the week they discovered it was a fraud. I was a junior in high school in 1953. I read it in one of the news magazines, *Time* or *Newsweek*. When it was first *discovered*, it made front page news all over the world. When it was discovered to be a fraud, it was buried in the back pages of newspapers, and news magazines.

Forty one years later, they finally went back and re-examined the skull. They discovered the skull was not really three hundred thousand years old after all. It was closer to a thousand years old. And the jawbone actually was the jawbone of an ape, but instead of being three hundred thousand years old, it was probably brand new when they *discovered* it. They also discovered it had been treated with iron pyrites to make it look old, and it had been sanded down with very fine sandpaper to make it fit the skull.

It took the world's most brilliant scientists forty years to discover it was an out and out forgery. It was a deliberate hoax to prop up a theory that cannot be supported any other way.

Several weeks ago, I waded through a book by an evolution-ary scientist by the name of James Trefil. I like to get both sides of the story. He talked about *the Piltdown Hoax*. He said he had been to England, and the skull is still on display in a glass case in the British Museum in London. (I wonder why they keep it on display almost fifty years after it has been proven to be a hoax.) He admitted, "The fact the teeth had been filed was pretty clear." It took the world's most brilliant scientists forty years to notice those sandpaper marks, which today, after almost fifty years, are still *pretty clear*.

Even though Mr. Trefil admits the whole thing was a farce, he still tries to defend the perpetrators. He thinks Arthur Conan Doyle (the author of the Sherlock Holmes mysteries) probably played a trick on the researchers of that day. It is a fact that Arthur Conan Doyle did live at Piltdown, England, but if he fooled those evolutionists, you can be sure they wanted to be fooled. They had already reached their conclusion; they were looking for evidence to support it, and they would accept any help they could get.

It is strange they waited about introducing that notion until Mister Doyle was long since dead, and could not defend himself.

Just a pig's tooth

Until the late '60's we had a law in Tennessee that made it a crime to teach evolution in the public schools. In 1922, the ACLU was getting ready to challenge that law. They put an advertisement in Tennessee newspapers searching for anybody who was willing to teach evolution in Tennessee schools, and submit to be put on trial. There was a young man by the name of John Scopes, who wrote back and volunteered for the task. They met with him in a drug store in Dayton, Tennessee, and laid their plans. He was brought to trial in 1925, in Dayton Tennessee, in what has become known as *the Monkey Trial*.

About the time they were preparing for the trial at Dayton, Tennessee, there was a man by the name of Harold Cook, who discovered a fossil tooth in Nebraska. He thought the tooth belonged to an *ape man*, a kind of in-between creature, not quite human, but not quite an ape either. With nothing more than that tooth to go by, they were able to reconstruct the entire man. They learned that his lips stuck out, kind of like a chimpanzee. He had heavy brow ridges. He walked all bent over, and his knuckles dragged the ground when he walked. They called him *Hespero-pithecus haroldcookii*. They seem to love those scientific sounding names. Most people called him the *Nebraska man*.

I like the comment Mark Twain made about that time. He said, "There is something fascinating about science. One gets such wholesale returns of conjectures out of such a paltry investment of facts."

For some reason they did not use Mr. Cook's tooth in the trial in 1925, but in 1927 they went back to Snake Creek, Nebraska and dug up the rest of the skeleton. **It was a pig.** Those brilliant scientists couldn't tell the difference between a tooth of an extinct pig, and the tooth of an *ape man*. But the story doesn't stop there. In 1972, a man by the name of Ralph Wenzel discovered the pig wasn't even extinct. He discovered an entire herd of those same pigs in a rain forest in Paraguay in South America. So much for *Hespero-pithecus*.

He hid the human skulls

One more illustration, there was a Dutch medical doctor by the name of Eugene Dubois, who was a disciple of the German evolutionist Ernst Haeckel. He was determined to prove that man evolved from some kind of ape man. He expected he would probably find the fossils in the South Pacific. So in 1891, he joined the Dutch army, as an army surgeon, and had himself assigned to Java, where he could dig and hunt for the fossils of this ape man. He hadn't been there long until he found what he was looking for. He found the skull and thigh bone of what he said was an ape man. He called it *Pithecanthropus erectus*. It got in all the textbooks, and stayed there for thirty years.

Thirty years later, when his hoax was about to be exposed, he called people in and admitted he had known all along it was really a gibbon, an ordinary ape. I am sure he did not want to tell it; it proved that his entire career as an evolutionist scientist had been a fraud. But I am told that he was about to die, and he didn't want to go out into eternity with that lie on his record. He went on to tell that he had also found two human skulls in the same location as the ape skull. It is obvious that man could not have evolved from those apes, if humans lived at the same time, and in the same place, as the apes. He admitted he had kept those skulls hid for thirty years.

You could make a career of studying the out and out forgeries that lie at the very heart of the notion of evolution, but perhaps, those three instances will give some idea of the kind of evidence the theory is based on.

There are only three kinds of evidence for evolution: the kind that has nothing to do with evolution, the kind that has been misunderstood, and the kind that has been forged. Christians do not have to take any abuse from the evolutionists. I cannot understand how, otherwise intelligent, people can believe any such notion.

The oldest book

But back to the book of Job. The book of Job contains internal evidence it is the oldest book in the Bible. I believe it contains evidence, that it was written during what paleontologists call the *ice age*.

Also there is also an abundance of evidence the book was written during the time when dinosaurs still roamed the earth. **It provides us with Job's eyewitness report on the nature and behavior of dinosaurs.**

When you tell somebody you do not believe in evolution, he almost always brings up the subject of dinosaurs. He wants to know, "Don't you believe in dinosaurs?" But what do dinosaurs have to do with evolution? Dinosaur fossils have been discovered all over the earth, and there can be no question that those huge creatures once roamed the earth, but what does that have to do with evolution? Somehow people have the idea that, because they have found the fossils of dinosaurs, they have confirmed evolution; but the fact dinosaurs once existed has nothing to do with evolution.

Dinosaur fossils have been found all over the earth. People have been finding them for hundreds of years, but they started digging them up in earnest a little less than two hundred years ago. But the existence, or non-existence, of dinosaurs has nothing to do with the question of evolution.

No need to be intimidated

Evolutionists examine the fossils of dinosaurs, and other extinct creatures, and they draw some of the most elaborate conclusions. Then they try to intimidate Christians with their theories about what (they pretend) those fossils prove. But let me tell you that Christians do not have to take any abuse from those people. They remind me of something Jerry Clowers used to say. He liked to talk about those people who are “educated beyond their intelligence.” It is hard for me to understand how, otherwise intelligent, people can believe some of the yarns evolutionists spin about fossils and how they came about.

My automobile did not evolve; somebody built it. If there had not been somebody to build it, it never would have existed. And you and I did not evolve; we have a Maker, and if we had not had a Maker, we would not have existed.

We do not have to be intimidated by the pretended learning of evolutionists. They dig up a pile of old bones and guess what they mean. Really, they dig up a bunch of old bones and fantasize.

Our man on location

But we do not have to guess. We had one of our men on location. He was there when dinosaurs were still walking around, terrifying people. And he wrote it up. We still have his report. We have his word for word description of two different kinds of dinosaurs. He tells us what those two kinds of dinosaurs were called in his day. He tells us what they looked like, and how they behaved.

We have had his report for over four thousand years, and for all that time the opposition has been hammering away at his testimony, and they cannot disprove it. It is a principle in any trial, that if you cannot dispute the evidence, you impugn the witness; you show that the witness is not credible; he cannot be believed. We have had his testimony for four thousand years; and the opposition cannot do anything with it.

Evolutionists fantasize about long ago ages, when (they tell us) lower life forms were evolving upward. They talk about a long ago time when dinosaurs and other strange creatures roamed the earth. But God has assisted his people by providing us with an eyewitness account, written during that very time. Bear in mind that the dinosaurs did not live some sixty-five million years ago, as the evolutionists would have us to believe, but rather a few thousand years ago. It was during that time this book was written, and it gives us a God-inspired, and God-preserved, record of what it was like.

During the ice age

It seems that Job lived during what paleontologists refer to as *the ice age*. That is another of the things evolutionists throw at us, when we tell them we do not believe in evolution. They want to know if we do not believe there was an ice age. They tell us there is geological evidence of an ice age, and they assume that if we do not believe in evolution, we must also deny there was ever an ice age. Of course, there was an ice age. There is no evidence there was more than one ice age; but there is an abundance of evidence for one. There is evidence in the huge boulders deposited by the glaciers of that age, and the scars they made in the rocks. There clearly was an ice age, and that is probably when Job lived.

Did you ever notice Job has more references to ice, and snow, and frost, and cold, than any other book in the Bible? People talk about whatever is on their mind. These people talked a lot about cold weather. I believe these people were cold. Is that proof it was written during the ice age? No, that is not enough proof.

But, in Job 38:29, listen to what Job says. “Out of whose womb came the ice?” There is only one conceivable ice formation that could be described by that expression, and that is the slow moving ice of a glacier.

Is that sufficient to prove that Job lived during the ice age? No, but there is more. Listen to the next verse, “The waters are hid as with a stone.” When are the waters hid as with a stone? When they are frozen solid.

That still is not enough, but listen to the next expression, “And the face of the deep is frozen.” *The deep* is a poetic expression referring to the ocean. We still sometimes refer to the ocean as *the deep*. Job said, the surface of *the deep* (the ocean) is frozen. In Job’s day the surface of the ocean was frozen.

Cave Men

Also, Job lived during a time when some people lived in caves, and we might properly call them *cave men*. There never has been any such thing as an *ape man*, half ape and half man, but from time there have been *cave men*, people, who, for whatever the reason, lived in caves. Some of them were Job’s neighbors.

They were just as human as you and I are. But they behaved like animals, and the people treated them like animals. Job had such a low opinion of them, that he said, he wouldn’t even let their fathers take care of his dogs [Job 30:1](#). They were too sorry to put out a crop, they dug up roots and chewed on them rather

than raise anything. You could hear them off out in the bushes braying like animals. If they came around civilized people, they treated them like animals and ran them off. If they don't like what you said, and if they were close enough, they might spit in your face. They were a very uncouth sort of people.

In chapter 30, Job (Job 30) says, "But now they that are younger than I have me in derision, whose fathers I would have disdained to have set with the dogs of my flock." He said he wouldn't even let their fathers take care of his dogs." Job 30:4, "Who cut up mallows by the bushes, and juniper roots for their meat." They would not put out a crop; they had rather dig up roots, and chew on them. Job 30:5, "They were driven forth from among men, (they cried after them as after a thief)." When they came around civilized people, they ran them off like a thief. He goes on, "to dwell in the cliffs of the valleys, in caves of the earth." People have found their drawings in caves. Job 30:7, "Among the bushes they brayed." You could hear them off in the bushes, making all sorts of strange noises. "Under the nettles they were gathered together. They were children of fools, yea, children of base men, they were viler than the earth. And now am I their song, yea, I am their byword. They abhor me, they flee far from me, and spare not to spit in my face." They were just a human as anybody else, but they acted like animals until people treated them like animals.

Before Moses' day

In the book of Job, God provides a written record of a long running conversation between Job and his friends. These were fairly well informed people. They had a lot of things wrong, but it is obvious they were thinking people. And the book of Job allows us to know what people believed, what they thought, and what they knew, four thousand years ago.

The book of Job was probably written somewhere between the time of Abraham and the time of Moses. The reason I am convinced it was written prior to Moses' day is that, first off, these were widely read men. They spent most of their time discussing moral, ethical, and religious questions, and they never once quoted Moses. As well informed as these men were, if the law of Moses had been around, these men would have quoted it; they didn't. They lived and died before Moses' day.

I believe it was written after Abraham's day. Notice that Job lived in the land of Uz. In the years after the flood the descendants of Noah spread out into the vast empty places of the earth. They and their descendants repopulated their respective areas. The various regions came to be called by the name of the man who was the ancestor of most of the people who lived in that area. We are told, "They call their lands after their own name, [Psalms 49:11](#)"

Job lived in the land of Uz; it was the area settled by Uz. If you want to look it up, you will discover that Uz was Abraham's nephew Genesis 22:20-21. There is another character in the book of Job named Elihu. "Then was kindled the wrath of Elihu the son of Barachel the Buzite," Job 32:2. Notice that Elihu was a Buzite. He was descended from Buz. Buz and Uz (or Huz) were brothers. So Elihu and Job were descended from Uz and Buz, Abraham's nephews. That seems to indicate the book was written sometime after Abraham's day.

Also, you will remember that after the flood, the life spans dropped almost steadily every generation. Before the flood, it was common for people to live to be almost a thousand years old. Most of the people listed in Genesis chapter eleven died somewhat younger than their fathers did. Noah lived 950 years, but his son Shem only lived to be 600 (Genesis 11:10-11) Moses lived to be 120; his father Amram, lived to be 137; his grandfather Kohath lived to be 133; Levi lived to be 137; Jacob lived to be 147. Their life expectancy declined steadily. Job lived to be 140, about as long as Jacob did. If that is an indicator, and I believe it is, then Job lived along about the time of Jacob.

When dinosaurs still roamed the earth

But to get back to our original premise, Job lived when dinosaurs still roamed the earth. In spite of all the protests to the contrary, dinosaurs were still around four thousand years ago. Job talked about them.

Somebody might say, "Now, Harold Hunt, I have read my Bible through five times, or, maybe, ten times, and the word *dinosaur* is not in the Bible." That is right; it is not. I will tell you why it is not. First off, our King James Version of the Bible was translated in 1611. The word *dinosaur* did not come into existence until the year 1841.

There was an English scientist by the name of Richard Owen, who was the world's foremost expert on comparative anatomy. In 1841, in a scientific paper Owen was delivering before the Royal Academy of Science in London, England, he talked about dinosaur fossils, and he was the first to call them *dinosaurs*. He coined the word. He got the word from the Greek word *deinos* (terrible) and *sauros* (lizard)—terrible lizard. They have been called dinosaurs ever since.

They called them dragons

What were they called before that day? They were sometimes called *dragons*. In the Bible they are sometimes called *leviathan* or *behemoth*.

Evolutionists claim dragons are a myth; they never existed. But they dig up their fossils, put them together, and call them dinosaurs. Have you ever looked at pictures of dragons. Don't they look like skinny dinosaurs? Sure they do.

If there never were any such thing as dragons, why is it that, all over the earth, there have been ancient cultures who have believed there were? People have been digging up dinosaur fossils for hundreds of years, but, until Richard Owen renamed them, they were usually called dragons.

One kind of dinosaur

In Job 40, Job talks about one kind of dinosaur; he calls it *behemoth*. "Behold now behemoth, which I made with thee; he eateth grass as an ox. Lo now, his strength is in his loins, and his force is in the navel of his belly. He moveth his tail like a cedar." Job 40:15-17.

The Bible is inspired of God. There are no mistakes in the Bible; you can depend on every word. But God did not inspire the center column references. Publishers included them for our convenience. Sometimes they are right, and sometimes they are wrong; but they are never inspired. The center column reference in my Bible says behemoth was an elephant. But the text says behemoth "moveth his tail like a cedar." An elephant does not have a tail like a cedar tree; an elephant's tail is more like a rope.

I never saw a dinosaur, but I have seen their fossils. You may have been to the Smithsonian Institute in Washington D.C. and walked around that huge dinosaur skeleton. It does have a tail like a cedar tree. Behemoth was one kind of dinosaur that lived in Job's neighborhood.

Job goes on to say, "His bones are as strong pieces of brass; his bones are like bars of iron," Job 40:18. And in Job 40:23, "Behold he drinketh up a river, and hasteth not; he trusteth that he can draw up Jordan into his mouth." So much for behemoth.

A lot like Tyrannosaurus Rex

In the next chapter (Job 41) he talks about *leviathan*. "Canst thou draw out leviathan with a hook? Or his tongue with a cord which thou lettest down?" The center column in my Bible says that is a whale. But Job throws out the challenge; "Can you draw out leviathan (a whale?) with a hook? "Canst thou put a hook into his nose? Or bore his jaw through with a thorn?" (Job 41:2). Job 41:7, "Canst thou fill his skin with barbed irons? Or his head with fish spears?"

Why, sure you can do that to a whale. That is the way they were harvested, before the environmentalists put a stop to it. They would go after them with harpoons with a barb (a *hook*) on the end.

He says, “Lay thine hand upon him, remember the battle, do no more. Behold the hope of him is in vain; shall not one be cast down even at the sight of him? None is so fierce that dare stir him up,” Job 41:8-10. People are not so afraid as that of whales. But if I came up on a Tyrannosaurus Rex, I would do exactly what Job said, wouldn’t you. I would give him plenty of room. When Job came across leviathan that is exactly what he did. He did not dare to *stir him up*.

In Job 41:14, “Who can open the doors of his face? His teeth are terrible round about.” Whales don’t have that kind of teeth. But paleontologists have been digging up dinosaur teeth, and that does describe their teeth. Job said, “His scales are his pride.” Does a whale have scales? No, but this creature did. “His scales are his pride, shut up together as with a close seal. One is so near to another, that no air can come between them. They are joined one to another, they stick together, that they cannot be sundered. By his neesings a light doth shine, and his eyes are like the eyelids of the morning. Out of his mouth go burning lamps, and sparks of fire leap out. Out of his nostrils goeth smoke, as out of a seething pot or caldron. His breath kindleth coals, and a flame goeth out of his mouth.” Job 41:15-21.

If you mention that to an evolutionist, he will just smile and tell you that dinosaurs couldn’t breathe fire. But we know very little about what dinosaurs could do. About the only thing we really know is the shape of their bones.

All those dragon myths

We do know that during the 15th and 16th centuries, when the European explorers began their great voyages of discovery, no matter where they went, they found ancient cultures, who had legends of fire breathing dragons. If there never was any such thing, how is it those primitive cultures—who had no contact with each other—all believed there was a time when there used to be fire breathing dragons? Where did the idea come from?

The bombardier beetle

In San Diego, California, there is an organization of scientists called the Institute for Creation Research. They have published several articles about a beetle called the *bombardier beetle*. This little insect has two tiny chambers in his abdomen. One of them is filled with hydrogen peroxide, and the other is filled

with enzymes, and something called quinones. Those tiny little chambers have plumbing that runs down to a mixing chamber. When a predator gets after the bombardier beetle, he swings his little behind around in the direction of the predator; he empties those two chambers into the mixing chamber, and in an instant the quinones and hydrogen peroxide turn into hydroquinones at 212 degrees Fahrenheit . He sprays it in the face of whatever is after him, and that takes care of his adversary.

We don't know all the dinosaurs could do, but we do know there have been dinosaurs discovered with exactly the same plumbing in their heads the bombardier beetle has in his abdomen. We don't know for sure what those chambers were for, but it looks mighty suspicious to me. We also know there are some substances that burn if they are simply brought together. There are other substances that burst into flames if they are exposed to air. There is no reason to doubt there were some dinosaurs that could breathe fire.

Bear in mind that we are not looking at bones and guessing, and we are not falsifying an unprovable theory. We had our man on the scene. We have his eyewitness report. The opposition has been hammering away at it for four thousand years and they cannot disprove it. "Yea, let God be true."

The majesty of the Book

Anybody can guess, but to those who take him at his word, God provides the authoritative answer. We are told, "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth," Genesis 1:1. An old philosopher made the observation that that verse, the very first verse in the Bible, *approaches the sublime*. The philosopher got it almost right. That verse does not approach the sublime; it is sublime.

I sit and read this book, and I tremble at the majesty of it. I stand amazed at the majesty of the language of this book, the majesty of its expressions, its symbols, its metaphors.

"Hear, O heavens, and give ear, O earth; for the Lord hath spoken," Isaiah 1:2. What other book would dare use such language? It would be ludicrous in any other book, than this one book written by God himself.

"In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth." I suppose I preach on that text as often as I do any text in the Bible. And I expect I will preach on it more often in the future, than I ever have in the past.

It doesn't bother me near as much as it used to, that I preach on some texts over and over. For one thing, I learned long ago that I am not bright enough to come up with a new text, and a new subject, every time I go into the pulpit.

For another, I believe there are some subjects, and some passages, that need to be preached on over and over. This verse is one of them.

For a long time now, we have been told that we are all an accident. We just somehow evolved. Millions of years ago, our ancestors started out as a little, tiny something on the order of an amoeba. Then, they evolved into something more like a salamander. Before long, they crawled out on dry land and turned into monkeys. Finally, our distant ancestors became what we are now. Just look how far we have come, and can you imagine what we are going to be in ages to come?

The dark side of evolution

It seems that I remember somebody else preaching that same doctrine long before Charles Darwin ever saw the light of day. That ancient evolutionist promised his students, "Ye shall be as gods," Genesis 3:5. When Charles Darwin published his *Origin of the Species* in 1859, he just gave a little more information on how we were supposed to go about becoming *gods*..

Just as a side note, you might be interested to know that the original title of that book was *The ORIGIN OF THE SPECIES and the Preservation of the Favored Races in the Struggle for Life*. Darwin, Nietzsche, and those other early evolutionists believed the lighter races were so much more highly evolved than the darker races, and the darker races so poorly evolved that the darker races were still closer to animals than they were to humans. Darwin and his friends went on to teach that the darker races were so different to full humans, that the darker races ought not be allowed to reproduce. Later, they taught that the darker races ought not be allowed to survive. They ought to be exterminated to make room for the *superior races*.

Adolph Hitler was an ardent admirer of Friedrich Nietzsche and Charles Darwin. That aspect of the evolution doctrine became virtually the state religion of Germany during the 1930's and early '40's. Ideas do have consequences. Nazism is what evolution becomes when it is made into state policy.

Life did not evolve from any lower form of life, but you can be sure the doctrine of evolution has evolved. That aspect of the doctrine has had to be laid aside. Darwin is virtually worshiped as the Messiah of evolution, but nobody would dare teach Darwin's form of evolution in the schools of today. That doctrine has

evolved, but it has not disappeared, by any means. It has simply adapted itself to the times.

One grand accident

We are told we are part of a grand accident. We evolved. We might have evolved into horses, or birds, or roach bugs. As it happened, we evolved into human beings.

In school, our little ones are taught that doctrine over and over, and it is drilled into our own minds on such a daily basis, that it, sometimes, becomes a part of our own thinking, without our realizing it. It creeps into our language almost undetected. If we are not mighty careful we will find ourselves using expressions such as, “Man is *the only animal that.....*” That is pure evolution, and yet it is a rare person who has never used the expression—usually without realizing what he has said. That doctrine is like water dripping on a rock; it has its effect even on those who are the most sound in the faith.

In its very first verse, the Bible comes directly to the point. It sweeps that doctrine aside. Where did this universe come from? God created it. “In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth.” Genesis 1:1

In the first chapter (Genesis 1), God refutes the doctrine, and in the third chapter (Genesis 3), he tells us where the doctrine of evolution came from, and who its first advocate was.

In the beginning God

Sometimes I like to preach on just the first four words of that verse: “In the beginning God.” I am not really fond of the word *theology*. That sounds too much like biology, and zoology, and paleontology. It makes it sound as if Bible truth is simply another of man’s *...ologies*. I prefer the simple expression *Bible truth*. No doubt, that is just another of my prejudices. We all have our prejudices, and that is one of mine.

But if you don’t mind the word, I will tell you there is an entire system of *theology* in those four words —*in the beginning God*.

When you come to think about it, that sums up our entire system of doctrine doesn’t it? God gave the entire system in just four words. I wrestle with a subject for an hour, and, sometimes, never get much of anything said.

God says it all in four words. The rest of the Bible is commentary. The rest of the Bible explains those four words—in *the beginning God*.

In the beginning of what? In the beginning of everything that had a beginning. Not everything had a beginning. God did not have a beginning. Rather, he is the beginning. He always has been. He always will be. He is the eternal one. Everything is *one eternal now* with him. In the beginning of the natural creation there was God.

In the beginning of the spiritual creation, there is God. All the time I was growing up, I was told, “God wants to save you; he is trying to save you; he is doing the best he can to save everybody. He would save a lot more if he could just get better financed, if he could get better organized, if he could get more assistance. If we would just pitch in and help him, he would save more people than he ever has.”

The first step

And then there was always that old challenge, “God wants to save you, but you will have to take the first step.” I am sure you have heard that one. God knew somebody would come along with that notion long before anybody ever thought of it, and he nipped that doctrine in the bud before it got started.

Does man have to take the first step? No, no, no, a thousand times, no. The very first verse in the Bible tells us it is, “In the beginning God.” That *first step* notion was the first false doctrine God dealt with.

So far as our home in eternal heaven is concerned, he takes the first step, the last step, and all the steps in between.

In the prophecy of Isaiah, he tells us, “I have trodden the winepress alone, and of the people there was none with me,” Isaiah 63:3. I have no idea how many steps it takes to tread a winepress, but no matter how many steps that is, he took them all—there was nobody with him.

He is the alpha and the omega, the first and the last, the beginning and the end. I don't know what somebody else may think, but to me that sounds like he is all of it.

He stood on nothing

I like an expression I borrowed from a godly, old black preacher out in Texas. The good brother tells it right most of the time. Some of you have heard his

tapes; we have passed them around often enough. He said, “God stood on nothing, because there was nothing to stand on. He reached out into nowhere, because there was nowhere to reach. And he laid his hand on nothing, because there was nothing to lay his hand on. And he took nothing, and out of that nothing he made everything there is.” I get very nearly on shouting ground every time I hear that old brother come over that.

If evolutionists can look at the majesty of this universe, and believe it’s just an accident, I am not going to say they are a bunch of idiots, but they must think we are, if they think God’s prayerful, obedient children are going to swallow that doctrine.

The atheist’s syndrome

There are probably more people, nowadays, claiming to be atheists than there ever have been in the history of the world. I am not sure whether there are any real atheists. There is an old saying, “There are no atheists in foxholes.” Even an atheist prays, when he is in immediate danger. He may insist he is an atheist five minutes before, and five minutes after; but when he is facing immediate danger, it is very likely he will pray.

Somebody wrote a book recently entitled *The Atheist’s Syndrome*. At least, to the best of my memory, that was the title. I did not read the entire book, but I did read enough to get the gist of it. The contention of the book was that there is a clear connection between atheism and insanity. He argued that no truly sane person can be an atheist—other than on a superficial level. He argued that any truly sane person who thinks he is an atheist believes that way, only because he has never taken the time to think it through.

I think he was probably right. I don’t see how any sane person could ever look at this universe and imagine it is all an accident.

If by *atheist*, you mean somebody who believes there is no god of any kind anywhere in the world, by definition, there are not, and cannot be, any true atheists.

There are simply people who believe in a different kind of god than you and I do. The universe itself prevents any sane person from being an atheist. This universe is very nearly infinite, very nearly boundless. It is not infinite; only God is infinite, but the universe is very nearly so. It reflects infinite wisdom in the design and construction of it. It reflects infinite power in the construction and preservation of it.

Pantheism

You can be sure that whatever has infinite wisdom, whatever has infinite power, whatever is eternal, is God. If the universe created itself, and that is what the evolutionists want us to believe, then the universe must have infinite wisdom and power. And if that is true, the universe must be God. That doctrine is called *pantheism*. That is the generic name for the old pagan religion called *Gaia*. That was the doctrine Paul was talking about, when he referred to those who “worshiped and served the creature more than the Creator,” Romans 1:25. They could not tell the difference between the Creator and his creation. But that doctrine is not true; God is the one and only Creator.

The universe came about somehow. Either God created it, or somebody else created it, or it is eternal—it created itself. Those are the only three options available. The evolutionist believes the universe was produced by the properties, and energies, and forces, inherent in the universe.

That is, they believe the universe produced itself. Bear in mind that whoever, or whatever, produced the universe, of necessity, had to have infinite power and wisdom. If the universe was produced by the properties, energies, and forces inherent in the universe, those properties, energies, and forces must, of necessity, have infinite power and wisdom.

The creative power of rocks and dirt

So the evolutionist attributes the universe, the very earth under our feet, with having virtually infinite power, and wisdom. Bear in mind that the earth is made up of a little water, but mostly rock and dirt. And it is this earth the evolutionist would have us believe evolved itself into all we see around us today. They believe the earth, and all the rest of the universe, for that matter, created itself.

Now we are getting to the real difference between the Bible-believing child of God and the evolutionist. The Bible-believing child of God believes in the almighty, creative power of God. The evolutionist believes in the almighty creative power of rocks and dirt. And they have the audacity to call us fanatics.

The ecology

We hear a lot about the ecology, nowadays. Environmentalists have ever so much to say about how the ecology is so perfectly in balance, how every aspect of the ecology has its own particular place, its own little niche to fill. They tell us if we get the ecology out of balance—if something is removed from its place—it just messes up the entire scheme of things.

I wonder who they think put the ecology in such balance in the first place? Who put our own bodies in such balance, that if some little part of it gets out of balance we are in so much trouble?

I had a friend several years ago, who died because the copper in his system got out of balance. I never hear much about copper in our system. I hear a lot about iron deficiency, and other kinds of deficiencies, but I rarely hear about copper deficiency. But somehow or other, the very tiny amount of copper in his system got out of balance, and it killed him.

God put these bodies of ours in balance when he created Adam. But the evolutionist would have us believe it is just an accident that every trace element in our system happens to be perfectly balanced with every other trace element.

The blindness of the human heart

God has given us all kinds of evidence of what he has done. The very complexity of the universe is its own evidence.

One of the grandest proofs of the depravity and blindness of the human heart is the fact that scientific men are no more religious than most of them are. Scientists ought to be the most religious people walking this planet.

Studying the wonders of the universe as they do, why do more of them not believe in the power and the majesty of God? Why is that? It is because of the blindness of the human heart.

Note: Over the years most of the world's greatest scientists were firmly committed to the fact that God created the universe. A list of those scientists is like a who's who in the history of modern science. But the last three or four generations have seen the notion of evolution capturing most of the scientific community. We are seeing some reversal in that trend. In recent years more and more of the ablest scientists have become outspoken in defense of creationism. Perhaps, the leading organization of creationist scientists is a group called Answers in Genesis, headed up by Ken Hamm. They have assembled a wide range of literature dealing with creation and evolution. The material ranges from the very simplest children's picture and coloring books to very technical monographs written primarily for the scientific community. Regardless of your level of expertise, they can provide you with more than enough information. They can be reached at Answers in Genesis, P. O. Box 6330, Florence KY 41022, or 1-800-350-3232, or www.AnswersinGenesis.org. hlh

Faith

FAITH: as opposed to rational assent: John Newton: You wish me to explain the distinction between faith and rational assent; and though I know no two things in the world more clearly distinct in themselves, or more expressly distinguished in Scripture, yet I fear I may not easily make it appear to you. You allow faith, in your sense, to be the gift of God; but in my sense, it is likewise wrought by the operation of God Colossians 2:12—that same energy of the power of his strength by which the dead body of Jesus was raised from the dead.

Can these strong expressions intend no more than a rational assent, such as we give to a proposition in Euclid? I believe fallen reason, is, of itself, utterly incapable even of assenting to the great truths of revelation; it may assent to the terms in which they are proposed, but it must put its own interpretations upon them, or it would despise them. The natural man can neither receive nor discern the things of God; and if any would be wise, the apostle's first advice to him is, Let him become a fool, that he may be wise; for the wisdom of the world is foolishness with God.

Indeed, when the heart is changed, and the mind enlightened, then reason is sanctified, renounces its curious disquisitions, and is content humbly to tread in the path of revelation. **This is one difference; assent may be the act of our natural reason; faith is the effect of immediate almighty power.**

Another difference is, faith is always efficacious, it “worketh by love;” whereas assent is often given where it has little or no influence on the conduct.

Thus, for instance, every one will assent to this truth, All men are mortal; yet the greater part of mankind, though they readily assent to the proposition—and it would be highly irrational to do otherwise—live as they might be supposed to do if the reverse were true. But they who have divine faith, feel, as well as say, they are pilgrims and sojourners upon earth.

Again, faith gives peace of conscience, access to God, and a sure evidence and substance of things not seen Romans 5:1-2; Hebrews 11:1; whereas a calm, dispassionate reasoner may be compelled to assent to the external arguments in favor of Christianity, and yet remain a total stranger to that communion with, that Spirit of adoption, that foretaste of glory, which is the privilege of believers.

So likewise, faith overcomes the world, which rational assent will not do. Witness the lives and tempers of thousands, who yet would be affronted if their

assent to the gospel should be questioned. To sum up all in a word, “He that believes shall be saved.”

But surely many who give a rational assent to the gospel, live and die in those sins which exclude them from the kingdom of God; as saith the apostle, “Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these; adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulation, wrath, strife, sedition, 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.”

Faith is the effect of a principle of new life implanted in the soul, that was before dead in trespasses and sins; and it qualifies not only for obeying the Savior’s precepts, but chiefly and primarily for receiving from and rejoicing in his fulness, admiring his love, his work, his person, his glory, his advocacy. It makes Christ precious, enthrones him in the heart, presents him as the most delightful object to our meditations; as our wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and strength; our root, head, life, shepherd, and husband. These are all scriptural expressions and images, setting forth, so far as words can declare, what Jesus is in himself, and to his believing people.

But how cold is the comment which rational assent puts upon very many passages, wherein the apostle Paul endeavors (but in vain) to express the fulness of his heart upon this subject.

FAITH: J.H. Oliphant: We do not regard faith as a *condition* of salvation, from the fact that **it is a gift or a grace that God bestows upon us.** While we believe that all men are in duty bound to believe in the being of a God, and to believe what God has said in his Word; yet, we believe that it is the result of God’s grace that we look to Jesus for life; that we believe in him as an all-sufficient Savior, and receive him as our righteousness.

Faith is a gift from God

We read in Hebrews 12:2, “Looking unto Jesus the author and finisher of our faith.” In this text he is declared to be the author and finisher of our faith; hence those who have this faith “are his workmanship,” Ephesians 2:10. **The faith, therefore, of God’s people is a gift, or the result of divine power.** It is called “the faith of the operation of God,” Colossians 2:12; that is, it is the result of God’s *operation*. In Ephesians 2:7, it is distinctly called “the gift of God.” Again, “The fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance,” Galatians 5:22-23. Here faith is declared to be “the fruit of the Spirit.” In this text, as faith is the fruit of the

Spirit, so is love. “Love is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost,” Romans 5:5. “We love him, because he first loved us,” I John 4:19. So love in us is not of human, but of divine origin. It is not the result of our efforts, but a gift; whatever goodness we have is from the Lord. So our faith is “the fruit of the Spirit.”

The Spirit produces faith

It is not faith that produces the Spirit in us, but the Spirit that produces faith. The Bible teaches us that God deals to us faith by measure. Romans 12:3, “According as God hath dealt to every man the measure of faith.” If faith is measured to us by God it can not be produced in us by teaching. “Without faith it is impossible to please God,” Hebrews 11:6. “They that are in the flesh can not please God,” Romans 8:8. A man without faith can not please God, and if it be said that a man must do something to get faith,” we reply, let him do what he will he can not please God.

If any man ever did please God, it was after he had faith, for it is impossible without it. In Acts 3:16, we read, “And his name through faith in his name hath man strong; * * yea, the faith which is by him hath given him this perfect soundness in the presence of you all.” Here faith is declared to be “by him,” as well as in his name, and I argue that it is by him in the sense that Jesus is its “author and finisher.” In Matthew 11:25, the things of God are said to be hid from some and revealed to others, and the reason assigned is “because it seemed good in his sight.”

Faith comes as a direct revelation

This passage fairly interpreted proves that a saving knowledge of God is produced by a *direct revelation* from God. John 17:3, “And this is life eternal, that they might know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent.” **So that to teach one to know God is no less a task than to give eternal life to him, but eternal life is God’s gift,** Romans 6:23. Therefore to know God is God’s precious gift, and he who presumes to teach the people to know God presumes to do that which God alone can do, and which he forbids him to do, Hebrews 8:13. “Neither knoweth any man the Father, save the son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him,” Matthew 11:27.

The Savior emphatically told the disciples that it was given unto them to know the mysteries of the kingdom, but to others it was not given, Matthew 13:11. So, under his teaching, those who understood his doctrine were enabled to understand it by a divine power, and hence Paul tells the Corinthians, “That your faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God,” I

Corinthians 2:5. Doubtless Paul understood that God's power was engaged to sustain and hold up their faith. If we are asked how men believe in him, we will let Paul answer, Philippians 1:29, "For unto you it is given in the behalf of Christ, not only to believe on him, but also to suffer for his sake."

Faith is more than the product of teaching

How terribly mistaken are they who hold faith to be nothing more than the mere product of teaching. II Thessalonians 1:11, "Wherefore also we pray always for you, that our God would fulfill the work of faith with power." Can one make such a prayer who believes faith to be the result of teaching? Paul prays God to fulfill the work of faith in his brethren with power. He knew that God's power could fulfill their faith and complete it. Paul declares that "the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God," Galatians 2:20. His faith was of the Son of God, and if of him, it was not of any one or anything else.

The doctrine of direct revelation is taught in Ephesians 1:18-20, "The eyes of your understanding being enlightened; that you may know what is the hope of his calling." Here the apostle thanks God that their understanding is prepared to know this hope, showing that Paul understood God to have prepared their hearts to know these things. "And what is the exceeding greatness of his power to us-ward that believe, according to the working of his mighty power."

Undoubtedly this teaches that it is the "mighty power of God" that makes men believe or gives them faith. Not only does their faith stand in God's power, upheld and sustained by it, but the "*mighty power of God* first makes men believe, **even** "the mighty power" of God "which he wrought in Christ, when he raised him up from the dead."

It was no mere teaching that raised Jesus from the dead, but an almighty influence from heaven. And the very Spirit that raised up Jesus dwells in his people, Romans 8:11. It was the Spirit that opened Lydia's heart and prepared her to know and do the things taught by the apostles, and that had taught Cornelius, a poor gentile, to know and love God before Peter visited him. The faith of God's people overcometh the world, * and the just shall live by faith; * by it men are justified. * and comforted * and have access with confidence into God's grace, * and we live by faith of God's Son; * and we are children of God by faith, * and the end of our faith is the salvation of our souls. * It was faith that caused Moses to see such glories in God's people that he preferred their suffering to Egypt's glory, * and by faith he forsook Egypt, not fearing the king, for he endured as seeing him who is invisible.

Faith originates in God

The wonderful deeds faith prompted God's people to do, anciently, tells clearly that their faith originated in God. The benefits derived, the effect it has in us and upon our lives, changing our rough, evil life into the lamb-like tempers of God's people; all these things, seriously considered, is no mean argument showing that God is *the direct author of our faith*.

“The express image of his person”

I desire to continue this subject in a plain, simple way, to show that faith is not a mere conviction, or the result of teaching by men. Hebrews 11:1, “**Now faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen,**” etc. The word rendered *substance* in the text is the same that is rendered *person* in Hebrews 1:3, in which Christ is called the “express image of his person.” Evidently the word *person* here and the word *substance* in the text means more than a mere *influence* or *belief*. It is certainly God referred to, **so the word substance is not a mere influence, but it is no less than Christ.**

The Greek word rendered *substance* in our text is *Hupostasis*, signifying “anything set under as a support.” What is it that supports the people of God? Is it a simple belief? No, it is Jesus. He is the chief corner stone that bears up all our hope. “Metaphorically it is the ground-work of a thing, the foundation or ground of our hope or confidence,” also *subsistence*. The definitions given this word forbid the idea that this faith is anything less than a God-given grace which upholds our hopes, and upon which we feed, and by which we are sustained.

Faith in us is Christ in us

This faith in us is Christ in us, the hope of glory. “He is our meat and drink,” John 6. Christ to us is what the manna was to ancient Israel; they were fed by it; so we are sustained by the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ. As further proof that faith is more than a bare influence or belief produced by teaching, I call your mind to I John 4:4, “Ye are of God, little children, and have overcome them, because greater is he that is in you, than he that is in the world.”

Who is this great one in the Christian by whom he overcomes? Christ without a doubt. See, also, I John 5:4, “And this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith.”

What is ascribed to Christ in our case is ascribed to faith in another. Our faith overcomes, because faith in us is no less than Christ in us, and he says, “Without me ye can do nothing.” By ascribing to faith this power or merit, *i.e.* By viewing faith in us as Christ, we can see beauty in the whole chapter that our

text is in. “By faith Enoch was translated that he should not see death * because God had translated him.” It was not argument that translated him, nor was he simply persuaded to be translated, but Christ, the almighty power of God in Christ, wrought this wonder in his case.

In Hebrews 11:11, “Through faith also Sara herself received strength to conceive seed, and was delivered of a child when she was past age.” Such events as this, when ascribed to faith, can not be understood in light aside from that of faith being a direct gift from God.

Not the result of argument

Also by faith Abraham gathered up his son and hurried away into the wilderness, three day’s journey, to make a sacrifice of him. Look at this affection of the father of his long-promised son, now made willing to slay him in obedience to the voice of God. Ask yourself, in all candor, is such faith the result of argument? *No*, NEVER. It is in-wrought by God’s blessed Spirit, by which he is assured that God is able of his ashes to raise him up a son; by faith Isaac blessed Jacob concerning things to come, looked far into the future and foretold the destiny of his two sons. Joseph also by faith saw the deliverance of Israel, so that the power of faith enabled them to know the future.

If we regard this faith as being Christ in these men, the narrative is easily understood. By faith (Christ) they passed through the Red Sea and the walls of Jericho fell down; by faith (Christ) they subdued kingdoms, wrought righteousness, obtained promises, and stopped the mouths of lions. Nothing less than Christ in men can enable them to do all this. The mighty deeds of Gideon, and Barak, and Sampson, can be explained in this way, and we can understand how David, the young stripling, took a sling and a few stones and sped away across the valley to meet the mighty Goliath, and how the three Hebrews walked unharmed from the fiery furnace, which was so hot as to consume those who threw them in; all this they did by faith. And Daniel came unhurt from the lion’s den; Jesus was there also. Women also received their children from the dead, not by the mere force of argument, but by Christ, who is the resurrection.

This divine faith caused the ancient saints to endure affliction as seeing him who is invisible. They endured being stoned and sawn asunder; they counted not their lives dear unto themselves, but gave up their lives as a toy; braved terrible storms of the wrath of men, faced death in every shape, looked on worldly honor, and wealth, and ease as nothing; by faith Elijah left his own native land and went to the mountain in the desert, not knowing of any friend on earth.

And I will add, dear brethren, that thousands live today, who are bearing burdens and hardships that nothing but grace within could cause them willingly to bear. Men who would die rather than give up their religion or Savior.

Reader, has your heart ever been opened to see the fullness there is in a Savior? And you been led to love him above all things? So that, though you are a weak worm, exposed to death and sin, yet rejoice as seeing him that is invisible?

Direct spiritual influence

If the foregoing positions are true, then the doctrine of a direct spiritual influence is true. In all the cases of conversion given in the Bible there is evidence of the Savior's presence. On the day of Pentecost the Spirit was marvelously manifested, and under its influence Peter preached with power; the people were pricked in their hearts. By the Spirit Lydia's heart was opened, and under the Spirit's influence Paul and Silas sang the praises of God at midnight in the prison, and when the jailor was converted, God's holy presence was fully manifested by the quaking earth, and the unlocking of the prison doors, and loosening of the prisoners; and the fact that the jailor came *trembling*, all proves God to be the direct author of the jailor's faith.

Cornelius was a devout man, whose prayers and alms had been received of God before he heard the preached word. Saul of Tarsus was visited by an immediate *operation of God*, the result of which was his conversion, and he assigns as a reason why the Colossians were the elect of God, that "our gospel came to you not in word only, but in power and in the Holy Ghost and in much assurance."

The true reason assigned why they had received the gospel was, that it came to them in the power and great majesty of the Spirit. "Who hath believed our report, and to whom has the arm of the Lord been revealed?"

Faith prepares the way for the gospel

It is the revealed arm of God that makes way for the reception of the gospel. In the parable of the sower, where some seed fell by the wayside, etc., it was not the falling seed that prepared the ground, and to demonstrate that the bare sowing of the seed can not prepare, we learn that none yielded a crop except what fell in a good and honest heart; a good and an honest heart is certainly one divinely prepared, and thus fitted to hear and obey the Word of the Lord.

The case, also, of Philip and the eunuch is one in which the Spirit's work is manifest; the Spirit directed Philip there to instruct one divinely prepared in heart to receive instruction, and whose mind had been turned to look after divine truth;

and after Philip had taught this serious man and baptized him, the spirit caught him away.

We learn that where the Spirit is there is liberty, and consequently where it is not there is bondage. Zacharias was filled with the Spirit when he spake the last twelve verses of Luke, 1st chapter (Luke 1). Mary and Elizabeth were filled with it, and thus prepared to speak the words ascribed to them in the same chapter. Peter and John and Paul also spake by the power of the Spirit, and Stephen, and in fact, all who ever spoke to good purpose spoke in his power.

Many men heard our Savior speak who were not benefitted by it, and the Savior says to them, "Ye can not hear my words," and also affirms that to some it is given to know the mysteries of the kingdom, and to others it is not given.

God the author of conversion

We should not overlook this class of scripture which abundantly proves that God is the direct author of our conversion. In the following passages a special, effectual and saving calling of God is plainly taught, "The promise is to you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even to as many as the Lord our God shall call," Acts 2:39. "All things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to his purpose," Romans 8:28. "Who hath saved us, and called us with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began," II Timothy 1:9.

A holy and effectual call

These passages teach that God calls with a holy calling, and with an effectual calling; and in no other light can we understand this scripture, "Not many wise men after the flesh, not many noble are called," etc. It is impossible to understand the things of the Spirit, unless we are first made spiritual. "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit, neither can he know them."

Nicodemus could neither see nor enter the kingdom until he was born of the Spirit, and this birth was "not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." The will of man is wholly excluded from this work, and God is emphatically declared to be its author.

To exclude the Holy Ghost from this world of ours would be to leave us in midnight darkness, spiritually. There would be no one convinced of sin, for the Spirit reproveth (convinceth) of sin, and there would be no hungering and thirsting

after righteousness, nor mourning on account of sin; there would be no real service to God on earth.

The Spirit is like the wind

The Spirit is compared to the wind, and it is to the people of God what the air is to this world; without it the whole world of animal and vegetable life would end, and so every vestige of religion would be at an end; but it can not be excluded from this world, although thousands are taught from the press and pulpit that they should neither expect or desire his presence or aid in their conversion. Their road escapes all mourning and weeping on account of sin; there are no tears and trembling for sin, no “God be merciful to me a sinner.”

The real marks of a gracious state

Oh, how sad and awful to know that many have the reputation of being teachers in Israel who entirely overlook the real marks of a gracious state, and whose congregations never heard one true description of the mourner given. The nature and origin of faith as laid down in this chapter is in harmony with what I have said on the subject of *depravity* and the *will*.

I have given, as I believe, the Lord’s manner of rescuing sinners from the awful situation they are in by nature. Praying that you and I may be the recipients of God’s mercy in these things, I close. (*Principles and Practices of The Regular Baptists: J. H. Oliphant*)

Feast Days, The, Under The Law Of Moses

The FEAST DAYS under the Law of Moses: *Sylvester Hassell:* Including the Day of Atonement, the Jews, before the Babylonian captivity, had nine sacred seasons, five connected with the Sabbath—the weekly Sabbath itself, the Feast of the New Moon, the Sabbatical Month and Feast of Trumpets, the Sabbatical Year, and the Year of Jubilee; and three great annual festivals—the Passover, the Feast of Pentecost, and the Feast of Tabernacles or Ingathering. After the captivity they had also the Feast of Purim and the Feast of Dedication.

The weekly Sabbath was a day of rest and recreation and mercy after six days of labor, in celebration of God’s completion of creation, and also of his deliverance of the Israelites from Egyptian bondage. It was a day of holy convocation; the morning and evening sacrifices were doubled; the shew bread was renewed; in later times the worship in the sanctuary was enlivened by sacred music; the people consulted the prophets; and instructed their children in sacred things.

After the Babylonian captivity, and in the New Testament times, the Jews had public worship in their synagogues on the Sabbath day. Christ and his apostles occasionally attended such worship.

The monthly feast of the New Moon was announced at the first sight of her new crescent by the sounding of two sacred silver trumpets; the day, though not kept as a Sabbath, had special sacrifices. The Sabbatical Month was the month of Tisri, being the seventh of the ecclesiastical and the first of the civil year; its first day fell on a Sabbath, and this, the new year's day, was ushered in by the blowing of trumpets, and was called the Feast of Trumpets. It was a holy convocation, and had special sacrifices. The tenth of this month was the great Day of Atonement; and from the fifteenth to the twenty-second of the month was the Feast of the Tabernacles.

The Sabbatical Year was each seventh year; and God, the proprietor of the land, required his people not to sow the land that year, nor even to gather the spontaneous fruits. But to leave such for the poor, the slave, the stranger and the cattle, and to release all Hebrew slaves and debtors.

Treble fertility in the sixth year was promised for the support of the people in the seventh, eighth and ninth years. They could in this year make their clothing, fish, hunt, take care of their bees and flocks, and repair their buildings and furniture; and especially in the Sabbatical year, were men, women, children and strangers to be gathered and taught the law.

The non-observance of the Sabbatical year was one of the chief national sins punished by the Babylonian captivity, during which the land was left desolate for seventy years, that it might enjoy its Sabbaths.

The Year of Jubilee came after a Sabbatic series of Sabbatic years, and was every fiftieth or Pentecostal year. It began with the great Day of Atonement, the tenth day of the seventh month (Tisri). After the sacrifices of that solemn day the trumpet of jubilee pealed forth its joyful notes, proclaiming liberty to the captive prisoner and slave, and the restoration of land to its original proprietors—a great protection to the poor, and an effectual safeguard against the accumulation of vast estates. This year completed the great Sabbatic cycle, and made all things new. It was a year of rest from labor, and of religious worship.

The very existence of these Sabbatical laws, so uncommon in the world, and so irksome to the covetous nature of man, proves the reality of the miracles wrought by God through Moses; for nothing else could have made an unspiritual people willing to submit to such restraining laws.

All the Sabbatical seasons typified Christ, the true rest of spiritual Israel; for he it is who, by virtue of his great atonement, has been anointed with the Spirit of the Lord, above measure, to preach the gospel to the poor, healing to the broken-hearted, deliverance to the captives, recovering of sight to the blind, liberty to the bruised, and comfort to all that mourn in Zion, that they may be called trees of righteousness, the planting of the Lord, that he may be glorified (Isaiah 61:1-3); Luke 4:16-21; Matthew 11:28-30; Hebrews 4:3).

Thus, by these constantly recurring seventh periods of rest, would God perpetually remind his spiritual people of their only true source of perfect rest, Christ Jesus.

This glorious rest will not be fully realized by the people of God until the heavenly jubilee of the resurrection trumpet is sounded, when every redeemed man, with reunited and incorruptible soul and body, shall enter upon his eternal possession in the antitypical Canaan (Leviticus 25:13; Isaiah 35:10; I Corinthians 15:53-57; I Thessalonians 4:16-18; Hebrews 4:9; I Peter 1:1-5).

Three times every year, at the three great annual festivals, Passover, Pentecost, and Tabernacles, all the Hebrew males were required to appear together before the Lord, at the tabernacle or temple, and make an offering with a joyful heart. God's object was to promote, in this way, the religious zeal and knowledge and union of his covenant people, to bring them frequently together in loving brotherly relationship for the worship of God—the very same object that is now beautifully and pleasantly subserved by the frequent assemblies of the people of God in their quarterly, yearly, union, corresponding, and associational meetings.

Devout women often attended these sacred festivals. Not only from all parts of Palestine, but, after the captivity, from all parts of the civilized world, the people of God assembled at these meetings Acts 2:5-11. The three great annual feasts had a three-fold bearing—natural, historical and spiritual (or typical or prophetic); “the thing that hath been is that which shall be,” says Solomon Ecclesiastes 1:9; or, as Bacon expresses it, “All history is prophecy.” (*Hassell's History* ppg 93-95)

Passover: Sylvester Hassell: The Passover was about the first of April, and marked the beginning of the grain harvest the first green ears of barley were cut, a handful presented to the Lord, and others were parched and eaten by the people. It was a memorial of the nation's birth, when the destroying angel passed over the houses of the Israelites, whose door-posts were sprinkled with the blood of the paschal lamb, while he destroyed the firstborn in every Egyptian family, thus delivering the Israelites from Egyptian bondage. For each family a lamb was slain and roasted entire, and eaten, with unleavened bread and bitter

herbs, by the members of the family, standing, with loins girt, feet shod, and staff in hand; and if any of the lamb remained till the morning it was to be consumed with fire.

The firstborn thus specially delivered by the Lord were specially devoted to him, and specially redeemed (Exodus 11:5,7; 13:2,14; Hebrews 12:23). Christ is the true paschal lamb sacrificed for spiritual Israel (I Corinthians 5:7). By his death, and his blood being applied by the Holy Spirit to our hearts, we are delivered from ruin.

In celebrating the Christian Passover, or the Lord's Supper, we are to put away the leaven of hypocrisy and wickedness and eat the bitter herb of godly sorrow for our sins, and remember that we are pilgrims, just ready, at any time, to depart to a better, even a heavenly country Hebrews 11:13-16. We should be devoutly thankful and consecrated to God for being specially redeemed by the precious blood of the Lamb (I Peter 1:15-21; Revelation 5:9).

The body of the paschal lamb was cooked entire, no bone being broken, to denote the completeness of the redemption of Christ, and the indissoluble oneness of his mystical body; and it was roasted, and not boiled in water and wasted, to indicate the preciousness of Christ's salvation and of his people; and, if any remained till morning, it was consumed by purifying fire, to prevent it from seeing corruption or from being put to a common use—indicating that God's people are never to become reprobates.

In later times, the Israelites, at the Passover, sang the Hallel, or Psalms 113-118. It is believed that this was the hymn sung by Christ and his apostles after the Supper. (*Hassell's History pg 95*)

Pentecost: Sylvester Hassell: The Pentecost, or Harvest Feast, or Feast of Weeks or First-Fruits, was about the last of May, fifty days or a week of weeks after the Passover, of which it was the supplement, and therefore was called by the Jews *Atzereth*, or the concluding assembly. As the Passover began, the Pentecost ended, the grain harvest, the wheat now being ripe, and two loaves of fine flour, were offered to the Lord, as a joyful dedication of the whole harvest to him as the Giver—both the land and the people belonging to him.

Pentecost was a social thanksgiving feast, and the Levite, stranger, fatherless, and widow, were invited. Historically, it is believed to have been a memorial of the giving of the law from Sinai, the second great era in the history of the elect nation—the fiftieth day after the deliverance from Egypt (Exodus 12 and Exodus 19).

Acts 2 explains the typical significance of the Feast of Pentecost. As God descended in consuming fire on Mount Sinai to give the moral law to national Israel, so he descended in the purifying fire of the Holy Ghost upon his disciples in Jerusalem, and wrote the new law of love upon the fleshly tablets of the hearts of his covenant people (Acts 2; John 16:7-11; II Corinthians 3; Hebrews 8; Matthew 22:36-40).

And, just as certainly as the Pentecost was the supplement or conclusion of the Passover, just so certainly will the Holy Ghost descend upon the purchase of Christ's, and consecrate them to the service of God." (*Hassell's History* ppg 95, 96)

The Feast of Tabernacles: Sylvester Hassell: The Feast of Tabernacles, or Ingathering, was about the first of October, after the oil and wine had been gathered in; and it was a great and joyful thanksgiving for all the harvests of the year. It was also a commemoration of the time when the Israelites dwelt in tents during their passage through the wilderness and called forth the gratitude of the people to God for their settled homes in a land of plenty.

The people took boughs of palm and willows of the brook, and made temporary huts of the branches, and sat under the booths, during this festival. The weeping willow (*Salix Babylonica*, Psalms 137) was an emblem of sorrow; but the willow of the brook (*Salix Alba*), because of its vigor, was a symbol of joyful prosperity Isaiah 44:4. The palm was also an emblem of joy, because of its erect growth, its usefulness, and its rich foliage (Psalms 92:12-14; John 12:13; Revelation 7:9).

In later times, at the hour of morning sacrifice, during the Feast of Tabernacles, water was drawn from the Pool of Siloam in a golden goblet, and poured into one of the silver basins on the west side of the altar of burnt-offering, and wine into the other, while the words of Isaiah 12:3 were repeated, in commemoration of the water drawn from the rock in the desert; the choir sang the great Hallel, and waved branches of palm. It was in allusion to this ceremony, that Christ stood and cried in the last day of the feast, "If any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink" John 7:2,37.

Coming next day at day-break to the temple court, as they were extinguishing the artificial lights, two colossal golden candlesticks in the center of the temple court, recalling the pillar of fire in the wilderness, Jesus said, 'I am the light of the world' John 8:1-2,12. As the sun by its natural light was eclipsing the artificial lights, so Jesus implies, I, the Sun of Righteousness, am superseding your typical light.

The believer having received redemption and the Holy Ghost, waits still for his inheritance and abiding home. The feast of Tabernacles points him to the heavenly Canaan, the everlasting inheritance, of which the Holy Spirit is the earnest (Ephesians 1:13-14; Hebrews 4:9). There shall the true church ever hold with her Divine Head, a Feast of Tabernacles, rejoicing in his presence, satisfied with his fullness, and her rest and pleasure will be heightened and enhanced by the remembrance of her toils and tribulation in this wilderness world forever past.” (*Hassell’s History* ppg 96, 97)

The Three Feasts: Sylvester Hassell There was in the Three Feasts a clear prefigurement of the Three Persons in the Godhead; the Father, in the work of creation, specially adored in the Feast of Tabernacles; the Son, in the Passover sacrifice; and the Spirit, in the Pentecostal Feast.” (*Hassell’s History* pg 97)

The Feast of Purim: Sylvester Hassell: The Feast of Purim, or Lots, was an annual commemoration of the deliverance of the Jews in Persia from the massacre plotted for them by Haman (see the book of Esther); it took place the last of February. (*Hassell’s History* pg 97)

The Feast of Dedication: Sylvester Hassell The Feast of Dedication (mentioned in John 10:22) was instituted by Judas Maccabeus to commemorate the purification of the temple from the profanations to which it had been subjected by Antiochus Epiphanes (B.C. 165); it occurred about the twentieth of December.” (*Hassell’s History* pg 97)

Feet Washing

FEET WASHING: C. H. Cayce: If I then, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet; ye also ought to wash one another’s feet. For I have given you an example, that ye should do as I have done to you. Verily, verily, I say unto you, The servant is not greater than his lord; neither he that is sent greater than he that sent him,” John 13:14-16.

Here it is plainly stated, that “Ye also ought to wash one another’s feet.” The Lord said this. He either was correct in this statement or else He was wrong. If He was wrong, then we should say, “Ye also ought not to wash one another’s feet.” Will you say, “Ye ought not to wash one another’s feet,” or will you say, “Ye also ought to wash one another’s feet?”

Was the Saviour right or was He wrong? John 13:15 says, “I have given you an example.” An example is something to be followed. If the Lord was right in this statement, the example which He set in washing the disciples’ feet should be

followed. Again, “That ye should do as I have done to you,” is a statement also made by Him in that same verse. An example which is right is something that those people to whom it is given are under obligation to follow. Anything which one ought to do is something which is wrong for him to leave undone. Anything which one should do is something which he is obligated to do. This obligation of doing rests upon him, and he is blameworthy if he fails. From this it is evident that there can be no question but what the followers of the Lord are required to wash each other’s feet, or to engage in the practice of feet washing.

Now the question is, as asked by you, “When should this be done?”By referring to John 13:2 you will find that John says, “And supper being ended.” And in John 13:4 says, “He riseth from supper,” and then goes on and relates the entire circumstance of the Saviour washing the disciples’ feet, down to and including verse seventeen. Then beginning with John 13:18, he goes back and relates the conversation which took place during the eating of the Passover supper, at which (Passover supper) he instituted the sacramental supper, or communion. To show you this is the same conversation I refer you to this fact—in John 13:21 he records the Saviour’s language thus, “Verily, verily I say unto you, That one of you shall betray me.” Matthew 26:20-29 gives an account of the eating of this Passover and the institution of the sacramental supper. In Matthew 26:21 he tells us that the Saviour said, “Verily, I say unto you, that one of you shall betray me.” This shows that the conversation was during the Passover supper. Verses twenty-six to twenty-nine in Matthew 26 (Matthew 26:26-29) show that the sacramental supper was instituted at the close of this Passover. Then John’s language shows that when the supper was ended the Saviour washed the disciples’ feet. Please read these references, and others, and investigate, according to this way of harmonizing the matters recorded concerning this question.” (*Cayce’s Editorials vol. 2, ppg 215, 216*)

FEET WASHING: Did the Lord wash the feet of Judas Iscariot?: C. H.

Cayce: The sacramental supper was instituted at the close of the eating of the last Passover supper which Jesus ate with His disciples. In the eating of that last Passover supper the Savior had the conversation as to who should betray Him. That conversation is referred to in the thirteenth chapter of John. It is also referred to by Matthew and Mark. During the eating of that Passover Jesus dipped bread in the sop (or gravy) and gave it to Judas, then Judas went immediately out. See John’s account of the matter.

Then when Judas had gone out, Jesus took the bread and the wine, the substance of the Passover supper, and instituted the sacramental supper. Then when the sacramental supper was ended He washed the disciples’ feet. Judas was present at neither the sacramental supper nor the washing of the disciples’

feet. He had gone out during the eating of the passover supper. (*Cayce's Editorials vol. 3, ppg 359*)

Fellowship

FELLOWSHIP: *J. H. Oliphant:* Every true lover of Zion is anxious to have peace prevail among us. Each member should labor to maintain the fellowship of the church. Great patience is required to live a consistent Christian life. We are all more or less imperfect and prone to err. We have our tempers, often ungovernable; and our tongues are often improperly employed. Also, we have conflicting interests in worldly things; we must have dealings with each other, buying and selling, borrowing and lending. Our children, with their various follies and imperfections, mingle together in social life. There are a thousand sources for strife to come up among us as a church; besides, each of us is liable to entertain a spirit of jealousy under which we interpret many things our brethren say and do for evil, when no evil was intended. "With green spectacles on, everything looks green."

While we have a spirit of jealousy, we can see no real marks of love in our brother. If he treats us well, we are apt to think "it is for a purpose." If he visits us, we are apt to suspicion him; and if he does not, we do the same. We put a bad interpretation on all he says or does; and we are all liable at times to be under such a spirit. Envy, hateful as it is, has a place within us; covetousness, malice, strife, hate, all, and more, have their influence upon us; and when we are governed by these, we are plunged into trouble ourselves, and often bring a whole church into trouble.

Sometimes a brother or sister steps aside from the path of obedience, and soon imagines that the brethren are feeling unkind to them; interpret everything against themselves and become mild and shy; act and feel distant; vacate their seats in the church and bring on themselves, and the church, a vast amount of trouble unnecessarily. To guard against all these things is the true wisdom of a Christian.

From these and similar considerations, it is clear that the only ground upon which we can hope to maintain fellowship is that of forbearance. "Bear ye one another's burdens, and so fulfill the law of Christ." If we would maintain fellowship, the strong must bear the infirmities of the weak, and not please ourselves," Romans 15:1. We are to expect our brethren and sisters to err, and do things that are wrong, and should not feel disappointed, when we have some things to bear. "If a man be overtaken in a fault, ye which are spiritual restore

such an one in the spirit of meekness, considering thyself, lest thou also be tempted,” Galatians 6:1.

If our brother errs, we are not to treat him cold and distant, but in a meek and quiet way seek to restore him to the path of duty and to the full fellowship of the church. If your brother does you a wrong, you should think how liable you are to do wrong, and remember that you may under temptation, do as wrong as he has. Think how tenderly you *would* be dealt with under such circumstances. Remember, too, that he is but a man in the flesh, with all the imperfections of our present state. If he has done you a wrong, you should not, for that, disobey God, who has taught you to deal tenderly with your brother. By looking over your past life you will perhaps see many places in which you have done wrong, and you should be willing to have your life tried by the same rule you use on others, for “with what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged, and with what measure ye mete it shall be measured to you again.” So that, in trying our brother’s case, we should ever remember that we may be tried. These considerations will make us moderate in our dealings with one another.

It is a maxim in law that “he that comes into court must have clean hands.” He that criticizes a brother himself must be above criticism. “Let him that is without sin cast the first stone.” “First cast the beam out of thine own eye, and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote out of thy brother’s eye.” If these considerations were always duly weighed, there would certainly be much less trouble in our churches.

If we consider the weakness of human nature, and the great power of the wicked one, we may thereby be led to apologize for the sins of our brethren. Our Savior said, “Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do.” A temper like this is the richest ornament of a Christian. We greatly desire that God should thus kindly and tenderly deal with us, and how reasonable, then, that we should exercise the greatest patience with one another. We are taught to pray “forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors.”

Matthew 6:12. How many of us can say that “we have manifested the same patient, forgiving temper towards others that we would have the Lord manifest toward us.”

We cannot go before God in prayer consistently while we entertain an unforgiving temper towards others. I have heard brethren say that if the brethren and sisters can bear with them in their imperfect manners, that they felt sure that they could bear anything sooner than have trouble in the church. This is a good state of mind to be in, but when these same brethren were tried and had something to bear they soon showed what mettle they were of by refusing to

bear anything; sometimes vacating their seats in the church and remaining away from their duty until the patience of the church was exhausted. Because some brother or brethren had treated them wrong they would venture to sin against the whole church, and violate the plain word of God, which directs an entirely different course to be pursued.

If your brother has injured you, are you, therefore, authorized to disobey God? Certainly not. The wrong of others should prompt us to live nearer and nearer to our duty. Matthew 18 is regarded as being a full directory respecting our duty in matters of difficulty. In Matthew 18:15 we read, "Moreover if thy brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between him and thee alone."

1st. This seems to have reference to matters of private trespass, or individual difficulty. The pronouns *thy* and *thee* seem to indicate that this instruction is intended to apply in cases where one member has been offended at another.

2nd. It is natural for one to say, "Well, he has done me a wrong and he knows it, and I will wait for him to come to me." But this instructs you to go to the offender and tell him your complaint; don't wait for him to come to you, nor tell your grievance to others; keep it in your own breast until you see him.

Sometimes a brother becomes stubborn, when he imagines he has been offended, and quits the church. This is rebellion, and a worse sin against God than others have committed against him. The law directs him to go to the party and tell him privately about it. "Let nothing be done through strife," etc., but "in the spirit of meekness," "considering thyself lest thou also be tempted."

It would be well to remember how our Lord dealt with us when he came to us. He told us all the things we had done. He displayed our sins before us, and that in such a sweet and affectionate manner that our hearts were won by him. We were led to repent of our sins and seek to do right. We were not made angry, although he opened the whole matter to us. Oh! what wisdom he displayed in approaching us, and how successful he was in gaining us!

We may sin in our manner of going, or talking after we go. We must go "in the spirit of meekness," not in a rash, overbearing temper. "Let nothing be done through strife." We need both grace and wisdom to act prudently in a case of this kind, that our brother may feel that our object is good, and that we have not come simply to get ready for a church trial; show that you love him and want to gain him; that you want fellowship; lay all the matter open to him, and patiently hear his side, bearing in mind that you may have done wrong, and in some degree provoked him to do what he has done. Remember that you are fallible

and liable to err, and if you gain the object sought, you have gained a great victory. The church need never know that there has been a difficulty.

3rd. If he fail to “hear thee, then take with thee one or two more” of the brethren or sisters “that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established.” This should all be done with the view of settling the matter. In selecting the “one or two” pains should be taken to get suitable persons, such as would be most likely to succeed, whose opinions would be heard with respect and without prejudice, and who would feel a great interest in getting a settlement.

If he repent, you are required to forgive him. “If he repent, forgive him,” Luke 17:3, and Luke 17:4, “If he trespass against thee seven times in a day, and seven times in a day turn again unto thee, saying, I repent, thou shalt forgive him.” You should, in heart, forgive him and feel the same love to him that you would, had nothing ever occurred to disturb your fellowship; this you will do, and feel, if he TURN and you see that there is real penitence of heart with him, and you will love him as well as ever, and perhaps better.

4th. If he neglect to hear thee, “tell it to the church.” Of course, this should be when the church is assembled for the transaction of business; and that same meek and tender temper should be manifested by the whole church. He should be kindly pointed to his error, and if he still persists in a stubborn, unyielding course, “let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican.” That is, let him be expelled. Great care should be taken by the whole church not to manifest a harsh spirit of strife. Do this “in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ,” and “by his Spirit,” I Corinthians 5:4.

It is serious business to expel a member from the house of the Lord and its privileges. To do this in a vain, fleshly spirit of strife is a grievous sin. I have felt as serious when I have seen the church of God withdraw the hand of fellowship from a disobedient person as I ever did in my life. This should be a last resort with us. Amputation is deferred as long as it is safe to defer it, and it is at last performed with great pain to the body. And so we should feel pained to see one of our members severed from the body. I have known persons who wept over their amputated limbs, and so we may justly weep to see sin control the members of our body so that we have to cut them off.

5th. The great principle of forbearance is taught in Matthew 18:23 to last, by the parable of a certain king who took account of his servants. One of his servants owed him ten thousand talents, which was about ten million dollars, and he had

nothing to pay, but this servant fell down and worshiped him, etc. And the Lord of that servant forgave him the debt.

This ten million dollars represents how great a sin our Savior has forgiven us, but this same man, to whom so great debt had been forgiven, went out and found one who owed him an hundred pence, which is less than one hundred dollars, and he laid hands on him and “took him by the throat” and demanded full payment. This shows, that though so much has been forgiven us, yet we are apt to entertain a harsh, unforgiving temper towards our brother. The last verse shows that our Heavenly Father will not forgive our sins, if we do not from our hearts forgive those who trespass against us.

Dear brother, how important that we should feel a tender spirit of forgiveness toward others. How it will embolden us to go to God for the pardon of our sins; to be able to say, “Lord, I freely, from my heart, forgive all that ever trespassed against me; I hold malice against none and pray a blessing upon my enemies, and now I come to thee for the pardon of my sins; my debt of sins to thee is immense, but I implore the pardon of all.” Can we thus approach the Lord? If so, he will hear and forgive us, and our faces will glow with love and cheerfulness; but, on the other hand, if we are carrying malice and long settled hate against others, we shall not be forgiven. “Whoso stoppeth his ears at the cry of the poor, he also shall cry himself, but shall not be heard.” And if we are deaf to all the Bible on this subject; if we entertain a low, unforgiving temper, we shall not be heard when we go before God in prayer. Mark 11:26, “But if ye do not forgive, neither will your Heavenly Father forgive your trespasses.” Also Matthew 6:12, “Forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors.” We are not likely to feel in death that we have borne too much with our brethren. You have a right to bear anything that comes upon you, if it does not become an offense to the whole body; as long as it is a private, individual matter you have a right to bear it, and go along with it; fill your seat in worship, be kind, rendering “good for evil,” and “overcome evil with good.” This is heavenly, and the brightest ornament you ever wore on earth; but if you become *sour*, *sulky* and *cross*, act stubborn, wear a jealous face and look, your sin is likely to be greater than his who has sinned against you.

If we will duly consider what poor creatures of a moment we are, how short a time we have to stay here, and how much sin and evil controls us, it will help us to “pass over offenses.” Shall we worry each other by taking each other “by the throat” for every offense? Let each of us think how poor, vile and sinful we are; let us run over the books to see how much the Lord has forgiven us; compare our sins of *ten millions* against God with our brother’s sins of *one hundred* against us, and remember that all ours is forgiven; it will help us to forgive others.

Besides, this harsh temper brings trouble to the whole church; it manifests that we are not humble as we should be. *A person easily offended is too proud.* Humility leads us to bear with each other. Our Savior opened not his mouth, although he was led like a poor sheep to the slaughter; and shall we open our mouths in charges and complaints when we receive trifling offenses from our brethren? The honor of the church greatly depends upon the fellowship of the brethren. The world is glad when Zion is in confusion, and crowds to our meetings to see our shame and confusion. We never should bring a case up for the church to hear unless it is a very plain one; it is a burning shame to go before the church with a mere trifling case; all such you should bear and say nothing about it. This spirit of forbearance among brethren is the safeguard of the church, where “each can his brother’s failings hide and show a brother’s love.”

What I have said relates entirely to matters of private trespass. In all such cases the church should refuse to take notice of them until due efforts have made to procure a settlement.

6th. In this same 18th of Matthew, verses 8 and 9 (Matthew 18:8-9), we have another case of difficulties, “If thy hand or thy foot offend thee, cut them off,” etc. The church is compared to the human body. I Corinthians 12. And so the church is addressed as a whole. “If thy hand,” that is, if one of thy members offend thee, “cut it off.” If you have a chronic sore on your hand, it may become dangerous to the whole body, and in such a case it would be better to cut it off.

And so the church may have a member who is so corrupt in his deportment as to be a disgrace to the whole church; his evil conduct is not against any one member individually, and therefore he need not be dealt with as above described, but should be cut off, and if his future life proves him worthy he may be restored. “A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump,” and so by the law of fellowship we may hold a corrupt man in our fellowship whose presence and association with us would be a disgrace to us as a church. A man guilty of theft or adultery, and whose character is generally known to be bad, would be a disgrace to the church and should be “cut off.”

In our rules of decorum this is mentioned as a *public offense*. No one individually is hurt, but the church as a body is *offended*, and as a body she should “cut him off.” When a man is guilty of theft, our practice has been to exclude him, although he confesses his guilt and promises to reform. Yet it is held to be prudent to exclude for such public offenses, and should his future life be prudent, he may, without injury to the church, be forgiven and restored.

In I Corinthians 5, Paul directs that the man guilty of fornication be excluded; he does not seek to reclaim him, but instructs that he should be “delivered to Satan,”

which is understood by writers generally to signify *exclusion*; his simple promise to reform is not to be taken; let him be expelled, and then in case he does reform and give evidence of true penitence, he may be restored without injury to the church.

By referring to II Corinthians 2, you will see that this same man mentioned in the first letter, was to be forgiven by the church, and so our usage is that for public offenses of this nature, sins that disgrace the person committing them, we do not seek to retain him, but withdraw the hand of fellowship from him until, by a suitable life, he proves himself worthy of a place in our body.

Such cases are not infrequent. In cases of bastardy, the uniform rule, so far as I know, has been to exclude. So of theft, murder, etc. We think the honor of the church requires it, and that where she fails to rid herself of such a person she is a partaker of his sins and justly loses her influence on society.

7th. Also, where members indulge in neglect of duty, vacate their seats, rail against the church or live lives that are injurious to us as a body, indulge in profanity or excessive drinking, etc. In all this the sin is against the body as a whole, and should be dealt with by the church as a body.

Where the church can, with safety to her credit, bear with a member, she should do it, and should use all the means in her power to reclaim the disobedient. The parable of the one hundred sheep, Matthew 18:2, is intended to teach us that we should seek to reclaim the disobedient. Sometimes we see a brother or sister go astray, become cold and careless about their duty. We should use all the means in our power to reclaim them, remove their jealousy by convincing them we love them, and desire their happiness and peace. As a shepherd would pursue the straying sheep, so you should pursue the dear child of God and reclaim him from the ways of sin.

But there is a time when prudence says, “cut them off,” let the church maintain the true dignity in the end by plucking out right eyes or cutting off right hands that will not obey the laws of the Great King. On this subject Paul says,

I Timothy 5:20,22, “Them that sin rebuke before all that others also may fear. I charge thee before God, that thou observe these things without preferring one above another, doing nothing by partiality.”

Churches are apt to show partiality to their *rich* or learned members in these things, which is a grievous sin and should be carefully avoided. “Lay hands suddenly on no man.” We should never in a rash and hasty manner exclude

members; give them time to “bethink themselves,” use suitable means to reclaim them and save them. He then adds, “Neither be partakers of other men’s sins.”

While we should use care not to be too hasty and rash, we should not retain the offender to our own ruin. We may hold a member in our body until we “are partakers of other men’s sins;” against this we should guard. “Keep thyself pure.” Steer clear of rashness on the one side and undue indulgence on the other. I think it right for brethren to confer with each other about what is right in such cases. I have heard dear brethren ask with deep concern, “What ought the church to do?” “Are we doing wrong to let this or that one alone in their neglect?” These are often very serious matters to them that love the house of the Lord.

Oh, dear reader, let me exhort you, never while you live, to give the church and your brethren such trouble. If you have been neglecting duty, go to the next meeting and confess your error, and ask pardon of the church. Think how precious the cause, how deep the trouble your course is giving, and be persuaded to do right. God is to be feared, and your course is against him and his people, and in harmony with Satan. Be persuaded to obey the Lord in all things. If you have sinned, God will forgive you; your brethren will forgive you and receive you to their arms and hearts in fellowship again, and your own happiness will be promoted by it.

8th. The scriptures do not furnish us the manner of proceeding in public offenses as in private trespass. We are told to “cut them off” and “pluck them out,” and “deliver such an one to Satan,” etc., but we are not instructed just how this is to be done. In matters of private trespass we are instructed to “tell him his fault between him and thee alone,” etc.; but all this is understood to relate to one brother dealing with another.

As there is no particular method given, we are left to adopt such method as seems most appropriate. I think where one of our members is guilty of a grievous sin, demanding exclusion, that the matter should be first taken up and considered by the church, and a *suitable* committee appointed to visit the accused and give him or her notice of the complaint, and cite him to the next meeting of business. In case he or she fails to be present, the church may, with proper testimony exclude.

The greatest possible pains should be taken not to exclude in a rude, passionate manner. The judge who passes sentence against the criminal is not *mad*; he but discharges his duty in obedience to law; neither should you be mad, when you execute the law of the Lord. By manifesting rashness, you are likely to disturb

particular friends of the excluded, and you may, while rooting up the tares, “root up the wheat also.”

The kind of evidence to be taken is a question of some interest; where church evidence can be had it is far better, and some good brethren have held that we should never exclude unless it be on the testimony of church members. It sometimes occurs that persons are esteemed by the whole community as guilty of gross sins, and yet no church member is able to state that he knows the party to be guilty. Persons have been tried for theft and sentenced to the state prison, and yet no brother in the church was able, from his own personal knowledge, to say the party was *guilty*.

In cases of this kind it is held by some good brethren that the most appropriate course would be for the church to select a committee of judicious brethren to investigate the facts and circumstances connected with the matter, getting all the evidence they can and report to the next meeting, and let the church act upon their report. I think this is a prudent course.

In such cases I am aware that we should exercise great care not to suffer our brethren to be imposed on by those that are without. But unless we do receive the testimony of those without, in some degree, we are liable to retain in our fellowship those who are guilty of grossest crime, and even tried and sentenced to the State prison for gross crime.

In cases where our brethren habitually neglect their meetings and indulge in railing against the church, etc., I think the church should appoint a committee of brethren or sisters, as prudence would dictate, to visit the party and learn the cause of such neglect, find out the nature of their complaint and seek to remove the difficulties, making every effort possible to induce them to resume their duties, and make a report to the church. They should be induced to continue in the church if it can be done honorably, but if not let them be excluded.

The church should seek to keep the house of the Lord in an orderly manner by looking after her members and their conduct, endeavoring to demonstrate that there is a power in religion to make men live upright lives. In this way she becomes the light of the world, and her presence and influence is felt for good in the community.

It is the duty of the church to see that the doctrine preached in her pulpit is sound, and in harmony with God’s word. “A man that is an heretic after the first and second admonition reject,” Titus 3:10. A minister who preaches heresy should be discountenanced, and his authority called in. I hope that what I have

written on this subject will lead to investigation, and in that way, if in no other, be a blessing.

Note—It is a rule in some churches, in settling matters of difficulty between brethren, to require all except the members to absent themselves from the house, so that the world may never know of there being a difficulty between the brethren. The instructions of Matthew 18 requires it to be kept between the interested parties, first and second; the one or two should keep it a secret, and these churches hold that it should likewise be a matter known only to the church. I know no reason why this is not a prudent course.

Fig Tree, The

The FIG tree Adam and Eve “sewed fig leaves together, and made themselves aprons” Genesis 3:7. When the Lord was on earth he pronounced judgment on a fig tree Matthew 21:19. Man’s efforts to cover his sin with his own works are under the judgment of God: “Let no fruit grow on thee henceforward forever.” The fig leaf aprons were not enough to satisfy them, much less God. They still realized their guilt; they still felt a need to hide from God. Our own works can never conceal our guilt.
Hlh

Figures

FIGURES: *Harold Hunt:* The Law Service provides us with an entire system of types, and shadows, and figures, of Bible truth. Those figures served as a kind of prophecy for the children of Israel during the time of the Old Testament, and they still serve as illustrations of Bible truth in our day.

Those figures are found, in the feasts, and sacrifices, and ceremonies of the Law Service, and in many of the experiences of the saints of that day. **They literally acted out divine truth**, and it is amazing how clear, and how graphic, those figures can be. But, while those figures are found throughout the ceremonies of the Law Service, and the lives of the saints, **we should never get the idea that every story recorded in that part of the Bible is a figure or a symbol of something.**

Most of the stories recorded in the Bible are not symbolic of anything at all. They simply tell us what they did, what they said, and what the consequence

was. The passage may, very well, serve to make a point, but it is not necessarily a symbol of anything. Many a minister has worn himself out trying to explain the symbolic connection of some passage, when there is no symbol to be found.

One of the experiences that seems to go with having preached for a long time is that sometimes people get the idea you are well supplied with answers. I feel flattered when somebody comes to me with a question, but I have always been much better supplied with questions than I have with answers.

Some young preacher is forever coming to me for an explanation of some passage. The text seems to be plain enough, and I tell him, "This is what they did, and this is what they said, and these are the consequences."

"But, what does it symbolize?"

"I can't tell that it symbolizes anything. This is what they did, and this is what they said, and these are the consequences."

"But is there not some deeper meaning than that?"

"Not that I can tell. This is what they did, and this is what they said, and these are the consequences."

In some sense, most people understand the Bible better than they think they do.

One of the reasons so many people are convinced they cannot understand the Bible is that they have been taught to look for something that is not there. If it is not there, you are not going to find it, and you should not beat up on yourself, because you cannot see it. I believe most people would be better off, if they would just accept the simple lessons of the Bible for what they say, and not be forever looking for some great mystery.

Granted that there are mysteries in the Bible we are never going to figure out. We could not understand some of those mysteries, even if they were explained to us. They are beyond our capacity to entirely understand. We will never entirely understand the doctrine of the Trinity. The Bible teaches it, and we believe it, but it is beyond our capacity to entirely explain it. We will never entirely understand the Incarnation of the Lord Jesus Christ. If the very heaven of heavens cannot contain him, how could he become a little baby his mother could hold in her arms? How could he become incarnate in human flesh and walk around among us? The Bible calls it a mystery I Timothy 3:16, and if it is a

mystery, you and I cannot entirely explain it. If we could, it would not be a mystery.

We cannot explain how God is going to raise the dead on that final day. Paul calls the resurrection a mystery I Corinthians 15:51, and, if it is a mystery, you and I cannot entirely explain it. Suppose a sailor dies and is buried in the sea. His remains are eaten by fish, and those fish are later caught and eaten by other people, and the flesh of those fish becomes the nutrition that makes up the flesh of other people. Then those people die, and are buried. How will God ever sort it all out? You can be sure that the God, who created the universe and everything in it, will not have any trouble on that day, but you and I cannot explain it.

Why does God save one person and pass another by? The only answer God gives—and, I believe, the only answer we will ever have—is, “Even so, Father: for so it seemed good in thy sight” Matthew 11:26. It pleased God, and if it pleased God, that is as far as I am going to pursue the question. I do not dare challenge him.

I doubt we will entirely understand some of these mysteries, even in the world to come. We sing a song that says, “We will understand it better by and by.” We will, indeed, understand it *better*, but, that does not mean we will know everything there is to be known. In order to know all about it, we would need a mind as great as the mind of God—and we will never have that.

God will always be the Creator, and we will always be the creature. When we arrive in that world, we will just as surely stand in awe of God, and his attributes, and his work, as we do in this life. We would not deny that there are some subjects that by their very nature—and our own finite nature—we cannot understand, but the fact remains that **God intended for the Bible to be read and understood.**

Any humble, prayerful, and obedient child of God can read the Bible and understand those things which will satisfy his present need. But, back to the subject of *figures*: **how can you tell if something is a figure?** Well, it helps, if the Bible tells us—in so many words—that it is a figure.

Baptism is a figure; the Bible says so. I Peter 3:21, “**The like figure** whereunto baptism doth also now save us (not the putting way of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God,) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ.” It is a figure of the death, burial, and resurrection of the Lord, and it is a figure of the child of God, dying to sin, and rising to walk in newness of life.

The sacrifices of the Law Service were a figure. Again, the Bible says so.

Hebrews 9:9, “**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 the conscience.”

The deliverance of Isaac on the mountain was a figure.

Hebrews 11:18-19, “Of whom it was said, That in Isaac shall thy seed be called: accounting that God was able to raise him up, even from the dead; from whence **he received him in a figure.**”

And, it helps if the type looks so much like the antitype that you cannot always tell which is under consideration.

King David was one of the clearest Old Testament types of the Lord Jesus Christ. He was such a clear and convincing type of the Lord that, in some passages such as Psalms 89, you cannot always tell whether you are reading about David, the son of Jesse, or the Greater David, the Son of God.

It also helps if you have someone, obviously sent from God, to point to the antitype and call him by his typical name.

John 1:29, “The next day John seeth Jesus coming unto him, and saith, **Behold the Lamb of God**, which taketh away the sin of the world.”

Every lamb, for that matter, every animal, sacrificed under the Law Service, was a type of the Lord Jesus Christ, and here we have John the Baptist calling our attention to that fact. There is a scarlet thread that reaches all the way from the Garden of Eden to Calvary. When Adam sinned, God made coats of skins for him and his wife. In order for them to have coats of skins, an animal had to die.

Hebrews 9:22, “And almost all things are by the Law purged with blood, and without shedding of blood is no remission.”

The Bible does not tell us what kind of animal it was. It is purely an opinion of mine, but I think it was a lamb. Every time the priest, or in the case of the Passover, the head of the house, took the sacrificial blade, and drove it home into the body of the sacrificial animal, the rich, warm, red blood of that sacrifice, flowed out of the wound, over the blade, and perhaps over the hand of the priest, and that shed blood extended that scarlet thread—the scarlet thread that reaches all the way to Calvary.

It appears to me that God has made the Bible as clear as it needs to be.

Sometimes I have trouble finding my way around in some of these big city hospitals. The way they have changed, and remodeled, and added on, I can get lost. But, some of the hospitals have come up with a simple way of helping out. “Do you see that red circle over there on the floor, and do you see the long red line leading from it? Well, you follow that red line all the way to the end, and you will be right where you need to be.” I can follow that kind of directions.

But in the Bible God does even better than that. God has John the Baptist stationed right at the end of that long scarlet ribbon, to announce that we have arrived at the end of our journey. There at the end of that long scarlet ribbon was the Lord Jesus Christ, ready to be baptized by John and to start his own public ministry.

John 1:29, “The next day John seeth Jesus coming unto him and saith, **Behold The Lamb of God**, which taketh away the sin of the world.”

There was John pointing to the Lord, and announcing that this is the one you have been waiting for. This is the one who was symbolized and prefigured by all those other sacrificial lambs. He was pointing people to the Lamb of God, pointing them to the Savior. That is what I am trying to do, I am trying to point you to the Lamb of God. Far too much of religion points people away from the Lord, and back to themselves—away from the Lord and his righteousness, and back to themselves, and their own accomplishments. It is the place of the gospel preacher to point people to the Lord, and away from themselves.

hlh

First Conventicle Act, The

The FIRST CONVENTICLE ACT: *Sylvester Hassell:* The “first Conventicle Act” in 1664 forbade as many as five or more persons, over sixteen years of age, besides the household, from meeting anywhere for religious worship in any other manner than allowed by the liturgy or practice of the “Church of England;” the penalty for the first offense was three month’s imprisonment, or a fine of five pounds; for the second offense six months’ imprisonment, or a fine of ten pounds; for the third offense banishment to America (the West Indies) for seven years (and death, if they returned without permission), or a fine of one hundred pounds. Vast numbers suffered under this act in every part of the kingdom.

The Five-Mile Act in 1665 forbade Non-conformist ministers from going within five miles of any city or town that sent members to Parliament, or within five

miles of any place where there was stated service in the Established *Church*; also declared them incapable of teaching any public or private schools. The penalty for each offense was forty pounds. This Act inflicted great suffering upon the true ministers of the word and upon their families; and it caused many Baptist Churches to be formed in villages, nooks and corners of the land, beyond the reach of the Five-Mile Act.

The Second Conventicle Act in 1670 was still more searching and extensive than the first. "All persons attending conventicles (or religious meetings of Nonconformists) were to be fined five shillings for the first offense; ten shillings for the second; the preachers were to be fined twenty pounds for the first offense; forty pounds for the second; the owners of the houses, barns, buildings or yards in which the meetings were held were to be fined twenty pounds each time; the fines were to be levied by distress and sale of the offender's goods and chattels; the money was to be divided into three parts, one-third for the king, one-third for the poor, and one-third for the informer and his assistants. In case of the poverty of the ministers, their fines were to be levied on the goods and chattels of any other present.

If the first Act scourged the Dissenters with whips, the second was a scorpion plague. They were plundered and imprisoned without remorse. Many of the Bishops exerted themselves in every possible way to enforce the Act. They sent circulars to the clergy, directing them to stimulate and aid the civil authorities; and some of the Bishops went in person to the places where the meetings were supposed to be held, in order to encourage the constables, or insure the rigorous discharge of their duty.

The activity of the informers was excited by the promised share of the penalties. Their infamous trade became lucrative, and many of them amassed large sums, mercilessly filched from the servants of God. A more degrading and detestable occupation cannot well be imagined. They spent their time in prowling about the retired streets and by-lanes of towns, or in exploring about the retired streets and by-lanes of towns, or in exploring the recesses of woods, and wild, desolate places, if happily they might hear the voice of singing or prayer, or watch the movements of some straggler hastening to join his brethren.

With savage glee they darted upon the secret assembly, gloating over their confusion and distress, and specially rejoicing when they seized the preacher, because of the heavier fine. They accompanied the constables when they executed warrants of distress on property; and they attended the sales of the goods seized, taking care to get bargains for themselves.

They scrupled not to take the bed from under the sick; they robbed of their bread children whose fathers were languishing in prison. The law created their calling, and encouraged them in diligently pursuing it. Magistrates urged them on. Clergymen and country squires applauded their cleverness; and judges on the bench commended them for their zeal.

There was an unholy alliance against truth and righteousness, in which the titled and the learned were willing to associate themselves with the meanest, the wickedest, and the most brutal of men. The prisons were crowded. Families were ruined. Houses were desolated. Estates were impoverished and abandoned. Numbers fled their native shores, and sought in Holland or in the American wilderness for freedom to worship God.

But all this severe persecution did not succeed in putting an end to the religious meetings of the Dissenters in England. They met for worship in private houses, in the lanes, in the fields, in the woods, at all hours of the day and of the night, wherever and whenever they could best escape the vigilance of the authorities.

The word of the Lord was very precious in those days. There was a very lively spirit of faith and prayer among the people of God; their numbers increased; it was a spiritual spring-time with them, though a period of great outward gloom; they felt and declared that the time of the singing of birds was come, and that the voice of the turtle was heard in the land. They blessedly realized the holy rejoicing of the prophet Habakkuk, not in worldly prosperity, but in the God of their salvation, Habakkuk 3:17-19.

It has been computed that, from 1660 to 1689, in England, seventy thousand persons suffered on account of religion, eight thousand perished, and two millions pounds sterling (ten million dollars) were paid in fines. “The Baptists,” says Sir James McIntosh, “suffered more than any others under Charles II., because they had publicly professed the principles of religious liberty.” (*Hassell’s History* ppg 521, 522) (See also under *Persecution in MASSACHUSETTS*)

Five Points of Calvinism, The

The FIVE POINTS (of Calvinism): *Sylvester Hassell:* The National Synod of Dort (in South Holland), convened by the States-General for the settlement of the Arminian controversy, and containing, among its eighty-four members, twenty-eight delegates from Germany, the Palatinate, Switzerland and England, sat from November 13th, 1618, to May 9th, 1619. All the Dutch members were orthodox. Three Arminian delegates elected from Utrecht had to yield their seats to their

orthodox competitors. Francis Gomarus was said to be the only Supralapsarian delegate.

Prof. Schaff says that, in learning and piety, the Synod has never been surpassed since the days of the Apostles. The Synod emphatically condemned all the five points of Arminianism, and affirmed, to the contrary: 1st. Unconditional Election; 2nd. Particular Redemption; 3rd. Total Depravity; 4th. Effectual Calling; 5th Final Perseverance.

They declared that election, instead of being founded upon foreseen faith and holiness, is itself the very fountain of faith, holiness and eternal life; that, while the atonement of Christ is of infinite worth and value, abundantly sufficient to expiate the sins of the whole world, its saving efficacy extends only to the elect, so as to bring them infallibly to salvation; that all men are born in the likeness of their fallen parents, in a state of spiritual death; that faith and repentance are the efficacious gifts or works of the Spirit of God in the hearts of all his chosen people, who are thus wholly of God rescued from the power of darkness, and translated into the kingdom of his dear Son, that they may show forth his praises, and glory not in themselves, but in the Lord; and that, notwithstanding all the remains of indwelling sin, and all the temptations of the flesh, the world and the devil, God, their heavenly Father and unchangeable friend, who has conferred grace upon his elect, is faithful, and will never leave or forsake them, but will recover them, in true repentance and humility, from all their falls, and mercifully confirm and powerfully preserve them in a gracious state even to the end.

The victorious party gave proof of the darkness still remaining in their minds by not only deposing about two hundred Arminian ministers, but by banishing such as would not consent to keep silent, and beheading (under a false charge of treason) the aged Advocate-General of Holland, Van Olden Barneveldt, and condemning to perpetual imprisonment Hugo Grotius, who escaped through the ingenuity of his wife.

In 1625, after the death of Prince Maurice, the Arminians were allowed to return and re-establish their churches and schools in Holland, which became more and more a land of religious toleration and liberty.” (*Hassell’s History* ppg 512, 513)

Flagellants, The

The FLAGELLANTS: *Sylvester Hassell:* The custom of voluntary flagellation, as a means of self-purification or of the propitiation of the Deity, was practiced by the ancient Pagan Egyptians and Greeks and Romans; and, before being abandoned by the latter in the fifth century, was adopted by some

Catholic *Bishops* in their courts. But, from the thirteenth to the fifteenth century, especially in the years 1260, 1349, and 1414, it raged in many countries of continental Europe as a religious mania. “All ranks, both sexes, all ages, were possessed with the madness—nobles, wealthy merchants, modest and delicate women, even children of five years old.

They stripped themselves naked to the waist, covered their faces that they might not be known, and went two by two, both day and night, in solemn, slow procession, from city to city, with a cross and a banner before them, scourging themselves till the blood tracked their steps, and shrieking out their doleful psalms. Thirty-three days and a half, the number of years of the Lord’s sad sojourn in this world of man, was the usual period for the penance of each.

Sovereign princes, as Raymond of Toulouse, kings as Henry II of England, had yielded their backs to the scourge. Flagellation was the religious luxury of *Saint Louis IX* of France, who had his priest scourge him every Friday with an iron chain, and in Lent on Mondays and Fridays, and who wore in his girdle an ivory case of such scourges, such boxes being his favorite presents to his courtiers.

A year of penance was taxed at three thousand lashes. **Dominic**, with one hundred lashes; of the Mendicant Order, accompanied each Psalm with one hundred lashes; so that the whole Psalter, with fifteen thousand stripes, equaled five years’ penance. *Dominicus Loricatus* (wearing a shirt of mail next to his skin) could discharge, in six days, the penance of an entire century, by whipping of three hundred thousand stripes. **Francis of Assisi**, from self-flagellation, had made his skin one sore from head to foot, when he died. Scourging was considered a substitute for all the “sacraments of the church,” and even for the merits of Christ. It became so excessive and scandalous that even popes and Catholic governments suppressed the public exhibitions; but the merit of voluntary self-chastisement is still a doctrine of Roman Catholicism. (*Hassell’s History* pg 447)

Flaming Sword, The

The FLAMING SWORD The pointed flame, darting its resplendent beams around on every side, so as to present an effectual bar to all access by the old approach to the garden, symbolized God’s unchangeable holiness and justice; while the cherubim symbolized his mercy. The flame and the cherubim at the front of Eden seem to have constituted the antediluvian local tabernacle Genesis 4:3-4,14-16, and were the forerunners of the sanctuary, where the cherubim on either side of the shekinah cloud represented the meeting together of God’s mercy and justice in man’s redemption. (*Hassell History* pg 50)

Flood, The Genesis

The Genesis FLOOD: Harold Hunt: Evolutionists and skeptics assure us there never was such a flood as we read about in the book of Genesis. They cite all the reasons they think there could never have been a world wide flood— much less a flood that covered the highest mountains. The fact is, there has never been an event in the history of the world, that is so well documented as the Genesis Flood. Everywhere we look we come face to face with incontrovertible proof of the flood. Much of the evidence is in the layers and layers of rock lying exposed all around us.

When I was in school, we studied sedimentary rock. By definition, sedimentary rock is rock settled out of water. We were told about a time, millions and millions of years ago, when the earth was covered with water. Evolutionists love those big figures. They know if they use those big figures, there are not going to be any eyewitnesses around to contradict what they say. So they can make up just about anything they want to.

But, anyway, they told us there was a time when, for millions of years, this entire continent was under water. They explained that during those millions of years ever so much sediment settled out of water. That is what sediment is; it is stuff that has settled out of a liquid. They told us the result was the sedimentary rock we see all around us. Somehow, they didn't seem to realize they just described the Genesis Flood. Anyway, they were sure those waters could not have been the Genesis Flood, because they were sure the Genesis Flood is only a myth. Besides, their waters covered the earth millions of years ago, and nobody claims it has been that long since the flood of Noah's day.

The power of moving water

I know next to nothing about hydraulics, or geology, but anybody with enough sense to come in out of the rain knows that if you stir up a mess of dirt and rocks in water, it is going to settle out in fairly short order. It does not take millions of years. But these evolutionists are sure it really did take millions of years for all that mess to settle out and make sedimentary rock.

Also, bear in mind that those layers of sedimentary rock are sometimes hundreds, or even thousands, of feet thick. In order for there to be that much material gathered up in the water, the water had to be moving with a lot of force, and it had to continue to move with that same force for millions of years. **They cannot tell us what kept the water moving with that kind of force for so long a**

time. After all, they tell us it took millions of years for all those layers of rock to form; so the water must have been in motion all during that time. But, that thought seems never to have occurred to them, and if you ask one of them about it, all of a sudden he goes blind and dumb.

Then one day, as a little boy, I realized the Bible told us exactly how and when all the sedimentary rock came about. That is some (just some) of the evidence God has left us of the Genesis flood. The waters were not disturbed for millions of years; they were disturbed for forty days, and forty nights Genesis 7:12. And it did not take millions of years for the sediment to settle; it took part of one year, from the six hundredth to the six hundred and first year of Noah's life Genesis 7:11; 8:13).

Where did the water go?

The evolutionist tells us there never could have been such a flood as the Bible describes. They tell us that if you could wring out every drop of moisture in the atmosphere, you could only cause a *world-wide* flood somewhat less than knee deep.

There can be no question. Meteorologists have equipment capable of measuring the water content of the atmosphere accurately enough to make that statement, and we can be sure they are telling it right. All the water vapor on earth is insufficient to cause a knee deep world-wide flood.

Then the evolutionist wants to know, "Does that fact not bother you?" No, of course not, why should it? That is just one more of those instances where they think they know what we believe better than we do. They forget that the Bible talks about the waters coming down; it does not say a word about the waters going back up again. Those waters that came down were "the waters which were above the firmament (the atmosphere)" we read about in Genesis 1. The Bible teaches that before the flood there was a vast body of water—a canopy of water—above the atmosphere. Before the flood those waters were up there, now they are down here.

If you would like to see the waters of the Genesis Flood, it is a very simple matter. From any point in the United States, you can get in your automobile, and drive east, west, or south, and eventually you will come to the waters of the Genesis Flood. We call them the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, and the Gulf of Mexico. Those, along with the other oceans of the world, are where the waters of the flood came to rest.

The place where thou hast founded for them

In the book of Psalms 104, beginning at verse 5 (Psalms 104:5), we read, “Who laid the foundations of the earth, that it should not be removed for ever. Thou coveredst it (the earth) with a deep as with a garment; the waters stood above the mountains.” That’s talking about the Genesis Flood.

“The waters stood above the mountains. At thy rebuke they fled; at the voice of thy thunder they hasted away. They go up by the mountains they go down by the valleys,” Psalms 104:6-8. Where did they go? He goes on to tell us, “...unto the place where thou hast founded for them.”

Where did the waters of the flood go? The Bible does not say one word about the waters of the flood evaporating. That is simply a ruse others have used to discredit the Bible. The Bible says clearly enough that the waters came down. It says nothing at all about their going back up.

The text reads, “They go up by the mountains; they go down by the valleys unto the place which thou hast founded for them.” The language could not be clearer; God *founded* (prepared) a place for the waters of the flood. Then at his *rebuke*, at the *voice* of his *thunder* they *hasted* (hurried) to the place he prepared for them.

He goes on to say that after the waters of the flood came to rest in the place he *founded for them*, “Thou hast set a bound that they may not pass over; that they turn not again to cover the earth,” Psalms 104:9. He *founded* a place them; he rebuked them; they *hasted* to that place; then he ordered them to stay put. With all that information provided by God himself, it does not take a rocket scientist to discover where the waters of the flood went.

If you want to know where the waters went, just find out where all the water is. It is a simple matter to see that the oceans of the world are the very waters that covered the earth in Noah’s day.

But, how did they go from covering the earth to filling the oceans of the world? Again, the text tells us. “At the voice of thy thunder they hasted away...unto *the place thou hast founded for them*,” Psalms 104:7-8. God *founded* a place (prepared a place) for the waters; he simply increased the capacity of the oceans to receive those waters, and at his rebuke they *hasted* to that place.

Notice he says, “At the *voice of thy thunder* they hasted away” Psalms 104:7. We cannot begin to imagine what it must have been like when God thundered in the heavens, dropped the bottoms of the oceans, and the waters of the flood rushed to the place he had founded for them.

What formed the canyons?

More than that, can you imagine how those waters must have sloshed back and forth until God finally “set a bound that they may not pass over; that they turn not again to cover the earth,” Psalms 104:8.

To give just one more proof text about that day when God commanded those mighty waves to stay put, in Job we read, “Or who shut up the sea with doors, when it brake forth, as if it had issued out of the womb.....And brake up for it my decreed place, and set bars and doors, and said, hitherto shalt thou come, but no further: and here shall they proud waves be stayed,” Job 38:8,10-11.

Can you imagine what great gashes (canyons, if you will) those waters cut in the earth, when they were sloshing back and forth, before God finally commanded them to stay put.

To give just one illustration, the Colorado River, as wild and rugged as it is, does not carry enough water to cut a canyon a mile deep, five miles wide, and two hundred miles long—but the Pacific Ocean does, and it did. I don’t want to offend anybody, but anybody who can believe the Colorado River cut the Grand Canyon is not the brightest person to come down the road.

But they tell us, “It took millions of years.” That might explain how the Grand Canyon got so deep, but it can never explain how it got so wide. Did it, perhaps, work like some sort of giant lathe, moving back and forth, from right to left, then left to right, so it could make such a wide cut? It is amazing what bizarre explanations evolutionists can come up with, trying to prop up their ridiculous theories.

When God dropped the bottoms of the oceans, all that displaced material had to go somewhere. Where did it go? God has provided us with an entire world full of evidence as to where all that displaced material went, and that expression, *an entire world full*, is not a figure of speech. The world is literally full of the evidence.

Bear in mind that sedimentary rock is rock settled out of water. Wherever you go, in the mountainous areas of this country, you can see those layers upon layers of sedimentary rock. Each layer is different from the layer above, and the layer below it. That is because, when those sedimentary rock layers were forming, the waters of the flood were still sloshing back and forth. They would slosh in one direction, and they would deposit the material they gathered in that direction. They would slosh in the other direction, and deposit a different kind of material

they had gathered in that direction, until finally, according to Job, God said, “Hitherto shalt thou come, but no further; and here shall thy proud waves be stayed,” Job 38:11. After those waters had done their work, God commanded them to stay put in the place he had *founded for them* Psalms 104:8.

Also bear in mind that sediment goes down; it settles on the floor; it does not settle on the wall. Depending on the surface on which it is accumulating, it settles in a fairly even pattern. It does not settle at steep angles, and it does not settle in long, wavy, undulating patterns, like corrugated roofing. But, when we look at those layers of sedimentary rock in the mountains, that is exactly what we do see. The layers of sedimentary rock are in every pattern imaginable. Some of it is in smooth, level layers, but more often than not, it is at some kind of an angle. Sometimes the layers are almost vertical; sometimes they are in long, wavy patterns; and sometimes they are all out of joint.

Sometimes they look, for all the world, like a giant quilt somebody has pushed from one side until it is all crumpled and folded. And there is the answer to our question. After all that rock had formed, while it was still somewhat soft, God *thundered* in the heavens, his mighty hand dropped the bottoms of the oceans to *found a place* for the waters to *haste away* to, and that same mighty hand that dropped the bottoms of the oceans, pushed aside all that soft, pliable rock, like a gigantic quilt, to *found a place* for the waters of the flood.

Then, all over this planet, he laid bare his mighty arm in exposing that sedimentary rock, so that no matter where we may go, before long, we come face to face with undeniable evidence of what he did.

In some places so much material was pushed aside to make room for the waters, the displaced material was pushed up into lofty mountains. It is in the mountains those layers of sedimentary rock take on such strange patterns. And it is in those mountains that we see the clearest evidence they have been pushed from somewhere—pushed aside to make room for the waters of the Genesis Flood.

Foreign Missions

FOREIGN MISSIONS: *Sylvester Hassell*: Modern Protestant Missions originated in the eighteenth century. The English “Society for Propagating the Gospel in Foreign Parts,” established in 1701, devoted itself to the diligent dissemination of High Church Episcopalianism. The Danish Government, under the influence of the German Pietist, A.H. Francke, sent out a few missionaries to India in 1705, to Lapland in 1716, and to Greenland in 1721. The Moravian Zinzendorf sent out from 1732 to 1750 “more missionaries than the combined

Protestant Church in two hundred years—illiterate laymen, who were enjoined to practice rigid economy, labor with their own hands, use only spiritual means, and aim at the conversion of individuals.”

Thomas Coke, John Wesley’s “right-hand,” “the embodiment of Methodist Missionism,” established in 1786 a mission among the Negroes in the West Indies. The Independent Protestant Missionary Societies formed in this century may be regarded as a substitute for the Orders of the Roman Catholic Church,” says the able and accurate Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge.

The “Baptist Society for Propagating the Gospel amongst the Heathen” was formed at Kettering England, October 2d, 1792, under the influence of **Andrew Fuller, William Carey**, and others, and operated in India. The “London Missionary Society” was formed in 1795, soon passed under the control of the Independents, and began work in the South Sea Islands and South Africa. The “Society for Missions to Africa and the East” was formed in 1799 by Episcopalians. (*Hassell’s History* ppg 538, 539)

Sylvester Hassell: In 1784 Mr. Andrew Fuller read a pamphlet on the importance of general union in prayer for the revival of true religion written by Jonathan Edwards, President of the College of New Jersey; and in the same year he read a poem by John Scott on the cruelties of the English in the East Indies. In this manner he was led to recommend prayer meetings the first Monday evening of every month for the extension of the gospel, and to urge the formation of a moneyed religious society for sending a mission to India.

The first Baptist Missionary Society was thus formed at Kettering England, Oct. 2, 1792, and the first collection for its treasury, amounting to (13 pounds, 2 shillings, 6 pence),. was taken up. Mark Fuller was chosen and remained its secretary till his death, traveling almost continually through the British Isles, and pleading for the mission cause, and charging the society nothing for his services.

He makes the following remarkable statement in his writings: “Our undertaking to India really appeared to me, on its commencement, to be somewhat like a few men who were deliberating about the importance of penetrating into a deep mine which had never been explored. We had no one to guide us; and, while we were thus deliberating, Carey, as it were, said: “Well, I will go down if *you* will hold the rope.” But before he went down, he, as it seemed to me, took an oath from each of us at the mouth of the pit to this effect, that, while *we* lived we should *never* let go the rope. You understand me. There was great responsibility attached to us who began the business.”

All this looks far more like faith in men and in money than faith in God. Instead of approving, the Scriptures utterly condemn all confidence in the flesh. Can it be possible that such fleshly confidence as that to which Mr. Fuller makes such full and candid confession was the source of modern Baptist and Protestant missions. If his language has any meaning, it would seem so.

Again, Mr. Fuller makes the astonishing statement that his own “church was in a famished condition of spiritual life, and found no salvation except in becoming identified with mission work!” Alas that the mission idol should be substituted for Christ!

This remark of Andrew Fuller is paralleled by a remark of the Methodist *Bishop*, George F. Pierce, of Georgia, substantially as follows; “The question is—not so much how can the *heathen* be saved unless we send them the gospel, but how can *we ourselves* be saved unless we send them the gospel?” If the essence of this remark is not *idolatry*, I confess that I do not understand the meaning of the term. How different is the declaration from the preaching of the Apostle Peter in Acts 4:10-12!

The Apostles were commanded by Christ to “go into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature.” Scripture prophecy makes it certain that, in God’s own best time, the Apostles, by their writings, will go into all the world, and a heavenly kingdom will take the place of all earthly kingdoms (Matthew 24:14; Revelation 11:15).

The Apostles must have understood Christ’s commandment to them better than subsequent uninspired men have understood it. but there is no clear Bible evidence, and, as admitted by all scholars, no other reliable evidence that the Apostles personally preached the gospel outside the Roman Empire.

By the dissemination of the Greek language and civilization, and by the multiplication of the facilities for travel under the mighty dominion of Rome, the providence of God had gradually prepared the way for the apostolic preaching of the gospel, at the same time that the Spirit of God had prepared a people to hear and be benefitted by such preaching.

No doubt the genuine future evangelization of the world will take place in a similar way. Not by such nineteenth-century machinery as unscriptural alliances, upon a money basis, of the world and the nominal *Church*, but by the providential assemblage of people from all nations at Jerusalem to hear the preaching of the Apostles, by persecution, by visions of the day and the night, by special communications of the Holy Spirit forbidding the Apostles to go in certain directions and commanding them to go in others, and by the Holy Spirit

preceding and accompanying the Apostles, the gospel was preached throughout the Roman Empire.

And during the early succeeding centuries, by social and commercial intercourse, by persecution, by conquest, by captivity, by slavery, by enlistment in the Roman armies, the inscrutable wisdom of God, which is able to overrule evil for good and make the wrath of man praise him, diffused the light of saving truth, to some extent, among the barbarian nations dwelling on the borders of the Roman Empire.

And during the Dark Ages the Cathari, the Patarenes, the Paulicians, the Albigenses, and the Waldenses, being persecuted in one country, fled to another, as commanded by Christ, and went in every direction preaching the word (Matthew 10:23; Acts 8:1-4). And in modern times the Baptists have suffered the most religious persecution, and have been driven from country to country, preaching the gospel.

The Roman Catholic Popes, in order to aggrandize themselves, sent missionaries from time to time to convert various tribes to their own heathenish superstitions, trustworthy historians affirming that many of these heathen tribes were far more moral than the Catholics themselves.

The most zealous and *successful* foreign missionaries of the pope have been the three monastic orders of Franciscans, Dominicans and Jesuits. The first two orders originated in the thirteenth, and the last in the sixteenth century. Vowing perpetual poverty, chastity, and obedience (to the General of the Order, or to the pope), these powerful organizations, equaling the ancient proselyting Pharisees, and utterly eclipsing all subsequent Protestant societies in zeal and apparent sincerity, have in the last six centuries victimized hundreds of millions of the human race, exterminating, by means of the Inquisition, millions of so-called heretics at home, and Catholicizing, by means of compromises with paganism, countless multitudes of poor deluded heathens in foreign lands.

Of these three monastic orders, the Jesuitic has been the most zealous and *successful*. Founded in 1534 to check and overbalance the Catholic losses by Protestantism, suppressed, because of their intolerable abominations, in 1773, by the pope, Clement XIV., who died by poison in 1774, and restored by Pope Pius VII in 1814, this nefarious order, the most powerful and the most missionary institution that ever existed on earth, has thoroughly undermined all the foundation of human morality, and, in a word, *made Jesuitism equivalent to diabolism*.

The Protestant Reformers, Luther and Calvin, never thought of sending missionaries to the heathen, Luther denouncing with great emphasis the worldly methods of prosecuting missions; and Calvin, in his comment on the final commandment of Christ to his Apostles Matthew 28:19, saying nothing whatever of missions to the heathen.

It is, therefore, admitted in the article on *Missions* in the second volume of the Schaff-Herzog "Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge," published in 1883, that "a church may have a vigorous spiritual life, and yet not prosecute missionary activity; and a church may be active in missionary operations, and yet be spiritually dead." (*Hassell's History* ppg 341-343)

Lemuel Potter: I have objections to the foreign missionary work, not because I think it is likely to spread the gospel. That is not it. My friend urges that as our position on the foreign missionary work; that is not it. We object to it because of the plea for it. As I have clearly shown during this discussion, that it is indirectly preaching the doctrine of the universal damnation of all people that do not hear the gospel. I object to the foreign mission work on that plea. I would not contribute to that sort of doctrine. I think this doctrine is unscriptural and unwarranted; that God is going to damn a majority of the race of men, because they do not hear the gospel. That is the very foundation of the foreign mission work, as I intend to prove before the close of this discussion.

I object to it on another ground. I do not believe it is warranted in God's word. Because in order to find even a shadow of authority for it in the Scriptures its advocates say that the great commission was given to the church, instead of the apostles and ministers. Remember the position that I am here to prove is that the Missionary Baptists believe that doctrine, and that the advocates of modern missions say that the great commission was given to the church, instead of the apostles and ministers. To prove that they do put forth that claim I wish to quote from the "Great Commission and its Fulfillment by the Church," by Mr. Carpenter. He says, in speaking of the commission.

"All forms of evangelistic work and enterprise are based upon these works. (That is the words of the great commission.) Not ministers only but all Christians, ordained and unordained, male and female, old and young, are bound by them. Some can go farther than others, but all are to go on this errand of mercy; some are to give more than others, but all are to give, according to their ability, the means requisite for saving the lost; some are to preach officially and more regularly than others, but all are to preach in the sense of communicating saving truth to those in spiritual darkness; and all are to contribute to that great, unceasing volume of earnest prayer which has only to become general and

tenderly importunate to secure the salvation of a great multitude of God's elect who are now wandering unsaved on the mountains of sin in every land."

A Missionary document says that the commission is assigned not only to the ordained but the unordained, male and female; that all are bound by the words of the great commission, all are to go. Some may go farther than others, for the commission is given to the church, and that is the meaning of the commission, that the church must send ministers abroad, in obedience to the commission.

The Savior said in the commission, "Go ye into all the world." He did not say "send." It would have been proper to say "send" if it was given to the church. But he said, "Go ye into all the world," talking directly to the apostles. They understood it that way and preached it that way. Turn to Matthew 28:19-20.

"Then the eleven disciples went away into Galilee, into a mountain where Jesus had appointed them. And when they saw him, they worshiped him; but some doubted. And Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you. And, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world. Amen."

To whom did he speak this language? To the eleven, not to the church, but to the eleven, so says the text itself. Let us also notice Mark 16:14-16. "Afterward he appeared unto the eleven as they sat at meat, and upbraided them with their unbelief and hardness of heart, because they believed not them which had seen him after he was risen. And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned."

To whom was this commission given by this text? To the eleven, not to the church. The church was not included there. But he gave it to the eleven, to the apostles, to the ministry. It belongs to them. And the command of Jesus comes to the minister and tells him to go; it does not come to the church and tell her to send.

Claud Cayce: Another speaker for the new movement, Dr. A. J. Brown, a missionary, says, "In Korea I traveled in a car made in Delaware, drawn by a locomotive from Philadelphia over Pittsburg rails, fastened by New York spikes to Oregon ties. I sat down to a meal that included Chicago beef, Pittsburg pickles and Minnesota flour. We could afford to support all the missionaries in Korea for the large and growing trade they have developed with this country."

Another *business* appeal! The missionaries built your trade up; therefore build up the missionaries. The missionaries developed the trade with Korea!

The real attitude of the new movement is this—and I am but saying plainly what its speakers say inferentially: Let us carry beef and flour and railroad ties and pig-iron to the heathen (deducting, of course, therefrom a good American profit from the transaction), and his soul will somehow take care of itself. We will carry a little side line of tracts for his soul, but we in our enlightened wisdom, are not so sure that our ideas are so much better than his. We will give him the benefit of the doubt on that point, and let him have his choice.

On one thing, however, he shall not have any choice—that is, on business. Our business is infinitely superior to his, and it is our sacred duty to send it to him. Beef and iron, flour and railroad ties, pickles and pork, candy and kerosene—these the heathen must have, even if he rejects the soul tracts. (*CAYCE vol. 1, ppg 371*)

P.D. Gold: Because we do not cooperate with the Missionary Baptists in their measures and methods of sending out their missionaries, they say we are opposed to preaching the gospel to the heathen.

We do not believe that they preach the gospel here at home, nor do we believe that man can *send* the gospel to the heathen. If these people loved and preached the truth here at home, we would feel more like fellowshiping them. People are not apt to act better out of sight than in sight. They deny the power of God here at home: nor do we suppose they preach any better away from home.

When the Lord sends one to preach to the heathen, and by the Holy Ghost says, Separate me Paul and Barnabas for the work whereunto I have called them, then we can encourage such to go, and help them on their journey of a godly sort, by ministering to their necessities, and praying the Lord to bless and prosper their journey.

We are not to receive any into our houses, nor bid them God speed, unless they bring the doctrine of Christ, which is not the doctrines of men nor devils. Where are the heathen? Everywhere, both in this continent and the Eastern continent.

It is no evidence that a people are right because they are zealous in propagating their views. The Catholics, Mormons and Mahometans are and were all active in spreading their gospel, as they call it, into all the world. Who could be more active than the ancient Pharisees, who compassed sea and land to make one proselyte?

It was a command to the Apostles to go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature, and they did this. Jesus himself sent them, and they literally obeyed the command. They were to preach the word. Jesus has all power in heaven and earth, and he sends laborers into his vineyard. We cannot prepare nor teach others to preach, nor send them to preach the gospel. The gospel is the power of God. We cannot carry that, but it can carry us and direct us when and where to go.

The money, that sends the doctrines that the missionaries preach, forbids the conclusion it is the power of God that sends it. It is common for the advocates of modern missions to hold that unless the people contribute their money freely, thousands of souls for which Christ died will be lost. We do not believe that the church of Christ is redeemed with corruptible things, such as silver and gold, but with the precious blood of Christ, as a lamb verily foreordained, but slain in these last times for you, who by him do believe in God, who raised him from the dead, and gave him grace and glory, that your faith and hope might be in God.

To misrepresent us, and say that we are opposed to preaching the gospel to the heathen because we do not believe the Missionaries as a denomination send the gospel anywhere (for what one has not got he cannot send off), is as absurd as to say that because man cannot raise the dead, therefore we are opposed to the resurrection of the dead; or that because man cannot save a dead sinner, therefore we are opposed to salvation.

Gilbert Beebe: The argument of Mission Baptists, as they are pleased to call themselves, is: These institutions, as auxiliaries to the church, or something nearly akin to them, have been of long standing with Baptists of former ages. Well, suppose this, though doubted, be admitted, cannot the other denominations adduce the same argument for their perversions of baptism? Cannot the Catholics show their invocation of saints, their purgatory and their triple-crowned pontiff, to be institutions and traditions of many centuries with as good a grace?

But we do not admit the claim that missionary societies, as distinct organizations from the churches, with presidents, vice-presidents, directors, treasurers, collectors and executive boards, have been known, either in our country or in any other for ages past. The cases which they have cited in England and Wales do not show that they were separate from their church organizations, or such missionism as we have and do repudiate and protest against. The self-styled Missionary Baptists make such remarks as these: "From the days of the Apostles to the present time, the true, legitimate Baptist Church has ever been a missionary body"—"the churches founded by Christ and the Apostles were missionary churches!"

If by missionary churches they mean only that these churches were, as churches, engaged in the dissemination of the gospel through the gifts which God bestowed upon the Apostles, evangelists, pastors, and teachers, which he himself raised up, called and qualified “for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ,” then we challenge them to show wherein we, the Old School Baptists of the present day, have or do differ from the primitive order.

Without any missionary society or board outside of the organization of the church of God to guarantee a salary, without purse, scrip or two coats, the Old School Baptists have today more gospel preachers of this description in the field than all the professedly Missionary Baptists in the world can honestly claim.

But if they mean to convey the impression that the churches organized by Christ patronized missionary societies outside of the church membership composed of members admitted at a specified price, organized with presidents, to employ men, appoint them their field of labor, and pay them their wages, then we demand proof from the Scriptures that any such institutions were known or tolerated in the primitive churches.

If the primitive churches founded by Christ and his Apostles were missionary churches, then so are the so-called Old School Baptists of the present time; for they occupy the same ground, observe the same order and ordinances, and refuse to practice or patronize any religious order other than such as are clearly authorized by the precepts and examples of Christ and his Apostles, according to the record of the New Testament.

It matters not what were the practices of the Baptists of five hundred or a thousand years ago. We have the laws of Christ as given in the New Testament, for our rule, and the Apostles of Christ as expounders of the laws of Christ to us. What they have bound on earth is bound in heaven, and what they have loosed on earth is loosed in heaven.

When the Fullerite heresies had been introduced among the Baptists, and produced great discord and turmoil, some of the old veterans of the cross met at Black Rock, Maryland, in 1832, and published a solemn protest against all the newly introduced innovations upon our former faith and order, and made the rejection of the new departure a test of fellowship.

To distinguish those who retained the apostolic doctrine from those who departed from it, we consented to be known by a name which had been given us by our opponents, viz., Old School Baptists. This appellation we agreed to accept, with the express understanding that it referred only to the school of Christ, and not to

any humanly devised system of scholastic divinity. It was not that we had changed in any wise from what we had always been, either in faith or order, but simply to distinguish us from those who had changed, and still chose to be called by our name to take away their reproach.

If the New School or Missionary Baptists claim to have a regular, unbroken succession from the Primitive Baptists of the Apostolic Age, upon the ground that they were largely in the majority when the division took place in 1832, will they please tell us why the claim of succession made by Catholics is not equally clear and valid?

The Old School Baptists never did consent to any of the antichristian doctrines and institutions of the new order, even when mixed up with them in denominational connection; they protested against every practice for which there was no "Thus saith the Lord," and after laboring to reclaim the disorderly until they found their labors were unavailing, they withdrew fellowship from them. Christ has commanded us to withdraw even from every *brother* that walks disorderly."

Fornication

FORNICATION: T. S. Dalton: I Corinthians 6:18, "Every sin that a man doeth is without the body; but he that committeth fornication, sinneth against his own body."

The former part of this chapter seems to relate to that early dispute among Christians, about the distinction of meats, and yet to be preparatory to the caution that follows against fornication. Some among the Corinthians seem to have imagined that they were as much at liberty in the point of fornication as of meats, especially because it was not a sin condemned by the laws of their country. They were ready to say, even in the case of fornication, "*all things are lawful for me.*" This pernicious conceit Paul sets himself here to oppose.

There is a liberty wherewith Christ has made us free, in which we must stand fast. But surely we should never carry this liberty so far as to put us into the power of any bodily appetite. Though all meats were supposed lawful, yet Paul would not become a glutton or a drunkard, much less would he abuse the maxim of lawful liberty, to countenance the sin of fornication, which, though it might be allowed by the Corinthian laws, was a trespass on the law of nature, and utterly unbecoming a Christian.

Meats and the belly are for one another; not so with fornication and the body. “The body is not for fornication, but for the Lord.” This seems to be the argument of the apostle. This sin of fornication is making things cross their intention and use. The body was made for meats, and though a man should eat too much, yet he hasn’t wrenched the body from its intended use. But he says, “the body is not for fornication.” It was never formed for such purpose, but *for the Lord*, for the service and honor of God, to be an instrument of *righteousness to holiness*, Romans 6:19, and therefore not of a harlot (Romans 6:15).

Another argument is, the honor already put on them (Romans 6:15), if they should be united to Christ in regeneration, the whole man has become a member to Christ in regeneration, the whole man has become a member of his *mystical body*, the body as well as the soul. How honorable this is to the Christian! It is good to know in what honorable relations we stand, that we may endeavor to become them.

Nothing can stand in greater opposition to the honorable relations and alliances of a Christian man, than has [this] sin. He is joined to the Lord, in union with him, and made partaker of his Spirit, and this one Spirit lives and dwells in all the members of his mystical body. Christ and his followers are one. But he that is joined to an harlot is one body, for two shall be one flesh, by carnal conjunction, which was ordained of God, only to be in a married state. And now the question is, shall those in so close union with Christ, as to be one spirit with him, yet, be so united to a harlot as to become one flesh with her? And could a greater indignity be offered to him or to ourselves? The sin of fornication is a great reproach to the cause of his Lord and Master, and a great blot upon the profession of the Christian. No wonder that the apostle would say, “flee fornication” (Romans 6:18), avoid it, keep out of the reach of temptations to it. Direct the mind and eyes to other things, and thoughts.

Other vices may conquered by fight, but this can be conquered alone by flight. So would, doubtless speak, many of the ancient fathers, who have been overtaken by this vice.

Another argument is, it is a sin against our own bodies, (Romans 6:18). Every sin, that is, every other sin, every external act of sin besides, is without the body, that it, it is not so much an abuse of the body as this one. If we eat meat, the body was made for it, but to eat to excess is sin. Yet it is not a sin against the body, because the body was made for it. If a man drinks, the body was made for drink, therefore it is not such a sin against his body, and where a man eats or drinks too much, it does not give the *power* of his body to another person, neither does it so much tend to the reproach of the body, and to render it vile.

This sin is in a peculiar manner styled *uncleanness, pollution*, because no sin has so much external turpitude in it, especially in a Christian. He sins against his own body, he defiles it, he degrades it, making it one with the body of that vile creature with whom he sins. He casts vile reproach on what his Redeemer has dignified to the last degree, by taking it into union with himself. We should not make our present vile bodies more vile by sinning against them.

Another argument against this is, that the bodies of Christians are “temples of the Holy Ghost, which is in them, and which they have of God” (Romans 6:19). He that is joined to Christ is one spirit with him, and he has yielded up to him, is consecrated thereby, and set apart for his use, and is therefore possessed, and occupied, and inhabited by his Holy Spirit. This is the proper notion of a temple—a place where God dwells, and sacred to his use. And it is clear that we are not our own; we are yielded up to God, and possessed by, and for God, and this in virtue of a purchase made of us. “Ye are bought with a price, therefore glorify God in your *bodies*, and in your spirits, which are his.”

In short, our bodies were made for God; they were purchased for him. If we are Christians, indeed, they are yielded to him, and he inhabits, and occupies them by his Spirit. So our bodies are not our own, but his, and shall we desecrate his temple, defile it, prostitute it, and offer it up to the use and service of harlots? This surely would be horrid sacrilege! This would be robbing God in the worst sense.

The temple of the Holy Ghost should be kept holy. Our bodies being his and the temples of the Holy Ghost should be kept as pure as possible, and fit for his residence. Our bodies should be clean that God may be honored by them. But God is dishonored when our bodies are defiled by so beastly a sin as fornication. Wherefore Paul would say, “Flee fornication,” yea and every other sin. We should use our bodies for the glory and service of our Lord and Master. We are not proprietors of ourselves, nor have we power over ourselves, and therefore should not use ourselves according to our own pleasure, but according to God’s will, and for his pleasure, whose we are, and whom we should serve. (*T.S. Dalton Zions’s Advocate March 1895*).

Four Hundred Years Affliction, The

The FOUR HUNDRED YEARS Affliction

Genesis 15:13-14, “And he said unto Abram, Know of a surety that thy seed shall be a stranger in a land that is not theirs, and shall serve them; and they shall afflict them *four hundred years*; And also that nation, whom they shall serve, will I judge: and afterward shall they come out with great substance.”

Four hundred and thirty years are reckoned from the promise made to Abraham to the giving of the law at Sinai (B.C. 1921-B.C. 1491), according to the received chronology Galatians 3:17. This period of time was about equally divided by Abraham and his descendants—say 215 years in Canaan and 215 years in Egypt. From the death of Joseph to the exodus was 144 years, and we may conclude that the length of rigorous oppression was only about 100 years.....This exodus or departure of the Israelites from Egypt closed the four hundred and thirty years of their pilgrimage, which began from the call of Abram out of Ur of the Chaldees” (*Hassell*)

Foxes, John, Book of Martyrs

John FOXES Book of Martyrs (*See under the CHURCH OF ENGLAND*)

Frederick Barbarossa

FREDERICK BARBAROSSA (*See under The CRUSADES*)

Frederick Elector of Saxony

FREDERICK Elector of Saxony (*See under Martin LUTHER*)

Free Moral Agency

FREE Moral Agency: C. H. Cayce: As to “free moral agency” I will say that the Arminian world talks about this as though **they think the human will is on an equipoise or equilibrium, without any bias to either good or evil.** They claim that the sinner is free to either accept or reject the Lord—accept the Lord and be saved, or reject the Lord and be condemned. They claim that the sinner is free to act for himself either way, hence a “free moral agent.” **As to the freedom, will say that man does act freely. The sinner acts freely in committing sin.** The unregenerate sinner loves sin. He prefers sin rather than holiness or righteousness.

If he rejects sin or unrighteousness, then, and accepts holiness, or accepts the Lord, he does not act freely, for he prefers unrighteousness. **The reason why he prefers sin and unrighteousness is because his nature is poisoned with sin.** Unrighteousness is in harmony with his nature. No one can prefer that which is not in harmony with his nature. **Therefore, the sinner is not free in the sense that his will is unbiased.**

Will being a product of life, it necessarily follows that **the will is like the life from which it springs**; the will and the life are necessarily alike in nature. From the natural life springs a will for natural things. The natural life is poisoned with sin, and the will which springs from that life, must, therefore, also be a poisoned will. **The will is, therefore, biased to evil or sin.** This being true, if the sinner accepts Christ, he accepts what he does not really want. To say that God saves the sinner upon such a condition as that is absurd, to say the least of it. But that is about as good as any of the modern theology.

In order that one act freely in the service of God, he must first possess the holy or righteous life, the life of Christ, which is a higher order of life than the natural life.

From that holy or righteous life springs a holy will, or a will for righteousness. If one accepts Christ, then, because he prefers holiness or righteousness rather than unrighteousness, it is because he already possesses the righteous life, from which the righteous will springs. He is already a child of God. In talking to people who had not the love of God in them the Saviour said, "And ye will not come to me, that ye might have life." [John 6:40](#).

Those people had no will to come to the Saviour. "Ye will not," is the language of our Lord. He certainly knew what He was talking about. These people did not have the love of God in them, and were destitute of a will to come to Christ. They had no such will as that. They did have a will for unrighteousness, but not for righteousness. (*Cayce's Editorials vol. 2, ppg 376,377*)

FREE Moral Agency: T.S. Dalton : Some people desire our views on the subject of free agency, and lay as a base for their belief of this unscriptural doctrine, that when God gave to Adam a law in the garden of Eden, he made him a free agent to choose or refuse as he pleased; consequently, man became a free agent.

It is strange to us that men of talent, men of good sound minds and judgment cannot see that **the term free agent is a contradiction of itself.** An agent is one employed by another, to act for another, and is held accountable by his employer for all of his acts, and all that he does must be done in the name of the employer.

If Adam was ever free it was before God ever gave him the law, for when God gave him the law, he restricted him, and man cannot be free and restricted at the same time. The law says, "Of all of the trees of the garden thou mayest

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

This doesn't sound to us much like Adam was free. **But Satan (the serpent) believed in free agency**, and he appeared to the woman in a subtle manner, and says, “Yea, hath God said, ye shall not eat of the trees of the garden?” And the woman said, “God hath said ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it lest ye die,” and the serpent (Satan) said to the woman, “Ye shall not surely die.” **The idea is, you are free agents, you have a right to eat of any of the trees of the garden if you wish.** The devil always has believed in free agency.

If the above texts prove anything, they surely prove that man is not free, but is under rigid restrictions, and the penalty is death, if he acts contrary to the prescribed rules in the law of God.

Therefore, there is no rule in logic, or scripture by which we can prove man to be a free agent, while there is any law, either human or divine, that restricts his liberties, and holds him bound under penalty of death for its violation.

After Adam had violated the law and had fallen under its curse, he surely was not free then, for God immediately cast him forth from the garden, and placed the Cherubim, and a flaming sword, pointing every way to keep the way of the tree of life, lest man should reach forth his hand and pluck and eat and live forever.

Now if it can be proven that God had removed the Cherubim and that flaming sword, and had given man free access to the tree of life, and had removed the penalty due to his crime for the violation of the law of God, and had exonerated him from all obligations to observe the moral precepts of any law, and has so released him from the clutches of Satan, as that he is no longer a servant of Satan in any sense, neither is he under any obligation to serve the Lord in any way, then, and not till then can it be proven that man is free.

The Bible teaches us that after the violation of the law **“God reserved them in chains of darkness** until the judgment of the great day. And again the Bible teaches us that **“We were taken captive by Satan at his will.”** How there can be such a thing as a free captive, we confess we are unable to see, and throughout the scriptures we are represented as being captives and servants of Satan, and Paul says, “His servants ye are, to whom ye obey, whether of sin unto death, or of righteousness unto holiness.”

What sense could there be in a free servant? A man is either a servant of sin, (or Satan) or a servant of the Lord, and in either case he is not free; therefore man cannot be a *free agent*. The prophet Jeremiah said, “O Lord, I know that the way of a man is not in himself; it is not in man that walketh to direct his steps.”

Surely, if the old prophet speaking under the direct and immediate influence of the Holy Spirit, has told us the truth, “that the way of man is not in himself,” man cannot be a *free agent*. **There would be as much sense in saying a white black bird, as there would be in saying a free agent,** for in either case one term contradicts the other.

You will have to excuse us from the belief that God has set evil before the man, for we cannot believe that God tempts man to evil. The Bible says, “God tempts no man to evil.”

If God sets evil before the man, and leaves him free to choose either good or evil, then it is God that tempts man to evil. We cannot believe that. God sets all good before man, we fully believe, but that God leaves man free to do either good or evil, we do not believe, but God holds man under obligation to obey the moral precepts of the law, and where man does evil or wrong, by violating the law of God, he is held under obligation to pay the penalty of a violated law; hence man is not free to do either, or choose either, but is morally bound to obey the precepts of the law, therefore there is no period of a man’s life that he can truthfully be called a *free agent*.

The next text to which our mind is directed is Matthew 7:21. “For not everyone that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter the kingdom of heaven, but he that

doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven.” There is a grand difference between doing the will of the Father, and doing what some people think is the will of the Father, and how any man could think that this proves that a man is a *free agent*, we confess we are not able to see, for **a man striving to do the will of God must of necessity be the servant of God.**

In this language the Savior was contrasting between those that serve him, and those that serve him not, or rather contrasting between those that obey the Lord, in humility and fear as his humble children, and those who profess to be doing the work of God. And the Lord in this chapter is warning his disciples against those people who do so many good works, and says to them that “many shall come up and say in the last day, Lord, we have prophesied in thy name, and in thy name done many wonderful works,” and the Lord says, “I will profess unto them, I never knew you, depart from me ye that work iniquity.”

These are to be known by their fruits. “Men do not gather grapes of thorns, nor figs of thistles.” And when men assume to themselves the power to convert a world of sinners to a knowledge of the truth, and start out prophesying with this end in view, they are not doing the will of God, but are professing to do God’s work, and God says that “he is a jealous God, and will not give his glory to another, nor his praise to graven images.”

But the humble, meek and lowly saint of God, who from a pure principle of the love of God shed abroad in his heart, walks in the ordinances and commandments of the Lord humbly claiming no glory, nor honor to himself, but ascribing it all to God, and goes to him, as an humble beggar, who is willing, yea, anxious to eat of the crumbs that might fall from his table, and ask of God the things that they so much need is “doing the will of his Father which is in heaven, for God says “to him that is of a poor, and contrite heart will I look.”
(*T.S. Dalton Zions Advocate April, 1893*)

Freemasonry

FREEMASONRY: (*See also under SECRET SOCIETIES*)

George Washington: I preside over no lodge, nor have I been in one more than once or twice during the last thirty years.

Daniel Webster: In my opinion the imposition of such obligations as Freemasonry requires should be prohibited by law.

D. L. Moody: I do not see how any Christian, most of all a Christian minister, can go into these secret lodges with unbelievers.....Do no evil that good may

come. You can never reform anything by unequally yoking yourself with ungodly men.

Wendell Phillips: Secret societies are not needed for any good purpose, and may be used for any bad purpose whatsoever. In my opinion such societies should be prohibited by law.

Friends, The

The FRIENDS (*See under The QUAKERS*)

Fuller, Andrew

Andrew FULLER: *Sylvester Hassell:* Mr. Andrew Fuller is claimed to have been the *sledge hammer* that beat Methodist fervor into the cold Baptists, and roused both Baptists and Protestants to “send the gospel into heathen lands.” Mr. Fuller is described by his adherents as a clear, plain, practical, judicious, powerful, profound theologian— “the Franklin of theology.”

As he is honestly admitted by learned “D.D.’s” and “LL.D’s” among modern Baptists to be their *standard*, it is eminently proper for us to examine, at least briefly, his life and labors. He was born in 1754 and died in 1815. His parents were poor, and he had only the barest rudiments of an English education; yet the Fullerite or New School Baptists, notwithstanding the case of Mr. Fuller, and the fact that all real scholars admit that every one of the Apostles except Paul was unlearned, consider a fine classical education almost indispensable for a successful preacher, and, in the number of their theological colleges in the United States (21), they surpass all the Protestants, and equal the Roman Catholics.

From his fourteenth to his sixteenth year Mr. F. says that he had two or three spurious conversions, and, in his sixteenth year, a genuine conversion; and this saving conversion of one called “the grandest champion of Christianity,” took place, be it noted, during the *universal* prevalence of hyper-Calvinistic views among the Baptists—views which he devoted the most of his life to denouncing as not only “false Calvinism,” but *false religion, more dangerous than irreligion*. But for the hyper-Calvinism in his own heart, making him feel that he needed some previous qualification to come to Christ, he reckons that he might have found rest sooner than he did; but Divine drawings enabled him to overleap this barrier.

He confesses that he was “saved by mere grace, in spite of himself, by free grace from first to last.” He declared that he “never had any predilection for Arminianism, which appeared to him to ascribe the difference between one sinner and another, not to the grace of God, but to the good improvement made of grace given us in common with others, and that his zeal for the doctrine of grace increased with his years;” and his dying declarations are that “all he had done needed forgiveness; that he trusted alone in sovereign grace and mercy; that he was a poor guilty creature, but Christ was an almighty Savior; that the doctrine of grace was all his salvation and all his desire; that he had no other hope than from salvation by mere sovereign efficacious grace, through the atonement of his Lord and Savior; that with this hope he could go into eternity with composure.”

The preacher of his funeral said that “he died a penitent sinner at the foot of the cross.” In his writings, Mr. Fuller admits that “the Scriptures clearly ascribe both repentance and faith to Divine influence;” and he professes himself to be a strict Calvinist or predestinarian.

Notwithstanding this admission and profession, and his attributing, both in conversion and in death, all his salvation to the mere, free, sovereign, efficacious grace of God, he maintains that the prophets, and Christ, and his Apostles, gave the *most unlimited invitations to unconverted hearers of the gospel*, and so should all gospel ministers do; that the obligations of men to repentance and faith are universal; that man’s inability is not proper or physical, but only figurative or moral; that man is able to comply with all that God requires at his hand; that all his misery arises from his *voluntary* abuse of mercy, and his *wilful* rebellion against God; that it is not a want of ability, but of inclination, that proves his ruin; that men have the same *power*, strictly speaking, before they are wrought upon by the Holy Spirit as after, and before conversion as after; that the work of the work of the Spirit endows us with no new rational powers, nor any powers that are necessary to moral agency.”

He allows that “these principles may be inconsistent with the doctrines of grace,” but he maintains that “both are scriptural and therefore true”—that “we must receive both the general precepts and invitations of Scripture, and the declarations of salvation, as being a fruit of electing love.” Though in one article admitting that the evidence of our interest in the blessings of eternal life must be internal, yet he, in another article, says that “the terms hunger, thirst, labor, heavy laden, etc., do not denote spiritual desires, and do not mark out the persons who are entitled to come to Christ.”

In accordance with this Fullerite principle, I myself heard the most learned Fullerite in North Carolina declare, in preaching upon [Isaiah 55:1](#), that the

address of the prophet applied to *every human being, for that all men thirst after something.*

While at times apparently delighting to stigmatize *hyper-Calvinism* as *Antinomianism*, and inconsistent with genuine conversion, Mr. Fuller admits that some adherents of this system may have true religion; and, in another article, he declares that *all men by nature are real Antinomians*, for Paul says that the carnal (or unrenewed) mind is enmity against God, not subject to his law, neither indeed can be.

William Huntington, S.S.(sinner saved), is regarded by many genuine Baptists in England and America as one of the most spiritual writers of the present century; but Mr. F. says that he never saw any marks of genuine religion in his writings.

I am glad to see that, in one place, Mr. Fuller, the standard of the New School Baptists in England and the United States, declares that he *never imagined himself infallible*. In this candid statement all Bible Baptists will heartily agree with him, especially after having read the perfectly fair exhibition of his inconsistencies just given.

The *Bible*, however, such Baptists do believe to be *infallible*, and therefore not to contain any pair of Mr. Fuller's inconsistencies, as truth cannot be inconsistent with itself.

Many of Mr. Fuller's expressions, in regard to the ability and power of the unrenewed mind, go far beyond the Arminianism of James Arminius, John Wesley and Richard Watson, who declare that the unrenewed will, and all the other faculties of the unrenewed mind, are dead in trespasses and sins. Paul declares that "the carnal mind cannot be subject to the law of God;" and Christ declares that "the world cannot receive the Spirit of truth."

What then shall we think of Mr. Fuller's fine-spun metaphysics about unrenewed human ability? How can any believer in the Scriptures believe a word of it? It is the superficial declaration of the Roman Catholic Council of Trent that Divine commands necessarily imply human ability—just as though man had never fallen. Though man has fallen and become unable to obey the commandments of God, the nature and law and requirements of God are unchanged and unchangeable.

The gospel addresses of the Scriptures are addressed, we believe, to gospel characters—to those persons who have *spiritual life, hearing, needs and appetites*. These limitations are either directly expressed or implied by the

circumstances. Even the letter of the word, where there is any fullness of narration, and the dictates of common sense teach this important fact.

Inspired men could, far better than we, read the hearts of those whom they addressed; and they addressed hearers of different characters, and therefore used sometimes the imperative and sometimes the indicative mood. God's under-shepherds are directed, *not to create*, but to *tend* the flock. I cannot conceive what benefit can be supposed by a believer in sovereign grace to be derived from universally and untruthfully extending the comforting spiritual addresses of the gospel to those declared in the Scriptures to be dead in trespasses and sins—Christ expressly forbids that pearls should be cast before swine Matthew 7:6.

Unless the Spirit of God first come and impart divine life and light to the hearer, such addresses will be forever and totally vain. The imperative mood has no more power than the indicative mood, in the mouth of a preacher, to awaken the dead to life. No language or labor of man, and no fact in creation or providence, independently of the Divine Spirit, has the slightest efficacy to take away the sinner's heart of stone and give him a heart of flesh. I do not deny that the minister may at times have a divine persuasion that some of his hearers are spiritually alive, and that he may then properly address them in the imperative mood.

William Cathcart, in his recently published "Baptist Encyclopedia," says that Mr. John Gill "knew more of the Bible than any one else with whose writings he is acquainted; that he was a man of great humility, and one of the purest men that ever lived; that, in his "Body of Divinity," the grand old doctrines of grace, taken unadulterated from the Divine fountain, presented in the phraseology and with the illustrations of an intellectual giant, and commended by a wealth of sanctified Biblical learning only once in several ages permitted to mortals, sweep all opposition before them, and leave no place for the blighted harvests, the seed of which was planted by James Arminius in modern times. In this work, eternal and personal election to a holy life, particular redemption from all guilt, resistless grace in regeneration, final preservation from sin and the wicked one, till the believer enters paradise, and the other doctrines of the Christian system, are expounded and defended by one of the greatest teachers in Israel ever called to the work of instruction by the Spirit of Jehovah." He adds that Mr. Gill's "commentary is the most valuable exposition of the Old and New Testaments ever published."

Well, after the bones of this wonderfully gifted servant of God had been laid safely in the grave (in 1771), Mr. Andrew Fuller began to ponder upon the expediency of making a change in Baptist tactics, and offering salvation freely to all sinners without distinction. After four years' ruminations his views on this

subject became entirely changed, and he wrote them in an essay entitled “The Gospel Worthy of All Acceptation,” which he did not venture to publish, however till 1782, seven years after it had been written.

This publication involved him in a bitter controversy of twenty years with some of his Baptist brethren, including Mr. Abraham Booth, a London Baptist minister, and the learned and able author of that admirable work, “The Reign of Grace;” but it is stated that “the ability and force of Mr. Fuller’s pamphlet ultimately prevailed,” and his views were adopted by the majority of those professing the Baptist name.

These views, Mr. Fuller says, were different from those held by the Baptists during the most of the eighteenth century, but were like those entertained by Bunyan and the other old Baptist writers of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. But it should be remembered that Bunyan, though we cannot doubt a child of God, yet did not have perfect light on all subjects, and was an open communionist, and at times did not seem very well established in doctrine; and, so far as we know, all calling themselves Baptists in the sixteenth and in the early part of the seventeenth century were Arminians, whose example furnishes a poor precedent for the imitation of Bible Baptists.

The *actual result* of Mr. Fuller’s methods has been, not to effectuate the eternal salvation of a single sinner (for Christ is the only and complete Savior of his people), but to increase largely the number of those professing, while unhappily not possessing, true religion.

In 1784, Mr. Andrew Fuller read a pamphlet on the importance of general union in prayer for the revival of true religion, written by Jonathan Edwards, President of the College of New Jersey; and in the same year he read a poem by John Scott on the cruelties of the English in the East Indies. In this manner he was led to recommend prayer meetings the first Monday evening of every month for the extension of the gospel, and to urge the formation of a moneyed religious society for sending a mission to India.

The first Baptists Missionary Society was thus formed at Kettering, England, Oct. 2, 1792, and the first collection for its treasury, amounting to 13 pounds, 2 shillings, 6 pence was taken up. Mr. Fuller was chosen and remained its secretary till his death, traveling almost continually through the British Isles, and pleading for the mission cause, and charging the society nothing for his services.

He makes the following remarkable statement in his writings, “Our undertaking to India really appeared to me, on its commencement, to be somewhat like a few men who were deliberating about the importance of penetrating into a deep mine

which had never before been explored. We had no one to guide us; and, while we were thus deliberating, Carey, as it were, said, ‘Well, I will go down if *you* will hold the rope.’ But before he went down he, as it seemed to me, took an oath from each of us at the mouth of the pit to this effect, that while *we* lived we should *never* let go the rope. You understand me. There was great responsibility attached to us who began the business.”

All this looks far more like faith in men and in money than faith in God. Instead of approving, the Scriptures utterly condemn all confidence in the flesh. Can it be possible that such fleshly confidence as that to which Mr. Fuller makes such full and candid confession was the source of modern Baptist and Protestant missions? If his language has any meaning, it would seem so. Again: Mr. Fuller makes the astonishing statement that his own “church was in a famished condition of spiritual life, and found no salvation except in becoming identified with mission work!” Alas that the mission idol should be substituted for Christ! (*Hassell’s History ppg 337-341*)

Future Identity

FUTURE IDENTITY As to knowing each other in heaven will say that all fleshly ties and relationships will be done away. Natural love and natural ties will not exist there. No man on earth knows, or can tell, how much the saints will know in heaven. We “now see through a glass darkly, but then face to face.” We now only “know in part.” “It doth not yet appear what we shall be.” We are sure that they will know more in heaven than they do here, but we cannot say how much more. It appears that the disciples knew Moses and Elias when they were with the Saviour on the mount of transfiguration. They may know them as Moses and Elias in heaven, but no natural ties of affections will exist. There has been much speculation on this question, and we suppose no one can settle the matter definitely. (*Cayce’s Editorials vol. 2, ppg 236*)

Galatians, The Book Of

The Book of GALATIANS The epistle to the Galatians encounters, not the spirit of presumptuous freedom (as those to the Corinthians), but the spirit of a willful bondage, which returns, after its own stubborn and insensate fashion, to the elements of the world and the flesh; and this epistle asserts the direct revelation from Christ of the apostolic doctrine which shines out more clearly as a dispensation of the Spirit and of liberty. It was directed against those Judaizing teachers who undermined Paul’s apostolic authority, and misled the Galatians churches into an apostasy from the gospel of free grace to a false gospel of legal

bondage. The epistle to the Galatians treats of the same subject as that to the Romans—the preparativeness and subordination of the law to the gospel. It is a remarkable fact that the two races represented by the original readers of these epistles—the Celtic and the Latin—have far departed from the doctrines taught them in them, and gone back from gospel freedom to legal bondage—thus repeating the apostasy of the fickle-minded Galatians. The Pauline gospel was for centuries ignored, misunderstood, and (in spite of Augustine) cast out by Jerusalem of old. But these two epistles, more than any other books of the New Testament, inspired the Reformation of the sixteenth century, and are to this day the Gibraltar of evangelical Protestantism.” (*Hassell’s History pg 206*)

Genesis, The Book Of

The Book of GENESIS: Harold Hunt The book of Genesis is the first book of the Old Testament. The name means *beginnings* or *origin*, and that is what it does; it tells about the beginning of those things which have a beginning. It tells about the beginning of the universe, the beginning of mankind, the beginning of sin (original sin), the beginning of marriage and the home, the beginning of human government, the beginning of the Jewish nation, and so on.

Not everything has a beginning; God has no beginning; he always has been, and he always will be. The very first thing the book of Genesis does is to introduce the subject of God. Its first expression is, “In the beginning God.....” The Bible is addressed to those in whose heart God already lives. They do not need proof there is a God. God’s Spirit already lives in their hearts. One of the ways in which the Bible differs from systematic theologies is that it makes no effort to prove the existence of God; it assumes the existence of God, and begins from there.

“In the beginning, God....” He is the beginning and the end, the Alpha and the Omega, the first and the last. He is the beginning in creation; before him, nothing, and no one existed. He is the beginning in regeneration; before he does his work in the heart, the sinner is dead in sins, and totally unable to do anything spiritually good.

One of the most common expressions among modern religionists is, “God wants to save you, but you will have to take the first step.” God answered that notion before anybody ever thought of it. The very first verse in the Bible says that it is “in the beginning God.” Until God acts in regeneration, the sinner cannot act in faith.

Genesis is the book of firsts; it provides the first mention of God: “In the beginning God....” (Genesis 1:1). It provides the first indication of the Trinity:

“Let **us** make man in **our** image...” (Genesis 1:26). It provides the first glimpse of the adversary Satan: “Now the **serpent** was more subtle than any beast of the field.” (Genesis 3:1)

It provides the first promise of the Redeemer. (Genesis 3:15) and the first indication that he would be virgin born: “...the seed of the woman...” Outside of the Lord Jesus Christ every person who has ever been born has been the seed of the man. It provides the first glimpse of substitutionary atonement. An animal died in the stead of Adam and Eve, in order that they might have a “coat of skins” to cover their nakedness (Genesis 3:21).

It provides the first indication of the sovereignty of God; God chose Abel and passed by Cain; he chose Abraham and passed by every other person in Ur of the Chaldees; he chose Jacob and passed by Esau.

“In the beginning God...” It is amazing how much God can say in a very few words. With these four words, he denies Arminianism; God is first in regeneration; man cannot act in faith until God acts in regeneration. He denies atheism; he assumes the existence of God. He denies pantheism; he makes a distinction between God and creation. Pantheism is the doctrine that God and the universe are one and the same. It is the fundamental principle in the theory of evolution.

Evolution credits the universe with the power to create itself.

It asserts the eternity of God; he was before all creation. It asserts the infinity of God. Only a God who is all-wise, all-powerful, and everywhere present could create the almost limitless universe.

Gnosticism

GNOSTICISM: Sylvester Hassell: It is thought that Simon Magus, the Nicolaitans, Cerinthus, the Ophites, Sefhites and Cainites, in the first century, were precursors of the Gnostics, whose system became fully developed in the second century. The three chief centers of Gnosticism were Alexandria, in Egypt, Antioch, in Syria, and Pontus, in Asia Minor. The most famous Gnostic was the Alexandrian Jew, Valentinus; his system was the most complete and consistent, and effected a fusion between nominal Christianity and the Platonic philosophy, **leaving out the humbling ideas of sin, repentance and atonement, and weaving in the proud ideas of Buddhistic pantheism,** man being set forth as the most perfect realization of the Divine.

This system left erect the great idol of paganism, humanity, which could behold itself deified upon the naked summits of the Valentinian metaphysics, no less than upon the golden heights of Olympus.

The Syrian Gnosis brought in the Persian or Zoroastrian idea of dualism, or the eternal existence of two first principles, one Good and the other Evil; and the system of Marcion, in Asia Minor, was distinguished by its rejection of the Old Testament and of about three fourths of the New Testament.

Gnosticism was a phantasmal philosophy of evolution substituted for religion, pretending to account for *evil* by identifying with *matter*, and thus **annihilating the moral nature of evil**, which lies in the *will* of the creature violating the Divine law.

Gnosticism flourished in the third century also, and did not finally disappear until the sixth century. (*Hassell's History* ppg 365, 366)

This was an aggregation of corruptions from all the countries where Christianity was disseminated---a combination of Platonic philosophy, Alexandrian Judaism, dualistic Parsism, pantheistic Buddhism, and phantasmal Christianity. A false Gnosticism exalted knowledge above faith, hope, love, humility, and every other Christian virtue. It represented God as an infinite, unfathomable, unnameable abyss, eternally and unconsciously evolving attributes or aeons, the lowest of which, falling, combined with dead, empty, eternal matter, and produced a weak or evil Demiurgus or Artificer who made this world; it represented Christ as the most perfect of the aeons, but declared his human life an illusion; and it represented the Holy Spirit as a subordinate aeon. The system degenerated into utter infidelity and sensuality, especially with the Ophite Gnostics. It originated in the first century, flourished in the second, and gradually lost importance after the middle of the third, but was to a great degree revived in the Manichaeism of the fourth and fifth centuries.” (*Hassell's History* ppg 241, 242) (*See also under The School at ALEXANDRIA*)

Gospel Ministry, The

The GOSPEL Ministry (*See under The Gospel MINISTRY*)

Gospel, The

The GOSPEL: S. A. Paine: I will now prove that the salvation, which is by the faith of the creature, is not regeneration, but a salvation of those already born of God. We refer you first to

Romans 1:16, "I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ, for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." Who, then, is a believer? As we have before proven, they are born of God, justified, etc.

Then the gospel *saves* those who are [already] born of God. It does not born them. The question is often asked; if they are already born, how and in what way does the gospel save them? The gospel is to God's children what your father's teachings, corrections, and reproofs are to you. There is a practical or gospel faith that no one can have without the gospel. See Romans 10. "How can they believe on him of whom they have not heard, and how can they hear without a preacher?"

This is the message Cornelius needed after God had cleansed and justified him. It was by Peter's mouth that the Gentiles were to hear the gospel and believe. Acts 15:7 It was not by the message of Peter's mouth that the Gentiles were to be cleansed or justified, but to believe.

Men believe only as they have been given ability. God gives ability in regeneration to believe the gospel. See I Corinthians 3:5 This shows that God gives the ability before the gospel will make a believer. The sinner being saved by grace is enabled to then believe in Christ and rejoice in the salvation so graciously bestowed. (*S. A. Paine: CAMPBELLISM: A Religious Deformity*)

J. H. Oliphant The reader will see that I have taken the view that **the Bible was never intended by its Author as a means or instrument through which eternal life is given.**

These acts are *evidences* that we are the children of God. A man may have this Spirit, and never have opportunity to see its fruits, but still he would be a child of God. **Fruit has simply nothing to do in producing the tree.** The tree may be good, and we never see any of its fruit. The question how long a man's nature may be changed before he manifests that change to others does not touch the point at issue. The Spirit must be in men first. "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ **is** born of God."

In the order of nature the birth is first, and let the interval be long or short, the birth is antecedent to believing. A man may be of God, and never have an opportunity to hear on earth, and yet he would be of God. **The act of believing is evidence of life, and nothing more.** Life precedes any impression made by the word, and it is the cause of its favorable reception. **Hearing and believing are not the cause of passing from death to life, but the evidence of it;** passing from death unto life is first. This life may be in men, idiots, and heathens, who may never have opportunity to manifest it; yet to heaven they will go. (*J. H. Oliphant: REGENERATION 1888*)

Sylvester Hassell So far as I know, the Kehukee Association never entertained or endorsed the doctrine that God sometimes uses the preached gospel in regenerating sinners * * * Man, not regenerated by God's Spirit, may have a natural conviction of sin and conversion (a turning from their outward evil conduct). In my time I never knew one of our ministers or members to believe or maintain that the preaching of any man is a means of regeneration; nor do I suppose that in 1778 any minister or member of the Kehukee Association held that the Holy Spirit comes through the human preacher to quicken into life a person who is dead in sin. He may regenerate a sinner while a minister is preaching, but he does so by his own direct operation in the sinner's heart or spirit. True conviction and conversion are the effects of immediate Divine regeneration. (*Sylvester Hassell in a private correspondence with W. H. Crouse 1924*)

E. W. Thomas It seems strange that after the subject of the gospel as a means through which God regenerates sinners has been so thoroughly discussed by our people the past thirty years, anyone should now have the effrontery to say it was Baptist doctrine. If any question can be settled, it surely is settled, that Primitive Baptists believe that in the regeneration of sinners God acts independent of all means and instrumentalities. To say that God sometimes uses the gospel as a means, I think, is begging the question and trying to hide from the real issue and putting up a camouflage for protection.

I would be utterly at a loss to know what scripture to quote to prove that God sometimes regenerates through the gospel. I fear this is only a subterfuge, and not the sincere faith of its advocates. This question was agitated among the Primitive Baptists at the time I began preaching. The division in the Danville (Indiana) Association in 1890 was caused chiefly—almost exclusively—from this doctrine and others that are naturally and inseparably connected with it. From my experience in controversies on this subject, I have observed that brethren taking this view have been slow and cautious to commit themselves clearly and plainly on the subject. (*E. W. Thomas in a private correspondence with W. H. Crouse*)

The GOSPEL: W. H. Crouse: (*The following is excerpted from REGENERATION by W. H. Crouse; written in 1928 in reply to Elders Screws, Sykes, Burnam, Pence and others, who had begun to preach that the gospel was an instrument in regeneration*) The point at issue between *means* and *antimeans* Baptists is not as to whether men may be brought to repent and believe through the preached word; they often are; indeed, that is one of the great purposes for which the gospel was to be preached. Nor do we deny that God may and sometimes does regenerate a sinner while the preacher is preaching. He may as easily do so as when the sinner is in his home, in the shop, or following the plow. But the exact issue before us is this: **Does God regenerate or make alive the dead sinner through the ministry and the preached word? And to this question Primitive Baptists have very emphatically answered, NO.**

In his earlier ministry John Gill clearly believed the gospel was an instrument in regeneration. Notice his comments on I Corinthians 4:15. "For though ye have ten thousand instructors in Christ, yet have ye not many fathers; for in Christ Jesus I have begotten you through the gospel" Which is to be understood of regeneration, a being born again, and from above; of being quickened when dead in trespasses and sins; of having Christ formed in the soul; of being made a partaker of the Divine nature, and a new creature.....through the preaching of the gospel; in and through which, as a vehicle, the Spirit of God conveys himself into the heart, as a Spirit of regeneration

and faith.” In this one short comment he uses at least ten different expressions to remove all doubt that he is saying regeneration comes by way of the preached gospel. That was in his commentary; but in his *Body of Divinity*, which he wrote years later, he took exactly the opposite position.

We should be very careful in writing about the dead. They are not here to defend or explain, and we should not give their writings a strained interpretation in an effort to prove our position. We observe, however, that later, after years of careful study, and after observing the results and outgrowth of his former position, that he wrote quite differently and indicated that he had undergone a change. In his *Body of Divinity*, which was written a number of years later than his commentary, he says: “This instrumentality of the word in regeneration seems not so agreeable to the principle of grace implanted in the soul in regeneration, and to be understood in respect to that, since it is done by immediate infusion, and is represented as a creation; and now as God made no use of any instrument in the first and old creation, so neither does it seem so agreeable that he should use any in the new creation.....So the first three thousand converts and the jailor were first regenerated, or had the principle of grace wrought in their souls by the Spirit of God, and then were directed and encouraged by the ministry of the Apostles to repent and believe in Christ; whereby it becomes manifest that they were born again.”

[This should remove all doubt; after much study, Gill reversed himself with regard to the purpose of the gospel. hlh]

Proof texts used in support of gospel regeneration

We now come to consider the scriptures relied upon to prove the means doctrine—that God regenerates through the ministry and the preached word. Let the reader give careful consideration. **If the scriptures here quoted do not prove that doctrine, it cannot be proven.**

1. I Corinthians 4:15, For though ye have ten thousand instructors in Christ, yet have ye not many fathers; for in Christ Jesus I have begotten you through the gospel.

He called them his sons. "As my beloved sons I warn you," I Corinthians 4:14. They had had many pedagogues, schoolmasters, or instructors. If it were possible that they should have ten thousand more, yet they had but one father, and that was Paul. The Apostle then shows them upon what foundation he claimed that relationship, viz., for in Christ Jesus he had begotten them through the gospel. I Corinthians 4:15. Whatever is embraced in the word *begotten* it contains the sole ground for the relationship which Paul claimed they sustained to each other, viz., father and sons.

Jesus said to his disciples, "And call no man your father upon the earth," Matthew 23:9 And in his instruction to them in regard to prayer, he said, "Pray ye, our Father which art in heaven," Matthew 6:9 **Jesus plainly taught here that saints have but one father, and that Father is in heaven;** and yet Paul would have these brethren at Corinth to recognize him as their father, and that they were his children.

This shows conclusively that Paul was not properly their father, nor were they properly his sons. The text cannot be taken in its literal meaning. All must readily admit that God is properly the father of all his children. We are not said to be born of Paul, nor of Apollos, but "born of God." And John, speaking of this spiritual relationship, says, "Beloved, now are we the sons of God," I John 3:2 Not sons of some gospel minister, but sons of God. The sense in which Paul was their father was infinitely below the sense in which God was their Father.

And inasmuch as God alone is our Father in regeneration, and as the sole ground upon which Paul claimed to be their father is embraced in the word *begotten*, we argue that it cannot here mean regeneration.

Many words, in the scriptures are used in a metaphorical sense. In Romans 4:16 Abraham is said to be "the father of us all." But none would be so foolish as to claim that it was through Abraham we were regenerated. It is also said of Abraham, "That he might be the father of them that believe."

Now in some sense Abraham is to be considered as our father, but not in the sense of regeneration.

In Judges 18:19 we find this language: "And Micah said unto him, Dwell with me, and be unto me a father." The word *father* here must be understood in some explained sense.

Paul calls Timothy his son I Timothy 1:18 and II Timothy 1:2, and yet there is no natural relationship, and no room is left for us to believe that Paul had anything to do with his regeneration, for Timothy was a beloved disciple when Paul first met him. Acts 16:1-3

Job said he was "a father to the poor," Job 29:16; and Joseph said God made him "a father to Pharaoh," Genesis 41:8; but neither of these scriptures can refer in any sense to the work of regeneration.

Paul was their father, not in the sense of regeneration, but in that they were made disciples by his ministry. He had established the church among them and brought them into the church. He was the minister by whom they believed. By him they had been brought from forms of idolatry to the faith of the gospel and the true service of the living God. He had laid the foundation among them and others could only build upon the foundation he had laid. As a *fisherman* divinely sent, he had fished them out from among the world and brought them into the service of the Master. **In the sense of faith and service he was their father, and they were his sons.**

We next observe that whatever work is meant by the word begotten, Paul did it. It was his work. Note his language: "I have begotten you." He did not say God had begotten them, but he positively declared, "I have."

If regeneration is here under consideration, then the proposition is established beyond dispute that one man can regenerate another man. Not that he does it by his own strength and power, we admit; but by the power and strength given of God, or God's power working through him, or however it may be explained, **He does the work, nonetheless.**

This language will not admit of the elimination of Paul in this work. It would be just as reasonable to conclude that when the Bible says Philip baptized the eunuch that it means God baptized him, or when it says David killed Goliath that it means God killed him, or that when we are told that Sampson arose at midnight, and took the doors of the gate of the city, and the two posts, and went out with them, bar and all, that it was not Sampson, but God who did it, as to say that it was not Paul, but God, who begot these Corinthians.

There are many instances in the Bible where men were used as instruments to do great works, and in every case they were made able to do the work, and they did it in a proper sense. Sampson had to be given supernatural strength to do the things he did, and they are recorded as his acts, although performed by strength given by the Lord. Certainly David could not of himself have done what he did. He did it through and by the help and strength of the Lord. But nevertheless, David killed Goliath; it was his act, and is so recorded.

However much God and the Holy Spirit may have dwelt in, and wrought through Paul, yet it remains that Paul begot these brethren; and if *begotten* means regeneration, as our means brethren insist, then Paul regenerated them. Strive as they may, they cannot escape this conclusion. And inasmuch as our means brethren deny that one man can regenerate another, we insist they have no right to use this text to try to prove the instrumentality of the gospel in regeneration.

The Bible often speaks of men saving others; but in no case does it have reference to the work of regeneration. This work is ascribed alone unto God, and God never moved and inspired any poor mortal to say to another, "I have regenerated you." Never!

The word begotten does not necessarily refer to regeneration. Note the language of the Apostle Peter: "Who hath *begotten* us again unto a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead," I Peter 1:3 We are very sure this does not mean regeneration. By the resurrection of Jesus their

hope had been restored, and they had been inspired with new confidence.

Men are not regenerated but once; but Peter says, "Who hath begotten us again." When Paul says he had begotten the Corinthians, he has no reference to regeneration. God never taught Paul that regeneration was any part of the work he was to accomplish through the ministry of the word. But Paul had accomplished through the gospel the work for which God had taught him the gospel was designed. He had preached to these people, and the good ground had brought forth fruit. **He had begotten them to gospel faith, and hope, and service.**

2. James 1:18 "Of his own will begat he us with the word of truth."

3. II Peter 1:21 "Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth forever."

The means brethren always assume that word in these texts means the written word. *Word* is one of the names of Christ Jesus the Lord. "In the beginning was the *Word*, and the *Word* was with God, and the *Word* was God." "All things were made by him." "And the *Word* was made flesh, and dwelt among us, and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father," John 1:1,3,14. "And he was clothed in a vesture dipped in blood, and his name is called the *Word* of God," Revelation 19:13.

Word in James 1:18; I Peter 1:23; John 1:1,3,14, and Revelation 19:13, is translated from the Greek word logos. This being true, and in view of the general teaching of the scriptures, before our brethren can use James 1:18 and I Peter 1:23 to prove that sinners are born again by the written word they must prove that *word* in those passages means the written word.

Until they do, we will continue to believe that the word by which the dead are made alive is Christ the living Word of God.

Eternal life is not in the written word, but in Christ. We

are taught that Christ as the Word made all things in creation; and it is just as clearly taught the new creation is through Christ and not the written word. This is the *incorruptible seed*. John says, "This is the record that God hath given us eternal life, and this life is in his Son."

4. Acts 26:15-18 "For I have appeared unto thee for this purpose to make thee a minister and a witness * * * delivering thee from the people, and from the Gentiles, unto whom now I send thee. To open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are sanctified by faith that is in me."

This is one of the scriptures to which Elder Screws cited us to prove that it is a Bible doctrine that God uses the preached word as an instrumentality in the work of regeneration. That a Primitive Baptist minister should so interpret this scripture will seem strange indeed to our brethren. If his interpretation of this one text is true, it means the complete overthrow of every fundamental of our faith.

If the work which God here assigned Paul was the regeneration of the Gentiles, Brother Screws need not seek another text in his effort to put to confusion, and the destruction of the faith of those whom he styles *modern* Baptists. With shamed faces for their ignorance, and almost unpardonable sin through all these years, they should fold up their tents and silently steal away into the land of oblivion. If God sent Paul out to open the blind eyes of the dead in sin, to turn alien sinners from the power of the devil unto God, to bring the spiritually unborn from the darkness of death into the light of life, to cause the lost to receive the forgiveness of sins to bring those who were by nature the children of wrath into sonship with God and the inheritance of the saints.

I say, if this is the work which God assigned this minister of the gospel, then, indeed, have Primitive Baptists violated their commission and well deserve the condemnation of men and the fierce judgments of Almighty God. For certain it is that we have never conceived this as any part of our mission. Our

denomination has not only neglected this commission, but they have determinedly opposed it.

Surely our brethren have not realized the awful and fatal consequences that must result by fastening this interpretation of scripture upon our people, or they would not have been so quiet, and for so long, and heedless of the pleadings of some of us, who for all our protests have received but one answer, viz., the charge of being possessed of an evil spirit.

We have been condemned by some for insisting that this teaching is heresy; but in the name of our blessed Lord, and in his Spirit, we ask in all candor; if this is not heresy among Primitive Baptists, then what is heresy?

And can it be supposed that we can accept this interpretation or tolerate this teaching and retain the love and fellowship, or respect, of our brethren at home and abroad? Is it not high time that we were laying aside all prejudice and personalities and coming to the rescue of that banner which has been so gloriously and bravely flung to the breeze and defended by our fathers, and now already in many places has been trailed in the dust?

This commission was given to Paul by Jesus Christ himself. Notice the last expression: "By faith in me." Read Romans 10 again, and once more note that if regeneration was the work assigned to Paul, then regeneration is again confined to the scope of the preached word. Is it not strange that one will give all these scriptures this interpretation and then play so much upon the term, "in some cases?"

Be not deceived. If it is in some cases through the gospel, it is in all cases. And the position of those who teach this strange doctrine among us is that only in exceptional cases does God vary from the rule of regeneration through the preached word. Dorcas is the rule; Lazarus is the exception. And we are now told that even the revelation which Christ told Peter God had made unto him (Peter) was made through Andrew his brother!

Elder Screws makes this commission of Paul's identical with that given to Christ as recorded in Isaiah 42:6-7 "I the Lord have called thee in righteousness, and will hold thine hand, and will keep thee, and give thee for a covenant of the people, for a light of the Gentiles; To open the blind eyes, to bring out the prisoners from the prison, and them that sit in darkness out of the prison house."

This interpretation has too much use for man, and too little use for God; "too much humanity, and not enough divinity." Paul was a sinner to be saved, but not a savior of sinners. Are Primitive Baptists now to take a position that must lead them at last to conclude that there are as many saviors as there are ministers of the gospel?

Paul was not commissioned to open blind eyes. He could not do that. That was the commission of Christ. It requires a greater force to open blind eyes than is found in the gospel. Men's eyes may be opened by moral force, but it will never cause a blind eye to see. Never!

Ministers, by gospel preaching, through the grace and blessing of God, are able to open eyes, in a sense; but they cannot cause the blind to see. And the work Christ gave Paul to do in his commission was to be his (Paul's) work—it was to be done by Paul. The light of the sun will enable us to see objects about us, but it never has caused the blind eyes to see, and was never intended to do so. Christ was among the Gentiles opening blind eyes. Paul was to open eyes closed by falsehood and error by the proclamation of truth. He was to sow the seed, but only the good ground would bring forth fruit. He was to be a minister and a witness. **Sinners are not regenerated by the ministry and witness of men. Teaching will not bring about this change.** Paul was never commissioned to regenerate anyone, or to give to any dead sinner eternal life. Eternal life is the gift of God through Jesus Christ, Romans 6:23 but never through Paul nor any other preacher.

5. II Corinthians 3:3 "Forasmuch as ye are manifestly declared to be the epistle of Christ ministered by us, written not

with ink, but with the Spirit of the living God, not in tables of stone, but in fleshy tables of the heart.”

This is another of the texts Brother Screws says he relies upon to prove the instrumentality of the gospel in regeneration. It seems to us that it will be rather difficult to hold that position concerning this text and still say that the gospel is not a means. Paul illustrates the regeneration by the writing of a letter.

It is an impossibility to use this illustration and put the preacher in it without leaving one of the persons of the Trinity out.

This text is always used against us in public discussion with the Arminians. They make Christ the penman, the preacher the pen, and the Holy Spirit the ink. This leaves the Father out of regeneration entirely. If you make God the penman, you must leave Christ out. And they always prefer to leave out the Father, or the Son rather than leave out the preacher!

Now, let us notice this illustration. If Christ is the penman, the preacher the pen, and the Holy Spirit the ink, and the hearts of men the paper, then please tell us how the Holy Spirit could reach the paper or heart without the pen or preacher. Here we have the penman and plenty of ink; but how can he write on the paper without something to serve as a pen?

There we are again. No preacher and no gospel, no regeneration. The reader cannot but see how that all roads traveled by the means brethren center in this one proposition. They can't escape it, though they strive ever so hard to do so.

But again, if the pen represents the minister, how can we say the minister is not a help and a means? Was the pen no help or means to the person in writing the letter with ink?

Elder Penick (Missionary) used this scripture as proof in his debate with Elder Cayce. Here is what Penick said: "I might use a simple illustration. Suppose I take a fountain pen. Here is ink in it. Here is Christ, the writer; here is Paul, the pen; here is

the heart, the paper; and the Spirit is the ink. Now, the means is brought in contact. The means don't save by itself. The Spirit is brought in contact; there is contact of both. There is God's Word; there is God's minister, and there is God's Spirit. I use that to illustrate this point in getting the matter before your minds. When a man denies that the means is used, or when he denies the Spirit is used, we are there to say that both the Spirit and the Word comes into contact with the heart." (Page 289)

Thus you see that our means brethren offer nothing new. All their proof texts are the proof texts Arminians have used against us time and again in public discussions. The only possible difference between Penick and Screws on this text is Brother Screws' play on the word *means*. And Penick will understand that well enough that it will not affect his fellowship for Brother Screws in the least.

Now, the real import of this scripture is this: God is the penman; Jesus is the pen; the Holy Spirit is the ink; the hearts of men the paper.

And as God wrote with his own finger upon the tables of stone (read the entire chapter), asking nothing of Moses, so God, through Christ and the Holy Spirit, writes upon the fleshly tables of men's hearts. This is that circumcision not made with hands Colossians 2:11. It is done by the finger of God. Exodus 1:18; Deuteronomy 9:10.

Gospel ministers—not even Primitive nor *original* Baptists, are to be considered fingers of God. All thus circumcised in heart—written upon by the finger of God—are said to be "the epistles of Christ." To them Paul ministered, "ministered by us."

6. Acts 2:37 "Now when they heard this, they were pricked in their heart, and said unto Peter and the rest of the apostles, Men and brethren, what shall we do?"

We are next cited to this text as proof of the gospel as an instrumentality in regeneration. We are told that these were not regenerated when they entered the house at nine o'clock that day. "Pricked in their heart," we are told was regeneration. This

was done by and through Peter's preaching. Therefore, it is argued, they were regenerated by or through the instrumentality of the gospel.

There is but one question for us to decide: Will the preached gospel prick the heart of an unregenerate sinner? Will it have that effect upon the dead? Will it thus affect a heart of stone? We can readily understand how the preached word would have that effect upon living subjects, with hearts of *flesh*; but we cannot understand how it could thus affect those who had not been made alive by the quickening power of God.

If it be said that the Holy Spirit pricked them, and not the preached word, the point is yielded, for it is thus admitted that the gospel cannot reach the dead, alien, unregenerated sinner.

But we would have the reader note that this text does not say, "While they heard this, they were pricked in heart," but "When they heard." It was what they heard that pricked them; and dead men, unregenerate men, do not hear.

They were listening to the word (gospel) of God. "He that is not of God heareth not us," I John 4:6. To be *of God* is to be born of God. These, who were pricked in heart by Peter's preaching, were *of God*, or they would not have understandingly heard Peter's words. They were therefore born of God. And being born of God before they heard, it was not through Peter's preaching they were regenerated.

7. John 17:20 "Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word."

Let the reader remember that we were referred to this text as proof of the instrumentality of the preached word in regeneration. It is evident; therefore, that Brother Screws understands that regeneration is connected with gospel belief; that making believers through the preached word is the same as regenerating sinners. If he does not so believe, we cannot understand why he cites us to this text to prove his position. The only work referred to in this text is the making of believers

through *their word*—the gospel. It was through *their word* that certain ones were to believe. If that teaches instrumentality of the preached word in regeneration, then belief and regeneration must be inseparably connected. And if to be made a believer is to be regenerated, and they were to be made believers through the preached word, we would have to conclude that none are regenerated where the word is not preached. See? And we remember that Brother Screws said this text includes all the elect who should be given to Christ.

If this means regeneration, we should be compelled to say that through the preached word unregenerate men are made believers. For if they must be regenerated before they can believe (as we insist) the believing through the preached word is too late for this text to prove the instrumentality of the preached word in regeneration or eternal salvation.

Gospel faith is produced in the hearts of the regenerate through the preached word. This is a part of the work of the gospel ministry. It is necessary to gospel service. But we are not to conclude that no one except gospel believers are regenerated and reach heaven. If so, then all infants, idiots and heathen are forever lost!

8. Ephesians 5:25-26 Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it; That he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word.

We have already given notice to Elder Screws' position on this text. We suppose the church here means all the church. It was the church for which Christ died. It is to be sanctified, cleansed and washed. Elder Screws says this includes regeneration and that this is to be done BY the word—the preached word. We make the following observations:

(1.) The church is to be sanctified and cleansed.

(2.) Paul says this is to be done “with the washing of water, BY the word.” He makes no exception whatever.

(3.) If he has regeneration under consideration, and if he means by the word the written or preached word, then, since none can get to heaven without regeneration, it must follow that none will ever get to heaven who have not come under the influence of the gospel.

Whatever washing and cleansing of the church is to be done BY the preached word is NOT a washing and cleansing from original sin and guilt, for that is done by the blood of Christ through the Holy Spirit; but it is a practical cleansing and washing. And this the gospel will do. God does not wash and cleanse alien sinners in regeneration by the gospel; to say that he does, is to deny the whole tenor of the Bible and place the ministry and the gospel in a field of labor where God expressly, time and again, says they cannot go.

9. II Thessalonians 2:13-14 But we are bound to give thanks always to God for you, brethren beloved of the Lord, because God hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth; Whereunto he called you by our gospel, to the obtaining of the glory of our Lord Jesus Christ.

This has been frequently quoted and stressed as a proof text by Brother Screws in contending for gospel instrumentality in regeneration. We have noticed it somewhat in a former article. In the first place, let us observe that if regeneration is here in this text connected with the belief of the truth and the call of the gospel, then there was not a single one of these Thessalonians, who had been regenerated WITHOUT the gospel. Not one. There was no exception to the "established rule" in this church. We do not know how many members there were in this church at that time, but it seems a little strange that not a single one was to be found here who had been regenerated without a preacher. Every member was a Dorcas; there was not a single Lazarus among them. It does seem that there would have been at least one "exception," if God only regenerates "in some cases" through the preached word.

Now, what proves too much for a proposition proves nothing. And their interpretation of this scripture makes it

prove too much for their position—at least at the present time. In fact the reader will note that if Elder Screws is right in his interpretation of ALL these scriptures, his great difficulty is not to find one who was regenerated through the instrumentality of the preached word, but to find ONE who was NOT. So far, Brother Screws has only referred us to one—Paul; and Brother Sikes tells us that even Paul was regenerated through means and instrumentalities.

If “belief of the truth” is connected with regeneration, HOW MUCH of the truth does one have to believe to be regenerated? Elder says all “thus chosen are caused to believe the truth.” (Vol. 3, No. 7, page 1) He admits that but few of our people throughout the United States for many years have preached that God regenerates through the preached word; Dr. Watson, in his attack upon our people, charged us with having woefully ignored the teaching of the Bible on this line. Now if Elder Screws and Dr. Watson have the truth, the rest of us have not—the denomination has not believed the truth on this point. If Elder Screws is correct in his interpretation of the book of revelation, a very large percent of our people have not and do not believe the truth on that line.

If Elder Sikes was correct in his explanation of election and atonement, as given us in his pamphlet, the great body of our people have not and do not believe the truth concerning these doctrines. **This being truth, I ask, in all seriousness, have the great body of our people been regenerated?** Were we chosen in Christ? And how about the other religious bodies who deny very much which we contend to be the truth—even salvation by grace? If so, just how much truth does one have to believe to be regenerated? These are fair and serious questions, and we feel that we have a right to a clear and honest answer, if indeed one must believe the truth or be classed as unregenerate, and not of those chosen in Christ from the beginning.

God teaches the doctrine of eternal, particular and unconditional election. His choice was “from the beginning.” He chose these very Thessalonians—that was personal. He chose them unto salvation THROUGH sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the

truth. He chose ALL his people at the same time. "Belief of the truth" comes through the gospel. It is something they DO. If this means regeneration, does this not smack of conditionalism? If not, why not? Are men active or passive in believing the truth? Does God compel his children to believe the truth? If so, how does it come that so many of them do not believe the truth? If the gospel compels saints to believe the truth, why don't ALL saints who hear the gospel believe the truth? Are any of the elect in lands where the truth has never been proclaimed? If so, how did God choose THEM unto regeneration?

Salvation and regeneration are not synonymous terms. Salvation is a much more comprehensive term than regeneration. Salvation includes regeneration; but regeneration does not include all of salvation by any means. There is a sense in which we were saved when Christ died on the cross; there is a sense in which we were NOT. There is a sense in which we were saved in regeneration; there is a sense in which our salvation was far from complete even then. Salvation began in eternity, in the mind and purpose of God; it began IN us in regeneration, and it will not be complete until every heir of promise, in soul and body, shall be safely housed in heaven.

We are personally brought into the enjoyment of this salvation, first, "through the sanctification of the Spirit, that is regeneration; second, "through belief of the truth," that pertains to this life and that phase of salvation sometimes called "time" or "common" salvation. Christ said, "Except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God;" **but nowhere did he say, Except a man believeth the truth he cannot enter heaven.**

Unto salvation we ARE called by the gospel (but not unto regeneration)—unto that salvation which God has designed for us in gospel faith and hope and service.

10. Ephesians 2:8 For by grace are ye saved through faith.

Elder Screws insists that this is regeneration, or eternal salvation, and that the faith here mentioned is that faith of which Paul speaks in Romans 10, which he (Paul) says one CANNOT have without hearing of Jesus through the preacher. And we have seen that he (Elder Screws) very emphatically declares that sinners are thus saved THROUGH this faith and "not to the exclusion of it," that Paul here lays down the irrevocable plan, and only way, whereby sinners dead in sin are brought to LIFE in Jesus Christ.

We are not going to discount the intelligence and ability of Elders Screws and Sikes by saying they can not and do NOT see that if this interpretation be true there can be no such thing as regeneration without the gospel and the preacher. Our readers see it, I am sure.

If regeneration is brought about through faith, and that faith is produced (or given) through the preached word, then strive as we may to prove otherwise, it is forever established that where the word is not preached there is no regeneration.

We do not want to be unfair. Elder Screws and Sikes say they do NOT believe that regeneration is confined to the scope of the gospel. Very many of the ablest ministers in the Missionary Baptist denomination say the same thing. But having taken this position on this text, and interpreted other scriptures to support it, the great body of that denomination NOW believe and insist that there is no regeneration where the gospel is not preached. Elders Screws and Sikes may never go that far; but having taken the Missionary Baptist position on this text and others, and teaching it among us, it is only a question of time until it produces the same effect among us that it has among the Missionaries.

Gill's position on these texts helped to open the door for Fuller's teaching; and it was doubtless the observation of the fruits of this teaching that led Gill, in his maturer years, to repudiate his former teaching.

According to this interpretation we must find ANOTHER plan of salvation taught somewhere in the Bible, or even

those who die in infancy are lost, since they cannot have THIS faith which comes by hearing the preacher.

Where do we find TWO plans of eternal salvation taught in the Bible? Where?

“By grace are ye saved.” Will anyone, infant or adult, be saved any other way? ALL of us, whether Primitive, “Original” or “Modern” must answer emphatically, NO. Well, then if this eternal salvation comes to dead sinners by grace THROUGH FAITH, and thus faith comes through the preached word, how will infants, idiots or heathen be saved?

The position of these brethren on this text must revolutionize the thought, the preaching, and all the activities of our denomination. It identifies us with the Means Baptists, and makes the fence so low between us and the Missionary Baptists that we may soon expect our flocks to be ring-streaked and spotted.

And it matters not how sound these brethren may preach on other lines; they may become quiet on this particular issue; but everywhere this seed has been sown it is taking root, and must bring forth its harvest unless speedily rooted up. If we are right in our contention—if our people agree with us in our defense of our recognized faith—then do we not have the right to expect that they condemn this heretical teaching, that it be stopped, and that our ministers and periodical labor to reclaim those who already have been led astray and to fortify our people against its destructive influence?

We seek the destruction of no minister. We welcome into our ministry any worthy man called of God. But let it be known by all who would enter our ministry that we have a recognized faith, and to that faith they are expected to be true. If they are coming among us to REVOLUTIONIZE us and to introduce destructive innovations—if they feel to be a MOSES specially called and divinely sent to lead us poor, ignorant and deluded Primitives out of the darkness and the mire into which they feel our fathers led us—then let the signboards upon every road

which leads into Zion bear the inscription, written in letters which he who runs may read, "Not wanted."

We have many doctors among who would prescribe for the peace, health and growth of our people. If I may pose as a doctor, I would prescribe the OLD TIME FAITH, THE OLD TIME RELIGION, ONLY SOUND AND SPIRITUAL HYMNS in harmony with the faith we believe, and humble, simple, quiet devotion in such faith in our father as will not shrink though pressed by every foe.

Some of the divisions among us were uncalled for and brought about by designing men. But much of the confusion among the Primitive Baptists was caused by restless and unstable leaders who sought to revolutionize the denomination, and who were unmindful of the feelings and hearts of their brethren and turned a deaf ear to all their entreaties. It is useless to plead and beg for peace, while the foundation stones upon which peace, love, fellowship and union rest are being removed.

We quote here another text, often used by Arminians to support the interpretation given of Ephesians 2:8, "Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ; By whom also we have access by faith into this grace wherein we stand, and rejoice in hope of the glory of God," Romans 5:1-2. It is argued that we are saved by grace, BUT that we have access INTO this grace through gospel faith. And since we cannot be saved only by grace, and we cannot get into this grace only by gospel faith, therefore the absolute necessity of the preacher and the gospel in order for sinners to be saved.

How could our means brethren answer their argument? Is there any way they could answer it without first giving up their position in reference to Ephesians 2:8?

Primitive Baptists have given their interpretation of these texts. Let the reader study it and take it for what he considers it worth.

“By grace are ye saved” saved with an eternal salvation. Paul has special reference to regeneration as shown in Ephesians 2:10. “Through faith”—the avenue through which we have personal knowledge of this salvation.

Faith is the eye by which we see and the hand by which we lay hold of the blessings laid up for us in this wonderful salvation in Jesus Christ. It is not the hand by which we lay hold of eternal life in regeneration. This would put faith BEFORE LIFE. It is that by which we consciously and experimentally have access into this grace “WHEREIN WE STAND” and thus rejoice in hope. **This faith justifies us, not at the bar of God, but at the bar of our own conscience; there it declares to us that we are righteous.** It is to us the evidence of the things God has done for us, and in us, and of the things yet held in store. This faith, as a seed or substance, is laid in the heart or soul in regeneration, is a work and fruit of the Holy Spirit, and is said to be the gift of God. Experience, environment, and teaching will develop it, and under the gospel it buds forth and blooms into belief in Jesus Christ, which is termed gospel faith.

It might very properly be said that no regenerate person, infant or adult, is without THIS faith mentioned in Ephesians 2:8. But it may be there only in substance undeveloped. The same may be said of all the Christian graces. MANY saints die without ever having GOSPEL faith, having never come under the sound and influence of the gospel. In this life our knowledge of our salvation and justification and the inexpressible joy that comes as a result of this knowledge depends largely upon the gospel—the written or spoken word.

Instances of regenerated characters who had never heard the gospel are given us in the New Testament; but it would be impossible for us to imagine the exact feelings and experiences of a child of god, who has never known anything of the Bible. Just how much the light of eternal life within and nature without would manifest this faith we do not know.

Faith, whether “given” or “gospel,” is NOT the avenue through which LIFE flows into the soul dead in sin, but it IS the avenue through which knowledge comes to the NEWBORN soul.

Elder Sikes lays great stress upon certain scriptures which speak of righteousness being imputed by and through faith. If these texts mean to teach that the righteousness of Christ is imputed or made over to us in the court of heaven and at the bar of God WHEN we, as unsaved and unrighteous sinners, exercise faith, then EVERY fundamental of our doctrine fails.

So far as eternity and heaven are concerned, and as respects the covenant and the law of God, our faith has absolutely nothing to do with our justification. When Christ died, his death absolved from ALL guilt everyone embraced in the covenant of grace. He then and there extinguished their guilt. It was done by substitution. Our sins were imputed to him and his righteousness was imputed to us. And through that transaction, ALL the saints of all ages—millions of his people who were yet unborn—stood fully justified and righteous before God.

To undertake to so explain these scriptures as to bring atonement and justification by the blood of Christ down to the TIME when the sinner believes is a complete denial of the fundamentals of Primitive Baptist faith. It forces a new explanation of election and atonement.

We ARE justified by faith; and his righteousness is imputed to us by and through faith; not as respects the law of God and the court of heaven, but experimentally—in our own knowledge, to our great comfort and joy and peace.

“Study to show thyself approved unto God; a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth,” Paul.

The GOSPEL: *Lemuel Potter:* The gospel is good news, glad tidings,—the joyful intelligence of salvation through a crucified and risen Savior. It is called the gospel of God. “Paul, a

servant of Jesus Christ, called to be an apostle, separated unto the gospel of God," Romans 1:1.

It is also called the Gospel of Christ; for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth: to the Jew first, and also to the Greek," Romans 1:16.

It is called the gospel of salvation. "In whom ye also trusted, after that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation, in who also, after that ye believed, ye were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise," Ephesians 1:13.

In another place it is called the gospel of peace. "And your feet shod with the preparation of the gospel of peace,"

Ephesians 4:15. Paul, in speaking of what had been committed to his trust, called it a glorious gospel. I Timothy 1:11.

Thus we have the Bible definition of the gospel that we are to preach in all the world to every creature. It was this gospel that our Lord commanded his disciples to go into all the world and preach to every creature. We understand from the commission that we are required to preach the gospel to all, both saint and sinner.

-
We are aware of the fact that we are often accused of not preaching to any but believers. The apostle says, "For the Jews require a sign, and the Greeks seek after wisdom. But we preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumbling block and unto the Greeks foolishness; but unto them which are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God," I Corinthians 1:22-24.

Here is a plain, positive declaration of the apostle, that they preached the same gospel to the Jews and to the Greeks, to whom it was a stumbling block, and foolishness, that they preached to them that are called. The effect was different but the preaching was the same.

The gospel does contain invitations; but, as a rule, the majority of ministers fail to discern that it discriminates between

the character of men in every invitation it makes. **It never gives an invitation without describing the character it invites.** In the invitation, "Ho, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters, and he that hath no money; come ye, buy, and eat, yea, come, buy wine and milk without money and without price," Isaiah 40:1. The thirsty are the ones invited. If none are thirsty, none are invited; if all are thirsty, all are invited; and the invitation extends just so far, and no farther than to the thirsty.

The same invitation is made in John 7:37; Revelation 22:17. In Matthew 11:28, we have another invitation to all that labor, and are heavy laden. Hence it would be wrong in any of us to conclude that the gospel had no invitations in it, and just as great a wrong for any to claim that those invitations are general.

There is not one gospel invitation in the Bible, that does not describe the character it invites. But the Arminian world seems to think they have a work to do that we have failed so far to find a Bible warrant for, and that is, they think it is the business of God's ministers to make people thirsty, and then invite them to come to the Lord.

We deem it the business of God's ministers to invite those who are thirsty. But the gospel is not made up merely by invitations, and, as some would be proud to lug into it, propositions, that is, it is not merely an offer of salvation to the world, for **it is not an offer of salvation at all. It is a proclamation of salvation through Christ.**

One grand reason why men make so many mistakes as to the object of preaching the gospel, is because they fail to arrive at a proper conclusion of what it is. **The primary object of the gospel is to encourage and comfort the children of God;** and they derive their comfort from what it proclaims to them,—not what it proposes to them on conditions.

The Lord say, "Comfort ye, comfort ye my people, saith your God. Speak ye comfortably to Jerusalem, and cry unto her, that her warfare is accomplished, that her iniquity is pardoned: for

she hath received of the Lord's hand double for all her sins,"
Isaiah 40:1-2.

Here is a proclamation, and not a proposition, to the children of God. The object is to comfort. When our Lord ascended he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men. "And he gave some apostles, and some, prophets, and some, evangelists, and some pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ: till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ."

We are often asked the question, what is the use of preaching, if your doctrine be true?" There are four different objects for preaching the gospel in the above quotation, and not one of them is for the making of saints.

One is for the perfecting of the saints. The perfecting of the saints is to give them all the instruction in righteousness, that they may be thoroughly furnished unto all good works. It always directs their minds to a crucified Savior, as suitably adapted to their case, and that freely supplies all their wants. It reminds them of all his ordinances, and their obligations to observe them; it teaches them to deny ungodliness and worldly lusts, and live soberly, righteously and godly in this present world.

When they see that there is no worthiness in themselves, and that Jesus has bestowed all his worthiness on them, freely, without any consideration on their part, and they are made to view him as altogether lovely, and that his ways are perfectly just and right, and that there is a beauty in holiness, as well as joys that the world is utterly incapable of giving, and they are led to an implicit confidence in him and his word, they are then willing and able to conform to his will, in obeying all the injunctions of his gospel.

The ministry is to point all these out to the saints and present to them all the blessed promises of the gospel, with a description

of the evidences of Christianity, and how they are to be tested. In this, it is for the perfecting of the saints.

It is for the edifying of the body of Christ. To edify is to build up in knowledge and piety. In this edification the saints mutually hold sweet communion with one another, their company becomes pleasant, and their fellowship is strengthened. "Let us therefore follow after the things which make for peace, and things wherewith one may edify another," Romans 14:19. "Let every one of us please his neighbor for his good to edification," Romans 15:2. "Even so ye, forasmuch as ye are zealous of spiritual gifts, seek that ye may excel to the edifying of the church," I Corinthians 14:12.

Read the 26th verse, same chapter (I Corinthians 14:26): How is it then, brethren, when ye come together, every one of you hath a psalm, hath a doctrine, hath a tongue, hath a revelation, hath an interpretation? Let all things be done to edifying." Again, "Wherefore comfort yourselves together, and edify one another, even as ye do," I Thessalonians 5:11.

Again, "And let us consider one another to provoke unto love and to good works," Hebrews 10:24. Here is the edification of the body of Christ, and this is one of the objects of the ministry. This noble work is to be performed by the Lord's ministers, till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ. What a glorious gift has the minister of Christ! He has news to tell the children of God that in its very nature is calculated to draw them together as one man.

Built up in the most holy faith of God's elect, they willingly and zealously contend for "the faith once delivered to the saints." And the ultimatum of the matter is, "That we be no more children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men, and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive."

The Savior, when he was here with his disciples charged them, saying, "Take heed and beware of the leaven of the Pharisees

and of the Sadducees," Matthew 16:6. He had allusion to their doctrine. **The apostle considered it a matter of great importance that the saints be saved from false doctrine.** He says, "But though we or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed," Galatians 1:8.

The gospel discriminates between the doctrine of Christ, and the false doctrines. This is one of its grand objects. The apostle John makes an urgent appeal to the church, "Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits, whether they are of God, because many false prophets are gone out into the world," I John 4:1.

Then, in view of the fact that the world is full of false teachers, and that the children of God cannot glorify God in the belief of false doctrines; and that, although they may rejoice in it for the present, it never looks farther ahead than this life; while the doctrine of Christ is repulsive to the world, yet in the enjoyment of the hearty belief of that doctrine, they can look far beyond all things that pertain to this life, and enjoy all the glorious promises of the gospel, what an important work is preaching the gospel!

It is in this way that God by the foolishness of preaching saves them that believe. Hence it is that even according to the position occupied by us, there are abundant reasons for the preaching of the gospel to the saints. It seems to us that the man that would ask us the question, "What is the use of preaching?" with all these things before him, does not think it a matter of much importance what a man believes. **Indeed, we often hear them say that they do not think it matters what a man believes, so he is honest in it.** Then we ask in all candor and sincerity, why make such a noise about the heathen? They believe in idolatry, but they are honest in that faith. We think it a matter of considerable importance that the church of God hold tenaciously to the doctrine of God our Savior. The great apostle thought it a matter of so vast importance that he gave a very solemn charge to Timothy, "I charge thee therefore before God, and the Lord Jesus, who shall judge the quick and dead, at his appearing and kingdom;

Preach the word; be instant in season; out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all longsuffering and doctrine. For 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," II Timothy 4:1,4.

It sometimes occurs to us that the more unpopular the truth is, the farther some, even who profess to be Baptists, are from wanting to preach it. If there was ever a time when it was proper to oppose error, it is when that error is prevalent. One reason that Paul gave the charge as he did to Timothy was because he knew the time was coming when it would not be endured.

Brethren, let us never be ashamed to preach the doctrine of Christ. But let us contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints. By so doing, we save the church from false doctrine. Sound doctrine never has killed a church, but the want of it has. Sound practice never killed a church, but the want of it has. Sound preaching is more likely to produce sound practice than anything else.

The object of the gospel is a subject of no little controversy among men in the world. While the Arminian world holds that it is the medium through which God offers salvation to the race of mankind, they generally make the impression that it is the only means of giving life to the sinner. Or, in other words, that it is absolutely essential in the work of quickening the sinner into divine life.

While they succeed in making their people believe this they have a good plea for their missionary organizations. They tell the people in their Bible lectures, that hundreds and thousands of souls are now writhing in hell, simply because they were not blessed with the Bible and preachers. In this they limit the salvation of God exclusively to those people whose lots have been cast in a land of Bibles. Their theory damns all those who have died in heathenism, and that without any chance of salvation.

We are far from believing that God has wrapped himself up in the Bible and the preacher. He is limited in nothing! It is the Spirit that quickens the sinner into divine life, and to limit the work of the Spirit to the proclamation of the gospel, as the Campbellites and Missionary Baptists do, together with all others who hold that the gospel and Bible are essential to the conversion of sinners, is to deny the omnipresence of God.

It is also to limit his power, and according to that position, he should not have made the promise that he did to Abraham; that in him, and his seed should all the nations of the earth be blessed. For if there is a nation of earth among whom there are no believers, the promise fails; for believers are the seed of Abraham.

The literal Jews were the literal descendants, or literal seed of Abraham, but they were only one small nation. It could not have been that it was with those that all nations were to be blessed; but the apostle lets us know that believers are the seed of Abraham. Then believers are to bless all nations of the earth—not merely where the Bible and missionaries get to, but all nations.

But where the gospel is preached, it is hid to some. The apostle says, "But if our gospel is hid, it is hid to them that are lost," II Corinthians 2:3. If they were so blinded that the gospel could not shine into them, and the Spirit of God could not operate in their hearts, unless it was through, or by the means of the gospel, then they were beyond the reach of ever being converted. Who are they that the gospel is hid to? Them that are lost." (*Lemuel Potter*)

Gospels, The Four

The Four GOSPELS: Sylvester Hassell: "Matthew, the Hebrew gospel, is the true commencement of the New Testament; it represents Jesus as the son of David, the son of Abraham, and continually refers to the fulfillment of the Old Testament Scriptures. Mark, Peter's gospel, represents Jesus, as Peter said to Cornelius, as anointed with the Holy Ghost and power, going about doing good and healing all oppressed with the devil; it is the gospel of action—rapid,

vigorous and vivid. Luke, Paul's gospel, presents Jesus, not as the son of Abraham only, but as the son of Adam; it seems broader in its human sympathy, and is pre-eminently a gospel for the Gentiles—the gospel of the Son of man, its key-note being mercy; the gospel for women, dwelling upon Elizabeth, the Virgin Mary, Anna, Martha and her sister Mary, and the female disciples who ministered to Christ and his Apostles; the gospel for children, dwelling upon the birth and youth of John the Baptist and of Jesus; and the gospel of sacred poetry, the first two chapters being a paradise of fragrant flowers, where the air is resonant with the sweet melodies of heavenly gladness and thanksgiving; the gospel of Luke says the infidel Renan, is the most beautiful book in the world.”
(T.D. Bernard. ” From Hassell’s History ppg 7,8)

Sylvester Hassell The gospel of John dwells especially upon the divine and eternal glory of the Lord Jesus Christ. Because of this fact, and of its recording the astounding miracle of the resurrection of Lazarus, and on account of its containing several long spiritual discourses of Christ, the especial malevolence of modern skeptics has been directed against the authenticity of this gospel, and it has been most learnedly and laboriously attempted to relegate its composition to the latter part of the second century and to some unknown and unreliable author. But critics have been forced to retreat from A.D. 170 to about A.D. 100, as the time when it was known and used by the church—that is, to the lifetime, if not of John himself, of many of his friends, upon whom such a work, if spurious, could not have been imposed. The internal proof of its authenticity is stronger than that of any classical work of antiquity. Its general structure and contents furnish a convincing argument for its strict historical truth. It contains more touches of an eye-witness than any other of the gospels; it is more observant of chronological order, and confessedly, the most valuable for consultation in the scientific construction of the Savior's history. It alone gives an adequate explanation of the manner and time in which Christ's death was brought about (by his raising Lazarus from the dead, near Jerusalem, after the latter had been dead four days, and thus presenting the strongest proof of his own divinity, and offending the Jewish rulers more than ever before).

Even Baur, the founder of the Tubingen school, admits that the author of the Fourth Gospel was a man of remarkable mind, of an elevated spirit, and penetrated with a warm and adoring faith in Christ as the Son of God, and the Savior of the world, and compares him with the Apostle Paul. Surely such a man could not have fabricated a life of his Master. Baur and Keim give the gospel of John the highest praise as a philosophy of religion. “Going from the first to the second century,” says Professor Fisher, “is passing into a far different atmosphere, descending from the heights of inspiration to the level of ordinary and often of feeble thinking, so that setting a work like the fourth gospel in the second century is a literary anachronism.”

No man but the Apostle John could have written it. “If he did not write it,” says Neander, “then its authorship is the greatest of enigmas. Through the Fourth Gospel, while the Apostle John is never mentioned by name, there moves an unnamed, veiled form, which sometimes comes forward, yet

without the veil being entirely lifted; the author must have well known who this person was, and he must have been the person himself, whom it was the whole joy of his life to know that Jesus loved, but who modestly and delicately suppresses his own name.” The authenticity of this gospel was abundantly acknowledged in the second century, and was not disputed till the nineteenth century.

The first epistle of John is remarkably similar, and must have been by the same author. The most radical critics admit that the Apocalypse or Revelation was written by the Apostle John; and they maintain that the Fourth Gospel is so much purer, calmer and more grammatical Greek, that it could not have had the same author. But the latest and profoundest scholars believe that the Apocalypse was written by John, as Boanerges, a son of thunder, about A.D. 69, after the Neronian persecution Revelation 6:9-11, and amid the terrible and portentous events just before the destruction of Jerusalem Revelation 11:1-14; and the Fourth Gospel was written by him some twenty or thirty years afterwards, when he had been residing many years in the Grecian cities of Asia Minor, and had acquired a much freer use of the Greek language, and when he was in extreme old age, and with memory refreshed by the Divine Spirit, according to Christ’s latest promises, he was occupied with tranquil and delightful reminiscences of his beloved Lord.” (*Hassell’s History* ppg 8,9)

Great Western Schism, The

The GREAT WESTERN SCHISM (The Great Papal Schism) Sylvester Hassell: In 1378, at Rome, Urban VI. was chosen Pope—the French *Cardinals* afterwards declaring that they were forced to this choice by the violent threats of the Roman populace demanding, under penalty of their lives, a Roman Pope; and Urban was so insolent and cruel after his accession to the papacy that these *Cardinals* retired to Anagni, declared that Urban was an apostate, an accursed Antichrist, and the elected Clement VII Pope, who removed his seat to Avignon. The different nations of Europe acknowledged that one of these two rivals whose circumstances best suited their individual temporal interests.

Thus, says Wycliffe, was the head of Antichrist cloven in twain, and each part fought against the other; and the friends of truth lifted up their heads and

rejoiced. Each pope excommunicated cursed and warred upon the other; and this “Great Western Schism” lasted from 1378 to 1417. There being two costly papal courts, and the field of revenue being divided, the papal exactions upon the Catholic world became intolerable; and many, not knowing which so-called “Head of the church” to look to, looked away from both to Christ, who is the only Head and King of his spiritual people.

Among the innumerable and abominable devices to fill the papal exchequer were the sales of income-yielding “church” offices, even before they were vacated by death, to all who applied for them, the pope selling the same office to as many as a hundred persons if he could, and some paying for it two or three times, and then seeking to compass the death of the incumbent so that they might take his place, and, after obtaining the office, never visiting the place, but sending their agents to collect the revenues; also, the multiplication of Jubilees in Rome, reducing the period from a hundred to fifty, and thirty-three, and twenty-five years, in order for the popes to reap more frequently the golden harvests of the sales of indulgences to sin; and the establishment of pardon-marts in numerous cities in Europe, spreading tables with rich cloths, like bankers, near the altars in the *church* buildings, setting a price upon each sin, and trading pardons for gold.

At this time “the whole (Catholic) organization,” says Trench, “seemed little better than *a vast and elaborate machinery for the wringing, under every conceivable plea, of the greatest possible amount of money from the faithful.*” (*Hassell’s History* ppg 453, 454)

Sylvester Hassell “The Great Papal Schism,” says Trench, “forever dissipated the nimbus of glory with which the early Middle Ages had encircled the papacy.” The Roman and the Avignonese popes, Gregory XII. And Benedict XIII., perfectly hated, mistrusted, and sought to destroy each other; neither would resign; and the cardinals of both finally united in calling a General Council to meet in Pisa in Italy to terminate the Schism, and to reform the church in its head and members.” At this Council, which sat from March 25th to August 7th, 1409, twenty-six *Cardinals*, some two hundred *Bishops* and some five hundred Doctors of Theology and of the Civil and Canon Law, with representatives of numerous Universities and temporal potentates, were present. Both the popes were declared by the Council to be notorious schismatics, heretics and perjurers, and they were both deposed; and Alexander V. was chosen in their stead. He dismissed the Council as soon as he could, and promised to call another in three years to “reform the church;” and thus matters were left worse than before—instead of two popes there were three, as Gregory and Benedict would not recognize or obey the Council, and no reformation was yet effected. People called the Catholic *Church* a Cerberus, a three-headed monster.

Alexander dying in less than a year, poisoned, as it was supposed, by his successor, Balthazar Cossa (John XXIII.), was, by fear or bribery, or both, chosen pope by the cardinals; he was said to be the ablest and worst man in *Christendom*. He had been a pirate; and, while papal lord of Bologna, had been guilty of the most outrageous tyranny, avarice and simony, had murdered multitudes of men and women, and had victimized two hundred maids, wives, widows and nuns.

Of the seventy charges preferred against him by the Council of Constance, he is said to have confessed the truth of forty; he was generally known, says that Council, as “the incarnate Devil.” Compelled by the German Emperor Sigismund, he summoned the Council just mentioned. Constance, where it met, now in Baden, was then a free city of the German Empire; it is situated on the southern side of the Rhine, at its exit from the Lake of Constance. Its population of 40,000 has now been reduced to 10,000.

The most famous thing that ever occurred in it was this Council and its immortal infamy in not only the condemnation but the burning of John Huss and Jerome of Prague. The session of the Council lasted from 1414 to 1418. Its object was threefold—to end the papal schism; to prevent the spread of the teachings of Wycliffe, Huss and Jerome; and “to reform the church in its head and members.”

It surpassed in the number and dignity of its attendants all the Councils that succeeded it. There were present, it is said, twenty-six princes, one hundred and forty counts, twenty-nine cardinals, thirty-three archbishops, one hundred and fifty Bishops, six hundred prelates and doctors, and four thousand priests—amounting, with their attendants, to eighteen thousand. Ordinarily fifty thousand, and sometimes one hundred thousand visitors, with thirty thousand horses, were in the city during the session of the Council.

John XXIII. was deposed, having made the name (John) so infamous that no succeeding pope has assumed it; but he was afterwards made by his successor Dean (or Chief) of the College of Cardinals.

Martin V. was chosen by the Council of Constance to succeed him; and, by making concordats with the delegates of each nation separately, he thwarted all the reformatory plans of the Council, showed them that he was their master, declared that the pope was above a General Council, and dictatorially assumed to himself the infallibility of God. He soon revived the worst evils of the papacy, and dissolved the Council, and left the city, with the emperor holding his bridle on one side, and the Elector of Brandenburg on the other, and with a train of forty thousand persons on horseback accompanying him on the first stage of his

journey home. What a triumph for the religion of Satan! The apparently deadly wounds of the Babylonish captivity and the Great Schism now seemed to be completely healed.

In compliance with a rule laid down by the Council of Constance, and because of the continued clamors for reform, and in order to attempt to reunite the Greek and Roman *Churches*, Pope Eugenius IV., the successor of Martin V., confirmed the act of his predecessor in summoning the Council of Basel (in Switzerland), which sat from 1431 to 1443. This Council is said to have been much more democratic than the other two, the “inferior clergy” carrying most of their measures.

The pope became alarmed at their entering into conciliatory negotiations with the Hussites, and tried to dissolve the Council, but that body obstinately refused to be dissolved, and the pope had to yield to them for a while. When they proceeded, however, to reform some of the papal abuses, and thus dry up some of the papal income, the pope became furious, declared that they were a collection of all the devils in the world, called upon the faithful to kill them, and, on the plea that negotiations with the envoys of the Greek *Church* could be more conveniently conducted in an Italian city, tried to remove the seat of the Council to Ferrara, and afterwards to Florence. He had Councils at both of these cities; but the Council of Pisa refused to stir; they deposed Pope Eugenius IV., and in 1439 elected Felix V., the last anti-pope, in his stead, who resigned his office in 1449.

This new schism so offended the Catholics generally, and so weakened the Council, that it finally died of inanition. Thus closed the last “Reforming Council” of the Roman Catholic *Church*, having failed in all its undertakings as completely and ingloriously as its two predecessors. The absolute necessity of reformation in that communion, or rather of *regeneration*, was, by these Councils, however, publicly acknowledged to the world; their failure was due, says Mr. Trencle, to their “refusing to see that abuses in practice were rooted in errors of doctrine, drawing all their poisonous life from them, and that blows stricken at the roots were the only blows which would profit.” (*Hassell’s History* ppg 462-464)

Gregory I

GREGORY I (Gregory the Great) Sylvester Hassell: Gregory I was Pope from A.D. 590 to 604. He is one of the four *doctors* of the Latin *Church*—Ambrose, Augustine and Jerome being the other three. He was a Semi-Augustinian, excessively superstitious, monastic, ritualistic and hierarchical,

hostile to secular learning, persecuted the Donatists in Africa, and was the father of medieval papacy, of the practical doctrine of purgatory and meritorious masses; he advocated the atoning value of good works, and furnished a basis for the later system of works of supererogation.

He sought to make converts, first by preaching, and if that failed, by bribery or imprisonment and torture. He applauded and flattered the centurion Phocas, a monster of vice and cruelty, who rebelled against, and atrociously slew the Roman Emperor Maurice and his wife and eight children, and who usurped the throne.

In 597 he sent out Augustine, a zealous and intolerant and self-sufficient monk, with forty followers, to convert the heathen Saxons in England to Roman Catholicism—the first strictly foreign mission, of the modern style, ever undertaken; and, as England was the field of this mission, so England has appropriately become the chief mother of nineteenth-century missions of the same character. In about a year three British kings and ten thousand of their subjects were baptized—many scandalous stories being told of these pretended conversions and baptisms; the old Pagan temples were *consecrated* by being sprinkled with *holy* water, and by having the *saints* relics put in place of the idols; and the old heathen festivals, such as Yule and Easter, were transformed into so-called *Christian* festivities. In such measures of compromise and accommodation, as well as in centralized power and unflagging perseverance, Papal Rome imitated Imperial Rome; and, using even greatly superior worldly wisdom and skill, she has achieved a natural success far more extensive and enduring than that ever attained by the Caesars or their political successors. The daughters of Papal Rome attain similar success just in proportion as they adopt similar measures of corrupting accommodation to the principles and practices of the world.” (*Hassell’s History* ppg 409, 410)

Sylvester Hassell Gregory was the first to make practical Origen’s and Augustine’s doctrine of purgatorial fire after death, and taught that the sufferings of Christians consigned to purgatory could be mitigated and shortened by the prayers, alms, masses, and other services of their surviving friends. He taught that each celebration of the communion was a new sacrifice, having new virtue for the atonement of sin.” (*Hassell*)

Heaven, Eternal

Eternal HEAVEN: **Sylvester Hassell:** “When Christ comes again it will be to be admired in all them that believe. Those who are then alive will be changed in the twinkling of an eye; their corruptible shall put on incorruption, and their

mortal shall put on immortality. Those who are in the graves shall hear the voice of the Son of man and come forth to the resurrection of life, their bodies fashioned like unto the glorious body of the Son of God. Thus changed, both classes of believers shall ever be with the Lord. The place of the final abode of the righteous is sometimes called a house, as when the Savior said, "In my Father's house are many mansions" John 14:2; sometimes "a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God" Hebrews 11:16; a country through which flows the river of the water of life, and "on either side of the river was there the tree of life, which bare twelve manner of fruits, and yielded her fruit every month; and the leaves of the tree were for the healing of the nations. And there shall be no more curse; but the throne of God and of the Lamb shall be in it; and his servants shall serve him; and they shall see his face; and his name shall be in their foreheads. And there shall be no night there; and they need no candle, neither light of the sun; for the Lord God giveth them light: and they shall reign forever and ever" Revelation 22:2-5. Sometimes the final abode of the redeemed is called a "new Heavens and a new earth" I Corinthians 2:9.

As to the blessedness of this heavenly state we know that it is inconceivable; "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" I Corinthians 2:9.

We know not, O we know not
What joys await us there;
What radiancy of glory,
What bliss beyond compare.

We know, however: (1.) That this incomprehensible blessedness of Heaven shall arise from the vision of God. This vision is beatific. It transforms the soul into the Divine image; transfusing into it the Divine life, so that it is filled with the fulness of God. This vision of God is in the face of Jesus Christ, in whom dwells the plentitude of the Divine glory bodily. God is seen in fashion as a man; and it is this manifestation of God in the person of Christ that is inconceivably and intolerably ravishing. Peter, James and John became as dead men when they saw his glory, for a moment, in the holy mount.

(2.) The blessedness of the redeemed will flow not only from the manifestation of the glory, but also of the love of God; of that love, mysterious, unchangeable and infinite, of which the work of redemption is the fruit.

(3.) Another element of the future happiness of the saints is the indefinite enlargement of all their faculties.

(4.) Another is their entire exemption from all sin and sorrow.

(5.) Another is their intercourse and fellowship with the high intelligences of Heaven; with patriarchs, prophets, apostles, martyrs, and all the redeemed.

(6.) Another is constant increase in knowledge and in the useful exercise of all their powers.

(7.) Another is the secure and everlasting possession of all possible good.”—C. Hodge.”

“The everlasting duration of the happiness of the righteous is shown by its being called eternal or everlasting life, eternal glory, a house eternal in the Heavens, an eternal inheritance, an everlasting kingdom, a continuing city, a better country, a being ever with the Lord, in accordance with the eternal purpose of God and the everlasting covenant of grace; were there any fears of its ever ending, it could not be perfect happiness.

As to whether there will be any degrees in the final happiness of the saints, those passages of Scriptures usually brought to support it usually belong to the militant, not to the triumphant state of the church.

The arguments against degrees in glory are: (1.) That all the people of God are loved by him with the same everlasting love. (2.) They were all chosen together in Christ before the foundation of the world. (3.) They are all equally redeemed with the same precious blood of Christ. (5.) They are all *freely* justified by the same righteousness of Christ. (6.) All are equally the predestinated and adopted children and heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ. (7.) They are all raised up from the same low and lost estate by Christ to be kings and priests unto God’ --- John Gill.” (*Hassell’s History* ppg 266, 267)

Heaven: High and Low Seats

HEAVEN: High and Low Seats: C. H. Cayce: If sinners were saved in heaven because of what they do, or because of their good works, it might be true that one would have a higher place or a more exalted position in heaven than others. But sinners are not saved in heaven because of their righteousness, or because of their good works. They are saved in heaven because of what Christ has done for them, and He did no more for one saved person than for another. What He did for one of His children He did for each one of them.

If what Christ did for one secures a high place in heaven for him, what He did for another will do the same for him also. Hence, as sinners are saved in heaven

because of what Christ has done, and not because of what they do, it follows that as Christ did no more for one of the saved than He did for another, all of the saved will be on an equality, or on a common level.

Paul said, II Timothy 4:8, a crown of righteousness was laid up for him. He also tells us that this crown was not only laid up for him, but it was also laid up for all who love the appearing of the Savior. This being true, it cannot be true that one will have a higher place or a more exalted position than another.

All the Lord's children will have the same inheritance I Peter 1:3-5; as they all have the same inheritance, and each one has all the inheritance, then there is no difference here. All are on an equality and on an equal footing, so far as the inheritance is concerned. This being true, it cannot be true that one will have a higher place or a more exalted position than another.

In Romans 8:17 we are told that the children of God are joint-heirs with Christ. Everyone knows that a joint-heir is an equal heir. Then as they are all joint-heirs with Christ, they will all, each and every one of them, share heaven and all that it is and all that it means equally with Christ. If one has higher place than another, then they are not joint-heirs, are not equal heirs. But they are equal heirs, and therefore one will not have a higher place than another.

If one should have a higher place than another, why could there not be jealousy arising? Why could not one be jealous of another and envious of another who might be occupying a higher place than himself? This would destroy the very idea of heaven, and there would be no heaven at all.

It appears to us that this idea of a high and low seat in heaven is very much akin to an exalted opinion of self. Usually those who hold to such an idea have such an exalted opinion of self that they expect to occupy a very high place, and if we are to judge by expressions they sometimes use, they expect to look down with contempt upon those who occupy a lower place. It is pharisaical in the extreme. It is contrary to sound reason, contrary to the teaching of God's word; and the idea of doing much for the Lord in order to enter heaven gave birth to it. May the Lord deliver His little children from every false way, is our humble prayer.
(*CAYCE vol. 1, ppg 339,340*)

Hebrews, The Book Of

The Book of HEBREWS: Sylvester Hassell: The epistle to the Hebrews presents to the perplexed Hebrew-Christian mind the correct divinely-intended relation and subordination of the Old Covenant to the New. The internal

evidence is that it was written from Italy between A.D. 60 and 70, before Paul's martyrdom. The author was a man full of faith and the Holy Spirit, and gifted with a tongue of fire. He had the grace of exhortation and consolation in the highest degree.

The epistle is a profound argument for the superiority of Christ over the angels, over Moses, and over the Levitical priesthood, and for the finality of the second covenant. It unfolds far more fully than any other book the great idea of the eternal priesthood and sacrifice of Christ, offered once and forever for human redemption, as distinct from the national and transient character of the Mosaic priesthood and the ever-repeated sacrifices of the tabernacle and the temple. He shows from the Old Testament itself that God had designed the latter as but the temporary shadow, type and prophecy of Christianity, the abiding substance.

The epistle is, like Colossians and Philippians, eminently Christological, and forms a stepping-stone to the Christology of John. The object of the author was to warn the conservative Christians in Jerusalem of the danger of apostatizing to Judaism. His arguments were providentially emphasized soon after by the destruction of the city and temple.

The language of the epistle is the purest Greek of the New Testament. The opening sentence is a rich and elegant period of classic construction. The description of the heroes of faith in Hebrews 11 is one of the most eloquent and sublime in the entire range of religious literature. (*Hassell's History pg 206*)

Hell, Eternal

Eternal HELL: Lemuel Potter: By the expression, endless punishment, I mean a punishment that will never cease.....The expressions of Scripture relative to this subject are, punishment, torment, death, damnation, shame and everlasting contempt, or separation, and while the term death is frequently employed I believe it to be death in the sense of separation, and not that they possess no vitality. This state will be a state of wretchedness and misery that will never cease."
(*Lemuel Potter*)

Lemuel Potter I claim that eternal damnation is endless damnation, the same as eternal life is endless life. And notice, the sons of men are spoken of here, which must be Adam's posterity. I quote again," Matthew 10:28, "And fear not them

which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul, but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell.”

Now notice it is not only the soul that goes to hell according to this text, but it is the body as well, and from the language recorded by Luke, it is after the death of the body. (*Lemuel Potter*)

C.H. Cayce: We are asked the following question: “Do the Scriptures teach that the grave is hell— that we are banished from God, when we are laid in the grave, until the day of the resurrection?” The word *hell* in our (King James) translation of the Scriptures is sometimes translated from a word which means the grave. The Scriptures do not teach that God’s people are banished from God at death until the resurrection. When a child of God dies he immediately goes to God in spirit, while the body goes to the grave. The spirit goes to God who gave it. The Savior said to the thief: “Today shalt thou be with me in paradise.” Paradise is not the grave. The body went to the grave, and the spirit to paradise, or rest, in the presence of God. God’s people do rest, in body, in the grave, because Jesus has gone there and gained the victory over it. It was an enemy, but it has been conquered by the Saviour.” (*Cayce’s Editorials vol. 2, ppg 148*)

Sylvester Hassell: “The chief objections to the doctrine of endless punishment,” says Prof. W.G.T. Shedd, “are not Biblical, but speculative. The great majority of students and exegetes find the tenet in the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures. Sin is voluntary; and endless sin must receive endless punishment. The unsubmitive, rebellious spirits of the lost go, with like-minded companions, to ‘their own place,’ which they prefer to Heaven. History shows that the disbelief of the doctrine of the endless punishment of the wicked is most prevalent in the most corrupt times—itsself being both a sign and a cause of the corruption.”

God said to our first parents in the garden of Eden that in the day they ate of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil they should surely die; but Satan afterwards came in the form of the serpent, and flatly contradicted God, telling them that they

should not surely die. So, in the present age of widespread infidelity, Satan, in the hearts of both the

professing and non-professing *Christian* world, assures men that, though they go on in sin and impenitence and unbelief till temporal death, they will not die everlastingly—thus meeting with point-blank contradiction the repeated, multiform, emphatic, indubitable assurances of God in the Scriptures.

This soothing, infernal poison, a combination of Arminianism and Universalism, is pervading and leavening the great masses in the Roman Catholic, Greek Catholic, Lutheran and Anglican communions. In the minds of multitudes, a terminable purgatory is taking the place, for all men, of an interminable hell—the idea being derived, not from the scriptures, but from the ancient Persian heathens, from whom the Jews obtained it and incorporated it in their Apocrypha and Talmud; the Catholics derived it from the Jews, and Protestants derived it from the Catholics.

According to this insidious deception, men after death are to be sent into purifying fires, chastened for their sins, instructed in Divine truth, and given another chance to repent and save themselves, and go to Heaven. High ecclesiastical office, pretentious scholarship, splendid eloquence, soul-moving rhetoric, and encyclopedic erudition, followed by countless hosts of lesser lights, zealously array themselves against the plainest declarations of the written word of God and in defense of this Satanic delusion. They urge that the doctrine of eternal punishment is by far the most objectionable part of the Bible to skeptics; and, unless this harsh and cruel doctrine is toned down, the infidel world never will receive the Bible.

But there are other teachings of the Scriptures that are intensely offensive to the carnal mind—such as the total depravity of man, salvation by grace alone, the plenary inspiration of the Scriptures, the Divinity of Christ, the atonement, the resurrection, the holiness of God, etc. All these and all other peculiar features of Christianity must be removed from the Bible, or explained away, before the unregenerate world will be willing to receive it. It will, therefore, be much

better for all who profess the name of Christ never to begin the work of toning down and explaining away the Scriptures.

The present writer has read, with deep attention, the most recent elaborate arguments advanced against the Bible doctrine of the everlasting duration of future punishment; he has compared these reasonings with themselves, with the original Hebrew and Greek Scriptures, and with the latest and most authoritative lexicons, and he is constrained to declare his belief that, for the very *perfection of sophistry*, these infidel treatises have no equal in the entire range of human literature. *The same methods of explanation would make anything mean nothing.*

The terms *almost invariably* used in the Scriptures to denote *everlasting duration* are *olam* in the Old Testament, and *aion* and *aionios* in the New Testament. While these terms, both in and out of the Bible, sometimes certainly signify *indefinite duration*, it is admitted by the best lexicographers that their common meaning is *everlasting*; they are the most frequent terms used in the Bible to denote the everlasting duration of God, and the everlasting duration of the happiness of saints in glory; it is therefore most scriptural to understand that, when they are applied to the duration of the punishment of the wicked, they also mean everlasting. The Scriptures, being addressed in the main to God's people, dwell more upon the perfections of God and the future happiness of his saints than upon the future punishment of the wicked.

In the Old Testament *olam* is used 40 times in reference to God, 94 times in reference to the future happiness of his people, and 11 times in reference to the punishment of the wicked. In the New Testament *aion* is used 14 times and *aionios* 3 times in reference to God; *aion* 9 times and *aionios* 51 times in reference to the happiness of the righteous beyond the grave; and *aion* five times and *aionios* 7 times in reference to the future punishment of the wicked.

In all these cases the reference is to the future duration of God and of the human race; and the making of a radical distinction in the meanings of these same terms, so that they shall denote

infinite duration in reference to the *righteous*, and *finite* duration in reference to the *wicked*, is, says Professor Stuart, "without parallel in the just principles of interpretation. The conclusion is plain, and philologically and exegetically certain. It is this: either the declarations of the Scriptures do not establish the facts that God and his glory and praise and happiness are *endless*, nor that the happiness of the righteous in the future world is *endless*, or else they establish the fact that the punishment of the wicked is *endless*."

In Matthew 25:46 the very same Greek word, *ainios* is used by Christ, in the same sentence in reference both to the duration of the punishment of the wicked and the duration of the happiness of the righteous. The plurals and reduplications and supplementations of these three terms are used several times in the Scriptures to express the duration of the existence of the glory of God, and of the future happiness of his people; so also are they sometimes used to express the duration of the future punishment of the wicked (Psalms 9:5; Revelation 14:11; 15:7; 19:3; 20:10).

The extreme position has even been taken that *aionios* has no reference to duration whatever, but simply means *spiritual, supra-sensuous, beyond and above time*; and that *aionion* (or eternal) life may last *but ten minutes*, and *aionion* (or eternal) death may last *but ten minutes*. Now the Lord Jesus Christ is, on this and on every subject, a higher authority than any creature; and in John 10:28 he defines *aionian* (or eternal) life to be imperishable or indestructible life; and in Matthew 25:41,46, he defines *aionian* (or eternal) fire or punishment or death Revelation 20:14,15 to be the same as the punishment of the devil and his angels, which, in Jude 1:6, is declared to be *aidios*, a term never meaning anything but *everlasting*; and in Mark 9:43, Christ declares that this "fire" is *asbestos, unquenchable, inextinguishable*; and in Mark 9:44,46,48 "the fire" signifies the wrath of God, and "the worm" signifies remorse of conscience.

The "great gulf fixed" between the righteous and the wicked after death is declared by Christ in Luke 16:26 to be *impassable*. Not a particle of all the quibbling about *olam, aion*

and *aionios* will apply to such unmistakable passages as Mark 9:43,48; John 3:3,36; Luke 16:26; Revelation 21:8.

The Scriptures everywhere represent the doomed state of the wicked after death as a **finality**; they contain not one syllable to justify the belief that there is any repentance, or forgiveness, or radical change of state in the world beyond the grave. Even the eye of the Apostle of love, as he stands upon the last and loftiest heights of inspiration, sees only endless misery for the wicked.

The filthy and unjust then will remain guilty rebels against God and wretched sufferers forever. The severe punishment inflicted by an avenging Judge, instead of softening and reconciling, will harden and exasperate the criminal.

That a Most Holy God has an infinite hatred of sin is shown by the Noachian deluge, the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, of Pharaoh and his host, and of Jerusalem, by the numberless and indescribable miseries of men in all ages of the world, and by the awful summons that *one soul every second* receives to quit these mortal shores and appear in the presence of its God.

And the infinite hatred of a Most Holy God against sin is shown infinitely more than it could have been shown by all the sufferings for all the human race forever, by the bleeding unutterable agonies of the meek and lowly and spotless Lamb of God in Gethsemane and on Calvary while he expiated the sins of his spiritual Israel. "It is far less possible that the bitter cup should pass from the lips of the finally impenitent than that it should have been taken from the trembling hand of the holy and harmless Son of God."

The unanswerable refutation of the entire body of argument used by the infidel *restorationist* is that this feeble, carnal, heathen and ungodly system wholly does away with the atonement of Christ and the sanctification of the Spirit, the most fundamental truths of Holy Writ, and substitutes, in their stead, satisfaction rendered to Divine justice, and purification obtained by each human being, by the actual individual sufferings of each sinner in this and the future world. If this

doctrine be true, there is *no salvation*, in the true sense of the term, for any member of the Adamic race. The Scriptures and arguments already adduced thoroughly refute also the position of those who advocate the annihilation of the wicked at or after death, or what they call a conditional immortality.

More fully, clearly and emphatically than all the prophets and Apostles does the Lord Jesus Christ, the incarnate God of eternity, the Savior of men, the last Supreme Judge of the human race, describe to us the awful state of the impenitent dead. May we have the wisdom, by Divine grace, as well upon this as upon every other subject, to turn from all other masters and to hear him.

It seems, according to the Scriptures, that the sufferings of the lost will arise: from the loss of all earthly good; from exclusion from the presence and favor of God; from the unrestrained dominion of sin; from the operations of conscience; from despair; from evil associates; from bodily tortures; and from the everlasting duration of their sufferings. (*Hassell's History* ppg 262-266)

Sylvester Hassell: Question: Will the everlasting punishment of the wicked be annihilation or endless conscious torment?

Answer: Annihilation, or the utter extinction of conscious existence, is the doctrine of the heathen atheistic Buddhists; it is a sign and a cause of the most corrupt times. As proved by the context and by other Scriptures, destruction in the Scriptures never means annihilation. The Almighty never made anything for nothing; such an idea impeaches His omniscience and His unchangeability. Non-existence, instead of being everlasting punishment, is an end of all punishment. The Son of God never endured the infinite horrors of Gethsemane, Golgotha and Calvary to save sinners from unconscious nothingness.

To every reverent, intelligent and candid believer in the Scriptures the following passages demonstrate, beyond the shadow of a doubt, the conscious, everlasting suffering of the wicked: Daniel 12:2; Matthew 10:28; 13:49-50; 25:36; 5:28; Romans 2:6-16; II Thessalonians 1:7-9; Revelation 14:11;

19:20; 20:10,15; 21:8; 22:11. Satan, transforming himself into an angel of light, perverts these and other plain Scriptures into fables and nothingness (Genesis 4:4-5; II Corinthians 11:3,14-15; II Timothy 4:3-4; Revelation 12:9). The false doctrine of annihil-ationism was first broached, among professed Christians, in the fourth century, by Arnobius, of Africa, a superficial rhetorician; but it has found many followers, in the last two or three deteriorating centuries, among Materialists, Pantheists, Universalists, infidels and Arminians.

Life is not existence (for things without life exist); but life is a condition of existence; and so death (the opposite of life) is not non-existence. Adam died (in trespasses and sins) in the day when he ate the forbidden fruit, Genesis 2:25, but he still existed as a natural though sinful man. And so the Ephesians, who were "dead in trespasses and sins"

Ephesians 2:1, had a natural sinful existence, in which they walked in worldliness and disobedience, Ephesians 2:2, until God quickened them, or gave them spiritual and divine life. The cutting off, or consuming, or perishing, or destruction of the wicked on earth (Psalms 37:20,34,36,38; Malachi 4:1,3) is their judicial, righteous, violent consignment to death, from which they "will come forth unto the resurrection of damnation" (John 5:29; Matthew 25:41,46).

Punishment is pain, physical or mental, and consciousness is essential to pain; therefore everlasting punishment is everlasting conscious pain—everlasting "contempt" Daniel 12:2, "indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish" Romans 2:8-9, "everlasting fire," Matthew 25:41, where there will be "wailing and gnashing of teeth," Matthew 13:41-42.

It seems enmity to God and cruelty to sinners to endeavor to soften these awful truths into annihilation or nothingness. Our English word punishment is derived from a Latin and Greek word meaning pain or suffering; and the Greek word rendered punishment in Matthew 25:46 ("these shall go away into everlasting punishment") means chastisement, and is in I John 4:18 rendered torment. Christ saves His people from the

everlasting torment deserved by their sins.—S.H.” (CAYCE’S EDITORIALS vol. 2, ppg 16-18)

John R. Daily: The Greek word *gehenna* is the word most frequently employed in the New Testament to designate a place of future punishment. I am aware that this term originally signified the valley of Hinnom, a place near the city of Jerusalem where children were cruelly sacrificed by fire to Moloch, the idol of the Amorites; afterward held in abomination, and used to cast carcasses of dead animals and malefactors, which were consumed by fire that was constantly kept burning. In process of time this place came to be considered as an emblem of hell. The name *gehenna* is frequently used in the New Testament to designate a place of punishment reserved for the wicked in a future state. In fact it is used only in that sense.

In Liddle and Scott’s Lexicon it is defined as *a place of everlasting punishment, hell-fire, hell*. In Grove’s Dictionary it is defined *hell, hell-fire, torments of hell*. It is translated hell in Matthew 23:33. “Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell.” The term “damnation of hell” is from the Greek phrase *krisios tes gehennes*. *Krisis* means *judgment, condemnation, final punishment*. This passage teaches that the place where this final punishment is to be inflicted is called *hell* or *gehenna*.

I now read Luke 12:4,5 and Matthew 10:28. The latter passage teaches that the soul is not killed by killing the body; that the hell here mentioned is entered after death; that it is not the grave, for those who kill the body have power to bury the dead; and that it is not the valley of Hinnom, for those who killed the body had power to cast it into that valley. These two parallel passages plainly teach that it is God who will cast soul and body into hell, and that this will be done after death. Therefore there is revealed to us in the scriptures a *place* of punishment in the future world.

The same conclusion is reached by the following process of reasoning: [either] **1**. Christ used this word *hell* or *gehenna* without any application of without any design and meaning

whatever; or **2.** He used it without any honesty, intending only to frighten them with literal burning in the valley of the son of Hinnom, an affliction they must have known they were absolutely in no danger of; or **3.** He intended to reveal to them the fact that the ungodly would be consigned to a place of punishment in the future world. No one can for a moment entertain the first two suppositions. We are compelled to adopt the last, therefore, or violate every principle of reason and consistency.

Moreover, it is well known that the Jews at this time believed in a place of future punishment, and as they used this term in that way themselves, they must have so understood Christ. Their use of this term must have been known to Christ, and if they had been in error, he certainly would have corrected them, but so far from this he used the term the same himself. He would not have done this had he not intended to confirm their views and press upon them with additional force the same truth. It does seem to me that all who entertain the least regard for honesty and consistency will be compelled to accept the conclusion that Christ did teach that there is in the future state a place of punishment to which the finally wicked and impenitent will be consigned. (*John R. Daily Zion's Advocate Nov. 1898*)

Henry IV, Emperor of Germany

HENRY IV, Emperor of Germany (*See under HILDEBRAND*)

Henry of Lausanne, and The Henricians

HENRY of Lausanne, and The HENRICIANS (*See under PETER de BRUYS*)

Henry VIII

HENRY VIII, King of England (*See under the CHURCH OF ENGLAND*)

Henry, Matthew

Matthew HENRY: Matthew Henry (1662-1714), an English Non-conformist minister, preached through the whole Bible, in expository sermons, more than once; and his Exposition of the Bible, though not scientific or critical, is said to be still the most practical, devotional and spiritual of all English commentaries. George Whitefield read it through four times, the last time on his knees. Matthew Henry's dying language was: "A life spent in the service of God, and communion with him, is the most pleasant life that any one can live in this world." (*Hassell's History* ppg 547, 548)

Henry, Patrick, And The Baptists

Patrick HENRY and the Baptists: In colonial times, the state of Virginia was subject to the same laws resulting from the union of the church and state as prevailed in the mother country. Emigrants from England brought over the same spirit which characterized them at home—the Churchmen or Episcopalians, the spirit of intolerance. And persecution, as evinced in the lives of the founders of that church, Henry VIII, Cranmer, Rogers, and others; and the Baptists, the spirit of independence and the love of civil and religious liberty. When then, it became known that the ruling power would not permit the Baptists to exercise their God-given privileges, persecution became the necessary consequence.

In 1775, three Baptist preachers, Lewis Craig, Joseph Craig, and Aaron Bledsoe, were indicted and brought to trial "for preaching the gospel of the Son of God in the Colony of Virginia." When the prosecutor had ceased, Patrick Henry, residing in a distant county, and present to defend the rights of these poor people, arose and said, "May it please your worships; I think I heard read by the prosecutor as I entered this house, the paper I now hold in my hand. If I have rightly understood, the King's attorney of this colony has framed an indictment for the purpose of arraigning and punishing by imprisonment three inoffensive persons before the bar of this court for a crime of great magnitude as disturbers of the peace. May it please the court, what did I hear read? Did I hear it distinctly, or was it a mistake of my own? Did I hear an expression as if a crime, and these men whom your worships are about to try for a misdemeanor are charged with what?"—adding in an impressive manner— "for preaching the gospel of the Son of God!"

Then pausing and slowly waving the paper three times over his head, and the interest of the audience being wrought up to the highest pitch of excitement, with an impassioned energy peculiarly his own, and with hands and eyes uplifted to heaven, he exclaimed, "Great God!" Continuing, he said, "May it please your

worships; there are periods in the history of man when corruption and depravity have so long debased the human character that man sinks under the weight of the oppressor's hand, and becomes his servile, his abject slave; he licks the hand that smites him; he bows in passive obedience to the mandates of the despot, and in this state of servility he receives the fetters of perpetual bondage. But, may it please your worships, such a day has passed away! From that period when our fathers left the land of their nativity for settlement in these American wilds for liberty—for civil and religious liberty of conscience—to worship their Creator according to their conceptions of heaven's revealed will, from the moment they placed foot on the American continent, and in the deeply imbedded forests sought an asylum from persecution and tyranny—from that moment despotism was crushed; her fetters of darkness were broken, and heaven decreed that man should be free—free to worship God according to the Bible. Were it not for this, in vain have been the efforts and sacrifices of the colonists; in vain were all their sufferings and blood shed to subject this new world, if we, their offspring, must still be oppressed and persecuted. But may it please your worships, permit me to inquire once more, for what are these men about to be tried? This paper says, 'For preaching the gospel of the Son of God.' Great God! For preaching the gospel of the Savior of Adam's fallen race."

And with vehement energy he asked again, "What law have they violated?" It is said the effect of this tornado of truth, passion and eloquence was to cause the prosecutor's frame to quake and his visage to become pale, and the judge to give the order, "Sheriff, discharge those men!"

Those were times that tried the souls of men. Like their predecessors in the faith, they suffered imprisonment, and indignities, but rejoiced in this their privilege of suffering shame for the name of Christ. No weight is heavy when he helps to sustain it. (*Zions Advocate May, 1893*)

Heresy

HERESY: C. H. Cayce: Heresy is a fundamental error in doctrine. There may be an error that is not fundamental. There have been differences on minor points of doctrine among brethren all along, and these differences should be borne with, and we should have forbearance with each other on those minor points. The fundamental principles of the doctrine of God our Saviour are election and predestination; that God made choice of His people in Christ before the world began, and predestinated their salvation and final glorification; that these people are sinners of Adam's race; the direct, immediate, and effectual operation of the Holy Spirit in the heart of the sinner in the work of regeneration, and that all the elect of God will surely be regenerated in time; the final preservation of all the

saints or children of God by grace to glory; that baptism is by immersion, and true believers are the only proper subjects; that the ordinances of the church are to be administered by those who have been called of God and been set apart for the work by a presbytery authorized by the church; that God is eternal, omnipotent, omniscient, the fountain of truth, the embodiment of justice and mercy; that there are three divine Persons in the Godhead (not three Gods, but one God composed of three), the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one; that the Son of God is equal with the Father in all His divine perfections; that the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments were given by inspiration of God, and are the only divinely authorized rule of faith and practice, and are given for the benefit of the Lord's children. These are some of the main points of the fundamental principles of the doctrine believed by the Primitive Baptists and taught in the Scriptures. A doctrine that contradicts these fundamental principles is heresy.

A heretic is one who persistently advocates a doctrine that is in direct opposition to the fundamental principles of the doctrine of the Lord, some of the points of which are mentioned above. We are commanded to reject a heretic after the first and second admonition. This does not mean to reject him without any admonition. He should be admonished one time, and if he still persists in advocating the heresy, he should be admonished again; then if he persists, he should be rejected. The only way we know of to reject him is to withdraw church fellowship from him. If one advocates a heresy, it is wrong not to admonish him. If it is right to admonish him, as we are taught, then it is wrong not to do so. It may not be a pleasant task, but it is a duty enjoined upon us in God's word, and should be obeyed, no matter how unpleasant it may seem to be. (*Cayce's Editorials vol. 3, ppg 360, 361*)

Herod The Great

HEROD The Great: Sylvester Hassell: During the great civil war in Rome the fate of Judea, like that of nearly all other nations, hung in trembling suspense. After the death of Pompey the prudent Antipater rendered Caesar essential service in his campaign in Egypt in favor of Cleopatra, and was rewarded with the full rites of Roman citizenship for himself, and (B.C. 47) the appointment of procurator or governor over the whole of Judea; also the full re-establishment of Hyrcanus in the high priesthood. Antipater, still further presuming on the favor of Rome, proceeded to appoint his elder son Phasael to the government of Jerusalem, and the younger Herod to that of Galilee, B.C. 47.

Herod began to develop his natural decision and severity of character. He arrested robbers and destroyed them without trial, and set at naught the

authorities in Jerusalem. When brought before the Sanhedrim he appeared in arms, and by affrighting them escaped punishment. Only one man, Sameas, dared even to rebuke him; and, strange to say, when he afterward slew the other members of the Sanhedrim, he spared this man Sameas. He afterward obtained by a bribe the military command of Coele-Syria, and advanced against Jerusalem; but, by the intervention of his father, withdrew his forces.

Upon the death of Caesar, Capias assumed the administration of Syria, B.C. 43. Judea was heavily oppressed every way, and the taxes were so exorbitant that the whole population of some towns were sold as slaves to raise tribute.

Herod was ever dexterous and bold. After the great battle at Philippi, Herod made his approaches to the rising sun, and obtained the favor of Mark Anthony. Antipater had been poisoned by Malichus to prevent the rising and then powerful Idumenean influence in Judea.

“An unexpected enemy arose, to trouble again the peace of Judea. At this juncture the Parthians under Pacorus, the king’s son, entered Syria and Asia Minor, and overran the whole region. A part of their army, under Marzapharnes, took possession of Coele-Syria. Antigonus, the last remaining branch of the Asmonean race, determined to risk his fortune in the desperate hazard of Parthian protection; he offered 1,000 talents and 500 Jewish women—a strange compact—as the price of his restoration to the Jewish kingdom. Antigonus himself raised a considerable native power and entered Judea, followed by Pacorus, the cup-bearer of the king, who had the same name with the king’s son. Antigonus fought his way to Jerusalem, and, by means of his party, entered the city. Jerusalem was torn asunder by the contending factions; and the multitudes who came up at the feast of Pentecost, adopting different parties, added to the fierce hostility and mutual slaughter. The Antigonians held the temple, the Hyrcanians the palace, and, daily contests taking place the streets ran with blood. Antigonus at length invidiously proposed to submit their mutual differences to the arbitration of Pacorus, the Parthian general. Phasaël weakly consented; and Pacorus, admitted within the town, prevailed on the infatuated Phasaël to undertake a journey with Hyrcanus, and submit the cause to Barzapharnes, the commander in chief. He set forth on this ill-fated expedition, and was at first received with courtesy; the plan of the Parthians being to abstain from violence till they had seized Herod, who, having vainly remonstrated with his brother on his imprudence, remained in the city. But the crafty Herod, receiving warning from his brother, whose suspicions had been too late awakened, fled with the female part of the family toward Masada. The journey was extremely dangerous, and at one time Herod, in despair, had almost attempted his own life. At Masada, a strong fortress on the west shore of the Dead Sea, he received succor brought by his brother Joseph from Idumea; him he

left in command at Masada, and retired himself into Arabia, from thence to Egypt, and at length to Rome. In the meantime Hyrcanus and Phasaël had been made prisoners; the former, Antigonus not wishing to put him to death, was incapacitated forever from the office of High Priest by the mutilation of his ears. Phasaël anticipated the executioner by beating his brains out against the wall of his prison.”—Milner.”

The Parthians plundered the city of Jerusalem and ravaged the country, notwithstanding their alliance with Antigonus. Herod, in the meantime, gained favor at Rome beyond his expectations, and Augustus and Antony united in conferring the crown upon him, 40 years B.C. He returned at once to Palestine, raised a force, rescued his brother and bride, who were shut up in the fortress of Masada, and reduced to great extremities by the besieging army of Antigonus, and, overrunning Galilee, at length sat down before Jerusalem. Silo, a Roman general who was acting with Herod, proved treacherous and retired from before Jerusalem, and Herod was compelled to do the same.

Herod fixed his headquarters at Samaria, and contented himself with destroying robbers, B.C. 39. The next year, with Roman auxiliaries, he made another attack on Jerusalem, and was defeated. He retired to make his complaints to Antony at Samosata, and, while absent, his brother risked a battle, against Herod’s advice, with the forces of Antigonus, and was killed. Herod on his return avenged the death of his brother Joseph by the total discomfiture of Pappus, the general of Antigonus.

In the spring of the next year, B.C. 37, he formed the regular siege of Jerusalem; during the siege he returned to Samaria to consummate his marriage with Mariamne, the beautiful granddaughter both of Aristobulus and Hyrcanus. By this marriage he formed an intimate connection with the line of the Asmonean princes, and he hastened to secure his throne by the conquest of the capital. Jerusalem held out for above half a year, but was finally taken by the Roman army under Sosius. Great cruelties were inflicted on the people, and much injury done to the town by the exasperated Roman soldiery, even against the expostulations of Herod himself, who did not wish to be left king over a desert. Antigonus was sent to Antony at Antioch and slain. Herod was fairly installed, by the authority of Rome, king of Judea, B.C. 37. This was that Herod the Great who swayed the sceptre over Jerusalem and Palestine till after the birth of our Savior.

He did more by far for the outward improvement of the cities, towns and fortresses of Palestine than any other king or ruler since the captivity. He thoroughly repaired and greatly enlarged and adorned the temple of Zerubbabel

at Jerusalem. He was upheld by the great power of Rome, and, while adding to his own fortune, he added to the wealth and ornament of his country.

But he was one of the most jealous and vindictive of men in all his private relations, and cruel to the last degree toward all whom he suspected of designs on his crown or disobedience to his authority. He had ten wives and fourteen children. The particulars of his reign might be traced, year by year, down to the period of his death, but they are so revolting, so cruel, and bloodthirsty, that the reader might as well be spared the shocking perusal. Suffice it to say that in addition to the vast number of murders committed by him during a long, unbroken reign of over forty years, may be mentioned that of his beautiful and noble wife Mariamne, her grandfather, father, brother, uncle, and two of her sons, most noble youths, who were his own children, who were educated at Rome, and unsurpassed in promise by any in the land.

All these were accused of treasonable designs toward him, without any foundation in truth. He himself arraigned before Caesar his two sons for trial, and took the lead in person to manage with all imaginable and unnatural hatred. No wonder then that such a monster in human shape should play off his hypocrisy with the wise men of the East, and, so soon as the birth of a "King of the Jews" was announced to him send forth and slay all the children in Bethlehem from two years old and under, in order to include that one who, he supposed, would aspire to his throne.

Neither need we wonder that a king so steeped in human blood, and so fully convinced that the execrations of an outraged people were resting on him, should, in order to make the people mourn, instead of rejoicing at his death, order some of the principal men in every family in the land shut up in prison, so that an executioner should be ready at the announcement of his own death to slay them also.

The innocents were slain in the last year of his life, it is supposed. And the last public act of his life was to order the execution of his son Antipater, who was in prison, and who, it was said, had attempted to bribe the keeper to let him out. He was slain just five days before his father's death. Herod for a long time was awfully afflicted both in body and mind; he was haunted with dreadful forebodings and distressing dreams, and yet nothing appeared to soften his stony heart or cause him to relent or repent for one hour. His conscience was seared, and failed to admonish or have any government over his mind. He lived to be seventy years of age, having been king of Jerusalem thirty-seven years, and died a few years before the Passover B.C. 4, at Jericho, after suffering the most horrible agonies, mental and physical. Josephus states that he had fever, and an intolerable itching over all his body, and intestinal inflammation, and dropsy, and

worms, and putrefaction. God thus gave the inhuman monster a foretaste of the awful and eternal retribution awaiting him beyond the grave.” (*Hassell’s History* pp. 167-170)

Hezekiah

HEZEKIAH: Sylvester Hassell: Hezekiah, the son of wicked Ahaz, in the royal household, was fully alive to the wickedness of his father’s course, and mourned in secret with other devout souls over the desolations of Zion. Expecting to occupy the throne at his father’s death, he had already made up his mind to abolish these terrible abuses. Accordingly, in the first month of the first year of his reign, and on the first day of the month, he re-opened and cleansed the house of the Lord. And he revived the celebration of the feast of Passover, sending messengers all through the land of Israel as well as of Judah to invite the faithful to the sacred and solemn festival, which was kept with greater joy than any since the days of Solomon.

Indeed, the whole course of the priests and the observance of the law appear in every particular to have been reconstructed and established by Hezekiah, and the reformation extended throughout Judah and Benjamin, and in Ephraim and Manasseh also. The groves were cut down, the high places thrown down, and the images broken in pieces..... Hezekiah was honest and sincere in what he did; his heart entered into the work; and the worship of the true God was beautiful to behold in all quarters of his kingdom.

Not so exactly with all the people; for, in respect to many of them, Isaiah said, wherefore the Lord said, Forasmuch as this people draw near me with their mouth, and with their lips do honor me,; but have removed their heart far from me, and their fear toward me is taught by the precept of men; therefore will I proceed to do marvelous work among the people, etc...” Isaiah 29:1-14, etc.)

Hezekiah engaged in successful wars with both the Assyrians and Philistines II Kings 18:1-16; but Sennacherib invaded his country in the fourteenth year of his reign, and forced him to tribute. Before the arrival of the Assyrian king, Hezekiah was miraculously healed of his sickness by the prophet Isaiah, and assured of the lengthening of his life fifteen years by the going back ten degrees of the shadow on his dial. And he was delivered out of the hand of Sennacherib, the Lord miraculously destroying his army.

These favorable circumstances exalted Hezekiah, and he became vain; they were a snare unto him. He was thought highly of and honored by the nations around him. The king of Babylon, Berodach-baladan, among others, had to send him

ambassadors to congratulate him on the recovery from his sickness, and Hezekiah, in a fit of vanity and pride, showed them all his wealth and magnificence.

The prophet Isaiah reproved him for this, and pronounced the judgment of the captivity against him, his family, and his kingdom. Upon this, “Hezekiah humbled himself for the pride of his heart, both he and the inhabitants of Jerusalem; so that the wrath of the Lord came not upon them in the days of Hezekiah” II Kings 20. So much for this worthy, patriotic, conscientious and devout king, Hezekiah. His son was a perfect contrast to him, and excelled in wickedness all who had preceded him. (*Hassell’s History ppg 129, 130*)

Hildebrand

HILDEBRAND: Sylvester Hassell: The most arrogant and audacious pope that ever lived (excepting Innocent III. and Boniface VIII.) was Hildebrand, who called himself Gregory VII, and was real master of Rome for thirty-seven years, the lord of five popes, Leo IX., Victor II., Stephen IX., Nicholas II. And Alexander II, (from 1048-1073), and then pope himself (from 1073-1085). He was an imperious, inflexible, cruel, unscrupulous politician, whose one unswerving purpose was to make the Pope of Rome the supreme ruler and arbiter of the human race.

Notwithstanding the example of Peter, and the advise of Paul, and the horrible immoralities of a nominal celibacy, Gregory, in order to bind the *clergy* absolutely to the pope, decreed that all the priests and Bishops who had wives should put them away, and that the single should not marry; and he inaugurated what is called the Controversy of Investitures, declaring that temporal princes should have no right to appoint to *church* offices—thus making the clergy wholly free from feudal obligation to their national sovereigns, and responsible to the pope alone (although the clergy were themselves large landed proprietors and civil magistrates).

Henry IV., Emperor of Germany, refused to surrender the right of investiture, and took under his protection Bishops and councilors who had offended the pope, and was summoned by the latter to appear at Rome to answer for his conduct. The emperor, enraged, assembled a diet at Worms (in 1076), and declared Gregory deposed from the pontificate. The pope retaliated by excommunicating and dethroning Henry, and absolving his subjects from their allegiance to him.

Papal supremacy being an integral idea of German *Christianity*, the Saxon princes declared, at a diet in Oppenheim, that, unless the sentence of excommunication were removed in twelve months, Henry should lose his crown. Subdued by the rebellion of his subjects and the course of the pope, the emperor, with his wife and infant child and one faithful attendant, undertook, in the midst of an unusually rigorous winter, the extremely difficult and dangerous passage over the awful precipices and ice-fields of the Alps, and finally presented himself before the Castle of Canossa, in Northern Italy, where the pope was comfortably housed with his devoted adherent, Matilda, the Countess of Tuscany.

On a dreary winter morning, the ground being deeply covered with snow, the emperor was admitted within two of the three walls that girded the castle. Divested of all his royal robes, he was clad only in the thin white linen dress of the penitent, and barefooted and bareheaded, shivering and hungry, he thus humbly awaited for three days (January 25th, 26th, and 27th, 1077) the pleasure of the stern pontiff to admit him to his presence.

The pope at last received him, and granted him absolution only on the condition that Henry would appear at the time and place named by the pope, and answer the charges made against him; if his defense were satisfactory, he should receive his kingdom back from the hands of the pope— otherwise, he was peaceably to resign his kingdom forever. Henry's humiliation and Gregory's absolution were both dictated by mere policy. Freed from the church's curse, Henry quickly won back the strength he had lost. He overthrew in battle the rival (Rodolph) whom Gregory upheld. He swept his rebellious lands with sword and flame.

He carried his victorious army to Rome, and was there crowned emperor by a rival pope. Gregory himself was only saved by his ferocious allies, Norman and Saracen, at cost of the devastation of half the capital—that broad belt of ruin which still covers the half-mile between the Coliseum and the Lateran gate. Then, hardly rescued from the popular wrath, he went away to die, defeated and heartbroken, at Salerno, with the almost despairing (the proudly bitter and Pharisaic) words on his lips: "I have loved righteousness and hated iniquity, and therefore I die in exile."

Again excommunicated, Henry, twenty years later, vainly sought mercy from his own son, the unnatural champion of the *church*; vainly asked shelter in a monastery; and died in want and forsaken, deprived even of the empty honor of a royal tomb. Thus the pope was really triumphant at last. (*Hassell's History* 429, 430)

History Of The Church

HISTORY of the Church: J. Harvey Daily: Believing that I see the great need of a brief history of the church of Christ so arranged that it can be readily referred to by any who desire to know the most important and the most interesting events, and feeling sure that such a work will tend to confirm the people of God in his promises, I have written this book, and now send it out with the humble hope that my labors in preparing it will not be in vain.

Only an elementary work

While it is to history only a kind of elementary work, yet the reader will find its pages replete with historic facts so arranged as to form a connected outline of the history of the people now called Baptists.

Mosheim's testimony

Mosheim admits that the true origins of this people is "hidden in the depths of antiquity and is, of consequence, extremely difficult to be ascertained. Their trail is not lost in these dark depths, as Mosheim claims, but may be traced out into the unclouded light of the first century, connecting with the clear footsteps of Jesus and his apostles, thus verifying the promise that the "gates of hell" should not prevail against the church of Christ.

The witnesses of Jesus have contended earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints, and have maintained that faith with martyr courage, unfurling the sacred standard of truth in all ages and keeping the ordinances as they were delivered to them. There can be no more interesting or profitable employment than tracing out the history of such a people.

A history of the Primitive Baptist Church

I have given but few points in history relative to the various orders that have risen since the days of the apostles, and have confined my writing principally to the history of the Primitive Baptist Church. It is a self evident fact that any order whose origin is of a recent date, or of any date subsequent to the apostolic day, cannot be the church of Christ. It is absurd to suppose, as some have, that the true church of Christ must be traced through the line of Catholicism. Such a claim is made by those only who have no other line to follow.

Brevity the aim

I have been brief and have not written all that could be said on the different subjects, but those who want to make a thorough study of the different events can find it in other histories. I have meant to put before our people a work that would be useful to those who want to know the history of our people. For this purpose I have endeavored to make the reference as convenient as possible. May the God of all grace bestow his all important blessings upon these pages that through them many may be confirmed in his promises and his precious name be glorified.

J. Harvey Daily

The beginning of the church.

“In the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed.” God had ever had a people from Abel unto this period, but was now to set up a church, which, being providentially supported by him, should ever exist, continuing in the paths marked out by her Lord and Master.

John the Baptist

John the Baptist came in the wilderness crying, “Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand,” and the people from all over Judea and the country around came to John to be baptized. John required them to come confessing their sins, which is the custom of his people unto this day.

The name Baptist

On account of this new practice of baptizing his converts (those who believed his report) John was called “The Baptist.” From that day until now this practice has been preserved and those who have been persistent in practicing it have ever borne that name.

Jesus’ baptism

When the time was fulfilled Jesus of Nazareth came and went down into the water with John and was baptized like unto his blessed burial and resurrection. From that on he began to preach his own everlasting gospel and gave examples as patterns for his people. This order of baptism has been handed down through an unbroken chain of baptized believers. The book of inspiration has likewise been kept by the power of God through them.

The Lord’s Supper and Washing Feet

After an instruction of three years the blessed Savior gave to his disciples the ordinance of the Lord's Supper and kneeling down and washing their feet he laid before them the important lesson of fidelity to their Lord and King, and humility toward one another.

The Commission

After his ascension Jesus appeared to his disciples and blessed them with power to proclaim him as the way, and many from all nations were made to believe, and the seed was scattered throughout the world. Jesus appeared unto his disciples saying, "All power is given unto me, in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." Thus his true ministers, those loyal to Jesus, have ever gone preaching this everlasting gospel, trusting in the blessed promise of his supporting grace.

Spreading the gospel and destruction of Jerusalem

The first Christian church founded by the Apostles was that of Jerusalem, the model of all those which were afterwards erected during the first century. Though the people had not entirely forsaken the Jewish worship, yet they assembled often and were instructed by the Apostles and Elders, prayed together, celebrated the holy supper in remembrance of Christ, and at the conclusion of these meetings manifested great love for each other.

Spread of the churches

The Apostles went from Jerusalem to many nations preaching the gospel, and in a short time planted a vast number of churches among the Gentiles. Several of these are mentioned in the New Testament, but these are only a small number of the churches formed by the Apostles.

Early persecution

While the Apostles and their disciples were spreading the gospel into all the world, the Jews continually opposed them. The innocence and virtue of the Christians, and spotless purity of their doctrine, did not protect them, but they were persecuted in many ways. They were opposed not only by the Jewish religion, but also by the idolatrous people of all nations. Notwithstanding this opposition they were so wonderfully blessed by the Spirit of God that they had followers in every city and town.

Nero's cruel persecution

Nero, who had become emperor over the Roman Empire, after having the city of Rome set on fire, accused the Christian people with the crime. He persecuted a large number of Christians in as cruel a manner as possible. He wrapped some in combustible garments and set fire to them at night.

Death of Paul and Peter

St. Paul and St. Peter were among the number on whom this persecution fell. It is generally held that St. Peter was crucified at Rome. Paul, being a Roman, could not be crucified, and so was beheaded about three miles from Rome. John, the Revelator, was banished to the lonely island of Patmos.

Destruction of Jerusalem

About this time the great city of Jerusalem was destroyed. "A contest had some time existed between the Jews and Syrians about Caesarea, which stood on the confines of both kingdoms, and was claimed by both alike."—Orchard's History.

The decision of Nero in favor of the Syrians enraged the Jews and they butchered some of the Roman and Syrian army. Then the Roman and Syrian army besieged the city of Jerusalem five months. During this time the Jews suffered many horrible things, the city of Jerusalem was overthrown and eleven hundred thousand lives lost and ninety thousand persons led into captivity.

Period of peace

After the destruction of the Jewish capital, the Christian church enjoyed several years of outward peace. During this period, however, many professed the Christian religion and advocated unscriptural doctrines which caused much disturbance and distress in the church.

Renewal of persecution

Christianity went on suffering and spreading during the second century. The emperors as well as the people of the empire were bitter in their feelings against the Christians. The saying was frequently used, "If God does not send rain, lay it to the Christians." At every famine, drought or pestilence they would cry, "To the lions with the Christians."

Ignatius devoured

At this time, when Trajan the Emperor was at Antioch, that city was visited by a dreadful earthquake. Trajan was injured with many others. Many were killed by

the walls of the buildings falling in. Ignatius was pastor of the church at Antioch and was condemned and “was accordingly seized, and by the emperor’s order sent from Antioch to Rome, where he was exposed to the fury of wild beasts in the theater and by them devoured.”

Ignatius, in his letter to Polycarp, another faithful soldier of the cross, says, “Let your baptism continue as a shield, faith as a helmet, love as a spear.”

Justin Martyr

Justin Martyr, a devoted Christian, who suffered death at the hands of the enemy at Rome in the year of 166, said, referring to baptism, “For they are washed in the name of God the Father and the Lord of the Universe, and of our Savior Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Spirit.”

Irenaeus

Irenaeus became bishop or pastor of Lyons in France in 177, and in his writings said, “He came to save all persons by himself, all I say, who are regenerated by him unto God, infants, and children, and boys and young men, and old men.” In this we have two points, the necessity of regeneration, and the salvation of all for whom Jesus came.

Hagenback, a German Pedobaptist, says that Irenaeus in treating on baptism “merely expresses the beautiful idea that Jesus was Redeemer in every stage of life, and for every stage of life; but that does not say that he became Redeemer for children by water baptism.”

Form of church government

It is admitted by all historians that the churches of the second century were united only by the tie of faith and charity or love. That every church formed within itself a separate and independent body and that the Christian world was not yet connected by any supreme authority or legislative assembly. They were Baptist churches, because they were composed of baptized members, and were independent of each other in government.

Alexandrian school

Orchard says, “The first and most fatal of all events to the primitive religion was the setting up of a Christian Academy at Alexandria.” Christians had been reproached with illiteracy, and this school was set up in 170 to get rid of the scandal. It seemed that the Alexandrian school was a nursery in which nearly all

the evils were germinated, the practice of which finally led to Popery. This should be an important lesson to the church of today. In trying to prepare boys for baptism by teaching, the church became filled with men who never had the love of God implanted in their hearts. If this practice corrupted the church in the second century, what will it do in the twentieth?

Baptism by immersion

Until this time there is not a single trace of infant baptism, or baptism in any way but by immersion. Those who were capable of professing faith in Christ were baptized and became church members. Cramp says, "We have searched the Christian writings of the first two centuries and have not yet found infant baptism."

Peace followed by corruption

At the beginning of this century the persecution was light and Christianity became very popular. Many professed religion who proved not to be sincere. They loved the world and fame more than the truth, and they began teaching false doctrines, leading off many of the professors after them. Much corruption crept in which finally divided the church

In Greece at this time the churches united in mutual unions for the management of spiritual affairs. This led to positions of distinction and many of the so called ministers of the gospel used every device to gain the ascendant positions. The ministers who were learned in philosophy were received by the masses and abundance of wealth was conferred on them.

Mr. Orchard says, "While the interests of religion retained their scriptural character, all were upon equality and each society possessed its government within itself; so that no one church originally can claim our attention more than another. The churches during this early period stood perfectly free of Rome and at after periods refused her communion. As churches rose into importance, contentions about offices were frequent, and tumults ensued; but having no secular aid, their rage against each other spent itself in reproaches and often subsided into apathy. The disappointed, the disaffected, the oppressed, the injured, with the pious, had only to retire from the scene of strife, and they were safe."

Decius persecution

In 249 Decius who became Emperor, required all to embrace the pagan or idolatrous worship. One writer says, "The gates of hell were once more opened,

and merciless executions were let loose upon the defenseless church and deluged the earth with blood.”

Chandler says, “Many were publicly whipped, drawn by the heels through the streets of cities, racked until every bone of their bodies were disjointed, had their teeth beaten out, their noses, hands and ears cut off, sharp pointed spears run under their nails, were tortured with melted lead thrown on their naked bodies, had their eyes dug out, their limbs cut off, and destroyed by every method malice could devise.”

Apostasy

Many who had been so energetic in the Christian religion forsook it and fell down to the gods of the pagans. Nearly all of the aspiring Christians forsook the church, but the true Christian people endured persecution. True followers of the Lamb were never driven from their religion by persecution and never will be. The persecution lasted about two years, and those who had forsaken the church during the trouble now wanted back, and reinstated to their former positions.

Novation

They were generally readmitted, but Novation, a very learned and upright Elder in the church at Rome, opposed the new ways and maintained that the church should be a “company of saints,” and should be separate from the world.

The first division in the church

Cornelius, another Elder in the church at Rome, was in favor of the readmission of their unworthy members, and he was chosen pastor of this church in March, 251, by the majority of the church. Novation and the minority, who believed in strict church discipline, withdrew from the majority and established a separate church of their own and would not receive members from such loose societies except by rebaptizing them. Following this division the Baptists over the Empire followed the act of Novation and separated themselves from the new ideas of church discipline, and thus went by the name of Novationists.

The church in Africa: Tertullian

We now proceed to examine the churches in Africa and their progress through this century. In 202, one Tertullian was a lawyer at Carthage. He became a Christian and joined the church in that city. He afterwards was elected an Elder and became a zealous defender of the Christian religion. In 215 it seems that Christians were very numerous in that city, and many congregations in other

parts. By this time the new doctrines, originated in the Alexandrian school in the previous century, had taken hold among the churches in this region, which Tertullian thought had caused the churches to grow too fast, consequently they had become filled with members who knew nothing about Christianity, only as they had been taught it by science of education.

Tertullian thought to remedy this evil by a strict adherence to discipline, and contended for receiving members by baptism in all cases, unless they could produce satisfactory evidence that they had been baptized by churches in communion with that of Carthage.

Question about infant baptism

“About this time the idea was first originated (which is but too common in the nineteenth century) that to believe certain points taught in the scriptures was all that was necessary to prepare a person for baptism, and the belief that baptism possessed a saving influence. This practice led to the practice of catechizing children, so as to prepare them for baptism.. This was done for the purpose of fulfilling the injunctions of John and the Savior, that faith is a prerequisite to baptism. These notions having become common in many churches, and especially in the East, gave rise to the question propounded to Tertullian by Quintilla, a rich lady who lived in Phrygia, whether infants might be baptized on the condition they ask to be baptized and produce sponsors; which Tertullian goes on to answer very exquisitely, and shows his opposition to minor baptism, and the blending of regeneration with it.” Owens’ History.

Council of bishops

About the year of 260 sixty-six bishops came together to consider the subject of baptizing infants, and agreed that “the grace of God should be withheld from no son of man, that a child might be kissed with a kiss of Christian charity as a brother so soon as born, that Elisha prayed to God, and stretched himself on the infant, that the eighth day was observed in the Jewish circumcision, a type going before, which type ceased when the substance came. If sinners can have baptism, how much sooner infants, who being newly born, have no sin, save being descending from Adam. This therefore, dear brethren, was our opinion in this assembly, that it is not for us to hinder any person from baptism and the grace of God, who is merciful and kind and affectionate to all, which rule, as it holds for all, so we think it more especially to be observed in reference to infants and persons newly baptized.”

Tertullian in his writings said, “That men’s minds were hardened against baptism, because the person (to be baptized) was brought down into the water

without pomp, without any new ornament or sumptuous preparation, and dipped at the pronouncing of a few words.”

Severus' persecution

We now come to treat of Christianity in France during the third century. Orchard says, “The city of Lyons was again visited with the vengeance of the Emperor. Severus in 202, treated the Christians of this city with the greatest cruelty. Such was the excess of his barbarity that the rivers were colored with human blood, and the public places of the city were filled with the dead bodies of professors. It is recorded of this church that, since its formation, it has been watered with the blood of twenty thousand martyrs. The severities led Christians to reside on the borders of kingdoms, and in recesses of mountains, and it is probable the Pyrenees and Alps afforded some of those persecuted people an asylum from local irritation. It is more than probable that Piedmont afforded shelter to some of these Lyonese, since it is recorded that Christians in the valleys, during the second century, did profess and practice the baptizing of believers, which accords with the views of Ireneus and others recorded during the early ages.”

Galetes first child baptized

During the first three centuries, Christian congregations all over the East subsisted in separate independent bodies, unsupported by government and consequently without any secular power over one another. All this time they were Baptist churches; and though all the Fathers of the first four ages down to Jerome were of Greece, Syria, and Africa, and though they gave great numbers of histories of the baptism of adults, yet there is not one record of the baptism of a child till the year 370, when Galetes, the dying son of the Emperor Valens was baptized by order of a monarch who swore he would not be contradicted.”

Summary

John the Baptist, by the authority given him from on high, instituted the mode of baptism which Christ confirmed and which has been preserved unto this day. Jesus lived and taught the true way for three years after which time he blessed his disciples with sufficient spiritual power to mark out the way and to spread the glorious truth throughout the world. Much opposition was met by the Christians, but the opposition kept them more closely to the truth. In these perilous times, Peter and Paul were killed by the Romans and many of the saints suffered martyrdom.

After the destruction of the Jewish nation, Christianity became popular and then became corrupt by false teachings which finally resulted in a division. Many

persecutions were endured, however, for three hundred years and the truth soldiers of the cross were willing to die for their faith. Until near the end of the third century the church continued as a unit in faith and practice, continuing as independent bodies in church government. By this time false doctrines arose, such as baptismal regeneration, denying that the Father, Son and Holy Ghost were one, and for this reason, baptizing in the name of each one separately, getting all to join the church they could, whether changed in heart or not. Novation and many of like faith denounced all of this and thus became known as Novations.

It is said by historians that the Novations forsook the path (would to God all would forsake the path of error) and taught that baptism was not in order to regeneration or salvation, but a mere confession of faith.

The fourth century

In the beginning of the fourth century the church had outward peace, but the pagan priests persuaded the Emperor, Diocletian, in 303, to pass an edict to pull down the church houses and burn their books and writings, and to persuade them to forsake their religion. They banished them from the country, kept them in caves and in many ways, for two years, punished all who would persist in the Christian religion.

In 306, however, Constantine the Great was made Emperor, who was decidedly in favor of Christianity. For a short time he gave religious freedom, but soon undertook to unite church and state, and then to control religion.

12,000 added to the church

“He gave Bishop Sylvester his mansion for a baptistery, and conferred freedom on those slaves who would receive baptism. He offered a reward to others, on their embracing Christianity, so that 12,000 men, besides women and minors, were baptized in one year. In 319 he relieved the clergy of taxes, and in 320 issued an edict against the Donatists. He abolished heathen superstition, and erected splendid churches, richly adorned with paintings and images, bearing striking resemblance to heathen temples. Places were erected for baptizing, some over running water, while others were supplied by pipes. In the middle of the building was the bath, which was very large. Distinct apartments were provided for men and women, as are found in some meeting houses at this day.” Orchard’s History.

A council called

There arose a dispute among the ambitious churches over the divinity of Christ, and Constantine, in attempting to settle the dispute, called a council which decided the dispute and also established a creed. The Bishops and Elders of this council were sent home in great honors, and the Emperor tried to get all who professed Christianity to accept their decision. This council decided on the time for the celebration of Easter, and Sunday was the day set apart for rest under the Christian religion.

Sunday a day of rest

“In remembrance of Christ’s resurrection the ancient church, like the Apostolic church, observed the first day of the week (or Sunday) as a day of sacred joy and thanksgiving, of public worship of God, and of collections for the poor; but neither the ancient nor the Apostolic church ever called that day the Sabbath. In the year 321 Constantine appointed the first day of the week, which he called ‘the venerable day of the sun,’ in reference both to the Roman sun-god, Apollo, and to Christ, the Sun of Righteousness, as in some respects a day of rest. He forbade the sitting of courts, and military exercises, and all secular labor in towns on that day; but allowed agricultural labor in the country.

The soldier’s prayer

As the fourth century is the source whence were derived the principal Greek and Roman Catholic liturgies or forms of prayer, so Constantine enjoined the following form of prayer for all his Pagan and Christian soldiers. On Sunday in the open field, at a given signal, they were required, with military exactness, to raise their eyes and hands toward Heaven and say these words: “Thee above all we acknowledge as God; Thee we reverence as King; to Thee we call as our helper; to Thee we owe our victories; by Thee we have obtained the mastery of our enemies; to Thee we give thanks for benefits already received; from Thee we hope for benefits to come. We all fall at Thy feet, and fervently beg that Thou wouldest preserve to us our Emperor Constantine and his divinely beloved sons in long life, healthful and victorious.” The co-called prayer, as may be seen, could be addressed to one god as well as another.” Hassell’s History.

The Donatists opposed by Catholics

As the Catholic church grew corrupt, the body that withdrew from them the last of the third century, continued strict in doctrine and discipline, and thus met the opposition of the nation. This strict church was known as Novations, Donatists, Montanists, and many other names, because they refused to receive the Catholics without baptism. We have found the Novations in the third century, and in 303, the able man, Donatus of Carthage, bitterly opposed the loose discipline and

false doctrines of the church. The example of Donatus and his party was followed all over North Africa. In Constantine's first edict in 312 professing to give universal religious freedom, he especially excepted the Donatists. From 316 to 321 they were treated as rebels resisting the authority of the Emperor and many of them suffered death and banishment. Donatus said, "What has the Emperor to do with the church?" Crispin, a French historian, says the Donatists and Novations were together in the following things; First, for purity of members, by asserting that none ought to be admitted into the church but such as are visibly true believers, and real saints; second, for purity of church discipline; third, for independence of each church; fourth, they baptized again those whose first baptism they had reason to doubt. They were consequently called rebaptizers and anabaptists.

Novations in Rome

The Novations, or the church in Italy, had been very successful and were planted all over the Roman empire. Although strict in discipline and sound in doctrine, yet they had great influence, and historians say they were instrumental in getting their religious freedom in 313. In the restraint in 331, however, they were in distress and suffered much. Their books were sought for, and they were forbidden to assemble for worship, and many of their church buildings were destroyed, because they would not adhere to the Catholic church.

In 375 the Emperor Valens embraced the Arian Creed. He closed the Novation churches, banished their ministers, and probably would have carried his measures to greater extremes had not his zeal been moderated by a pious man named Marcion.

The church in liberty

"In 383 Theodosius assembled a synod with a view to establishing unity among churches. On the Novationists stating their views of discipline, the Emperor, says Socrates, 'wondered at their consent and harmony touching the faith.' He passed a law, securing to them liberty, civil and religious, all their property, with all churches of the same faith and practice. While these pure churches were in peace and concord, it is stated that discord prevailed in the national churches."

"At the conclusion of this fourth century, the Novationists had three, if not four churches, in Constantinople; they had also churches in Nice, Nocomedia, and Cotivens, in Phrygia, all of them large and extensive bodies, besides which they were numerous in the Western Empire."—Orchard's History.

Fifth Century

In 412 Cyril was pastor of the Catholic church in Alexandria, and one of his first acts was to shut up the churches of the Novatianists, and in Rome, Innocent followed his example. Before this the Christians were persecuted by the Pagans and Emperors, but in 413 the clergy of the Catholic church assumed this authority.

Novations and Donatists opposed by Catholics

After the Catholic church had been supported by the Emperor, they felt that they must unite the entire church on one doctrine and practice, but the Novations and Donatists would not agree with them on infant baptism, and rebaptized all who wanted to come to them from the other churches. The spirit of persecution was raised against all those who rebaptized Catholics. A council met and ordered all the rebaptizers, and those rebaptized by them, to be put to death, and Emperor Theodosius and Honorius passed a law supporting this order.

Under this law many of the Novations in Italy were put to death and the Donatians in Africa were deprived of many of their privileges, but the officers would not enforce the law in Africa.

Novations retreat from Italy

These combined modes of oppression led the faithful followers of Christ to abandon the cities in Italy, and seek retreats and more private settlements in the country, being robbed of their churches. In 455 a council met at Arles and at Lyons, in which the views of the Novatianists on predestination were controverted and by which name they were stigmatized.

Christians in Pyrenees Mountains

By the severe opposition met by the Christians, they were compelled to seek a secreted place of worship, and many went to the Pyrenees Mountains, where they were not bothered with the Catholic party.

I will now quote a little description of the mountains given by Orchard. "The south of France is separated from the north of Spain by the Pyrenees Mountains, which extend from the Mediterranean Sea to the Atlantic; that is about two hundred miles, and in breadth, in several places, more than a hundred. The surface is, as may be supposed, most wonderfully diversified. Hills rise upon hills, mountains over mountains, some bare of verdure, others covered with forests of huge cork trees, oak, beech, chestnut and evergreens. * * * * Numerous flocks of sheep and goats enliven the hills, while the herdsmen and

manufacturers of wool inhabit the valleys. To these mountains, in all periods, the sons of freedom fled. Persons holding sentiments in accordance with the true Waldenses were very numerous in Spain; they were thousands and tens of thousands.

Albigenses

“At an early period,” Dr. Allix says, “the churches of the north of Spain were always united with those of the south of France.” The religious views of these people are now known by the term Albigenses, from their residing at or near Albi, a city about forty-two miles northeast of Toulouse.

Baptists in Africa

The Donatists, or Baptists, in Africa, enjoyed religious freedom at this period. Africa was ruled by a people called Barbarians, and “their conduct was more mild toward the followers of the Lamb than the Catholics had ever been.” But in 534 the Emperor regained Africa and deprived the Christians of their freedom, and not long after this history loses trace of this people in this country, but some seem to think they went to the mountains, as did the Novations.

Sixth century Baptists called Anabaptists

The Baptists in France and Spain, from their conduct were called Anabaptists. They baptized Pagans and Jews and reimmersed all Catholics, and Robinson says that they baptized none without a personal profession of faith.

In 524 in a Catholic council held at Lerida, it was decided that those who had been baptized by the Baptists in the name of the Trinity should be admitted into the Catholic church without rebaptizing them.

Waldenses

The Baptist people that inhabited the Pyrenees Mountains were afterward called *Waldenses*, by which name we trace them for many years. They were given this name from a valley which they inhabited, known as Piedmont. From the Latin word *vallis*, the low Dutch *valleye*, the Provincial *vauz vaudois*, the ecclesiastical *Valdeness*, *Waldenses* and *Waldenese*. The words imply valleys, inhabitants of valleys, and no more. It happened that the inhabitants of the valleys of the Pyrenees did not profess the Catholic faith; it fell out also that the inhabitants of the valleys about the Alps did not embrace it.

The name Waldenses

It happened, moreover, in the ninth century, that one Valdo, a friend and counsellor of Berengarius, and a man of eminence, who had many followers, did not approve of the papal discipline and doctrine; and it came to pass that about one hundred and thirty years after that a rich merchant of Lyons, who was called Valdus, or Waldo, openly disavowed the Roman Catholic religion, supported many to teach the doctrine believed in the valleys, and became the instrument of the conversion of great numbers; all these people were called *Waldenses*. This view is supported by the authority of their own historians, Pierre Gilles, Perrin, Leger, Sir. S. Moreland, and Dr. Allix.

Waldenses same as Novations

“Paul Perrin asserts that the Waldenses were, time out of mind, in Italy and Dalmatia, and were the offspring of the Novatianists, who were persecuted and driven from Rome in A.D. 413, and who for purity in communion were called Puritans. The name of *Paterines* was given to the Waldenses, who for the most part held the same opinions, and therefore have been taken from the same class of people, who continued till the Reformation under the name of *Paterines* or *Waldenses*.

There was no difference in religious views between the Albigenses and Waldenses. All these people inhabited the south of France and were called in general Albigenses, and in doctrine and manners were not distinct from the Waldenses.

Bossuet, bishop of Meaux, says as to the Vaudois, they were a species of Donatists. They formed their churches of only good men. They all without distinction, if they were reputed good people, preached and administered the ordinances. The Waldenses were in religious sentiment substantially the same as the Paulicians, Paterines, Puritans and Albigenses,”—Owens History.

It is evident that the Christians were numerous throughout the entire Empire, but because of the opposition of the Catholic party, and other religions of the world, we have no accurate record of their proceedings during this century, other than that they were persecuted because they rejected the Catholic baptism, and refused to baptize infants into their fellowship. It is thought that during this period they went to other nations and formed colonies and thus planted their churches in all the Eastern hemisphere. The pure gospel was yet maintained throughout the providence of God and many were made to die for the Truth.

Seventh century

It is asserted by historians that but few of the clergy of the Catholic church could compose a discourse in the seventh century. The corruption of the church increased and many things were practiced that were both unscriptural and immoral. They still had a hatred for the Christians, because of their strict discipline and doctrine. Baptism by immersion, however, was still universally practiced, even by the Catholics, as all historians agree, and many fine places were built for this purpose.

The doctrine of the Waldenses

At this time the Waldenses believed in the doctrine of the Trinity, and baptized believers, refused to baptize infants, and were reproached with the term re-baptizers, or anabaptists. Paul Perrin asserts that the Waldenses were the offspring of the Novatianists, who for purity in communion were called Puritans.

Paulicians

In Greece the Baptist people were known by the name of Paulicians, because they contended for the writings of Paul and John, and tried to conform their lives to that of Paul's.

Greeks against the Paulicians

The Greeks were engaged, during this century, in the most bitter and virulent controversy with the Paulicians of Armenia, and the adjacent countries, whom they considered as a branch of the Manichean sect. This dispute was carried to the greatest height under the reigns of Constans, Constantine Pogonatus, and Justinian II, and the Greeks were not only armed with arguments, but were also aided by the force of military legions, and the terror of penal laws. A certain person, whose name was Constantine, revived under the reign of Constans the drooping faction of the Paulicians, now ready to expire, and propagated with great success its "pestilential doctrines." But this is not the place to enlarge upon the tenets and history of this sect, whose origin is attributed to Paul and John, two brothers who revived and modified the doctrines of Manes.

Constantine

Let us next give an account of Constantine and his success as an able minister of this people in the year 660. A stranger, who was a deacon, who had been taken a prisoner, but was on his return to his home, passed through Mananalis, and was entertained by Constantine.

Constantine's New Testament

From this passing stranger Constantine (Mosheim's History) received the precious gift of the New Testament in its original language, which, even at this early period, was so concealed from the vulgar that Peter Siculus, to whom we owe most of our information on the history of the Paulicians, tells us, the first scruples of a Catholic, when he was advised to read the Bible was, "It is not lawful for us profane persons to read those sacred writings, but for the priests only."

Ignorance of the Catholics

Indeed, the gross ignorance which pervaded Europe at that time rendered the generality of the people incapable of reading that or any other book; but even those of the laity, who could read, were dissuaded by their religious guides from meddling with the Bible. Constantine, however, made the best use of the deacon's present—he studied his New Testament, with unwearied assiduity, and more particularly the writings of the Apostle Paul, from which he at length endeavored to deduce a system of doctrine and worship. "He investigated the creed of primitive Christianity," says Gibbon, "and whatever might be the success, a Protestant reader will applaud the spirit of the inquiry." The knowledge of which Constantine himself was, under divine blessing, enabled to attain, he gladly communicated to others around him, and a Christian church was collected. In a little time several individuals arose among them qualified for the work of the ministry, and several other churches were collected, throughout Armenia and Cappadocia,"— Jones History.

Baptism and the Lord's Supper

In these churches of the Paulicians, the sacraments of baptism and the Lord's Supper they held to be peculiar to the communion of the faithful; *i.e.*, to be restricted to believers.

The Paulicians, or Bogomilians, baptized or re-baptized adults by immersion, as the Manichaens and all other denominations did in the East, upon which mode there was no dispute in the Grecian church.

"It is evident," says Mosheim, "they rejected the baptism of infants. They were not charged with an error concerning baptism." "They, with the Manichaens, were Anabaptists, or rejecters of infant baptism," says Dr. allix, "and were consequently often reproached with that term."

Scriptural in doctrine and practice

They were simply scriptural in the uses of the sacrament,” says Milner. They were orthodox in the doctrine of the Trinity; they know of no other Mediator than the Lord Jesus Christ.”—Orchard’s History.

Eighth century

At the beginning of the eighth century the Paulicians were put to death and these people who desired to adhere to the Bible were persecuted in every nation. It is evident, though, that the gates of hell could not prevail against the church in any part of the world. The humble yet bold people would attract the attention of the enemy often in every nation, but were kept in obscurity only when the enemy saw fit to persecute.

Peace in Pyrenees

In the Pyrenees Mountains they were not molested, and they had large churches, but were not molested by the kings because of their behavior.

Disturbed by Moors

In 714 the Moors entered Spain and conquered that kingdom. It is said that the Moors were rather in favor of liberty, and even religious freedom could be procured for a small sum; yet these Baptists disdained to purchase a native right and so fled to the mountain home. These people also took France in 721, but in 732 Charles Martel succeeded in recovering his kingdom. To what extent the Baptist churches realized injury from these barbarians we do not learn, but they settled in the French province near the foot of the Pyrenees—Gibbon’s History, 6, 22.

So these persecuted people would go from one place to another. How wonderful are the dealings of God in controlling the universe, although he suffered nations to be governed by wicked men, and while one nation was influenced by anti-Christ, God gave the Christians protection in another, so that their increase was gradual but sure.

Doctrine and practice in 750

We are informed by Bonizo, bishop of Sutrium, that the Paterines arose, or became more conspicuous during Stephen II’s pontificate, 750. The public religion of the Paterines consisted of nothing but social prayer, reading and expounding the gospels, baptism once, and the Lord’s supper as often as convenient. Italy was full of such Christians, which bore various names, from various causes. They said a Christian church should consist of only good people;

a church had no power to frame any constitutions, *i. e.*, make laws; it was not right to take oaths; it was not lawful to kill mankind, nor should he be delivered up to the officers of justice to be converted; faith alone could save a man; the benefits of society belonged to all its members; the church ought not to persecute; the law of Moses was no rule for Christians. The Catholics of those times baptized by immersion; the Paterines, therefore, in all their branches made no complaint of the action of baptism, but when they were examined they objected vehemently against the baptism of infants, and condemned it as an error.—Orchard's History.

Ninth century: The Dark Ages

We are now entering into the period in history known as *the dark ages*, through which it is difficult to give the true succession of this unbroken chain of true and faithful soldiers of the cross, but we have abundant evidence that they continued in a steadfast way to contend for the same precious truth we have been tracing by the authority of all acknowledged historians.

Protected by Claude

We see that the Catholic church at Rome during this time continued to grow corrupt, and their elders desired to rule the world, thus putting all opposition down, if necessary by death. In 817, however, the Emperor of France, being desirous to check the power of the Roman Church, promoted Claude to the See of Turin.

This man was a great reformer, which afforded great protection for the Waldenses and others of like faith. He was born in Spain, and grew to be a bold defender of the right. Mr. Robinson said, "He bore a noble testimony against the prevailing errors of his time, and was undoubtedly a most reputable character."

The doctrine of Claude

Let it be observed, then, that throughout the whole of his writings, he maintains that "Jesus Christ is the alone head of the church." This, the reader will perceive, struck immediately at the root of the first principles of popery—the vicarious office of the bishop of Rome. He utterly discards the doctrine of human worthiness in the article of justification in such a manner as overthrows all the subtle distinctions of Papists on the subject. He pronounces anathemas against traditions in matters of religion, and thus drew the attention of men to the word of God and that alone, as the ground of a Christian's faith, without the deeds of the law—the doctrine which Luther, seven hundred years afterwards, so ably contended for, and which so excessively provoked the advocates of the church of

Rome. He contended that the church was subject to error, and denied that prayers for the dead can be of any good to those that have demanded them; while he lashed, in the severest manner, the superstition and idolatry which everywhere abounded under the countenance and authority of the See of Rome.

The results of his teachings

“By his preaching and valuable writings, he disseminated the doctrine of the kingdom of heaven, and although the seed were as a grain of mustard seed cast into the earth, the glorious effects ultimately produced by it justify the truth of our Lord’s parable, that when it is grown up, it produceth a tree, whose branches are so ramified and extended that the birds of the air come and lodge therein. His doctrine grew exceedingly. The valleys of Piedmont were in time filled with his disciples, and while midnight darkness sat enthroned over almost every portion of the globe, the Waldenses, which is only another name for the inhabitants of these valleys, preserved the gospel among them in its native purity, and rejoiced in its glorious light.”—Jones’ History.

God’s providence

This man being in sentiment with the Baptist people, we can see the purpose of God plainly manifested in sending such a man to preside over the Catholic interests at Piedmont, in the mountain retreat of the Pyrenees. The effects of his teaching were felt during the next two centuries and the church enjoyed to some degree a freedom of speech.

The efforts of Claude to restore the Catholic Church to apostolic practice and doctrine affected the entire Roman province. The dispute that consequently affected the Catholics gave opportunity to the Baptists of Italy and other places to spread their doctrine through the world. The people were known by the term Paterines, a name, says Mezeray, from the glory they took in suffering patiently for the truth.

Tenth century: Baptists in every province

In the tenth century the Paulicians, being persecuted, emigrated from Bulgaria and spread themselves abroad through every province of Europe. While the Catholic Church was in a deep sleep, the Baptist people, known by many names, were contending for the same doctrine and practice.

Worthy of the name

When we consider their object in diffusing truths and holding up the lamp for guidance of others, their self-denials and trials, we cannot withhold from them the praise due to their names. The boon such a people proved to the nations sitting in darkness and death will be made evident in the day of decision. They rest from their labors, and their work will follow them. Many of the Bulgarian Baptists lived single, and adopted an itinerant life, purposely to serve the cause of their Redeemer. It was in the country of the Albigeois, in the southern provinces of France, remarks Gibbon, where the Paulicians mostly took root. These people were known by different names in various provinces.

Views of Baptists

The French Paulicians or Albigenses were plainly of the same order in church affairs as the Bulgarians. They have no bishops; the candidates were prepared for baptism by instruction and stated feasts. They viewed baptism as adding no benefit to children. They received members into their churches after baptism by prayer with imposition of hands and the kiss of charity.

They did not allow of the Catholic baptism of infants, but baptized those again who went over from that church to their community.

Doctrine of the French Baptists

Let us give a summary of their doctrine, as given by Mosheim: Their particular tenets may be reduced to the following heads; First, they rejected baptism of infants, as a ceremony that was in no respect essential to salvation. Second, they rejected, for the same reason, the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. Third, they denied that the churches were endowed with a greater degree of sanctity than private houses, or that they were more adapted to the worship of God than any other place. Fourth, they affirmed that the altar was to be considered in no other light than as heaps of stones, and were therefore unworthy of any marks of veneration or regard. Fifth, they disapproved the use of incense and consecrated oil in services of a religious nature. Sixth, they looked upon the use of bells in the churches as an intolerable superstition. Seventh, they denied that the establishment of bishops, presbyters, deacons, and other ecclesiastical dignitaries was of divine institution, and went so far as to maintain that the appointment of stated ministers in the church was entirely unnecessary. Eighth, they affirmed that the institution of funeral rites was an effect of sacerdotal avarice, and that it was a matter of indifference whether the dead were buried in the churches or in the fields. Ninth, they looked upon the voluntary punishment called penance, so generally practiced in this century, as unprofitable and absurd. Tenth, they denied that the sins of departed saints could be in any measure atoned for by the celebration of masses, the distribution of alms to the poor, or a vicarious

penance; and they, consequently treated the doctrine of purgatory as a ridiculous fable. Eleventh, they considered (Catholic ceremonial) marriage as a pernicious institution, and absurdly condemned, without distinction, all connubial bonds. Twelfth, they looked upon a certain sort of veneration and worship as due to the apostles and martyrs, from which, however, they excluded such as were only confessors, in which class they comprehended the saints who had not suffered death for the cause of Christ, and whose bodies, in their esteem, had nothing more sacred than any other human carcass. Thirteenth, they declared the use of instrumental music in the churches and other religious assemblies, superstitious and unlawful. Fourteenth, they denied that the cross on which Christ suffered was in any respect more sacred than any other kind of wood, and in consequence refused to pay to it the smallest degree of religious worship. Fifteenth, they not only refused all acts of adoration to the images of Christ, and of the saints, but were also for having them removed out of the churches. Sixteenth, they were shocked at the subordination and distinction that were established among the clergy, and at the different degrees of authority conferred upon the different members of the sacred body. Thus the truth in opposition to error was spread all over the inhabited world at that time.

Darkest page of church history

It is admitted, however, by all historians, that this is the darkest page of church history, but we can find the records of the true followers of the Lamb, both by the various names, and by their untiring efforts to restore truth. “Many efforts were made,” says Mosheim, “by Protestants, the witnesses of the truth by whom are meant such pious and judicious Christians as adhered to the pure religion of the gospel, and remained uncorrupted amidst superstitions. It was principally in Italy and France that this heroic piety was exhibited.”—Orchard’s History.

Eleventh century

We enter upon the history of this century with more light upon the true teachings and practices of the church, as though the hand of bitter persecution was raised against them. The death of their brethren, and the prospect of themselves being martyred, could not affright them from the love of the truth, the work of righteousness, the exercise of faith, and the patience of hope. The persecution and accusations raised against them but gave sure marks of their continuing in the faith.

Council at Orleans

One of the first religious assemblies which the Paulicians had formed in Europe is said to have been discovered at Orleans in the year 1017, under the reign of

Robert. Its principal numbers were twelve men eminently distinguished by their piety and learning, among whom Lisogius and Stephen held the first rank; and it was composed in general of a considerable number of citizens who were far from being of the lower order. A council held at Orleans used every exertion that could be devised to bring these people to a better mind, but all endeavors failed.

Thirteen Paulicians burnt alive

They adhered strenuously to their principles, and therefore were condemned to be burnt alive, which sentence was actually executed on thirteen of them. Afterwards the Puritans that came from France into Bulgaria were murdered without mercy. They held that baptism and the Lord's supper possessed no virtue to justify. These clergymen, says Archbishop Usher, affirmed that there was no virtue capable of sanctifying the soul in the Eucharist or in baptism. For preaching this doctrine, their enemies took liberty of charging them with denying baptism and the sacrament; which, taking it in its broad sense, was very far from being true. They denied the Eucharist before baptism, and that baptism conferred no grace, and denied that ordinance to children.—Orchard's History.

Synod at Toulous

We here quote from Mr. Orchard: "In 1019 a synod was held at Toulous, to consider the most effectual method to rid the province of the Albigenses; and though the whole sect was in 1022 said to have been burnt, yet the emigrants from Bulgaria, coming in colonies into France, kept the seed sown, and the churches recruited, and soon after the same class of people was found inhabiting Languedoc and Gascony."

Berengarius and Gundulphus

About the year 1035 two reformers made their appearance, Berengarius of France and Gundulphus in Italy. Orchard says Berengarius, by his discourses, charmed the people, and drew after him vast numbers of disciples. Some men of learning united themselves with him, and spread his doctrines and views through France, Italy, Germany and other kingdoms. The effects of these reformers' preaching was not only the enlightening of the ignorant, but it gave encouragement to the Baptists to become more prominent in society. The alarm was great to Catholics. One of their prelates, Deodwin, Bishop of Seige, states that there is a report coming out of France, and gone through Germany, that Bruno, Bishop of Angiers, and Berengarius, Archdeacon of the same church, maintain that the host is not the Lord's body, and as far as in them lies overthrow the baptism of infants. Matthew, of Westminster, speaks of Berenger (Berengarius) as having corrupted all Italy. It means, says Dr. Allix, that his

followers who were of the same stamp with the Paterines, kept to the primitive faith of the church, which it was the object of the Popes to remove them from, and in their opposing the Church of Rome, they were called heretics and corrupters, though this name and practice belonged rightly to the popish party.

His success was so great that old historians say that France, Italy, Germany, England, the Belgic countries, etc., were infected with his principles. No doubt thousands joined with him that had been strongly opposed to the church and party in power, but dared not avow it for fear of the persecution and punishments that were inflicted upon dissenters, but finding in Berengarius a bold defender of their faith, they took courage and came out from their state of obscurity, and publicly professed their disapprobation of the corruption of the Church of Rome, a community of malignants, the council of vanity, and the seat of Satan. It is said that he was required by the Pope to renounce his errors and burn his writings, which he actually did, and yet he ceased not while he lived to write and speak in the same severe strain.”

Orchard’s statement

Orchard says of Gundulphus: “Having given some persons in his connection a portion of spiritual instruction, he sent them forth as inherants to preach the gospel. Some of his followers were arrested in Flanders, and on their examination, they acknowledged they were followers of Gundulphus.

“They were charged,” says Dr. Allix, “with abhorring baptism, i.e., the Catholic baptism.” These disciples said in reply; “The law and discipline we have received of our Master will not appear contrary either to the gospel decrees or apostolic institutions, if carefully looked into. This discipline consists in leaving the world, in bridling carnal concupiscence, in providing a livelihood by the labor of our hands, in hurting nobody, and affording charity to all, etc. This is the sum of our justification to which the use of baptism can superadd nothing. But if any say that some sacrament lies hid in baptism, the force of it is taken off by three causes; First, because the reprobate life of ministers can afford no saving remedy to the persons baptized.” Second, because whatever sins are renounced at the font, are afterwards taken up again in life and practice. Third, because a strange will, a strange faith, and strange confessions, do not seem to belong to a little child, who neither wills nor runs, who knoweth nothing of faith, and is altogether ignorant of his own good and salvation, in whom there can be no desire of regeneration, and from whom no confession of faith can be expected.”

Baptists in Piedmont

In the valleys of Piedmont during the same time, while in the countries around them, the Baptists were persecuted for refusing to buy or sell under the mark of the beast, the Baptist people here had protection from the oppression of all nations, where they could hide from the face of the serpent. Their enemies acknowledge they were very zealous, and that they never ceased from teaching night and day.

Their churches were divided into sixteen compartments, such as we call associations. The association of Milan is thought to have had about one thousand five hundred members in all.

Twelfth century

It is recorded that in the beginning of this century the Waldenses had spread their doctrine and influence all over Europe. They were often described nearly in the following language: If a man loves those that desire to love God and Jesus Christ; if he will neither curse, nor swear, nor lie, nor commit lewdness, nor kill, nor deceive his neighbor, nor avenge himself of his enemies, they presently say, he is a Vaudois—he deserves to be punished.

Articles of faith

In an article of faith the following is recorded by Mr. Jones that will be of interest to the readers: “We believe and firmly maintain all that is contained in the twelve articles of the symbol commonly called the Apostles’ Creed, and we regard as heretical whatsoever is inconsistent with the said twelve articles.

“We believe there is one God—the Father, Son and Holy Spirit. “We acknowledge for sacred canonical Scriptures the books of the Holy Bible. (Here follow the title of each, exactly conformable to our received canons, but which it is deemed, on that account, quite unnecessary to particularize.)

“The books above mentioned teach us that there is one God, Almighty, unbounded in wisdom, and infinite in goodness, and who, in his goodness, has made all things. For he created Adam after his own image and likeness. But through the enmity of the devil and his own disobedience, Adam fell, sin entered into the world, and we became transgressors in and by Adam.

“That at the time appointed by the Father, Christ was born—a time when iniquity everywhere abounded, to make it manifest that it was not for the sake of any good in ourselves, for all were sinners, but that he who is true might display his grace and mercy upon us.

“That Christ is our life, and truth, and peace, and righteousness—our shepherd and advocate, our sacrifice and priest, who died for the salvation of all who should believe, and rose again for their justification.

“We also believe that after this life there are but two places—one for those that are saved, the other for the damned—which two we call paradise and hell, wholly denying that imaginary purgatory of anti-Christ invented in opposition to the truth. “We acknowledge no sacraments (as by Divine appointment), but baptism and the Lord’s Supper.”

Peter de Bruis

About the same period Peter de Bruis became prominent as a bold defender of the truth. Mosheim gives the following account of this man: “Peter de Bruis made laudable attempts to reform the abuses and to remove the superstitions that disfigured the beautiful simplicity of the gospel; but after having engaged in his cause a great number of followers, during a laborious ministry of twenty years, he was burned at St. Giles, in the year 1130, by an enraged populace, instigated by the clergy, whose traffic was in danger from the enterprising spirit of this reformer. The whole system of doctrine, which this unhappy martyr, whose zeal was not without a considerable mixture of fanaticism, taught to the Petrobrusians, his disciples, is not known; it is, however, certain that the five following tests made a part of his system: First, that no persons were to be baptized before they had the full use of their reason. Second, that it was idle superstition to build churches for the service of God, who will accept a sincere worship wherever it is offered, and that therefore such churches as had already been erected were to be destroyed. Third, that the crucifixes, as instruments of superstition, deserved the same fate. Fourth, that the real body and blood of Christ were not exhibited in the Eucharist, but were merely represented in that holy ordinance by figures and symbols. Fifth, and lastly, that the obligations, prayers, and good works of the living could in no respect be advantageous to the dead.”

Arnold of Brescia

Arnold of Brescia is another of the faithful ministers of this century. Arnold was an Italian by birth, but went to France early in life, and was made to love the ways of the Puritans. He received into his heart the light of the gospel. He returned to his former home and began his public ministry even on the streets.

He pointed his zeal at the wealth and luxury of the Roman clergy. The eloquence of Arnold aroused the inhabitants of Brescia. They revered him as the apostle of religious liberty, and rose in rebellion against the bishops. The church

took an alarm at his bold attacks, and in a council he was condemned to perpetual silence. Arnold left Italy and found an asylum in the Swiss canton of Zurich. Here he began his system of reform, and succeeded for a time, but the influence of Bernard made it necessary for him to leave the canton.

Arnold's defense of truth

This bold man now hazarded the desperate experience of visiting Rome, and fixing the standard of rebellion in the very heart of the capitol. In this measure he succeeded, so far as to occasion the change of the government, and the clergy experienced for ten years a reverse of fortune and a succession of insults from the people. The pontiff struggled hard, but in vain, to maintain his ascendancy. He at length sunk under the pressure of the calamity.

Successive pontiffs were unable to check his popularity. Eugenius III withdrew from Rome, and Arnold, taking advantage of his absence, impressed on the minds of the people the necessity of setting bounds to clerical authority, but the people, not being prepared for such liberty, carried their measures to the extreme, abused the clergy, burnt their property, and required all ecclesiastics to swear to the new constitution. "Arnold," says Gibbon, "presumed to quote the declaration of Christ, that his kingdom was not of this world. "The abbots, the bishops, and the Pope himself must renounce their state, or their salvation." The people were brave, but ignorant of the nature, extent and advantages of a reformation.

Arnold's death

He was not devoid of discretion, he was protected by the nobles and the people, and his services to the cause of freedom, his eloquence thundered over the seven hills. He showed how strongly the clergy in vice had degenerated from the primitive times of the church. He confined the shepherd to the spiritual government of his flock.

In 1155 this noble champion was seized, crucified and burned. His ashes were thrown into the river. "The clergy triumphed in his death; with his ashes his sect was dispersed; his memory still lives in the minds of the Romans."

Peter Waldo

In 1160, whilst anarchy and confusion awfully prevailed in the Roman community, strife, rebellion and conflict between popes and emperors, cardinals, clergy and councils on the claims of contending pontiffs, a person was called by Divine grace to advocate the cause of truth.

Peter, an opulent merchant of Lyons, in translating from Latin into French the four gospels, perceived that the religion which was taught in the Roman church differed totally from that which was originally inculcated by Christ and his apostles. Struck with a pious zeal for religion, he abandoned the glaring difference and animated his mercantile vocation, distributed his riches among the poor and formed an association with other pious men. He adopted the sentiments of the Waldenses of Piedmont, and from them borrowed those reforming notions which he diffused successfully over the continent.

In 1165 he assumed the character of a public teacher in the city of Lyon. He maintained at his own expense several persons, who were employed to recite and expound to the people those translations of the scripture he had made, which proved of unspeakable service to the cause he espoused.

The rules of practice adopted by Peter of Lyons, or Peter Waldo, and his followers, were extremely severe. They took for their model, to regulate their moral discipline, Christ's sermon on the mount, which they interpreted and explained in the most literal and rigid manner, and consequently prohibited war, lawsuits, and all attempts towards acquisition of wealth; the infliction of capital punishments, self-defense against unjust violence, and oaths of all kinds.

Various names of Baptists

The followers of Waldo, like himself, renounced all worldly property and interest, making common stock with the poor of the church. From this circumstance the enemies termed them, "the poor of Lyons," and from the city where Waldo commenced his labors, they were named Lionists; but in general they were mixed with the Waldenses, their sentiments being the same, and were known in general by that name.

They are said to have been men of irreproachable lives. They were the pious of the earth. Their views of the ordinance were, says Reiner, "that the washing (immersion) given to children does no good." Dissenters were called by various names, as the poor of Lyons, Lionists, Paterines, Puritans, Arnoldists, Petrobrussians, Albigenses, Waldenses, etc., etc., different names expressive of one and the same class of Christians.

"However various their names, they may be," says Mezeray, "reduced to two, that is, the Albigenses and the Vaudois, and these two held almost the same opinions as those we called Calvinists." Their bards or pastors were every one of them heads of their churches, but they acted nothing without the consent of the people and clergy. Deacons expounded the gospels, distributed the Lord's

Supper, baptized, and sometimes had the oversight of churches, visited the sick, and took care of the temporalities of the church—Orchard's History.

“Peter Waldo and his brethren were bitterly opposed by the Catholic party, and were finally made to flee for protection. Some went to the mountain home in the Pyrenees, and some to Germany. In the same year, a council was convened at Tours, at which all the bishops and priests in the country of Toulouse were strictly enjoined to take care, and to forbid, under pain of excommunication, every person from presuming to give reception, or the least assistance to the followers of this heresy; to have no dealings with them in buying and selling, that thus, being deprived of the common necessities of life, they might be compelled to repent of the evils of their way.” Thus they were compelled to leave this part of the country for refuge in other parts.

Thirteenth century: jealousy of the Pope

The cruelty of the twelfth century was increased in this century. In 1200 the cities and towns were filled with the Baptists being protected by the lords, barons, viscounts and others of the French nobility. This awakened the jealousy of the Pope and different measures were taken to subdue them. In the fall of 1209 the monks preached up a crusade against the more northerly provinces of France. To stir up the nation, they opened to all volunteers the gates of paradise, with all its glory, without any reformation of life or manners.

Alice's Army

The army raised from these efforts was directed in the ensuing spring, 1210, by Alice, Simon de Montfort's wife. With this army a renewal of last year's cruelties commenced. All the inhabitants found were hung on gibbets. A hundred of the inhabitants of Brom had their eyes plucked out, and their noses cut off, and then were sent, under the guidance of a man with one eye spared, to inform the garrisons of other towns what fate awaited them. The destruction of property and life must have been very great, from the sanguinary character of those who managed these cruel measures.

Albigenses die for their faith

The most perfidious conduct was conspicuous in the leaders of the Catholic cause. Pope, bishops, legates, and officers of the army; whatever terms were submitted to availed nothing, when in the hands of their enemies. On the 22nd of July, the Crusaders took possession of the castle of Minerva. The Albigensian Christians were in the meantime assembled—the men in one house, the women in another, and there, on their knees, resigned to the waiting circumstances. A

learned abbot preached to them, but they unanimously cried, “We have renounced the Church of Rome—we will have none of your faith; your labor is in vain, for neither death nor life will make us renounce the opinions we have embraced.”

An enormous pile of dry wood was prepared, and the abbot thus addressed the Albigenses, “Be converted to the Catholic faith, or ascend this pile,” but none of them were shaken. They set fire to the wood, and brought them to the fire, but it required no violence to precipitate them into the flames. Thus more than one hundred and forty willing victims perished, after commending their souls to God. This sacrifice of human life under this crusade cannot be computed,”—Orchard’s History.

A time of great trial

“I have,” says Mr. Jones, “traced the total extermination of the Albigenses, and with it the extinction of the cause of reformation, so happily introduced in the twelfth century. The slaughter had been so prodigious, the massacre so universal, the terror so profound, and of so long duration, that the church of Rome appeared completely to have obtained her object. The churches were drowned in the blood of their members, or everywhere broken up or shattered. The public worship of the Albigenses had everywhere ceased. All teaching had become impossible.

Almost every pastor or elder had perished in a frightful manner, and the very small number of those who had succeeded in escaping the edge of the sword now sought an asylum in distant countries, and were enabled to avoid persecutions only by preserving the most studied silence respecting their opinions. The private members who had not perished by either fire or sword, or who had not withdrawn by flight from the scrutiny of the inquisition, knew that they could preserve their lives only by burying their creed in their bosoms. For them there were no more sermons, no more public prayers, no more ordinances of the Lord’s house—even their children were not to be acquainted for a time at least, with their sentiments.”

Raymond’s protection

Raymond was an earl of Toulouse, who spent his days in opposition to the church in power, but at his death his young son Raymond, feeling stung by the injustice done his father, banished the crusaders and inquisitors from the country of Toulouse, and continued to give the whole Catholic party trouble until about the middle of the century. But in 1243 Raymond was subdued and the land became quiet. Thus terminated all hopes of protection in Toulouse and the blood

of one million inoffensive lives was spilled. It is asserted, however, that 800,000 faithful Christians yet remained in that part of France.

Liberty in Piedmont

Let us now turn our attention to the valleys of Piedmont. While the other countries were persecuting the saints, the dukes of this country protected them.

Mosheim says, "Their numbers became so formidable as to menace the Papal jurisdiction with a fatal overthrow. It has been observed, and the thing is worthy of notice, that a period when all the potentates of Europe were combined to second the intolerant measures of the court of Rome, the Dukes of Savoy, who were now become the most intolerant monarchs in Christendom, should have allowed their subjects the liberty of conscience, and protected them in the legitimate exercise of their civil and religious principles.

They were secluded in a considerable degree from general observation, and led a quiet and peaceful life, in all godliness and honesty. The princes and the governors of the country in which they lived were constantly receiving the most favorable reports of them, as a people simple in their manners, free from deceit and malice, upright in their dealings, loyal to their governors, and ever ready to yield them a cheerful obedience, and in everything that did not interfere with the claims of conscience; consequently, the governors constantly turned a deaf ear to the solicitations of priests and monks to disturb their tranquility.

The tolerant principles of the dukes, with the sequestered habitations of these people; the difficulty of approaching their territories; their little intercourse with the world, connected with their simplicity of manners, were favorable circumstances to all the pious of the glens of Piedmont, while it afforded nothing inviting to strangers or the polite and fashionable. Consequently these people appear to have enjoyed a considerable share of tranquility, while their brethren in the south of France were exposed to the fury of Papal vengeance."

Origin of Albigenses

It is natural to conclude, therefore, that when persecution raged against the church of France, the persecuted would seek protection where there is freedom.

These people were sound in doctrine and were faithful to their profession, even through the most severe persecution. It is asserted by Orchard, "First, it has been fully admitted by all creditable historians, that the Albigenses were originally called Puritans, from the Novatian, Paulician, and Paterine dissenters, whose sentiments have passed under review.

Secondly, the constitution of all those dissenting churches left on record, viz., Novatianists, Donatists, Paulicians, with the Albigenses, was strictly on the terms of “believers’ baptism indispensable to church fellowship.”

Thirdly, after Novatian, Donatus and Constantine appeared as reformers, Gundulphus, Arnold of Brescia, Berenges, Peter of Bruys, Henry of Toulous, and Peter Waldo, who all equally renounced infant baptism, with those who were called after their names, which subject we shall refer in full section.

Fourthly, the productions of their pens, their creed, or confession of faith, the Noble Lesson, and What is Antichrist, are in accordance with Baptist views.”

Dr Wall records that the Lionists, or followers of Waldo, say that the washing given to children does no good. Dr Allis says, “Baptism added nothing to justification, and afforded no benefit to children.”

Persecution in Italy

In Italy the Paterines were very numerous during this century, and it is said they kept up correspondence with other countries. They were bitterly opposed by the Catholic party, however, as they were in many other places. In 1224 a cruel decree was passed according to the desires of the Pope, denouncing all Puritans, Paterines, Arnoldites, etc., expressed in these terms, “We shall not suffer these wretches to live.” A second, third and fourth followed, all of the same cruel character. The edicts declared that all those Paterines to whom the bishops were disposed to show favor, were to have their tongues pulled out that they might not corrupt others by justifying themselves.

The new settlement

The extreme cruel opposition of both King and Pope caused many of these Baptists of Italy to go to the valleys of Piedmont with the Waldenses, but they continually increased in Italy, and they suggested the propriety of seeking a new territory. They obtained a district north of Italy, with terms of liberty. This new settlement prospered and their religious peculiarities awakened displeasure in the old inhabitants, but the landlords were pleased with their industry and afforded them protection. This colony increased from time to time by those who fled from the persecution raised against them in other countries. Thus we find that the truth prevailed and the church was preserved in all parts of the world, as we have traced from the apostolic day to the end of the thirteenth century.

The fourteenth century

We will now turn our attention to the Waldenses. At the beginning of the fourteenth century they had become so numerous that they were compelled to emigrate. Several of them went to the colony east of Italy, where arrangements were made for their enjoying civil and religious privileges. Many of them went to different parts of the known world in sufficient numbers to set up churches.

Liberty in New Colony

“For one hundred and thirty years after the destruction of the church in France, the Waldenses in these valleys experienced a tolerable portion of ease, and a respite from the severity of a general persecution; all which time they multiplied greatly, and were as a people whom the Lord had evidently blessed. They took deep root, they filled the land, they covered the hills with their shadow, and sent out their boughs unto the sea, and their branches unto the rivers,”—Orchard’s History.

Cruel persecution in the Piedmonts

In some parts of the country, however, the Waldenses were troubled by the inquisitors during this century, and especially at the close of it. About the year 1400, the Catholic party disturbed the peace of the Waldenses in the valley of Pragela in Piedmont. The most outrageous attack was made in the winter, when the mountains were covered with snow and the inhabitants of these valleys were not looking for it, and were taken by surprise.

The inhuman enemies took possession of the caves and kept the people from their place of retreat. When the news came to the people they fled to one of the highest mountains in the Alps, with their wives and children. These inhuman servants of the Catholic party pursued them in their flight, and many were slain before they could reach the mountains. When night fell upon them they were hid from the enemy, but were exposed to cold, and when day revealed the facts many children were frozen in their cradles, and many mothers lay dead by their sides in the snow. During the night the enemy took what they could find that was valuable in the homes.

Many other inhuman persecutions followed, and though the King desired to protect this inoffensive people, yet the Catholic party had such power that these servants of Satan could not be checked, and the evil continued.

Pure life of the Waldenses

In 1480, Candius Scisselius, Archbishop of Turin, resided in the valleys; from his situation and office, he must have known something of these people. He says of the Waldenses, "Their heresy excepted, they generally live a purer life than other Christians. They never swear, but by compulsion. They fulfill their promises with punctuality, and live, for the most part, in poverty; they profess to preserve the apostolic life and doctrine. They also profess it to be their desire to overcome only by the simplicity of faith, by purity of conscience, and integrity of life; not by philosophical niceties, and theological subtleties. In their lives and morals they are perfectly irreprehensible, and without reproach among men, addicting themselves with all their might to observe the commands of God. All sorts of people have repeatedly endeavored, but in vain, to root them out, for, even yet contrary to the opinion of all men, they still remain conquerors, or at least, wholly invincible."—Jones History.

Innocent the Pontiff

In 1484, Innocent the Eighth was made Pope of Rome. This Pontiff follows the footprints of Innocent the Third, by issuing his bulls for the destruction of the Waldenses. "We have heard," said the Pope, "and it is come to our knowledge, not without much displeasure, that certain sons of iniquity, followers of that abominable and pernicious sect of malignant men, called "the poor of Lyons," or Waldenses, who have so long ago endeavored, in Piedmont and other places, to ensnare the sheep belonging to God," etc.

Inhuman persecution

"An army raised by Albert, the Pope's legate, and marched directly into the valley of Loyre. The inhabitants, apprized of their approach, fled to their caves at the tops of the mountains, carrying with them their children, and whatever valuables they possessed, as well as what was thought necessary for their support.

3000 perished

The lieutenant, finding the inhabitants all fled, and that not an individual appeared with whom he could converse, had considerable trouble in discovering their retreats; when, causing quantities of wood to be placed at the entrance of their caves, he ordered the same to be set on fire. The consequence of this inhuman conduct was, four hundred children were suffocated in their cradles, or in the arms of their dead mothers, while multitudes to avoid death by suffocation, or being committed to the flames, precipitated themselves headlong from their caverns upon the rocks below, when they were dashed to pieces; if any escaped death by the fall, they were immediately slaughtered by the brutal soldiers. It

appears more that three thousand men and women, belonging to the valley of Loyre, perished on this occasion.”—Orchard’s History.

The monk’s confession

Desiring to put an end to heresy without so much bloodshed, and in fact seeing that even the shedding of blood did not put a stop to it, a monk was selected to instruct the people in the right way. The monk on his return said he had learned more Scripture than he had in his whole life, the few days he was conversing with the heretics. Others visited them, being sent by the Catholics, and came back with the same report.

“The first lesson the Waldenses teach those whom they bring over to their party,” says Reiner, “is, as to what kind of persons they disciples of Christ ought to be, and this they do by the doctrine of the evangelists and apostles; saying that those only are followers of the apostles, who imitate their manner of life.”

The customs of the Waldenses

The celebrated president and historian, Thuanus, says, “Their clothing is of sheep skins, they have no linen; they inhabit (1540-1590) seven villages; their houses are constructed of flint stone, having a flat roof covered with mud. In these they live with their cattle, separated, however, from them by a fence. They have also two caves set apart for particular purposes, in one of them they conceal their cattle, in the other themselves, when hunted by their enemies. They live on milk and venison, being, through constant practice, excellent marksmen. Poor as they are, they are content, and live in a state of seclusion from the rest of mankind. One thing is very remarkable, that persons externally so savage and rude, should have so much moral cultivation. They know French sufficiently for the understanding of the Bible, and singing of Psalms. You can scarcely find a boy among them who cannot give an intelligent account of the faith which they profess. In this, indeed, they resemble their brethren of the other valleys. They pay tribute with good conscience, and the obligation of this duty is particularly noted in their confession of faith. If, by reason of the civil wars, they are prevented from doing this, they carefully set apart the sum, and at the first opportunity, pay it to the king’s tax gatherers.” This man was a candid enemy.

Orchard says, “Calvin, who began in 1534 to preach the reforming doctrines, was found in his views more in accordance with the sentiments of the sacramentarians, or Anabaptists, than Luther. It does not appear that any great difference existed between the Anabaptists and Calvin’s doctrinal views, but the principal points of discrepancy were on the churches constitution and discipline.”

A boy disputes with a monk

“An Observantine monk, preaching one day at Imola, told the people that it behooved them to purchase heaven by the merit of their good works. A boy who was present exclaimed, ‘That’s blasphemy, for the Bible tells us that Christ purchased heaven by his sufferings and death, and bestows it on us freely by his mercy.’” A dispute of considerable length ensued between the youth and the preacher. Provoked at the pertinent replies of his juvenile opponent, and at the favorable reception which the audience gave them, “Get you home, you young rascal!” exclaimed the monk. “You are just come from the cradle, and will you take it upon you to judge the sacred things, which the most learned cannot explain?” “Did you never read the words, ‘Out of the mouths of babes and sucklings, God perfects praise?’” rejoined the youth; upon which the preacher quitted the pulpit in wrathful confusion, breathing out threatenings against the poor boy, who was instantly thrown into prison, “where he still lies,” says the writer. Dec. 31, 1544. M’Crie’s History.

Confession of faith of 1554

We will now give an extract from a confession of faith put forth by the Waldenses in 1554. In Art. 4 they say, “We believe that there is one holy church, comprising the whole assembly of the elect and faithful, that have existed from the beginning of the world, and shall be to the end thereof.” Art. 7, “We believe in the ordinance of baptism; the water is the visible and external sign, which represents to us that which, by virtue of God’s invisible operation is within us, namely, the renovation of our minds, and the mortification of our members through the faith of Jesus Christ; and by this ordinance we are received into the holy congregation of God’s people, previously professing and declaring our faith and change of life.”—Jones’ History.

Confession of faith of 1655

Now we will quote a few articles from a Waldenses confession of faith of 1655, published in order to correct any false report that might be given by the enemies who were threatening persecution: “Art. 25. That the church is a company of the faithful, who, having been elected before the foundation of the world, and called with a holy calling come to unite themselves to follow the word of God, believing whatsoever he teacheth them and living in his fear. Art. 26. And that all the elect are upheld and preserved by the power of God in such sort that they all persevere in the faith unto the end, and remain united in the holy church, as so many living members thereof. Art. 29. That God hath ordained the sacrament of baptism to be a testimony of our adoption, and of our being cleansed from our sins by the blood of Christ, and renewed in holiness of life.”—Gilly’s Narrative.

In 1685 the Pope would not tolerate one that opposed the Catholic Church to live in France or any other country. Fifteen days were allowed for these faithful ones to leave the kingdoms. This caused millions to be banished from their native soil. In 1689, however, they were permitted to settle again at their old homes.

The Baptists in Germany

The wilds of Germany afforded a place of retreat for the persecuted Baptist people, and so many gathered in different parts that it is said that Baptist preachers could, during the ninth century, “pass through the whole German empire and lodge every night at the house of one of their friends.” It is very probable these traveling ministers were Paulicians or Paterines from Bulgaria or Italy. They were termed by Catholics Anabaptist preachers. Their sentiments of religion are learned, and their view of the ordinances proved, from their confession of faith, which asserts, “In the beginning of Christianity there were no baptizings of children, and their forefathers practiced no such things.” and “we do from our hearts acknowledge that baptism is a washing which is performed with water, and doth hold out the washing of the soul from sin.”

“We shall now exhibit our claim to these pious Waldenses, so far as it respects the ordinance. We own their religious views are not fully known. They thought Christianity wanted no comment, but a pious walk; and they professed their belief of that by being baptized, and their love of Christ and one another by receiving the Lord’s Supper. Jacob Merhing says that he had, in the German tongue a confession of faith of the Baptists, called Waldenses, which declared the absence of infant baptism in the early churches of these people, that their forefathers practiced no such thing, and that people of this faith and practice made a prodigious spread through Poland (yea Poland was filled with them), Lombardy, Germany and Holland. These people re-baptized such as joined their churches, as the Waldenses had done in early age; and although a law was made against the Picards for re-baptizing, yet they suffered burning in the hand and banishment rather than forgo what they considered their duty. Dr. Wall, who is a candid opponent, says the Beghards were also called Picards or Pighards. They spread themselves over the great territory of Upper Germany; they abominated popery; they chose their pastors from among married men; they mutually called one another brother and sister; they owned no other authority than the Scriptures; they slighted all the doctors, both ancient and modern; their ministers wore no other garments to celebrate communion; nor do they use any collection of prayers but the Lord’s Prayer; they believed or owned little or nothing of the sacraments of the Catholic Church; such as came over to their church must every one be baptized anew in mere water; they believe that the bread and wine do only, by some occult signs, represent the death of Christ—that the sacrament

was instituted by Christ to no other purpose but to renew the memory of his passion, etc., etc. In this statement may be discovered a family likeness of those churches in the south of France.”— Orchard’s History.

Kept by God

Many persecutions followed them from year to year, but through the providence of God we see that the church in its purity was likewise kept in Germany. Their history, however, seems to be somewhat obscure except the accusations that were brought against them by their enemies, until the able leader, Menno Simon, appeared as an assistant.

The terrors of death in the most awful form, were presented to the view of the people, and numbers of them were executed every day. It seemed that all their liberty was taken away from them. Many of them were discouraged, but like the Waldenses, they were willing to suffer death in any way that the evil one could devise.

Menno Simon

“The venerable Menno Simon was born at Witmansum, in Frieland, A.D. 1496. His education was such as was generally adopted in that age with persons designed to be priests. He entered the church in the character of a minister in 1524. He had no acquaintance with the sacred volume at this time; nor would he touch it, lest he should be reduced by its doctrines. At the end of three years, on celebrating mass, he entertained some scruples about transubstantiation; but attributed the impressions to the devil. No moral change was yet effected; he spent his time in dissipating amusements; yet he was not easy in his mind. He resolved, from the perturbed state of his thoughts, to pursue the New Testament. In reading this volume, his mind became enlightened; and with the aid of Luther’s writings, he saw the errors of popery. Menno was generally respected; and all at once became a Gospel Preacher, without the charge of heresy or fanaticism. This is accounted for, by his being courted by the world, and still continued in alliance with it.

Menno’s Experience

Among the thousands that suffered death for anabaptism, was one Sicke Snyder, who was beheaded at Lewarden. The constancy of this man to his views of believers’ baptism, preferring even an ignominious death to renouncing his sentiments, led Menno to inquire into the subject of baptism. Menno could not find infant baptism in the Bible; and, on consulting a minister of that persuasion, a concession was made, *that it had no foundation in the Bible*. Not willing to

yield, he consulted other celebrated reformers; but all these he found to be at variance, as to the grounds of the practice; consequently he became confirmed, that the Baptists were suffering for truth's sake. In studying the word, convictions of sinfulness and of his lost condition became deepened; and he found God required sincerity and decision. He now sought new spiritual friends, and found some, with whom he at first privately associated, but afterwards became one of their community. Menno was baptized by immersion, as he confessed that, "We shall find no other baptism besides dipping in water, which is acceptable to God and maintained in his word."—Orchard's History.

"They admit," says Mosheim, "none to the sacrament of baptism but persons that are come to the full age of reason." They rebaptized such persons as had that rite in a state of infancy; since the best and wisest of the Mennonites maintain, with their ancestors, that the baptism of infants is destitute of validity; they therefore refuse the term of Anabaptists as inapplicable to their views.

Baptists collected by Menno

"It was in 1536, under Menno, that the scattered community of Baptists were formed into a regular body and church order, separate from all Dutch and German Protestants, who at that time had not been formed into one body by any bands of unity. Some of the perfectionists he reclaimed to order and others he excluded. He now purified also the religious doctrines of these people. As in the early, so among these modern Baptists, two classes are found, at a later period distinguished by the term of rigid and moderate. The former class observe, with the most religious accuracy, veneration and precision, the ancient doctrine, discipline and precepts of the pure Baptists. The latter are more conformed to Protestant churches."—Mosheim's History.

Let us now notice the candid admission of the careful Lutheran historian, J.L. Mosheim, in reference to the origin of the Baptist church in Germany.

Mosheim's testimony

"The true origin of that sect which acquired the denomination of Anabaptists, by their administering anew the rite of baptism to those who came over to their communion, and derived that of Mennonites, from that famous man to whom they owe much of their present felicity, is hidden in the depths of antiquity, and is of consequence difficult to be ascertained. This uncertainty will not appear surprising when it is considered that this sect started up suddenly in several countries at the same time, under leaders of different talents and different intentions, and at the very period when the first contest of the Reformers with the Roman pontiffs drew the attention of the world, and employed all the pens of the

learned in such a manner as to render all other objects and incidents almost matters of indifference.”

[These Anabaptists] “not only considered themselves descendants of the Waldenses, who were so grievously opposed and persecuted by the despotic heads of the Romish church, but pretend, moreover, to be the purest offspring of the respectable sufferers, being equally opposed to all principles of rebellion on the one hand, and all suggestions of fanaticism on the other.”

“It may be observed,” continued Mosheim, “that they are not entirely in an error when they boast of their descent from the Waldenses, Petrobrussians, and other ancient sets, who are usually considered as witnesses of the truth in times of general darkness and superstition. *Before the rise of Luther and Calvin*, there lay concealed in almost all countries of Europe, particularly in Bohemia, Moravia, Switzerland and Germany, many persons who adhered tenaciously to the doctrines, etc., which is the true source of all the peculiarities that are to be found in the religious doctrine and discipline of the Anabaptists.”

Baptists descended from the apostles

We will next give a quotation from a noted Dutch Reform Church history, published in 1819, “We have seen that the Baptists, who were formerly called ‘Anabaptists,’ and in later times ‘Mennonites,’ were the original Waldenses, and who have long in their history received the honor of that origin. On this account the Baptists may be considered as the only Christian community which has stood since the days of the apostles, and, as a Christian society, which has preserved pure the doctrines of the Gospel through all ages. The perfectly correct external and internal economy of the Baptist denomination tends to confirm the truth, disputed by the Romish Church that the Reformation brought about in the sixteenth century was in the highest degree necessary, and, at the same time, goes to refute the erroneous notion of the Catholics that their communion is the most ancient.”

Baptists of England: same as Waldenses Baptists of Germany

We will now turn our attention to the Baptist people of England. In giving an account of them we will show that they were in line with the Baptist people of Germany and of the same denomination. We will, however, just give short sketches. It is observed that churches were planted in England as early as sixty years after the death of Christ. Many persecutions had been inflicted upon them by the Catholic party.

Walter Lollard

“In 1215, Walter Lollard, a German preacher of great renown among the Waldenses, and a friend to believers’ baptism, came into England and preached with great effect. His followers and the Waldenses generally in England for many generations after were called Lollards.”—Benedict’s History. “Lollard,” says Mosheim’s history, “in the common tongue of the ancient Germans, denotes a person who is continually praising God with a song or singing hymns to his honor.”

John Wycliff

In the reign of Edward III, in 1340, John Wycliff began to be famous in England. Wickliff was an able, bold and enlightened Catholic *priest* and *doctor*, who, though living and dying in the Catholic communion, spent his life in translating, circulating and explaining the Scriptures, and exposing the corruption of the Catholics. Among the principles he advocated were that the church consisted only of believers; that baptism was a “sign of grace received before,” and consequently should be administered to those only who professed to have received *grace*. While Wycliff never entirely left the Catholic Church, yet in many respects he was a Baptist and bore a great part in the Reformation. Wycliff was the first to give the Bible to the English people in their own tongue, to their great delight, and the *Lollards* became familiar with its teachings and their numbers were greatly increased.

Tyndale

Tyndale, another learned man, took upon himself to translate the Bible into the English language in the sixteenth century. Because of the opposition of the King of England he was compelled to flee to Holland for safety, and there completed his work of translating the Scriptures. He was burned at the stake, however, at Smithfield, in 1533. His last words were, while burning in the flame, “Lord, open the eyes of the King of England.”

William Sawtre and Edward Wightman

In the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries hundreds of the Baptist people were imprisoned and those who would not repent and turn from their religion were put to death in the most horror possible. At the beginning of this period a devout man William Sawtre, who was a Baptist preacher, was the first to be burned. The last was Edward Wightman, who was burned at the stake at Litchfield, England, April 11, 1612. Many of his offspring came to America, some of whom were ministers in the Baptist Church.

Benedict says, "From the death of William Sawtre, who was burnt in London, to the time that Edward Wightman perished in the flames at Litchfield, was a period of two hundred and twenty years. We have very good grounds for believing that Sawtre was a Baptist; we are sure that Wightman was, and thus it appears that the Baptists have had the honor of leading the van, and bringing up the rear, of the part of the noble army of English martyrs who have laid down their lives at the stake."

This, however, was not the end of the persecution, for a great many were thrown into dark prisons and there died. The natural man never has been a friend of true Christianity, and never will be.

Confession of Faith in 1643

In 1643, the English Baptists drew up a "confession of faith," which was afterwards revised and published in 1689, known as "the London Confession of Faith," which contains all the doctrinal and practical features of all the former "confessions of faith" put forth by the Baptists. It has ever been recognized as the nearest expression of the faith of true Baptists everywhere, until the present time, that has ever been published in a like form. A short time afterwards it was republished, with the addition of two articles by the Baptists of America, known as the "Philadelphia Confession of Faith."

Means of tracing Baptists

These people can be traced through history (1) by the persecution and shedding of blood and banishment by the enemies; (2) by the practice of immersing anew all that came over to them from any other sect ever since there has been more than one denomination, which has been since A.D. 251; (3) by their claiming that God has but one church, and it alone has church authority; (4) by their refusing infant baptism entirely and contending alone for believer's baptism.

Robinson's evidence

Robinson says, "I have seen enough to convince me that the present dissenters, contending for the sufficiency of the Scripture and for primitive Christian liberty to judge of its meaning, may be traced back in authentic manuscripts to the Nonconformists; to the Puritans; to the Lollards; to the Valdenses; to the Albigenes; and, I suppose, through the Paulicians and others, to the apostles."

Baptists of the United States: the organization of the first churches and associations

We will next turn our attention to the Baptists of our native country. It has been with great interest that I have prepared this history of this period. There have been many things that I have omitted that would have been of great interest to many, but my only intention has been to give to our people a brief, useful record of the true church of Christ.

John Clark

From the most recent and thorough investigation it is believed that Dr. John Clark (a physician) and eleven other persons formed, at Newport, Rhode Island, in 1638, the first Baptist Church in America. Clark resigned the care of the church in 1651 to return to England, and was succeeded by Obadiah Holmes. The pastors and members of this church remained Calvinistic until the year 1820.

The Welsh Tract Church

The Welsh Tract Church, whose meeting house is two miles from Newark, in New Castle County, Delaware, is the oldest Old School, or Primitive Baptist Church in the United States, and the only American Baptist Church that was regularly organized in Europe before emigrating to this country. It was constituted in the spring of 1701, by sixteen Baptists, in the country of Pembroke and Caermarthen, in South Wales, with Thomas Griffith, one of their number, as pastor. A "Church Emigrant," they embarked at Milford Haven in June, 1701, and landed at Philadelphia, where they continued about a year and a half, and where their membership increased to thirty-seven. They then procured land in North Delaware, and in 1703, they built a small meeting house near Iron Hill. In 1746, they rebuilt on the same a stone house for worship, which they have now used for 163 years. Over two hundred years they have held regular service at that place That was one of the five churches that formed the Philadelphia Association, the first association in America.

Hopewell Church

The second oldest Old School Baptist church in the United States is Hopewell in a village of the same name in New Jersey. This church, composed of twelve members, five of whom were Stouts, was organized at the residence of Joseph Stout, April 23, 1715, upon these eight fundamental principles; 1st, the Three-Oneness of God; 2nd, His Self-existence and Sovereignty; 3rd, The Total Depravity of the Natural Man; 4th, The Eternal, Personal, Unconditional Election of all the Members of the Body of Christ; 5th, The Special and Definiteness of the Atonement; 6th, The Necessity of a Spiritual Birth in order to Worship God in

Spirit and in Truth; 7th, The Sovereign and Efficacious Operations of Divine Grace upon all Vessels of mercy; 8th, The Baptism of Believers by Immersion.

Philadelphia Confession

The Baptists at that time adopted the London Confession of Faith with two additional articles known then as the Philadelphia Confession of Faith.

Elias Keach

The church at Southampton, Bucks County, Pennsylvania, was constituted in A.D. 1746. Its organic members were from the church at Pennepek. The Pennepek Church was constituted in A.D. 1687. It was gathered by the faithful labors of Elias Keach, who was also its first pastor. He was the son of the noted Benjamin Keach of London, who was a member of the convention that drew up and published the London Confession of Faith in A.D. 1689.

Earliest associations in America

The Philadelphia Association in Pennsylvania, was the first Baptist Association formed in American, constituted in A.D. 1707; the second was the Charleston Association of South Carolina, organized in 1751; the third was the Sandy Creek

Association in North Carolina organized in A.D. 1758; the fourth was the Kehukee Association of North Carolina organized in A.D. 1765; The fifth was the Kestockton Association of Virginia organized in A.D. 1766; the sixth was the Warren Association of Rhode Island organized in A.D. 1767; the seventh was the Stonington Association of Connecticut organized in A.D. 1772; the eighth was the Strawberry Association of Virginia organized in A.D. 1776; the ninth was the Shaftsbury Association of Vermont organized in A.D. 1780; the tenth was the Salisbury Association of Maryland organized in A.D. 1782; the eleventh was the Woodstock Association of Vermont organized in A.D. 1783; the twelfth was the Dover Association of Virginia organized in A.D. 1783; the thirteenth was the Georgia Association of Georgia organized in A.D. 1784; the fourteenth was the Vermont Association organized in A.D. 1785; the fifteenth was the Salem Association of Kentucky organized in A.D. 1785; the sixteenth was the Elkhorn Association organized in 1785; the seventeenth was the Holston Association of Tennessee organized in 1786.

First association in each state

The first associations organized in each of the following states were as follows: New Hampshire; the Meredith Association in A.D. 1789; New York, the

Warwick Association in A.D. 1791; Ohio, the Miami Association in A.D. 1797; Mississippi, the Mississippi Association in A.D. 1807; Indiana, the Whitewater Association, in 1809; Illinois, the Illinois Association in A.D. 1809; New Jersey, the New Jersey Association in A.D. 1811; Massachusetts, the Boston

Association in A.D. 1811; Alabama, the Bethlehem Association in A.D. 1816; Missouri, the Missouri Association in A.D. 1817; Louisiana, the Louisiana Association in A.D. 1820; Michigan, the Michigan Association in A.D. 1827.

[For Patrick Henry's Defense of Lewis and Joseph Craig and Aaron Bledsoe see *Patrick HENRY and the Baptists Anthology Henry, Patrick, And The Baptists*]

The origin of the Campbellites

Thomas Campbell, an ordained minister of the "Seceder Church of Scotland," left Ireland in 1807. He came to western Pennsylvania. His son, Alexander Campbell, a licentiate minister in the same *church*, followed his father in 1809. The theological views of the Campbells became "altered and liberalized, and regarded by many as both novel and objectionable; hence they and the few who at first sided with them formed an isolated congregation, called the Christian Association, at Brush Run, Washington Country, PA, in 1811." Their special plea was to restore the apostolic Christianity, and, becoming satisfied that immersion was the only scriptural baptism, both father and son and the majority of their members were immersed in 1812 by Elder Loos, a Baptist minister. They soon began to advocate that immersion was the essential part of regeneration or the new birth, without which ordinance there was no pardon or salvation.

On account of this doctrine the Baptist people withdrew fellowship from the followers of the Campbells, and the latter then constituted themselves into a separate body, that have called themselves *Disciples of Christ*, and afterwards some who were more aggressive called themselves *Christians*, but have been generally known by writers as *Campbellites*.

Missionary Baptists: a division over means

About the same time that the Campbells caused so much disturbance in the church another imposter came in view. When the persecution ceased, false teachers crept in to deceive and draw away disciples after them. So it ever has been and ever will be. Persecution never tears up a church, but draws it close together.

Through the influence of some progressive men some missionary societies were formed under the doctrine that the gospel is used as a means in regeneration, and from these views originated the idea that “thousands were going to hell for the want of the gospel.”

Andrew Fuller

As Andrew Fuller is admitted to be the *standard* among the Missionary Baptists, I desire to give a brief sketch of his life and work. He was born in 1754 and died in 1815. His parents were poor, and he had only the barest rudiments of an English education. He concluded that we should offer salvation freely to all sinners, without distinction, and in 1782 he published an essay entitled “The Gospel Worthy of All Acceptation.” This involved him in a bitter controversy of twenty years with those who loved the old Bible principles.

First missionary society

The first missionary society was formed in Kettering, England, by Dr. William Cary, in 1792, and Andrew Fuller was chosen as secretary and remained in this office until death. The latter part of his life was spent in working in this cause.

Black Rock protest

When the Fullerite heresies had been introduced among the Baptists, and produced great discord and turmoil, some of the old veterans of the cross met at Black Rock, Maryland, in 1832, and published a solemn protest against all the newly introduced innovations upon our former faith and order, and made the rejection of the new departure a test of fellowship.

Old School and New School Baptists

To distinguish those who retained the apostolic doctrine from those who departed from it, we consented to be known by the name which has been given us by our opponents, viz., *Old School Baptists*. This appellation we agreed to accept, with the express understanding that it referred only to the school of Christ, and not to any humanly devised system of scholastic divinity. It was not that we had changed in any wise from what we had always been, either in faith or order, but simply to distinguish us from those who had changed, and still chose to be called by our name to take away their reproach. If the New School or Missionary Baptists claim to have a regular, unbroken succession from the Primitive Baptists of the Apostolic Age, upon the ground that they were largely in the majority when the division took place in 1832, will they please tell us why the claim of succession made by Catholics is not equally clear and valid?

The Old School or Primitive Baptists never did consent to any of the anti-Christian doctrines and institutions of the new order, even when mixed up with them in denominational connection; they protested against every practice for which there was no “Thus saith the Lord,” and after laboring to reclaim the disorderly until they found their labors were unavailing, they withdrew fellowship from them. Christ has commanded us to withdraw even from every brother that walks disorderly.

This disturbance continued in different parts of the United States until about the year 1845, and at this time there were about 50,000 of the members who came out and contended for the old principles that had been so much loved by this people all through these ages.

Another extreme

Because of this extreme position on the use of the gospel, some of the Baptist people went to an extreme on the other side, and believed that the actions of all men were predetermined and caused to be by the Lord, and, reasoning from this standpoint, they said that when God gets ready for his people to join the church they would join. This extreme doctrine weakened the church in many places. It caused churches to lock up their doors and quit having meeting, thinking that as it was God’s will, it was as much to his glory for them to quit holding meetings. It is likely that that is true—that it is as much honor to God for them to quit holding meetings as for them to publish to the world that God was compelling men to do what he has told them not to do. Those, however, that have advocated that doctrine have lost hold, and those who exhort the people of God to obedience have, in most places, held up their churches and built up the numbers until they have reached over 200,000; however, a definite number cannot be gotten, as many are opposed to giving the number.

Division over the means question

About the year 1880, there arose a dispute among the ministers of the denomination over the use of means in regeneration, some claiming the preached word was used as a means in the hands of God in giving spiritual life, others claiming that life must be given before the sinner could hear or believe the gospel, and for that reason it could not be used as a means in giving that life.

This resulted in a division in parts of Virginia, Ohio, Indiana, and some other states. Later another effort was made to lead the church off into Arminianism, in about 1902, which resulted in some of the ministers who were weak in the faith leaving us and going to the Missionaries.

We see how that, through the ages, the church has been standing on the same grand principles, trusting in the providence of an all-wise God to support them. As it is written, "In the days of these kings shall the God of Heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed," so we see that in the fulfillment of it God has wonderfully cared for it, not by giving worldly ease or honor, but heavenly blessings, that encouraged the true followers of the meek and lowly Jesus to press on to the mark of their high calling.

As the saints of old went in the mission of the gospel trusting in the Lord, for a financial as well as spiritual support, so the God-sent servants still are willing to do, with prayerful hearts, enthused with the inspiring thought that God's redeeming love was their support, being impressed with a duty to God; they have ever been willing even to press into death for the welfare of the cause. J. Harvey Daily

Holmes, Obadiah

Obadiah HOLMES (*See under Persecution in MASSACHUSETTS*)

Holy Orders

HOLY ORDERS: Sylvester Hassell: The popes founded the **Mendicant Franciscan** and **Dominican Orders** and the **Inquisition** to aid them in counteracting the growing *heretical* sects, either by conversion or extermination. One of the characteristic features of Roman Catholicism is its incorporation of hundreds of religious institutions, male and female, by which to accomplish its purposes.

The Military Orders were established in the twelfth century to fight against the Saracens; and the Mendicant (or Begging) Orders, in the thirteenth century, to war against the *heretics*; just as the **Jesuit Order** was created in the sixteenth century to counteract the Protestant Reformation.

Sacerdotal *Christianity* had, in the thirteenth century ascended a throne so high above the people, teaching them only by ritual, and neutralizing even the small benefit derivable from that teaching by priestly wealth, pride and corruption; and those communions which it denominated *heretical sects* had drawn so near the people by their moral and lowly condition, and by their private and public preaching of the simple gospel of Christ; that the papists realized and sought to obviate this great disadvantage of theirs in winning and retaining the masses.

The Franciscan Order, named for Francis of Assisi (a town in Italy), was founded in 1210; and the Dominican Order, named from Dominic, a Spanish priest, was founded in 1216. The avowed principles of both Orders were poverty, chastity and obedience, the latter to be rendered to the pope through the Superior of the Order.

Those who entered the Orders thereby renounced all freedom of thought and conscience, and became absolutely devoted to the papal service, each Order, like a vast army, acting as the instrument of a single will. Their fundamental principle, not to work, but to live by begging, was in point-blank contradiction to the express Divine commandment both of the Old and the New Testament that man should labor. “The begging friar soon became a by-word for all his ignoble arts, his shameless asking, his importunity which would take no refusal, his creeping into houses, his wheedling of silly women, his having rich men’s persons in admiration because of advantage, his watchings by wealthy death-beds to secure legacies for his house, his promising spiritual benefits, not his to grant, in exchange for temporal gifts. **Bonaventura**, himself the head of the Franciscan Order, and writing not fifty years after Francis’s death, does not scruple to say that already in his time the sight of a begging-friar in the distance was more dreaded than that of a robber.”

These Orders were most successful Catholic missionaries. They spread with wonderful rapidity, and soon became wealthy, proud and corrupt. It was pretended that each of their founders, Francis and Dominic, performed far more miracles than Christ, and that Francis equaled or surpassed Christ in the glories of his birth, transfiguration, gospel and death, insomuch that, in the minds of multitudes, the idolatrous worship of Francis took the place of the professed worship of Christ.

The Dominicans were so eager and successful in hunting and persecuting *heretics* that they were called by the people *Domini Canes*, dogs of the Lord. Teaching that there is virtue in frequent repetitions of forms of prayer, they invented the rosary, a series of prayers and a string of beads by which they were counted.” (*Hassell’s History* ppg 444, 445)

The HUMANITY of Christ

(See Elder Lemuel Potter’s article under *The INCARNATION*)

Huss, John

John HUSS: Sylvester Hassell: On account of the marriage of Richard II of England to Anne of Bohemia, there rose up a close association between these two countries; after her husband's death Anne returned to Bohemia with many of Wycliffe's writings. These productions were also carried with them by several Oxford students who went to the University of Prague; and thus the influence of Wycliffe's writings was added to that of the writings of Milicz, Conrad and Matthias, in the publication of the truth in Bohemia.

John Huss (1369-1415) was a man of poverty and affliction all his life of forty-six years. "His is undoubtedly the honor of having been the chief intermediary in handing on from Wycliffe to Luther the torch which kindled the Reformation, and of having been one of the bravest of the martyrs who have died in the cause of honesty and freedom, of progress and of growth towards the light. He added nothing to the intellectual, but immensely to the moral capital of the world. Seldom have the power of conscience and the imperial strength of a faith rooted in Christ asserted themselves in so commanding and heroic a manner."

He was a humble, upright, God-fearing, straight-forward, unswerving, conscientious man. He did not discern as much of the truth as did Wycliffe; but what he did discern he was neither ashamed nor afraid to proclaim to the world. First a student, then a graduate, a professor and a rector of the University of Prague, he also preached in the Bohemian tongue to the people, and earnestly denounced many of the flagrant abuses of Catholicism, though he did not deny transubstantiation nor any other of the ordinary doctrines of that communion.

Inconsistently, however, with these doctrines, he taught the Bible doctrine of salvation by the electing love and grace of God, and also the right of private judgment in the interpretation of the Scriptures.

Summoned to appear before the Council of Constance he attended under a safe-conduct of the German Emperor Sigismund, and he was not in the least abashed or intimidated in the presence of that imposing and formidable assemblage. He suffered greatly, but most humbly, in the six long months of his imprisonment.

After his condemnation to death on thirty-nine articles, he fell on his knees in the Council, lifted up his hands, appealed to Heaven and prayed for his enemies. He was then degraded from the priesthood with many childish formalities, but he bore all the insults with meekness and dignity. Delivered to the secular arm, he went with fortitude and even cheerfulness to his dreadful death. Reaching the place of execution, he kneeled and prayed, using especially the fifty-first and

thirty-first Psalms, and repeatedly saying, “Into thy hands, Lord, I commit my spirit.”

After being chained by his neck to the stake he was again called upon to recant, but answered that he could not unless convinced of his error; that his chief aim had been to teach men the necessity of repentance and the forgiveness of sins according to the truth of the gospel of Jesus Christ.

When the fire had been kindled, he sang with a loud voice the *Kyrie Eleison*, “Jesus, Son of the living God, have mercy upon me.” His voice was stifled by the flames, but his lips were seen for some time afterwards to move as if in prayer. The ashes of the body were cast into the Rhine.” (*Hassell’s History* ppg 466, 467)

Iconoclastic Controversy, The

The ICONOCLASTIC CONTROVERSY: Sylvester Hassell: The Iconoclastic (or image breaking) controversy lasted from 716 to 842. Both the Greek and the Roman Catholics had long been sunk in the Pagan worship of images or pictures of Biblical personages. In the eighth and ninth centuries six Eastern Roman Emperors assembled councils and issued decrees against this degrading idolatry; but they could not change the hearts of their paganized subjects, and, therefore, they achieved only a temporary success.

The monks, the ignorant and corrupt priestly rulers of the people, monopolized the manufacture of the images and accumulated wealth thereby. Seeing their craft in danger, they contended with all their might against the imperial decrees. They invented lying wonders in regard to the images, build up sophistical arguments, declared that a failure to worship images was worse than the vilest sins, and they succeeded in thus deluding and persuading the people until other emperors arose who seconded their efforts and again (A.D. 842) legalized the old idolatry.

The popes of Rome zealously favored the worship of images all the time, and used their “accustomed policy by elevating the popular idolatrous feeling into a dogma of the faith.”

The Germans, under Charlemagne, in the Council of Frankfort, A.D. 794, declared not against the use but against the worship of images, as idol-worship was the practice of the Pagans against whom they fought. This decision helped to restrain the pope’s championship of images until the death of Charlemagne.

A Greek Monk, **John of Damascus**, in the civil employ of the Mohammedan caliph, was the ablest defender of image worship. He was said to have been “a child of light from his birth,” and was the most learned man in the East. He advocated the worship of images in three elegant orations, which were rapidly and widely distributed by the monks; and he declared that opposition to such worship was Manichaeism, as representing matter as essentially evil.

No wonder that the spiritual-minded Paulicians, who abominated idolatry, were stigmatized as Manichaeans. And no wonder, either, that the spiritually blind and dead honored John Damascus, the child of darkness, as “a child of light.”

Mingling Aristotelianism, traditionalism and Pelagianism, he also wrote a summary of Greek Catholic theology, which was the standard of faith in the communion for a thousand years.” (*Hassell’s History* ppg 421, 422)

I AM, The Great

The Great I AM: Proof Texts: Ex 3:13-15, And Moses said unto God, Behold, when I come unto the children of Israel, and shall say unto them, The God of your fathers hath sent me unto you; and they shall say to me, What is his name? What shall I say unto them. And God said unto Moses, **I am** that **I am**: and he said, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, **I am** hath sent me unto you.

Joh 8:57-58, When said the Jews unto him, Thou art not yet fifty years old, and hast thou seen Abraham? Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Before Abraham was, **I am**.

John 4:25, The woman saith unto him, I know that Messiah cometh, which is called Christ: when he is come, he will tell us all things. Jesus saith unto her, **I** that speak unto thee **am** he.

John 6:35, And Jesus said unto them, **I am** that bread of life; he that cometh to me shall never hunger; and he that believeth on me shall never thirst.

John 8:12, The spake Jesus again unto them, saying, **I am** the light of the world: he that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life.

John 10:9, **I am** the door: by me if any man enter in, he shall be saved, and shall go in and out and find pasture.

John 10:10, **I am** the good shepherd: the good shepherd giveth his life for the sheep.

John 11:25, Jesus said unto her, I am the resurrection, and the life: he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live.

John 13:19, Now I tell you before it come, that, when it come to pass, ye may believe that **I am** he.

John 14:6, Jesus saith unto him, **I am** the way, the truth, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father, but by me.

John 15:1, **I am** the true vine, and my Father is the husbandman.”

John 18:6, As soon then as he had said unto them, **I am** he, they went backward, and fell to the ground.”

Immaculate Conception, The

The IMMACULATE CONCEPTION: Sylvester Hassell: The doctrine of the Immaculate (or Sinless) Conception of the Virgin Mary was broached, about 1140, by certain canons of Lyons, in France. It was opposed by **Bernard** and **Thomas Aquinas** and other leading Catholic theologians of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, as being in conflict with the doctrine of Original Sin; but it was defended by **Duns Scotus** and adopted by the Franciscans in the fourteenth century, impliedly sanctioned by the **Council of Trent** in the sixteenth century, and finally affirmed by Pope Pius IX in 1854. (*Hassell's History pg 435*)

Immortality Of The Soul

IMMORTALITY of the Soul: It was the body Paul was talking about when he said this mortal must put on immortality. He was not talking about the spirit or the soul. The word immortal has more than one meaning. One meaning is, always living and never dying. Another is, always existing. The soul or spirit never ceases to exist. It may be always dying, yet never dead, or never ceasing to exist. The soul or spirit of the child of God is always living and never dying. (*CAYCE vol. 1, ppg 387*)

Incarnation, The

The INCARNATION (Humanity) of Christ: Lemuel Potter: Among other things that Elder Paine preached, besides the no-soul doctrine, as I have stated in another chapter, was that the flesh and bones of Christ and his human nature had existed in heaven from all eternity. I had about as little use for this as for the no-soul doctrine, or the non-resurrection doctrine, and I had frequent conversations with him upon that subject. I also believe that Jesus Christ took everything from the Virgin Mary, his mother, that pertains to his humanity. (*Lemuel Potter*)

“In his days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely; and this is his name whereby he shall be called: The Lord our Righteousness,” Jeremiah 22:6.

This is a portion of the prophecy of Jeremiah, concerning the coming of the Messiah, the Lord Jesus Christ, and is doubtless in perfect harmony with all that is written in the law and in the Psalms and prophets concerning him. As there are some controversies in the present age about the humanity of Christ, and we have often feared, many contentions by some without that strict and impartial investigation of the subject that every one should give before taking a permanent position, we have concluded not only to take a position, but to appeal to inspiration as the author of whatever position we may assume, as well as our warrant for opposing erroneous sentiments on this subject.

The first impression that we wish to make is, that it is the humanity and not the divinity of Christ that this brief chapter will treat of; for while there may be a dissension between ourselves and others on the eternal humanity of Christ, we presume all will agree on his eternal divinity. If, therefore, the eternal existence of Christ should be denied in this investigation of the subject, it will be his humanity. The doctrine of the eternal humanity of Christ, we expect to disprove in this chapter, and to this question the chapter is devoted.

The verse preceding the one at the head of this chapter will doubtless prove advantageous to the cause in which we now engage. “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 in the earth.” We do not apprehend for a moment that any would deny that the prophet in this language has direct allusion to Christ. Being confident that there will be no dispute on this point, we will examine closely what idea the language conveys.

In the first place, allow us to say, that whatever of Christ might have existed before this, the branch here spoken of was something else. And while there are strong advocates for the doctrine that the body of Christ is eternal, we should notice very careful what is said on the subject. Whatever it was that is so

frequently called a branch of David, or seed of David, is what he took from his mother, whether it be blood exclusively, or flesh, bone and blood.

We may also further consider that this branch came out of David, and not out of eternity. “And there shall come forth a root out of the stem of Jesse, and a branch shall grow out of his roots,” Isaiah 11:1. Let us not forget that this is a prophecy, and that if it has ever been fulfilled, it has been since it was spoken by the prophets, and that the only existence this branch had at the time of the prophecy was in the loins of Jesse.

If he did exist in eternity, in flesh and bone he could not be the seed of David according to the flesh. Neither could it be true that he is in any way related to us in fleshly relation. But, in the Scriptural account of the succession of the kings of Israel, we have the following, “And when he removed him (Saul) he raised up unto the David to be their king; to whom also he gave testimony, and said: I Have found David the son of Jesse, a man after my own heart, which shall fulfill all my will. Of this man’s seed hath God, according to his promise, raised unto Israel a Savior, Jesus,” Acts 13:22-23.

Let it be understood that in whatever sense Christ is related to David, is what is meant here. If he was not related to him at all, he is not of his seed; and more, to deny any relation is to deny the truth of the Scriptures quoted. Of this man’s seed God had promised to raise up a Savior, Jesus.

What are we to understand from the expression, “this man’s seed?” Is it not plain to all that the manner in which it is used refers to his lineage, or posterity? Then Christ was of that particular lineage, and as he himself declares, he is the “root and the offspring of David, and the bright and morning star,” Revelation 22:16. The seed of David is doubtless his offspring. It is in this sense that he is the Lion of the tribe of Judah. Revelation 5:5.

It is he that is spoken of in this language: “The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a law-giver from between his feet, until Shiloh come; and unto him shall the gathering of the people be,” Genesis 49:10.

Shiloh, in this text, simply means Christ, and Judah is one of the twelve sons of Jacob, the head of one of the twelve tribes of Israel; and by following the history of this tribe through to the coming of Christ, we are assured that no law-giver came out of it until Christ came. “For it is evident that our Lord sprang out of Judah; of which tribe Moses spake nothing concerning priesthood,” Hebrews 7:14.

If the Lord sprang out of Judah and was carefully preserved through all generations from Judah down to the time of his birth of the virgin Mary, was he not properly of the lineage of Judah? It is, surely in this sense that he is the seed of David according to the flesh.

But the objector says that his flesh and bone and nature were in heaven, and were put forth in the womb of the Virgin Mary when she was overshadowed by the Holy Ghost, and then he took his blood. But a difficulty occurs in this. John, in his vision of the book sealed with seven seals, saw, "A strong angel proclaiming with a loud voice, Who is worthy to open the book, and to loose the seals thereof? And no man in heaven, nor in earth, neither under the earth, was able to open the book, neither to look thereon."

After John had wept, doubtless under the true conviction of his heart of the dreadful state of affairs, looking at and meditating upon the justice of God's wrath kindled against a ruined and wretched world, "One of the elders said, weep not; behold, the Lion of the Tribe of Judah, the root of David hath prevailed to take the book, and to open the seven seals thereof."

The difficulty is, where was the body of Christ, at that time? It could not have been in heaven, nor earth, nor under the earth; for none was found in either that was able to do the work of opening the sealed book. But the branch of David, the son of man, the high priest from the tribe of Judah comes up, according to prophecy, fully authorized to do the work. He, by being a near kinsman, can assume our debts, and is adequate to the task of paying them off for us. Divinity and humanity unite and compose a complete Son of God, and just as complete a Son of man.

But let us proceed with the Scriptural testimony relative to his assuming humanity. The apostle gives the following admonition: "Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus; who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God; but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men. And being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross." [Philippians 2:5,8.](#)

What was it that was made in the likeness of men? It could not have been his body, if it existed in eternity in the form of a man; for that which already existed could not be made. It could not have been human nature if he always possessed that, and yet he was made in the likeness of men. In this it seems clear from the Scriptures already noted, that he became like a man by taking on him the nature of and body of a man. Whatever the nature of a man is, is the human nature, and it is strictly in this sense that he was of the tribe of Judah.

But I am asked, what was it that took this nature? I answer, Divinity. And when, Divinity took upon himself the form and nature of a man, he possessed two natures—human and divine.

When the angel explained to Joseph the condition of Mary, he did not say that an eternal human body or nature had been put forth in the womb of the blessed Virgin, but that something was conceived or begotten in her; he did not say it was of humanity, but of the Holy Ghost, Matthew 1:20. Hence the truth that he is begotten of God, and is known in the Scripture as the only begotten of the Father, John 3:15,18. Jesus being thus begotten of God and born of the Virgin Mary, comes into the world just what had been promised from the time man needed a Savior.

It is sometimes said that “necessity is the mother of invention,” and the doctrine of the eternal humanity of Christ being an invention of some one, we have often wondered what was the necessity of it. For the Bible never mentions eternal humanity at all.

Then let us ask all who may read this, and at the same time believe the doctrine of eternal humanity, what advantage is it to you? Is the doctrine of the perfection of God in all attributes easier established by assuming that position? Is the doctrine of election and salvation by grace through Christ more easily established by holding the doctrine of eternal humanity than it would otherwise be? Is it any advantage to you in establishing any one or more of the doctrinal points in the Bible?

If not, and you find nothing said about eternal humanity, why do you contend for it so earnestly to the great grief of those who wish to have, at least, one “Thus saith the Lord” for what they believe? But it is sometimes urged that God is immutable, yet “It repented him that he had made man on the earth, and it grieved him at his heart,” Genesis 4:6.

It is thought that as God never changes, the one who repented of making man was the humanity of God, or it was Christ. It is further urged that to say otherwise would involve us in a difficulty which we could not solve, for God never changes. But suppose we show that Christ as God is just as immutable as the Father, especially when spoken of as the Lord, as in this case, would it be any easier solved then, by claiming the doctrine of eternal humanity?

Let us see if the Son as well as the Father, is not unchangeable. “But unto the Son, he saith, Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever; a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom. Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity;

therefore God, even thy God, hath appointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows. And thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth; and the heavens are the work of thine hands. They shall perish, but thou remainest; and they shall all wax old as doth a garment. And as a vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed; but thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail,” Hebrews 1:8,12.

In this quotation the Father addresses the Son. And it is certain the language of the text is as emphatic on the immutability of the Son, as it ever occurs relative to the Father; but this is not all, for when we read in the Scriptures of the “three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost,” he says emphatically, “and these three are one,” I John 5:7.

If the three are one, we would think that they were all three immutable alike. One is not contrary to the other, so that one can be unchangeable and the other not.

So, without introducing any further testimony to prove the immutability of Christ, it is plain that to assume the doctrine of eternal humanity does not let us out of the difficulty introduced in the case above referred to. Hence, we now propose to notice him in his original capacity. In his original nature he is God. His name—Son of God—imports divinity; “The same in substance, equal in power and glory,” with the Father and the Holy Ghost. He is called God in the highest; God over all; the true, the great God, Jehovah; Jehovah of hosts.

“In the year that King Uzziah died I saw also the Lord sitting upon a throne high and lifted up, and his train filled the temple,” Isaiah 6:1. The Son of God, or “The Word,” is equally holy with the Father.

“And one cried unto another and said, Holy, Holy, Holy, is the Lord of hosts; the whole earth is filled with his glory,” Isaiah 6:3. The works of creation are ascribed to him. “I said, O my God, take me not away in the midst of my days: thy years are throughout all generations. Of old hast thou laid the foundation of the earth; the heavens are the work of thy hands,” Psalms 102:24-25.

How beautifully this language harmonizes with the first verses of St. John: “In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.” We have known the position taken by those claiming eternal human nature, that there were two Words here; one that was God, which was divine nature, and the other that was with God, which was human nature.

Such extremes are doubtless necessary in the work of advocating the doctrine of the eternal humanity of God. But in this text only one word is mentioned, and

that one is both God and with God. It is one of the three that bear record in heaven; and these three being one God, it is impossible to speak of one and not the others.

If we call upon God in our petitions at a throne of grace, we address the Three; and so, if we call on the Word or Holy Spirit. Either of these is properly God. One of the three, to-wit: the Word is the one mentioned in the verse quoted. The Word was in the beginning, and was truly God; and also was just as truly with God, being with the Father and the Holy Ghost.

“The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him; and without him was not anything made.”

Let us not forget that the subject here is the Word, one of the three that bear record in heaven; and that so far as his existence is concerned, he is co-eternal with the Father.

We read on down to the 14th verse (John 1:14); it is said, “The word was made flesh and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth.” But when we ask, how could that be made flesh, that was always flesh?

We are met with the answer: It does not say when it was made flesh. That indeed is masterly, as if it could be eternal at all, and yet be made. It does not matter when it was made flesh; but was it made flesh at all? If so, flesh is not eternal; for that which is made is not eternal. The Word was eternal, but flesh was not. Hence, when we speak of the Word that was in the beginning, we speak of the Son in his original capacity.

We have already said that in his original nature he is God, and that the works of creation were ascribed to him. “For thy Maker is thine husband. The Lord of Hosts is his name; and thy Redeemer, the Holy One of Israel; the God of the whole earth shall he be called,” Isaiah 54:5.

This quotation tells what he is, the nearness that he sustains to his bride, and what he shall be called in the future. We see all this verified; for after he had taken upon himself the form of a servant, and become obedient unto death, “God [for that reason] hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name; that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth. And that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father,” Philippians 2:9-10.

Although it was by him the worlds were made, and he is truly said to have come down from heaven; yet his flesh and bone; or human nature, did not come down; for it was “made of a woman, made under the law, [not made in heaven,] to redeem them that were under the law,” Galatians 4:4-5.

Notwithstanding he was in the fulness of time, made of a woman, yet in his original state all the attributes of God did belong to him. We have already shown that he was as unchangeable as the Father, so is he everlasting. “But thou, Bethlehem, Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be the Ruler in Israel; whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting,” Micah 5:2. Again, “I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, saith the Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty,” Revelation 1:8.”

Also, “Thus saith the Lord, the King of Israel, and his Redeemer the Lord of Hosts; I am the first and I am the last; and besides me there is no God,” Isaiah 44:6. “Hearken unto me, O Jacob and Israel, my called; I am he; I am the first; I also am the last,” Isaiah 48:12.

The foregoing scriptures doubtless refer to the Word that was with God, and was God, by whom the worlds were framed. Not only does it prove to us conclusively that he possessed the attributes of God before he took our nature, but he still retains all the attributes while here in his humility.

He is not only everlasting, but omniscient and omnipresent. “For where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them,” Matthew 18:20. “And no man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the son of man which is in heaven,” John 3:13.

From this we are clearly taught that even when he was in the flesh he filled immensity. He was here teaching the people, and yet was in heaven. If it was necessary for him to have a body in eternity in order to exist as the Son of man it would not become necessary for him to have two bodies; one on earth, and one in heaven.

But this text is sometimes used to prove that he came down from heaven in a body, undertaking to show from it that whatever of Jesus ascends to heaven first came down from heaven. But it always seems to prove too much when it is all quoted, and according to the interpretation they give it, that nothing will go to heaven only what comes from there, the body of the Savior will be excluded from heaven; for he is here in the body, and says no man has ascended up to heaven but the Son of man which is in heaven.

His body is not in heaven when he makes use of the expression. This is not all we may learn from this text; for something has descended from heaven, and whatever is called the Son of man now without a human body, may also have existed in eternity as the Son of man without a human body.

But it seems that this is as good an opportunity as is afforded in the Bible anywhere for us to ascertain whether the body of Christ did come down from heaven or not. Whatever was in heaven called the Son of man was that which had ascended; and that which had ascended, had come down from heaven. If the body had not ascended, it had not come down from heaven, and yet something had come down from heaven, and that something had ascended while the body of Jesus was still on earth.

Hence, it is easily understood from this that when the Bible gives any account of the Savior coming down from heaven, it has direct allusion to something besides his body. It must therefore be understood to be that which was in the beginning with God, which is the Word.

He, in this capacity, as the Son of man, held the office of Redeemer before the creation; for, in view of his fulfilling this office, and as a part of his work, the creation of other worlds, as well as our own, and all that it contains, was assigned him by the Father. He therefore, existed before he appeared in the world; yea, he sat upon the mediatorial throne and executed his office from the beginning of time.

Divinity is essential to his office as Redeemer. His divinity lays the foundation and qualifies him for the assumption of the duties of his office. As divine he owes no obedience to that violated law under which sinners are condemned; on him, as the Son of God, that law has no claims whatever.

As divine, he has a perfect right to undertake the office and work of the Redeemer if he shall so choose to do. As divine, he possesses every attribute of wisdom, power, holiness, justice, goodness and truth in an infinite degree to enable him without the shadow of failure, to meet every demand, and perform every duty required of him on behalf of God and man, and, finally, descends from heaven to earth, assumes human nature, takes upon him a body of human flesh, bone and blood, to which body, his divinity adds an infinite dignity and value, and all to his obedience, suffering and death. He is able to stand before the Eternal God, and bear all his just demands against his creatures, and he is also able to stand before men as "their Lord and their God," to deliver them from their enmity by his Holy Spirit, to raise up from corruption and misery, clothe them with his glorious righteousness, and reconcile them to God.

Help is therefore laid upon one, not only willing, but able to save. In his assumed nature he is man. He came not to assist angels but men; therefore, was he “the seed of the woman,” “partaker of flesh and blood” and one “made under the law,” otherwise he could not have obeyed, suffered and died, nor been our example, and faithful sympathizing High Priest.

“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,” Hebrews 2:15,18.

Two distinct natures, human and divine, are (in a manner incomprehensible to us) united, and form one person, Immanuel, God with us. Everything belonging to God is ascribed unto and belongs to him; and everything belonging to man is ascribed unto and belongs to him, sin excepted. Such is the Scriptural account of our most glorious Redeemer.” (*Lemuel Potter—BAPTIST WATCHMAN 1874*)

John Gill “Though he, a divine Person, possessed of the divine nature, was made flesh, or became man; the divine nature in him was not changed into the human nature, nor the human nature into the divine, nor a third nature made out them both. Was this the case, the divine nature would have been changeable; but so it was not; for as it has been commonly said, “Christ remained what he was, and assumed what he was not;” and what he assumed added nothing to his divine person; he was only manifest in the flesh; he neither received any perfection, nor imperfection, from the human nature; though that received dignity and honor by its union to him., and was adorned with the gifts and graces of the Spirit without measure, and is now advanced at the right hand of God. Nor was any change made in the divine nature by the sufferings of Christ; the divine nature is impassible, and is one reason why Christ assumed the human nature, that he might be capable of suffering and dying in the room and stead of his people; and though the Lord of life and glory was crucified, and God purchased the church with his own blood, and the blood of Christ is called the blood of the Son of God; yet he was crucified in the human nature only, and his blood was shed in that, to which the divine person gave virtue and efficacy, through its union to it; but received no change by all this” (*Gill*)

Independents, The

The INDEPENDENTS: *Sylvester Hassell:* The Independents, originating in England about the year 1581 under the leadership of **Robert Browne** (hence first called Brownists), and being deserted by Browne, who in 1590 conformed to the “Church of England,” chose **John Robinson**, a pious Calvinist, as their pastor in

1603, and in 1608, to secure liberty of conscience and worship, fled to Amsterdam, and in 1609 to Leyden, in Holland; and one hundred and one of them, for the same purpose, emigrated, with their Ruling elder William Brewster, in the **Mayflower**, in 1620, to Plymouth, Massachusetts.

These emigrants (forty-one men, with their families) are known as the “**Pilgrim Fathers**;” they were mostly poor men and artisans; they advocated the self-government of each local church, and the admission of none but true believers to the Lord’s Supper; and they were not much disposed to persecute others for having different religious views and practices from themselves.

But in 1629 the “**Puritans**,” or Episcopalians, who wished to purify the discipline and worship of the “Church of England,” and still not separate from that “Church,” began emigrating to Massachusetts. They consisted in great part of the professional and middle classes; and, though establishing a system of Congregationalism, yet like their brethren in England they set up a sort of theocratic state, and strove to secure uniformity of worship by rigorous laws for the civil punishment of heresy and schism. They unscripturally retained the pedobaptism of the “Church of England;” and they therefore wreaked their peculiar vengeance on Baptists and Quakers.

The “Church of England” was established by law in Virginia, the Carolinas and Georgia, in Maryland after the decline of the Roman Catholic influence, and in New York after its cession by the Dutch;” and its tyrannical and persecuting spirit, combined with its lack of “Bishops” and its dependence on England, caused it to languish in a country destined by Providence to be the home of religious liberty. (*Hassell’s History ppg 518, 519*)

Infant Salvation

INFANT SALVATION: C. H. Cayce: Now, let us say that God’s elect are all saved. Those who are not of God’s elect are not saved. Then, if all who die in infancy are saved, it necessarily follows that all who die in infancy are of the elect of God. Then the question would necessarily be, Are all those saved who die in infancy? To this we would most emphatically say, YES. Then, we say that those not of God’s elect do not die in infancy. Those who die in infancy are embraced in the number of God’s elect, and all of God’s elect are saved; hence, all that die in infancy are saved.

In Mark 10:15, the Savior says: “Verily I say unto you, Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall not enter therein.” You must receive the kingdom of God just as a little child receives it, or you shall not

receive it at all. If you receive the kingdom of God as a little child, and a little child misses it, then you will miss it, too. If one of the Adam's race receives the kingdom of God, then every little child receives it. Not only is this true, but the language carries with it the very idea that a little child receives the kingdom of God—not simply that one special little child receives it, but *a little child*. That expression embraces every little child. It is therefore true that every one who dies in infancy is saved. (*Cayce's Editorials vol. 2, ppg 394*)

S.A. Paine: The following article was written in response to the Church of Christ denomination, whom Elder Paine refers to as *Campbellites*. hlh

The Bible says the “wicked are born,” therefore every claim of infantile purity is subverted forever. Campbellism says: “The holy are estranged from the womb, they (the holy) go astray as soon as they reach **the age of accountability** and as a result become wicked.”

Friendly reader, which will you have, the Bible or Campbellism? I speak of Campbellism in its latter day dress, as it is today.

Tradition may tell you to choose the latter, but which is true? Remember “If the truth make you free you shall be free indeed.”

The only turn our friends endeavor to make here is to charge infant damnation upon the advocates of depravity, not because we believe or advocate it, but to prejudice the minds of others against us. Is it conclusive that, because an infant is by nature a sinner, that those of them that die, die in their sin and go to torment? By no means. While we believe in original sin, we also believe there is a reigning, all-prevailing remedy for sin, which is sent to the heart of every infant that dies in infancy, preparing it for glory. This is sovereign grace. Grace saves every infant that is taken from us. The child is saved like the adult and the adult like the child. Proof: “Verily (truly) I say unto you, whosoever shall not receive the Kingdom as a little child, shall in no wise enter therein,” Luke 18:17.

If the child receives it upon its original purity, so does the adult. And if the adult receives it conditionally on their part, so does the little child. The Bible declares they must receive it alike. As the adult can not receive the Kingdom upon inherent purity, and the child can not receive it conditionally, we conclude that neither plan is correct, as neither can save both classes.

But God's plan can and will save both classes, which plan is grace. Grace is so well adapted to the needs of sinners that it is like a mighty river, flows to the hearts of all for whom it was prepared, regardless of their conditions, stations, or

environments of life. It saves heathens, idiots, infants, yea, all the Son received in the gift of the Father. "All the Father giveth me shall come to me," says Jesus. (*Writings of Elder S.A. Paine*)

Infralapsarianism

INFRALAPSARIANISM (*See under John CALVIN*)

Innocent III

INNOCENT III: Sylvester Hassell: Innocent III. Was pope from 1198 to 1216. The papacy reached the zenith of its power in him. He was the Commander-in-chief of the armies and navies of Christendom. No other man ever wielded such power in both "Church" and State. He ruled from the Jordan to the Atlantic, and from the Mediterranean to beyond the Baltic. (*Hassell's History pg 442*)

Inquisition, The

The INQUISITION: Sylvester Hassell: The inquisition, the special and unprecedented enormity of Roman Catholicism, surpassing, in cold systematic treachery and cruelty, the wildest imaginations of romance, the most formidable engines devised by popery to subdue the souls and bodies, the reason and the consciences of men, to its sovereign will, was founded during the Albigensian war to extirpate those obstinate *heretics* and against the Jews and Moors.

The Greek Emperor Theodosius I., in 382, had instituted the first Inquisition against *heresy* especially Manicheism, and had enforced the first death penalty for religious opinion. The Inquisition was revived in more awful form by the Twelfth General Council (Fourth Lateran) in 1215, and its code established by the Council of Toulouse in 1229. It was made a permanent tribunal in 1233, and put in charge of the **Dominican Order** in 1234.

Special Courts (independent of the local authorities) for hunting out and exterminating "heretics" had been established under Dominic and his followers during the crusade against the Albigenses. "The base of the code of the Inquisition," says Milman, "was a system of delation at which the worst of the Pagan emperors might have shuddered as iniquitous; in which the sole act deserving of mercy might seem to be the Judas like betrayal of the dearest and most familiar friend, of the kinsman, the parent, the child.

The Court sat in profound secrecy; no advocate might appear before the tribunal; no witness was confronted with the accused; who were the informers, what the charges, except the vague charge of heresy, no one knew.

If the suspected heretic refused to testify concerning himself and others similarly suspected, he was cast into a dungeon—a dungeon the darkest in those dreary ages—the most dismal, the most foul, the most noisome. No falsehood was too false, no craft too crafty, no trick too base, for this calm, systematic moral torture which was to wring further confession against himself, denunciation against others. If the rack, the pulleys, the thumbscrew and the boots were not yet invented or applied (as they were afterwards), it was not in mercy.

It was the deliberate object to break the spirit. The prisoner was told that there were witnesses, his death was inevitable. In the meantime, his food was to be slowly, gradually diminished, till body and soul were prostrate. He was then to be left in darkness, solitude, silence. Then were to come one or two of the faithful, dexterous men, who were to speak in gentle words of interest and sympathy—“Fear not to confess that you have had dealings with those men, the teachers of heresy, because they seemed to you men of holiness and virtue; wiser than you have been deceived.”

These dexterous men were to speak of the Bible, of the Gospels, of the epistles of Saint Paul, to talk the very language, the scriptural language, of the heretics. “These foxes,” it was said, “can only be unearthed by fox-like cunning.” But if all this art failed, or did not perfectly succeed, then came terror and the goading to despair. “Die you must—bethink you of your soul.” Upon which if the desperate man said, “If I must die, I will die in the true faith of the gospel,” he had made his confession; justice claimed its victim.

The Inquisition had three penalties; for those who recanted, penance in the severest form which the Court might enact; for those not absolutely convicted, perpetual imprisonment; for the obstinate or the relapsed, death—death at the stake, by the secular arm. The Inquisition, with specious hypocrisy, while it prepared and dressed up the victim for the burning, looked on with calm and approving satisfaction, as it had left the sin of lighting the fire to pollute other hands.

In case of sickness, however severe, no “heretic” was allowed the services of a physician. “Friends and relatives were admitted to testify, but only against the prisoner, never in his favor.” The property of the condemned heretic—often even before condemnation, pretendedly to pay the expenses of the mock trial—was confiscated, the most of it being given to the accusers and judges.

The Inquisition (which was never established in England) was established in France, Spain, Italy and Germany during the thirteenth century, steadily increased in power and vigor through the fourteenth century, became the most terrible at the close of the fifteenth and during the sixteenth centuries, steadily declined during the seventeenth century, abandoned torture and was almost abolished during the eighteenth century, and has been partially revived, with the old murderous will, but with little power for harm, on account of the separation of *Church* and State, in the nineteenth century.

Its last capital punishments were those of a Jew who was burnt, and a Quaker schoolmaster hanged in Spain, in 1826. Roman Catholic writers of the present century acknowledge the horrible deeds of the Inquisition, and seek to justify them; and large numbers of Catholics, especially the Jesuits, yearns for the reestablishment of the Satanic institution, with all its original powers. The Prince of Darkness and his worshipers still passionately love the old deeds of darkness of the darkest ages of the world. But God is mightier than Satan, and has never left himself without witnesses on earth. (*Hassell's History* ppg 445, 446)

Inquisition, The Spanish

The Spanish INQUISITION: Sylvester Hassell: The notorious Spanish Inquisition was established at Seville in 1480 by the blind religious zeal of Queen Isabella and the unscrupulous avarice of King Ferdinand and of Pope Sixtus IV—the grand object of this infamous institution being to *make money* by the confiscation of the property of wealthy *heretics*. In 1481, the first year of its operation, two thousand persons were burned. In the sixteen years of the generalship of **Thomas de Torquemada** (1483-1498), it is said that 8,800 were condemned to the flames, 6,500 burned in effigy, and 90,000 subjected to imprisonment, confiscation and other penalties. Llorente, the secretary and official historian of the Spanish Inquisition, estimates that that institution, during the whole period of its existence, burned about 30,000 persons alive, and condemned about 300,000 to punishments less severe than death. In 1492 persecution was begun against the Jews, of whom 500,000 were expelled from Spain and their wealth confiscated. In seventy years the population of Spain was reduced from 10,000,000 to 6,000,000 by the banishment of Jews, Moors, and Morescoes (*Christianized Moors*), the most

wealthy and intelligent of the inhabitants of that country.
(*Hassell's History pg 470*) (See also under *AUGUSTINE* and *The Temporal Power of the POPE*)

Interdict, The

The INTERDICT (*See under The Temporal Power of the POPE*)

Investitures, The Controversy of

The Controversy of INVESTITURES (*See under HILDEBRAND*)

Invitation System, The

The INVITATION System (*See under The GOSPEL*)

Islam

ISLAM (*See also ALLAH*)

Israel, The Kingdom Of

The Kingdom of ISRAEL: Sylvester Hassell: King Solomon was succeeded by his son Rehoboam; and very soon thereafter the ten tribes revolted, and set up Jeroboam to reign over them. This separation continued until the return of the Jews from the Babylonish captivity, when what was left to return, both of Jews and Israelites, united as one nation again, and were thenceforward called Jews. The ten tribes had revolted twice before this against the throne of David; first, under Abner and Ishbosheth, after the death of Saul, for seven years; second, under Absalom, and at his death under Sheba, for a short continuance. This last revolt (under Rehoboam) was about the year B.C. 975. The ten tribes were captured and carried away into Assyria by Shalmaneser, B.C. 721, which gave them an independence of the throne of David for 254 years. The kingdom of Judah, composed of the tribes of Judah and Benjamin and the most of Levi, continued from the setting up of Rehoboam to the first taking of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar (a period of 369 years), B.C. 606, from which the date of the seventy years' captivity commences.

According to this, the two kingdoms, that of Judah and Israel, were separated 439 years, say from 975 to 536 B.C., when the seventy years were ended. During all this period of separation, however, they were one people still, in feeling, in origin, in religion and destiny, and had more or less intercourse with

each other. Besides this, many from the ten tribes, during the wicked reigns of Jeroboam and his impious successors, before Israel was carried off into Assyria.

It is deplorable to notice the sad declension of the ten tribes after this third revolt until carried away. They had not a righteous prince to rule over them during the whole period from Jeroboam the first to Hoshea the last. All were wicked, all idolatrous, and caused Israel to sin. What must have been the mortification and suffering of God's spiritual worshipers among them for that long 254 years! They had nineteen kings to rule over them in nine distinct dynasties. Of these nineteen, seven were murdered by conspirators, namely, Nadab, Elah, Jehoram, Zachariah, Shallum, Pekahiah, and Pekah; one, Zimri, after a brief reign, to avoid falling into the hands of his competitor to the throne, burnt himself up in his house; and the last, Hoshea, was dethroned and carried a captive into Syria; eight only died quietly in their beds, namely Jeroboam, Baasha, Omri, Jehu, Jehoahaz, Jeroboam II., and Menahem.

The kingdom of Israel was scourged with wars, and these were mostly with the kingdom of Judah. Their armies or populations were nearly the same, Judah having, as is supposed, two-thirds the number of Israel, some of the tribes having run down very low, and many persons uniting their fortunes to Judah, a powerful and the most religious tribe. The advantages gained on either side were about equal in the end.

“The separate history of the idolatrous kingdom of Israel may be well divided into four periods: 1st Idolatry taking root—about fifty years, during the reigns of Jeroboam I., Nadab, Baasha, Elah and Zimri, and during the prophecies of Ahijah and Jehu. 2nd. Idolatry rampant—about forty-eight years, during the reigns of Omri, Ahab, Ahaziah and Jehoram, and during the prophecies of Elijah, Micaiah and Elisha. 3rd. Idolatry slightly checked—about one hundred and two years, during the reigns of Jehu, Jehoahaz, Joash, Jeroboam II., and Zachariah, and during the prophecies of Jonah, Hosea, and Amos. 4th. Idolatry terminating in ruin—about fifty-four years, during the reigns of Shallum, Menahem, Pekahiah, Pekah, and Hoshea, and during the prophecy of Oded.”—W.G. Blaikie.”

The enemies most to be dreaded by Israel were the Assyrians, who finally conquered and swept them away. Tiglath-pileser, king of Assyria, in the reign of Pekah, B.C. 740, conquered and carried into captivity the two tribes, Reuben and Gad, the half tribe of Manasseh, east of Jordan, Naphtali, and portions of Galilee on the west (I Kings 15:20; I Chronicles 5; II Kings 15). The others of the tribes in the reign of Hoshea, B.C. 721, were carried away captive by Shalmaneser, king of Assyria.

The captivity of the ten tribes was a punishment from God, “because they obeyed not the voice of the Lord their God, but transgressed his covenant, and all that Moses the servant of the Lord commanded, and would not hear them nor do them.” (II Kings 17:18). This captivity was a terrible punishment to idolaters, but not more than they deserved and not more than God had already threatened. He was faithful to carry out his long-declared purpose, known to these wicked rulers and these wicked people, from generation to generation, by his holy prophets (II Kings 17:20-23; I Kings 14:7-16).

This is the last account we have of these tribes as an independent and separate body of people. History is silent concerning them afterwards. Many of their descendants returned to Jerusalem, no doubt, upon the cessation of the Babylonian captivity, when Israel and Judah became one stick again (Ezekiel 37:16-17). The Babylonians conquered the Assyrians and carried many Israelites to that country, probably before the Jews were taken there from Jerusalem. When they met, they fraternized, and felt to be one people. (*Hassell’s History* ppg 121-123)

James, The Book of

The Book of JAMES: *Sylvester Hassell:* James was not an apostle, but the brother of the Lord, and the first pastor of the church in Jerusalem, where he died a martyr. He was a man of the most exemplary piety, being called even by the Jews “the Just,” and he enjoyed almost apostolic authority, especially in Judea and among Jewish Christians. He had high regard for the Mosaic Law. His epistle is addressed to “the twelve tribes scattered abroad,” and is directed against a one-sided, speculative, dead, Antinomian faith, and shows the practical, ethical side of the doctrine of Christ.

James exhorts his readers to good works of faith, warns them against a merely nominal orthodoxy, covetousness, pride, and worldliness, and comforts them in view of present and future trials and persecutions. Though meager in doctrine, it is rich in comfort and lessons of holy living, based on faith in Jesus Christ, “the Lord of glory.” It is a commentary upon Christ’s sermon on the mount. James was unwilling to impose the yoke of circumcision upon the Gentiles (Acts 15:19-20), and he recognized Paul as the Apostle of the Gentiles, giving him the right hand of fellowship (Galatians 2:9).

There is no real contradiction between James and Paul on the subject of faith and works. James says: “Faith is dead without works.” Paul says: “Works are dead without faith.” Both are right; James in opposition to dead orthodoxy, Paul in opposition to self-righteous legalism. James does not demand works without

faith, but works prompted by faith; while Paul, on the other hand, likewise declares faith worthless which is without love, though it removes mountains. James looks mainly at the fruit, Paul at the root.

Paul solves the difficulty in one phrase—“faith working through love” (Galatians 5:6). By *faith* Paul never means dead faith, but James sometimes does. James maintains the absolute necessity of living faith (James 1:3,6; 2:1,5,18,22-23,26; 5:15); and Paul emphasizes the value of good works as evidencing our faith, profiting others, and glorifying God (Romans 2:13; 12-16; I Corinthians 16; II Corinthians 9; Galatians 5:6; Ephesians 2:10; 5:6; Colossians 1:10; 3; 4; Philippians 4; II Thessalonians 2:17; I Timothy 2:10; 5:10; 6:18; II Timothy 3:17; Titus 2:7-14; 3:8). Paul’s life of self-sacrificing labors for Christ peaks more loudly on the importance of works of love than all his writings.” (*Hassell’s History pg 211*)

Jansenists

JANSENISTS (*See under Blaise PASCAL*)

Jehoahaz

JEHOAHAZ Josiah’s wicked son, Jehoahaz, succeeded him, and was deposed and carried away captive into Egypt by Pharaoh-necho, in three months after his coronation, and died there. Pharaoh-necho made **Eliakim**, another son of Josiah, king in his stead, changed his name to Jehoiakim, and laid him and his people under tribute. Urijah prophesied against the city and the land, for which Jehoiakim had him slain with the sword, and his body cast contemptuously into the grave of the common people.” (*Hassell’s History ppg 131, 132*)

Jehoiachin

JEHOIACHIN (*See under JEHOIAKIM*)

Jehoiada

JEHOIADA (*See under Ahaziah*)

Jehoiakim

JEHOIAKIM: Sylvester Hassell: The godless and reckless Jehoiakim, in the fourth year of his reign, rebelling against Babylon, Nebuchadnezzar captured

Jerusalem, and carried off to Babylon the vessels of the temple, and a number of royal and noble, handsome and gifted Hebrew youths, including Daniel, Hananiah (Shadrach), Mishael (Meshach), and Azariah (Abednego), to be trained in Chaldean learning for his service.

Jehoiakim, after reigning three years as a vassal of Nebuchadnezzar, rebelled again, and was conquered and put to death, as Jeremiah had prophesied. His son **Jehoiachin** (or Jeconiah, or Coniah—Jah or Jehovah having abandoned him) was placed on the throne of Judah by Nebuchadnezzar, but in three months and ten days he was dethroned by Nebuchadnezzar because of rebellion; and the conqueror carried off to Babylon the king and all his officers, and all the chief men and soldiers and artisans, including Ezekiel and Shimei, the grandfather of Mordecai, and the remaining treasures of the temple and palace—leaving none but the poorest people in Judah. **Mattaniah**, the uncle of Jehoiachin, under the name of Zedekiah was made king over the miserable remnant.” (*Hassell’s History pg 133*)

Jehoram

JEHORAM: Sylvester Hassell: The two prosperous reigns of Asa and Jehoshaphat were soon shorn of their excellency by the wicked reign of Jehoram, son of Jehoshaphat. He married the daughter of Ahab, and engaged in the wickedness and idolatries of that abominable house. He murdered in cold blood his brothers who were better than he, restored the idolatrous high places on the mountains of Judah, and endeavored to compel all the people to forsake the worship of the true God and go with him in all his impurities of idolatrous worship.

In the full tide of his apostasy he received a letter, written to him by the prophet Elijah, who died in the reign of his father, but who saw what the future course of this young prince would be when he came to the throne, and therefore wrote this letter, to be handed to him in proper time. He had fulfilled the prophecy to the letter.

He had not walked in the ways of Jehoshaphat, his father, nor in the ways of Asa, king of Judah: but had walked in the way of the kings of Israel, and made Judah and the inhabitants of Jerusalem to go a whoring, like to the whoredoms of the house of Ahab; and had slain his brethren of his father’s house which were better than he.

All this he had done! And what was to follow? Heavy and miserable judgments, unless he should repent, and Judah with him. “Thus saith the Lord, Because thou

hast so done, behold with a great plague will the Lord smite thy people, and thy children, and thy wives, and all thy goods; and thou shalt have great sickness, by disease of thy bowels, until thy bowels fall out by reason of the sickness day by day.”

This letter of Elijah was despised both by king and people. The judgments followed rapidly. The Edomites revolted from under his hand. The Philistines and Arabians invaded his territories, entered Jerusalem, sacked his palace, carried away his wives and all his sons save one. “And after all this the Lord smote him in his bowels, with an incurable disease; and after the end of two years his bowels fell out by reason of his sickness: so he died of sore diseases, without being desired, after a reign of eight years; his people made no burning for him, and gave him no burial in the sepulchres of the kings” (II Kings 8; II Chronicles 21).

What a remarkable letter was this! Was such a one ever written or received before that day? God is a being of infinite wisdom and foreknowledge, and he inspired His prophet to write a letter to this man before he came to the throne, telling him what he should do to others, what others would do to him, and with what disease he should die. He died, leaving a weak and wicked nation behind him. (*Hassell's History ppg 126, 127*)

Jehoshaphat

JEHOSHAPHAT: Sylvester Hassell: Asa's son Jehoshaphat succeeded him, and he proved another worthy son of the house of David. One of his first acts was to conclude peace with Israel, which had been broken for sixty years. There had been trouble and war, more or less, existing between the two kingdoms from B.C. 975 to 915. This wise and virtuous king suppressed it altogether.

He was zealous for the cause of God. He did more than others before him—he became a preacher—a public instructor in the law of the Lord. He went to the extent of his dominion exhorting the people to obey God, keep his law inviolate, and worship the God of their fathers exclusively. And he established judges throughout his territories, from Beersheba to Mount Ephraim, in the various fenced cities, he exhorted them to discharge their duties in the fear of the Lord.

He not only went himself, but he commissioned others to go and teach the people in the knowledge of the Lord and remove ignorance from their minds. “He sent five princes, accompanied by nine Levites and two priests, to teach in the cities

of Judah: and he taught in Judah, and had the book of the law with them, and went about all the cities of Judah and taught the people.

This was in advance of anything ever before done in Judea, and seemed pointing to the spread of the gospel under the Christian dispensation. Our blessed Savior both preached His own gospel in the cities and villages of Palestine, and called and qualified his disciples to do the same thing.

Jehoshaphat was unfortunate in agreeing to make an alliance with Ahab, king of Israel, and with Ahab's son and grandson—Ahaziah and Joram. It was no advantage to Israel and great disadvantage to Judah. He was greatly blessed of the Lord, however; he strengthened his kingdom, and had an army, prepared for war, numbering one million, one hundred and sixty thousand men—seven hundred and eighty thousand of Judah and three hundred and eighty thousand of Benjamin.” (*Hassell's History* ppg 125, 126)

Jeremiah

JEREMIAH: *Sylvester Hassell:* Nineteen years before the accession of Jehoiakim, Jeremiah, the son of Hilkiah, a priest of Anathoth, three miles north of Jerusalem, in the territory of Benjamin, having before his birth been ordained of the Lord a prophet, had been called when a mere child to the sacred office. Naturally gentle, sensitive and timid, he was made, by the indwelling Spirit of God, strong and bold, and fearless—a defenced city, an iron pillar and a brazen wall—against the wicked king, and princes, and priests, and false prophets, and people of the land, to declare to them their religious superficiality and hypocrisy, to denounce their idolatries and corruptions, and to predict that God would for their abominations, carry them into seventy years' captivity in Babylon; but that, though he would make a full end of their Babylonian oppressors, he would not make a full end of them, but in covenant faithfulness would visit them again and restore them to their own land.

Jeremiah was accused of being a traitor to his own people and a friend to the Babylonians: he was mocked and persecuted more than any other prophet—hated, taunted, derided, put in stocks and in a miry prison, and sought to be killed. Both literally and spiritually, more than any other servant of God in the Old Testament dispensation, he experienced the fellowship of the suffering of Christ—his whole life being one long martyrdom in the cause of truth. At times, when left to himself, he became bitterly despondent, and bewailed, like Job in his extremest agony, the day on which he was born—feeling that his whole life was a failure (as the people did not heed his warnings), and doubting whether his very mission was not a delusion, and thinking that he would afterwards keep

silent; but the word of the Lord was like burning fire in his bones, and he continued to deliver his solemn prophetic messages, and his eyes became fountains of tears for the sins and coming calamities of his people.

Yet, “in that stormy sunset of prophecy, he beholds, in spirit, the dawn of a brighter and eternal day. He sees that, if there is any hope of salvation for his people, it cannot be by a return to the old system and the old ordinances, divine though they once had been (xxx.31).

There must be a new (and spiritual) covenant. The relations of God and man must rest, not on an outward law with its requirements of obedience, but on that of an inward fellowship with him, and the consciousness of entire dependence. For all this he saw clearly there must be a personal center”—the Messiah, the righteous and royal branch of David, the Lord our righteousness, bringing salvation to Israel, writing his law in their minds and hearts, making a personal and inward revelation of himself to them as their God, and forgiving their iniquities (xxiii.5,6; xxxi.31-34).

Of this Messiah, in his persecution by and suffering for his people there was no more striking human type than Jeremiah, who is believed to have been finally carried to Tahpanhes in Egypt, and there stoned by the Jews, irritated by his rebukes.” (*Hassell’s History* ppg 132, 133)

Jerome of Prague

JEROME of Prague: *Sylvester Hassell:* Jerome of Prague (1365-1416), the ardent friend and disciple of Hus, was even a more able, learned and eloquent man. He was a graduate of the University of Prague, and a “doctor of divinity” in the Universities of Paris, Cologne, Heidelberg and Oxford. He traveled through many countries of Europe, circulating the writings of Wycliffe, and declaiming against the corruption of the clergy.

Going to Constance to defend Hus, he was arrested and thrown into a fetid dungeon. “Four months of weary imprisonment, in chains, in darkness, on meager diet; the terror, as himself owned, of the stake; sickness; the bland promises of some; the awful threats of others; the persuasions of weaker friends, broke his spirit. In a public session of the Council he retracted all errors against the Catholic faith, especially those of Wycliffe and Hus.”

But his remorseless enemies declared that his recantation was ambiguous; new articles were drawn up against him, and he was brought again to trial. His courage now returned, and he declared that he deeply regretted his cowardly recantation, and was resolved to maintain even to death the tenets of Wycliffe and Hus, believing them to be the true and pure doctrine of the gospel, just as their lives were blameless and godly.

In a powerful and magnificent oration of twelve hours, occupying two days of the Council, he replied to the accusations against him, and vindicated the scriptural truth of the principles to which he had devoted his life; and from his iniquitous judges he appealed to the Supreme Judge, before whom they, as well as himself, should shortly appear. Condemned to death, he prayed for his persecutors. His heroism shone with increasing splendor as he approached the scene of martyrdom. With cheerful countenance he sung many psalms and hymns to God. Bound to the stake, and enclosed up to his breast with fagots, he sung with deep untrembling voice, “*Hanc animam, in flammis, offero, Christe, tibi*”—This soul of mine, in flames of fire, O Christ, I offer Thee.” His ashes were also cast into the Rhine.

The execution of Hus and Jerome occasioned a storm of passionate indignation in Bohemia and Moravia. After the burning of Hus, an assembly of fifty-four Bohemian and Moravian nobles endorsed his doctrines, and protested against the action of the Council of Constance, and leagued themselves together to protect the free preaching of God’s word on their estates. Pope Martin V. inaugurated a crusade against Bohemia; and in a war of eleven years (1420-1431), characterized by the greatest atrocity, the Bohemians were almost uniformly victorious.

The horrible Catholic butcheries of the Bohemian prisoners were met by equally awful reprisals on the part of the Hussites, from whom the spirit of Hus departed more and more as the hideous conflict went on. They became divided into two factions—one called the Calixtines (from calix, a cup), who chiefly demanded the restoration of the cup to the *laity* in communion; and the other Taborites (from Mount Tabor, their principal fortress, sixty miles south of Prague), who desired to sweep away all traditions and return to the simplicity of the apostolic church.

The Catholics, not being able to conquer these stubborn *heretics*, made, in the Council of Basel, in 1433, some illusory concessions to the Calixtines, which were withdrawn by Pope Pius II. in 1462; but these arts accomplished their purpose in permanently dividing the Bohemians and reducing the Calixtines into submission.

The Taborites were signally defeated by the Catholics in 1434, and their stronghold was taken and destroyed in 1453. The remnant fled to the borders of Moravia and Silesia, and reappeared about 1460 as the Bohemian Brethren (Unitas Fratrum), who utterly renounced all war and tradition and sought to return to the apostolic usages; and who, though cruelly persecuted by the Catholics, fled to the deserts and caves (being called Cave-dwellers), and

overcame now, not by the weapons of carnal warfare, but by the blood of the Lamb.

Some joined the Reformers in the sixteenth century. Others retained a separate organization; and to them the Moravians of the eighteenth century retrace a succession. The galling feudal and ecclesiastical oppressions suffered by the Bohemians were the chief cause of their taking up arms.

The Lords had long been encroaching more and more on the peasants' rights, increasing their burdens and decreasing their privileges, and reducing them to almost abject slavery. They had to work for their lords in fair weather, and for themselves on rainy days; and were not allowed their common rights in the pastures, forests, and rivers. On holidays they had to turn out and gather wild fruit for the folks at the Castle.

When a peasant died, the lord's agent came and carried off from the widow's home the *heriot* or best chattel, perhaps the horse or cow on which the family was dependent. And to the Catholic priests the peasants had to pay the tenth of all their corn, grass, wood, colts, calves, lambs, pigs, geese, chickens, eggs, wool, milk, honey, wax, cheese and butter; and, besides, they had to pay the priests money for baptism, for confirmation, for marriage, for confession, for indulgences, for extreme unction, and for burial.

It was no wonder that, in that dark age, the poor victims of such oppressions mixed political and ecclesiastical affairs together in their minds, and demanded in one breath both civil and religious freedom." (*Hassell's History* ppg 467-469)

Jerome Savonarola

JEROME Savonarola: Sylvester Hassell: Jerome Savonarola, of Florence (born 1452), endeavoring to stem the corrupt torrent of the Italian Pagan Renaissance, was tortured, strangled and burnt, in 1498, by the sentence of Pope Alexander Borgia. (*Hassell's History* pg 470)

Jerusalem, The Fall Of

The Fall of JERUSALEM: *Sylvester Hassell:* "There is scarcely another period in history so full of vice, corruption and disaster as the six years between the Neronian persecution and the destruction of Jerusalem. The prophetic description in the last days of our Lord began to be fulfilled before the generation to which he spoke had passed away, and the day of judgment seemed to be near

at hand. So the Christians believed, and had good reason to believe. Even to earnest heathen minds (such as those of Seneca and Tacitus) that period looked as dark as midnight, according to their own descriptions.”

“The most unfortunate country in that period was Palestine, where an ancient and venerable nation brought upon itself unspeakable suffering and destruction. The tragedy of Jerusalem prefigures in miniature the final judgment, and in this light it is represented in the eschatological discourses of Christ, who foresaw the end from the beginning.”—P. Schaff

Intimately connected with the early progress of Christianity was the destruction of Jerusalem, and the entire and final overthrow of the Jewish nation. The Jews crucified the Lord of life and glory, and persecuted his followers in the most cruel manner until their nationality was put an end to—a period of about 40 years from the Savior’s death.

The Jews asked that his blood should be on them and on their children (Matthew 27:25), and their imprecation was answered. He had already foretold their overthrow and the certainty that God’s vengeance would fall on them. Said he, “That upon you may come all the righteous blood shed upon the earth, from the blood of righteous Abel unto the blood of Zacharias, son of Barachias, whom ye slew between the temple and the altar. Verily, I say unto you, All these things shall come upon this generation. O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wing, and ye would not! Behold, your house is left unto you desolate” (Matthew 23:36-38).

When the disciples showed him the buildings of the temple that he might admire them, he “said unto them, See ye not all these things? Verily I say unto you, There shall not be left here one stone upon another, that shall not be thrown down” (Matthew 24:1-2).

And again said he, “The days shall come upon thee, that thine enemies shall cast a trench about thee, and compass thee even with the ground, and keep thee in on every side, and shall lay thee even with the ground, and thy children within thee; and they shall not leave in thee one stone upon another” (Luke 19:43-44).

As the accomplishment of these predictions ended in the utter abolition of the Jewish church and state, a constitution which was originally founded in Divine appointment, and had existed during a period of fifteen hundred years; and as it was unquestionably the most awful revolution in all the religious dispensations

of God, and which, moreover, in various ways, contributed greatly to the success of the gospel, it seems to merit especial attention at our hands.

From Nero to Vespasian there were five different Roman emperors, if we include these two, in the short space of eighteen months; and during this period the empire was a scene of confusion, desolation and misery, and not in a mood to persecute Christians, as it was subsequently.

After the death of King Herod Agrippa, the particulars of which the reader will find recorded in Acts 12., Judea again became a province of the Roman Empire, and Cuspius Fadus was sent to be its governor. He found matters very much unsettled in Palestine. The country was infested with banditti, and an imposter named Theudas had drawn large numbers after him, promising them to divide the waters of Jordan, as Joshua had done, by his single word, and lead them to pleasures beyond, etc. Theudas was taken and beheaded, and his followers dispersed, the Jews were quelled, and the banditti partially suppressed. Cuspius was succeeded by Tiberius Alexander, an apostate Jew, who very shortly gave way to make room for Ventidius Cumanus, under whose rule the troubles began which ended in the downfall of Jerusalem.

One of the Roman soldiers, at the time of the Jewish Passover, insulted the Jews by exposing his nakedness, and this exasperated them to such a degree that they complained of it to Cumanus, and charged him with ordering the offense to be given. He endeavored to reason with them, but could not succeed by words, so that he ordered his troops to the spot; and this so terrified the Jews that they fled in every direction, and twenty thousand were stifled to death in their flight by running over one another in the confined avenues that led to and from the temple.

Cumanus was succeeded by Claudius Felix as governor of Judea, and under his administration things went from bad to worse. The country swarmed with banditti; Jerusalem became the prey of false prophets and pretended workers of miracles, who were continually inciting discontent and sedition; and numbers of assassins, under the name of *Sicarii*, abounded in all the cities and towns of the country, committing the most horrible murders under the pretext of religious and patriotic zeal. These *Sicarii* could be hired by any one to assassinate an enemy or any person who seemed to stand in the way of another.

The Jewish priests, and even the pontiffs, made no hesitation in hiring these assassins to rid them of all such persons as were obnoxious to them. In the meantime Felix went forth with his soldiers in every direction, punishing the innocent with the guilty, and thereby destroyed all confidence in the Roman government as a power for the promotion of justice and equity in the land.

Felix was succeeded in the government by Festus, who, when entering upon the duties of his office, found the very priesthood engaged in war with each other. The high priests claimed a full share also, while the inferior priests were loth to yield what belonged to them. Thus parties were formed, and, each party hiring a squad of the *Sicarii* to accompany them, dreadful encounters often occurred, wherein many were murdered, both in Jerusalem and other towns; and even the very temple itself was defiled with the blood of these victims.

Festus, therefore, had a threefold task upon his hands; he had to suppress the violence of the priesthood against each other; that of the seditious Jews against the Romans and such as contentedly submitted to their government; and that of the banditti abroad, who infested the whole country, and robbed, plundered and massacred everywhere without mercy.

Festus dying soon after Paul was brought before him, Nero nominated his successor Albinus, of whom it is related by historians that he was such a cruel and rapacious monster that Felix and Festus, with all their faults, were angels when compared with him.

After a two years' tenure of office he was succeeded by Gessius Florus, the last and worst of all the Roman governors. His rapines, cruelties and acts of oppression, his compromising with the banditti for large sums of money, and, in short, his whole behavior, were so openly flagitious that the Jews were disposed to regard him rather as a bloody executioner sent to torture than as a magistrate to govern them. His great object seemed to be to goad the Jews to open rebellion against the Roman government, and he succeeded well at that.

In the days of Felix a dispute arose between the Jews and Syrians as to the ownership of Caesarea, each claiming it. It was referred to the emperor, who decided against the Jews, and the latter became indignant, and took up arms in defense of their claim. They assailed both Syrians and Romans in all places and on all occasions of their meeting together. Throughout all Judea little else was heard of but robberies, murders, and every species of cruelty—cities and villages filled with the dead of all ages and each sex, and of every quality, down to the tender infant.

The Caesareans fell suddenly on the Jews in their city and massacred twenty thousand of them; two thousand were murdered at Ptolemais, and fifty thousand at the city of Alexandria, in Egypt. At Jerusalem, Florus one day caused his troops to go and plunder the market, and to kill all they met; and they accordingly murdered three thousand five hundred persons, men, women, and children, and the streets of the city were day after day deluged with blood. Florus gloated over the carnage, and wrote to Cestius, the governor of Syria, casting the blame of all these horrible cruelties upon the Jews.

This war of open rebellion against the Roman government was fairly inaugurated in the second year of the government of Florus, in the twelfth of Nero's reign, A.D. 66.

The Jews next pushed their conquests beyond the river Jordan, took the fortress of Cyprus, razed it to the ground, and put all the Romans to the sword. The governor of Syria then bestirred himself, marched into Judea with a powerful army, burned towns and villages in his way, massacred all the Jews he could come at, and then encamped before Gibeon about the feast of tabernacles.

The Jews at Jerusalem, hearing of his approach, forsook the solemnities of their religion, and, even though it was the Sabbath day, flew to arms and proceeded to meet him with such fury, that had not the cavalry arrived at the moment to the support of his infantry, he had sustained a signal defeat. He lost five hundred men, while the Jews lost but twenty-two.

Cestius proffered terms of peace. The Jews killed one of his messengers, and wounded another. Enraged at this, he marched forward, and encamped in order of battle before Jerusalem on the 30th of October, A.D. 66. This put the Jews in great consternation, and they abandoned all their outworks, and retired to the inner cincture near the temple. Cestius fired the former, and laid siege to the latter, and took up his headquarters in the royal palace. He now hesitated; his generals were bribed; the Jews made a sortie and succeeded in repulsing him; they drove him back to his camp at Gibeon, harassed his rear, secured the passes, and attacked his army in flank.

Hemmed in on all sides, the mountains re-echoed with the hideous cries of his soldiers, and having lost four thousand foot and two hundred horse, favored by the intervening night, they on the eighth of November happily found a pass through the narrow straits of Bethoron and escaped.

Milman says that the Romans might easily have made themselves masters of the city of Jerusalem; and it was to the universal surprise that Cestius called off his troops. Though the war continued, Jerusalem was not besieged again till April, A.D. 70.

During this interval of about two years and a half the Christians in Jerusalem, remembering Christ's words of warning (Matthew 24:15; Mark 13:14; Luke 21:21), fled beyond the Jordan to Pella, in the north of Perea, in the mountains of Gilead, some sixty miles northeast of Jerusalem, where king Herod Agrippa II opened to them a safe asylum; and they escaped the horrors of the final siege of Jerusalem.

The retreat of Cestius aroused Nero, who sent Vespasian and his son Titus, in the ensuing spring, into Galilee with an army of sixty thousand men, well disciplined and equipped for service. They burnt Gadara, and marched towards Jotapata; but Josephus, the celebrated historian, and at that time governor of the province, threw himself into that place and defended it for a period of forty-seven days. It was finally taken about the beginning of July, with the loss of all its inhabitants—forty thousand slain, and only twelve hundred prisoners; among the latter was Josephus himself.

Josephus predicted the elevation of Vespasian to the throne of the Caesars in three years. Vespasian did not believe it, but treated Josephus kindly as a prisoner, and when he was elected, the next year, emperor of Rome, left the army and Josephus in the care of his son Titus, who gave him much liberty, and sent him occasionally to the Jews to urge them to desist from further rebellion.

Titus took Jaffa, two miles southwest of Nazareth, while his father was besieging Jotapata. All the men were put to the sword, and women and children taken prisoners. Joppa, which had been re peopled by a great number of seditious Jews since it was taken by Cestius, was retaken by Vespasian, and about four thousand of its inhabitants destroyed. Tarichea and Tiberius were next taken. The other cities of Galilee then submitted to the Romans, except Gischala, Gamala and Mount Tabor.

Gamala was taken, and four thousand of its citizens were put to the sword, while vast numbers took their own lives rather than surrender to the Romans. Mount Tabor was taken by stratagem, and, after John of Gischala left that city and fled with his soldiers towards Jerusalem, the remaining citizens surrendered. This completed the conquest of Galilee, after which the whole Roman army took respite at Caesarea before they began the siege of Jerusalem.

While Vespasian was resting his army in winter quarters at Caesarea, the Jews were exhausting themselves in Jerusalem by their factions, and warring against each other. They were at that time, no doubt, the worst population on the face of the globe, and eventually suffered more than any other.

The dominant party, which was the war party, consisted of men of the vilest and most profligate characters that perhaps the pen of the historian ever described. They were proud, ambitious, cruel, rapacious, and addicted to the most horrid crimes. Josephus says they acted more like infernal beings than men. Yet there were men peaceably disposed within the city, and who would have sought terms with the Romans if they could. These were few, however, and suffered for their virtues.

John of Gischala, who fled from that place to Jerusalem to escape the clutches of Vespasian, had placed himself at the head of the dominant party, and practiced the most unheard of cruelties upon the innocent and inoffensive. At one time he and his party put to death twelve thousand persons of noble extraction, and in the flower of their age, butchering them in the most horrible manner. In short, the whole nation trembled at the mention of the names of these men, and did not dare to be seen or heard to weep for the murder of their nearest relatives nor even to give them burial.

When the party of John had quelled, as they supposed, all opposition to them within the walls of the city, they began to turn their murderous weapons against each other, all of which was favorable to the Romans, and well known to them. Famine and pestilence also prevailed in the city and made its conquest the easier.

Vespasian marched out of Caesarea in the spring of A.D. 70, penetrated Idumea, and plundered and burnt every place through which he passed, except where it was necessary to leave a garrison to keep the country in awe. On receiving the intelligence of his election as emperor, he left the army in charge of his son Titus, and repaired to Rome. His advice to his son was to utterly destroy Jerusalem.

Titus lost no time in complying with this command. He set his army in motion in April, marched at once to the walls of that devoted city, and commenced the siege immediately after the Passover, when Jerusalem was filled with strangers. It seemed almost impregnable, being on an eminence and surrounded with three walls and many stately towers. The first or old wall, which by reason of its vast thickness was looked upon as impregnable, had no less than sixty of these towers, lofty, firm, and strong. The second had fourteen, and third eighty. The circumference of the city was nearly four English miles.

The siege fairly commenced on the 14th of April and ended on the 8th of September, when it was taken and entered by Titus—lasting five months wanting six days. The wonder to us how a single city could withstand the power of Rome for such a length of time. Unheard of cruelties and sufferings occurred within that period. It was reported to Titus by a deserter that at one of the gates where he was stationed there were carried out to be buried one hundred and fifteen thousand eight hundred and eighty persons from the 14th of April to the 1st of July. Another told him that they had carried out at all the gates six hundred thousand, and that then, being unable to carry them all out, they had filled whole houses with them and shut them up.

One circumstance will suffice to show the deplorable famine that prevailed in the city. An unhappy and starving mother, in fulfillment of the prophecy of Moses (Deuteronomy 28:56-57), was reduced to the necessity of feeding upon her own child. "This lady's name was Miriam, who had taken refuge, with many others, in this devoted city, from the breaking out of the war. As the famine increased, her house was repeatedly plundered of such provisions as she had been able to procure. She had vainly endeavored, by her entreaties, to prevail upon them to put an end to her miserable existence, but the mercy was too great to be granted her. Frantic at length with fury and despair, she snatched her infant from her bosom, cut its throat and broiled it; and, having satiated her present hunger, concealed the rest. The smell of it soon drew the voracious human tigers to her house; they threatened her with the most excruciating tortures if she did not discover her provisions to them; upon which she set forth before them the relics of her mangled infant, bidding them eat heartily and not to be squeamish, since she, its *once* tender mother, had made no scruple to butcher, dress, and feed upon it. At the sight of this horrid dish, inhuman as they were, they stood aghast, petrified with horror, and departed, leaving the astonished mother in possession of her dismal fare.

"When the report of this spread through the city, the horror and consternation were as universal as they were inexpressible. They now for the first time began to think themselves forsaken of the providence of God, and to expect the most awful effects of his anger. Nor were their fears either unreasonable or ill-founded; for no sooner had Titus heard of this inhuman deed than he vowed the total extirpation of the city and people. "Since," said he, "they have so often refused my proffers of pardon, and have preferred war to peace, rebellion to obedience, and famine to plenty, I am determined to bury that cursed metropolis under its ruins, that the sun may never more dart his beams upon a city where the mothers feed on the flesh of their children, and the fathers, no less guilty than themselves, choose to drive them to such extremities rather than lay down their arms."—W. Jones

And yet such was the humanity of Titus that he felt reluctant to destroy so many human beings, frequently tendering them forgiveness upon repentance: and such his regard for the magnificence and value of the temple that it was set on fire, at last, and consumed, against his orders and in defiance of his commands, expostulations, and canings of his soldiers who did the awful deed.

Seeing that all was lost, and his endeavors to save the temple ineffectual, "Titus entered into the sanctuary and Most Holy place, the remaining grandeur and riches of which, even yet, surpassed all that had been told him of it. Out of the former he saved the golden candlestick, the table of the shew-bread, the altar of incense, all of pure gold, and the book of the law, wrapped up in a rich golden

tissue. Upon his quitting that sacred place some soldiers set fire to it, obliging those who had staid behind to come out also, in consequence of which they all began to plunder it, carrying off the costly utensils, robes, gold plating of the gates, etc., insomuch that there was not one of them who did not enrich himself by it.

“A horrid massacre succeeded to this, in which many thousands perished, some by the flames, others falling from the battlements, and a greater number still by the enemy’s sword, which spared neither age, sex, nor quality. Among them were upwards of six thousand persons who had been seduced thither by a false prophet, who promised them they should find a miraculous deliverance on that very day.”

“The Romans carried their fury to the burning of all the treasure houses of the place, though they were full of the richest furniture, vestments, plate, and other valuable articles, there laid up for security; nor did they cease the dreadful work of devastation till they had destroyed all except two of the temple gates, and that part of the court that was destined for the women.”

“The temple was burned on the tenth of August, the same day of the year it was said that the first temple was destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar. Josephus states that the hill on which the temple stood was seething hot, and seemed enveloped to its base in one sheet of flame; that the blood was larger in quantity than the fire, and all the ground was covered with corpses. The Romans planted their eagles or standards on the temple ruins, offered their sacrifices to them, and proclaimed Titus *Imperator* with the greatest acclamations of joy. Thus was fulfilled Christ’s prophecy concerning the abomination of desolation standing in the holy place.”

“The city was now abandoned to the fury of the soldiers, who proceeded forthwith to plunder it, setting it on fire in every direction, and murdering all that fell into their hands—whilst the factious party among the Jews, that had hitherto escaped, went and fortified themselves in the royal palace, where they killed eight thousand of their own countrymen who had taken refuge there.”

“Preparations were now making for a vigorous attack on the upper city, and particularly on the royal palace, and this occupied Titus from the 20th of August to the 7th of September, during which time great numbers came and made their submission to him, among whom were forty thousand citizens of the inferior classes, to whom he gave permission to go and settle where they would. On the 8th of September the city was taken (as had been said) and entered by Titus.”

“Josephus estimates that one million and one hundred thousand Jews were slain during the siege; eleven thousand died from starvation shortly afterwards; and ninety-seven thousand were sold into slavery, or sent to the mines, or sacrificed in the gladiatorial shows in different cities.”

“It is not a little remarkable that Titus, though a heathen, was frequently obliged, during this war, to acknowledge an overruling providence, not only in the extraordinary success with which he had been favored, but also in the invincible obstinacy, through which the Jews, to the last, preferred their total destruction to an acceptance of his repeated overtures of mercy.”

“Again and again did he, in the most solemn manner, appeal to heaven that he was innocent of the blood of this wretched people (Josephus’ Wars, b.5 ch.12). In almost every chapter we find Josephus also ascribing these dreadful calamities, and the final ruin of his nation, city and temple, to an overruling power; to the offended Deity; to the sins of the people; but nowhere more pathetically than in that chapter in which he sums up a number of dreadful warnings, sent beforehand not so much to reduce them to obedience as to make them discern the Almighty hand that was ever pouring out the awful vials of his wrath upon them (Josephus’ Wars, b.6 ch.5, and b.5, ch.13).”

“As soon as the Romans had completed their destructive work of fire and slaughter, Titus set them to demolish the city, with all its noble structures, fortifications, palaces, towers, walls and other ornaments, down to the level of the ground; as though he had nothing in view but to fulfill the predictions of Christ concerning its destruction, as contained in the twenty-fourth chapter of Matthew’s gospel. He left nothing standing but a piece of the western wall and three towers, which he reserved merely as a monument to future ages of what had been the strength of the city, and the skill and valor of its conqueror. His orders were executed so punctually that, except what has been just mentioned, nothing remained that could serve as an index that that ground had been once inhabited; insomuch that when Titus himself, some time afterwards, passed through it on his way from Caesarea to Alexandria, in order to embark for Rome, he wept profusely at the sight of a devastation so dreadful, cursing the wretches that had compelled him to be the author of it (Josephus’ Wars, b.6 chs. 8 and 9).”

“Such was the dreadful issue of this war, terminating in the utter downfall of the Jewish state and nation, from which it has never recovered to this day; it involved in it the destruction of the temple, and the discontinuance of the services annexed to it. The desolation of the country itself went on increasing; till, from being, for its size, one of the most fertile and populous countries in the world, having about five million inhabitants, it is now become the most barren

and desolate, the latest computation of the number of its inhabitants scarcely exceeding three hundred thousand.”

“Not only the wisdom, but the justice of God is also conspicuously displayed in this great event. A particular Providence had ever attended these people. They had always been favored with prosperity while obedient to God and his prophets; and, on the other hand, calamity of some kind had been the never failing consequence of their disobedience. But the measure of their iniquities was now filled up, and the wrath of heaven came upon them to the uttermost. Never had the nation in general shown a more perverse or obstinate disposition towards any of their prophets than was evinced towards Christ and his Apostles, though none of their prophets had even been sent to them with such evident marks of a Divine mission. Their inveterate hostility to Christianity continues to this day, and so does their dispersion, though they are still a distinct people, and never mix, so as to be confounded, with any of the nations among whom they have settled.”

“All other ancient peoples have blended together in an indistinguishable mass; but the Jews, having disobeyed God, and having, according to the prediction of Moses ([De 28:49-68](#)), been plucked up out of their own land by a distant, eagle-like nation, of strange tongue and fierce countenance, and having been scattered among all people from one end of the earth to the other, remain still distinct from all other people, for the purpose of being, to all men, living proofs of the truth of the Old Testament, and for the fulfillment of the prophecies that are still to be accomplished.”

“The reader will perceive that the history of the Jewish war, as detailed by their own historian, Josephus, in many instances a witness of the facts he attests, forms a commentary on the prophecies of Christ. Amongst other things, he has given a distinct account of the “fearful sights and great signs from heaven” which preceded the destruction of Jerusalem; and Tacitus has confirmed the narration of Josephus (Tacit. Annal, b.5). If Christ had not expressly foretold these things, some might have suspected that Josephus exaggerated, and Tacitus was misinformed; but as the testimonies of these historians confirm the predictions of Christ, so do the predictions of Christ confirm the wonders recorded by the historians.”—*W. Jones. (Hassell's History ppg 215- 224)*

Jesuits, The

The JESUITS: *Sylvester Hassell:* The seventeenth was the great century of the prevalence of Jesuitism; and Macaulay's unrivaled characterization of this perfection of Pharisaism and Pelagianism must now be given. In the sixteenth century “the Pontificate, exposed to new dangers more formidable than had ever

before threatened it, was saved by a new religious order, which was animated by intense enthusiasm and organized with exquisite skill.”

“When the Jesuits came to rescue, they found the Papacy in extreme peril; but from that moment the tide of battle turned. Protestantism, which had, during a whole generation, carried all before it, was stopped in its progress, and rapidly beaten back from the foot of the Alps to the shores of the Baltic.”

“Before the Order had existed a hundred years it had filled the whole world with memorials of great things done and suffered for the faith. No religious community could produce a list of men so variously distinguished; none had extended its operations over so vast a space: yet in none had there ever been such perfect unity of feeling and action. There was no region of the globe, no walk of speculative or of active life, in which Jesuits were not to be found.”

“They guided the counsels of kings. They deciphered Latin inscriptions. They observed motions of Jupiter’s satellites. They published whole libraries, controversy, casuistry, history, treatises on optics, Alcaic odes, editions of the fathers, madrigals, catechisms and lampoons. The liberal education of youth passed almost entirely into their hands, and was conducted by them with conspicuous ability.”

“They appear to have discovered the precise point to which intellectual culture can be carried without risk of intellectual emancipation. Enmity itself was compelled to own that, in the art of managing and forming the tender mind, they had no equals. Meanwhile they assiduously and successfully cultivated the eloquence of the pulpit. With still greater assiduity and still greater success they applied themselves to the ministry of the confessional. Throughout Roman Catholic Europe the secrets of every government and of almost every family of note were in their keeping.”

“They glided from one Protestant country to another under innumerable disguises, as gay Cavaliers, as simple rustics, as Puritan preachers. They wandered to countries which mercantile avidity nor liberal curiosity had ever impelled any stranger to explore. They were found as Mandarins, superintending the observatory at Peking. They were to be found, spade in hand, teaching the rudiments of agriculture to the savages of Paraguay.”

“Yet, whatever might be their residence, whatever might be their employment, their spirit was the same, entire devotion to the common cause, unreasoning obedience to the central authority. None of them had chosen his dwelling place or his vocation for himself. Whether the Jesuit should live under the Arctic circle or under the equator, whether he should pass his life arranging gems and

collating manuscripts at the Vatican or in persuading naked barbarians under the Southern Cross not to eat each other, were matters which he left with profound submission to the decision of others. If he was wanted at Lima, he was on the Atlantic in the next fleet. If he was wanted at Bagdad, he was toiling through the desert with the next caravan. If his ministry was needed in some country where his life was more insecure than that of a wolf, where it was a crime to harbor him, where the heads and quarters of his brethren, fixed in the public places, showed him what to expect, he went without remonstrance or hesitation to this doom.”

“Nor is this heroic spirit yet extinct. When, in our time, a new and terrible pestilence passed round the globe, when, in some great cities, fear had dissolved all the ties which hold society together, when the secular clergy had forsaken their flocks, when medical succor was not to be purchased by gold, when the strongest natural affections had yielded to the love of life, even then the Jesuit was found by the pallet which bishop and Curate, physician and nurse, father and mother, had deserted, bending over infected lips to catch the faint accents of confession, and holding up to the last, before the expiring penitent, the image of the expiring Redeemer.”

“But, with the admirable energy, disinterestedness and self-devotion which were characteristic of the Society, great vices were mingled. It was alleged, and not without foundation, that the ardent public spirit which made the Jesuit regardless of his ease, of his liberty, and of his life, made him also regardless of truth and of mercy; that no means which could promote the interest of his religion seemed to him unlawful, and that by the interest of his religion he too often meant the interest of his society. It was alleged that, in the most atrocious plots recorded in history, his agency could be distinctly traced; that, constant only in his attachment to the fraternity to which he belonged, he was in some countries the most dangerous enemy of freedom, and in others the most dangerous enemy of order.”

“The mighty victories which he boasted he had achieved in the cause of the church were, in the judgment of many illustrious members of that church, rather apparent than real. He had indeed labored with a wonderful show of success to reduce the world under her laws; but he had done so by relaxing her laws to suit the temper of the world. Instead of toiling to elevate human nature to the noble standard fixed by Divine precept and example, he had lowered the standard till it was beneath the average level of human nature.”

“He gloried in multitudes of converts who had been baptized in the remote regions of the East; but it was reported that from some of those converts the facts on which the whole theology of the gospel depends had been cunningly

concealed, and that others were permitted to avoid persecution by bowing down before the images of false gods, while internally repeating Paters and Aves. Nor was it only in heathen countries that such arts were said to be practiced.”

“It was not strange that people of all ranks, and especially of the highest ranks, crowded to the confessionals in the Jesuits temples; for from those confessionals none were sent discontented away. There the priest was all things to all men. He showed just so much rigor as might not drive those who knelt at his spiritual tribunal to the Dominican or the Franciscan Church.”

“If he had to deal with a mind truly devout, he spoke in the saintly tones of the primitive fathers; but with that large part of mankind who have religion enough to make them uneasy when they do wrong, and not religion enough to keep them from doing wrong, he followed a different system. Since he could not reclaim them from vice, it was his business to save them from remorse.”

“He had at his command an immense dispensary of anodynes for wounded consciences. In the books of casuistry which had been written by his brethren, and printed with the approbation of his superiors, were to be found doctrines consolatory to transgressors of every class. There the bankrupt was taught how he might, without sin, secrete his goods from his creditors. The servant was taught how he might, without sin, run off with his master’s plate. The pander was assured that a Christian man might innocently earn his living by carrying letters and messages between married women and their gallants. The high spirited and punctilious gentlemen of France were gratified by a decision in favor of dueling. The Italians, accustomed to darker and baser modes of vengeance, were glad to learn that they might, without any crime, shoot at their enemies from behind hedges.”

“To deceit was given a license sufficient to destroy the whole value of human contracts and of human testimony. In truth, if society continued to hold together, if life and property any security, it was because common sense and common humanity restrained men from doing what the Order of Jesuits assured them that they might with safe conscience do.”

“The Jesuits unfolded the doctrine of moral Probabilism in such manner and measure,” says Gieseler, “that, while they condemned sin in general, yet in its particular manifestations they very frequently excused and palliated it. At the same time, they so defined the difference between mortal and venial sins, and made such statements upon the sufficiency of repentance, that men’s minds were cradled in complete carnal security.”

They elevated the papal power above everything, since their own rested on it. Bishops and councils might err, but the pope was infallible, and could never lapse into heresy; indeed, he was so far the lord of Christendom that sin itself, enjoined by him, would be a duty. Thus he was elevated so far above the human sphere that he must be looked upon as a demi-god. As it was with the doctrine about the pope, so the other doctrines assailed by Protestants were for the most part carried to excess—the celibacy of the clergy, their independence of the civil power, the worship of saints, of Mary, and of images, the multiplication of indulgences. To keep dangerous light away, not only were the Indexes of Prohibited Books set to work, but the Indexes of Expurgated Books were also published, mutilating and falsifying the ancient writings.

In 1622 Gregory XV., the first pope who had been a pupil of the Jesuits, established the *first* great Missionary Board in the world, the prototype of all other Missionary Boards, whether Catholic or Protestant, the *Sacra Congregatio de Propaganda Fide* (Sacred Congregation for Propagating the Faith), consisting of cardinals, and having in charge the entire Roman Catholic Missionary System. This body is still in existence.

The object of this organization was and is the conversion of heathens and Protestants to Roman Catholicism and the extirpation of heretics. For this latter purpose the civil power has been employed in Catholic countries, and will be also employed in all Protestant countries wherever Roman Catholicism gains the supremacy. To promote the same purpose of Catholicizing the world, the next pope, Urban VIII., established, in 1627, the *Seminarium or Collegium de Propaganda Fide* (Seminary or College for Propagating the Faith), “to which young men from all nations are brought at an early age, and gratuitously instructed in languages and sciences, and fitted out for the missionary work.

This College was subordinated entirely to the Congregation of Cardinals or Missionary Board, and a splendid palace was built for both institutions. To the Propaganda no small part of the aggressive power of the Church of Rome is due. It has complete military power, under the pope, over the whole missionary field, not only to send missionaries wherever it is the interest of the church to send them, but to give them special training adapted to their special work. (*Hassell's History* ppg 513-516)

Jesus Christ

Jesus CHRIST: See the Person and Work of CHRIST in Volume Four.

Jews, Natural and Spiritual Jews

Natural JEWS and spiritual JEWS: C. H. Cayce: The Jews, as a nation, were the chosen people of God. He made choice of the Jews as a nation. They were His people, as a nation. But He did not make choice of the entire nation to eternal life. “They are not all Israel which are of Israel.”—Romans 9:6. All of Abraham’s seed were not children of God—see Romans 9:7. Some natural Jews were not spiritual Jews. Natural Jews are natural Israelites. Spiritual Jews are spiritual Israelites. The natural Israelites represented spiritual Israelites. All of the spiritual Israelites will be finally saved in heaven.” (*Cayce’s Editorials vol. 2, ppg 147*)

Joash

JOASH (*See under Ahaziah*)

John of Damascus

JOHN of Damascus (*See under The ICONOCLASTIC CONTROVERSY*)

John, First, Second and Third

First, Second, and Third JOHN: Sylvester Hassell: The first epistle of John is a postscript of the fourth Gospel. It is a practical application of the lessons of the life of Christ to the wants of the church at the close of the first century. It is a circular letter of the venerable Apostle to his beloved children in Asia Minor, exhorting them to a holy life of faith and love in Christ, and earnestly warning them against the Gnostic *antichrists*, already existing or to come, who deny the mystery of the incarnation, sunder religion from morality, and run into Antinomian practices. The second and third epistles of John are short private letters, the second to a Christian woman (some suppose to a Christian church), and the third to Gaius (whether in Macedonia, Acts 19:29, or in Corinth, Romans 16:23; I Corinthians 1:14, or Derbe, Acts 20:4, is unknown). The second epistle greatly resembles the first, and so does the style of the third. In both the Apostle calls himself “the Elder” as Peter had done. True grace produces modesty and meekness.” (*Hassell’s History pg 212*)

John, The Apostle

The Apostle JOHN: *Sylvester Hassell quoting Pressense:* As in the first period of the Apostolic age, the principal part is enacted by St. Peter, and in the second by St. Paul, so in the third period the paramount influence is that of St. John. His natural disposition and peculiar gifts account for this delay in the exercise of his Apostleship. With a soul meditative and mystical, he had neither the impetuous zeal of Peter nor the indefatigable activity of Paul.

On him Christianity had wrought most intensively; he had penetrated into the deepest meaning of the teaching of Christ, or rather he had read the very heart of the Master. It was his vocation to preserve the most precious jewels in the treasury of Christ's revelations, and to bring to light the most sacred and sublime mysteries of the gospel.

In order to fulfill this mission, he must needs wait until the church was ready for such exalted teaching. The first storms of division must subside. Just as the prophet heard the still small voice which was the voice of God, only after the sound of the tempest and the roar of the thunder; so the Apostle of supreme love could not speak till a calm had succeeded to the storm stirred up by the polemics of St. Paul. His work was not more important nor attested with diviner seal than that of the controversialist of the apostolic age; the two are closely connected, and the latter is the natural sequence to the earlier.

The revelation of love could not be complete till Judeo-Christianity had finally succumbed, and had carried with it in its fall all the barriers within which it had sought to limit the grace of God. So true is this that we find St. Paul himself sounding the first notes of the hymn of love, and thus inaugurating the work of St. John.

The former sowed in tears, the latter reaped in joy. The one resisted to blood; the other received for the church the prize of the well-fought fight. This diversity of the methods employed by them in order to establish the truth of which they are the organs. While St. Paul wields the weapons of warfare in his

irresistible and impassioned dialectics, St. John is satisfied with expounding doctrine. He does not dispute; he affirms. It is clear that he has been led into the possession of the truth by a path of intuition, of direct vision.

His language has the calmness of contemplation. He speaks in short sentences, strikingly simple in form; but that simplicity, like a quiet lake, holds in its depths the reflection of the highest heaven. "He has filled the whole earth with his voice," says John Chrysostom, "not by its mighty reverberations, but by the Divine grace which dwelt upon his lips. That which is most admirable is, that this great voice is neither harsh nor violent, but soft and melting as harmonious music."

It is very far from the truth, however, to regard St. John as the type of feminine gentleness, as he is represented in legend and in painting, which is only another form of legend. The ancient church had a far worthier conception of him when it gave to St. John the Evangelist the symbol of the eagle soaring to the sun, as though to signify that the mightiest and most royal impulse—that which carries farthest and highest is love.

The soul of the Apostle of Ephesus is as vigorous as that of Paul. He was called the son of Thunder before grace had subdued his natural vehemence; and something of this early ardor always remained with him. In proportion to his love of truth was his hatred of error and heresy. Such love is a consuming fire, and, when it sees its object despised or wronged, it is as ardent in its indignation as in its adoration.

The truth which St. John loved and served was no mere abstract doctrine; it was to him incarnate in the person of Jesus Christ. He was ever the beloved disciple of the Master, the disciple admitted to his most tender and intimate friendship; and the church has ever pictured him in the attitude in which he is represented in the Gospels at the Last Supper, leaning on the bosom of the Lord. It was by the power of love so strong and deep that he was enabled to fulfill his mission of conciliation, and to harmonize all the apparent contradictions of the apostolic age in the rich synthesis of his doctrine.

Let us now inquire how he was prepared for this glorious vocation. John was the son of Zebedee, a fisherman of the Lake of Gennesaret, who dwelt at Bethsaida (Matthew 4:21; Mark 4:21; Matthew 10:2). It is not proved that he was actually poor, as Chrysostom maintained, for his father had "hired servants" (Mark 1:20); his mother was among the women who ministered to Jesus of her substance (Luke 8:3); and John himself had a house of his own (John 19:27).

Be this as it may, however, he was of obscure and humble origin. His mother was among the earliest followers of the Savior. John, as well as Peter, was a disciple of the Forerunner; the preaching of John the Baptist answered to the needs of his heart, which was eagerly waiting for the hope of Israel.

Peter and John did not at once leave all to be Christ's disciples (John 2:25). The Master gave time for their first impressions to deepen before he called them to forsake family and fishing-nets and to come after him (Matthew 4:18-22; Mark 1:19-20; Luke 5:1-11). John appears to have been very young at this time; his grave and thoughtful nature peculiarly fitted him to receive the education which Jesus Christ imparted to his disciples, and which consisted in impressing on them the features of his own likeness.

John, Peter and James were, as we know, admitted to special intimacy with the Savior. There is no reason to suppose that John had, at first, a much clearer comprehension than the other disciples of the doctrine of Christ. He shared their carnal conceptions of the earthly kingdom of the Messiah (Matthew 15:20-28), and exhibited sometimes the narrow spirit of the sectary (Luke 9:49-50).

His invocation of wrath upon the Samaritans displays an alloy of human passion, blended with his affection for the Savior (Luke 9:54). But this affection was so real and true that it was sure to lead to all the developments of the religious life. He proved his love in a way not to be mistaken at the time of Christ's passion. He followed him into the court of the high priest, and even to the foot of the cross (John 19:26). He is the only one of the Apostles who witnessed the last sufferings of Christ; and

probably for this reason he was chosen to render the most emphatic testimony of his eternal glory in the bosom of the Father.

We can well imagine what an ineffaceable image of unparalleled love and sorrow would be left on the soul of John by this scene. Who can tell with what feelings he caught those last words of the God-man spoken almost in his parting agony, which committed to him the mother of his Lord as a sacred legacy? (John 19:27). He was also one of the first to see the risen Christ (John 20:8). All these memories, and many more connected with them, were to be successively illuminated by the Holy Spirit till they should form in the mind of John a perfect whole. But he was not himself capable, immediately after the Pentecostal effusion of the Spirit, of receiving, in all its fullness, this Divine revelation.

During the earlier period of the apostolic age we see John by Peter's side, lending him efficient help, but leaving to him the initiative in speech and action (Acts 3:1; 8:14,25). He enjoyed much consideration, but did not exert a preponderating influence; nothing is recorded of his share in the council at Jerusalem, though he appears to have been present (Galatians 2:9).

At this time he still adhered to the Mosaic law (for Jewish converts), as did Peter and James—a course of conduct confirmed by the decisions of the council at Jerusalem. There are no means of ascertaining in what year he left that city; but he was no longer there in the year 60, when Paul made his last visit (Acts 21:17-18). Nicephorus asserts that he remained in Jerusalem until the death of Mary; but this gives us no exact information, inasmuch as the date of the event is entirely unknown.

There is one whole period of the life of the Apostle of which we possess no details (that are to be implicitly relied on). But if we have no precise records of his life during these years, his writings give evidence that the time was not lost in reference to his own development.

He learned to contemplate one aspect of the person and doctrine of his Master, which had not presented itself to any of the other Apostles with equal distinctness; this was the profound mysterious fact of his eternal Divinity, his pre-existence and incarnation.

We are free to suppose that the period of his life about which we have no information was devoted (under the directing grace of God) to climbing that spiritual Tabor, on the summit of which the only and eternal Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, was to appear to him in all the glory of his Divinity. The Apostle, like Mary, pondered in his heart all that he knew of his master; in the silence of devotion he listened to his living voice, and under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit discerned more and more of the mystery of his being.

Augustine says while the three other evangelists remained below with the man Jesus, and spoke little of his Divinity, John, as though impatient of treading the earth, rose from the very first words of his gospel, not only above the bounds of earth, air and sky, but above the angels and celestial powers, into the very presence of him by whom all things were made. Not in vain do the Gospels tell us that he leaned on the bosom of the Savior at the Passover Feast. He drank in secret at that Divine spring: *De illo pectore in secreto bibebat.*

All the life of St. John, during the period when scarcely a trace of him is to be found in the apostolic church, is summed up in these words: "The time was to come when the Apostle would emerge from his obscurity and would in his turn exert a wide and deep influence over the churches of the first century."

According to the testimony of Clement of Alexandria and Irenaeus, St. John, after the death of St. Peter and St. Paul, took up his residence at Ephesus. No city could have been better chosen as the center from which to watch over the churches, and follow closely the progress of heresy. At Ephesus the apostle was in the center of Paul's mission-field in Asia Minor, and not far from Greece.

Christianity had achieved splendid conquests in the flourishing cities of that country; but it had also encountered dangerous enemies. It was there that false Gnosticism, first of all, showed itself, and perpetually sought new adherents. The Apostle Paul had spoken before his death of its rapid progress (I Timothy 6:20-21). In his second epistle to Timothy (II Timothy 1:15-18) he seems to point to Ephesus as the city most threatened with heresy, where consequently the presence of an Apostle would be especially needed. St. John made this city his settled abode, without, however, devoting himself exclusively to the important church there founded. Ephesus was the center of his apostolic activity, but that activity extended over a wide area. Clement of Alexandria tells us how the Apostle visited the churches, presiding at the election of bishops (or pastors) and restoring order where it had been disturbed, etc.

It is not possible to determine accurately at what date St. John suffered for the gospel. The *Fathers* differ as to the time of his banishment to Patmos. We are inclined to place it shortly after the death of St. Peter and St. Paul. His exile may have been protracted during some years. The Revelation appears to us to have been written long before the gospel. It carries us back into a period very little removed from the fearful persecution under Nero, which was the great typical war of Antichrist against Christ. The mode of thought, the form of language, the prominent ideas, the historical allusions, all suggest this date; and, in the absence of any decisive evidence, we are free to give full weight to the internal.

With reference to the gospel and epistles, tradition is agreed in the date affixed to them. These writings are the slowly ripened fruit of all the labors of the apostolic age; but at the same time, like every other good gift, they come down from Heaven, and bear the undeniable seal of inspiration. They clearly belong to a period when heresy was rife, and especially those forms of heresy which, denying the corporeal reality of the Savior's sufferings, contained the first germ of Docetism.

John did not indeed design his gospel to be a systematic refutation of the errors of Cerinthus or of any other heretic. He was satisfied with setting forth true Christian Gnosticism in

opposition to false Oriental or Judaizing Gnosticism; and his Gospel is beautifully characterized by Clement of Alexandria as pre-eminently the gospel of the Spirit.

We should do injustice to the fourth Gospel were we to regard it as a mere polemical writing, or as only the complement of the synoptics (Matthew, Mark and Luke). The latter supposition cannot be reconciled with the admirable unity of composition to be observed in the Gospel of John. It is full of a creative inspiration. The style is altogether unlike that of a mere commentator who is completing by a gloss a text already given. John epitomizes in his Gospel the substance of his preaching at Ephesus and in the other churches in Asia Minor. According to Jerome, he had no intention at first of preserving his discourses in writing, but agreed to do so at the express request of the churches.

We have no detailed information of the last years of the Apostle. Two incidents have come down to us which agree perfectly with what we know of him. Irenaeus relates that, going one day into the public baths at Ephesus, and hearing that Cerinthus was also there, he immediately went out, exclaiming that he feared the house might fall, because of the presence of so great an enemy of the truth.

Jerome tells us how the aged Apostle, no longer able to preach at any length, would be carried into the assemblies of the Christians to speak the simple words, "Little children, love one another." To his brethren and disciples who asked him why he thus repeated himself, he replied, "It is the Lord's commandment, and when it is fulfilled, nothing is wanting."

This hatred of error and this holy love give us the perfect portraiture of John. It does not appear that he died a violent death. He fell asleep in Christ at a very advanced age, at the commencement of the reign of Trajan (about A.D. 98 or 99).

Augustine tells us that in his time there was a very current belief that the Apostle was not dead, but was only sleeping in his grave. Evidently, this impression arose from a wrong interpretation of the words of Christ spoken to Peter with

reference to John, "If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee?" (John 21:22). Perhaps also the Christians may have found it hard to believe that the Apostle, whose influence was still so great, had really passed from the world.

They were not altogether wrong. As Luke has said, "He lives, and will ever live, by his writings, and the future belongs to him even more than the past.

Paul is, in his statement of doctrine in his life, the man of contrasts and antitheses. He aims to show how deep is the gulf between human nature and God, that he may the more exalt the grace which has bridged the chasm; and he traces vigorously the line of demarcation between the Old Covenant and the New.

It is not so with John. Having attained gradually, and without any sudden shock, the highest elevation of Christian truth, he starts from the summit and gently comes down again. He does not even pause to establish the superiority of the gospel over the law. With him that is a settled point, and admitted principle, from which he deduces the consequences.

John does not commence, like Paul, with man and his misery, but with God and his perfections. His doctrine, by this character of sustained elevation, and by the part assigned in it to love and to the direct intuition of Divine things, bears the impress of mysticism, but of a mysticism which is essentially moral, in which the great laws of conscience are always maintained, and which is as far removed from Oriental pantheism as from Pharisaic legalism.

At the summit of his doctrine St. John places the idea of God. God is the Absolute Being, the great I Am, whom no eye hath seen nor can see. He is a Spirit (John 1:18; 4:24). All perfection dwells in him; he is at once light, life and love. As he is Absolute Being, so he is Absolute, Eternal Life, the inexhaustible source, the sole principle of every being (I John 5:20).

But this life is at the same time light (I John 1:5). Light represents perfect knowledge and spotless purity (I John 3:20). God knows all things; God is holy. But John does not pause at this abstract conception of moral good. He gives us a concrete notion of it when he tells us that God is love (I John 4:16). Thus he is as essentially as he is life and light. Love is not only a manifestation of his being; it is his very essence.

Never before had this sublime thought been expressed with such clearness; it had been discerned only by glimpses. Under the Old Covenant the love of God was subordinate to his justice. Under the New, this limited view had for a long time prevailed. St. Paul insisted with much force upon the love of God, but he considered it rather in its historical manifestation for the salvation of men than in its eternal principle.

It is on this eternal principle that St John dwells. He sees in the cross not only reconciliation between man and God, but also the revelation of the true name of God, of his very being. He is love; the God who is love is the true God (I John 5:20). Love is so assuredly the absolute truth, that he who loveth is "of the truth." He is a partaker of the nature of God (I John 4:7).

Thus truth or light is inseparable from love; it is not simple knowledge or mere theory. St. John does not recognize the ray of light which has no flame. Truth is, as it were, full of life; it is life as it is love. To be of the truth is to be born of God, to possess him, to be what he is: it is, therefore, to have love in one's self. The object of knowledge being the God who is love, it is natural that true knowledge should be inseparable from love.

To the Apostle, love is not one of the attributes of God (simply); it is God himself. The metaphysical attributes are the attributes of the Divine love. God is holy, infinite, almighty love, knowing everything, everywhere present. John delights, therefore, to give him the name of Father—that wondrous name which commands at once tenderness and reverence (John 1:14,18; I John 3:1).

This eternal invisible Being is revealed to the world by the doctrine of the Word, by whom the worlds were made, and who came into this world to reveal the Father to his people and to lay down his life for them (John 10:15). "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God." "And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father), full of grace and truth." "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him" (John 1:1-2,14,18).

The Father and the Son are one (John 10:30). The Holy Ghost, the Comforter, proceeding from the Father and the Son, is recognized by John also as God. He is the author of the new birth (John 3:9). He takes up his abode in the church and abides with her forever. He brings all things to her remembrance, whatsoever the Savior hath said to her. He testifies of Christ. He glorifies him, and takes the things of Jesus and shows them to his saints John 14:26; 15:26; 16:13-15). He also convinces the world of sin, of righteousness and of judgment (John 16:8).

John recognizes the intrusion of a principle of discord into the world. The power of sin has been let loose. He does not enter into any argument on the origin of evil. He affirms the fact, and is content without proving it. A kingdom of darkness has set itself in opposition to the kingdom of light, of which God is the Sun. The devil has had a great influence upon man, seducing him into evil. He is not, indeed, to be regarded as Ahriman the eternal, confronted with the eternal Ormazd; no, the principle of light was before the principle of evil. Satan himself was born (or created) in the light, for it is said, "He abode not in the truth" (John 8:44).

It is evident that John supposes a fall in his case, no less than in ours, and that, consequently, in the origin of things, all was light, as became a creation called into being by the Word. The cause of evil is entirely moral. "Sin," says the Apostle, "is the transgression of the law" (I John 3:4). There is a law for the creature. It is this law which John calls the old commandment,

the commandment of love based upon the very being of God (I John 2:5-10).

The blessed destiny of the moral creature is to become like his Creator, conformed to his nature. The creature, soon after being made, voluntarily took part against God; that is to say, he rejected life, love and light. Thus the world became dark from the day in which it turned from God. It is now plunged in moral night; all the higher elements are stifled in man; the outward and sensible life predominates; the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, enshroud it in threefold darkness (I John 2:16-17). It is given over to a lie, because it has set itself against good and love—that is against God and the Word. Its prince is he who was a liar and murderer from the beginning (John 8:44), and who, having fallen himself, has dragged after him in his descent all those who have freely, and under no external constraint, followed his suggestions.

The Word, which was the organ of creative love, is also the organ of the compassionate love of the father. The whole work of salvation rests upon him. This work is twofold. It is both internal and external; for it is to effect the reconciliation between God and man. It is not enough that God should draw near to man by a series of revelations; it is also necessary that man should be inclined toward God.

In truth, that he may come to the fountain of living waters, man must be athirst (John 17:26). He must be born from above in order to receive the Redeemer, who comes down from Heaven. Only "he who is of God heareth the words of God" (John 8:23-49). The voice of the good shepherd is known only by his sheep (John 10:27). In other words, the soul must have recovered the sense of Divine things, and there must be an affinity between it and the truth, in order that it may come to the light.

The incarnation is the only reparation of the fall. We know with what emphasis St. John insists upon the reality of the incarnation in opposition to the heresies of his time, which, by a spurious spiritualism, regarded the body of the Savior as a sort of delusive semblance. "Every spirit," he says "that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is of God" (I John 4:2-3).

Writing his Gospel and epistles in presence of those dualistic tendencies, which identified evil with the corporeal element, he felt himself called upon to magnify this glorious aspect of his incarnation. He does not dwell on the humiliation of Christ as St. Paul does, but there is no contradiction on this point between the Apostles. If the glory of the only begotten of the father is apparent to John through the veil of mortal flesh, that glory is, nevertheless, revealed in shrouded splendor.

He shows us Jesus Christ as subject to the weaknesses and suffering conditions of human life; he is weary; he groans; he weeps; he dies. His death is undoubtably a lifting up, in a spiritual point of view (John 3:14); and it was important to prove this in contradiction to Cerinthus, who regarded his death as only illusory. St. John gives emphasis to the truth, that it is both glorious and real: "This is he that came by blood." But death is still death—that is, the depth of humiliation. He is subject to a certain abasement; but he is subject to it voluntarily; it is an act of his Divine freedom. The Son has power to lay down his life, and has power to take it again. (John 10:18); thus, in our aspect, he is glorious in his humiliation. Yet more, to the Apostle of love the highest glory is that which comes from love. For him, as for Pascal, this is the supreme order of greatness. Thus regarded, what glory can be compared with the glory of him who gave his life for his brethren on the accursed tree?

After so much suffering and strife, endured from the beginning of the world, Divine love will at length win a glorious victory on the very scene of its conflicts. Even the brilliant colors of the Apocalypse fail to depict this triumph, for St. John exclaims in his first epistle: "It doth not 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" (I John 3:2). To be made like God—is not this the highest realization of the sublime purpose of the redeeming Word? Is it not the fulfillment of the prayer of Christ, "That they all may be one; as Thou, Father, art in me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in us?" (John 17:21).

Having ascended to these heavenly heights, the theology of John is complete; no mysticism can soar above it, however bold its flight. The perfect union of the creature with the Creator through the Word is the ultimate expression of the doctrine of love; beyond it there is nothing.

This is, therefore, the closing utterance of the apostolic age; the conclusion and not the refutation of all that has gone before; the conciliation of all contradictions in the church; in a word, the last revelation from Heaven, absolute truth, God himself. Freed from all error, comprehended in all its depth, it will ever be the grandest result wrought out by the historian of theology, who, bending over the book in which it was inscribed by the aged saint of Ephesus, seeks to decipher it from age to age. (*Hassell's History ppg 238-247*)

Joseph

JOSEPH: Symbolism: Sylvester Hassell: Joseph was a type of Christ in his father's special love for him, in his being sent to his brethren, rejected by them, sold to the Gentiles, delivered to death, in the sanctity of his life, in his humiliation, in his exaltation to be a prince and a savior, in the bowing down of his kindred before him, in his first speaking to them harshly, to humble them, but all the while loving and dealing kindly towards them, not taking their money for his corn, and finally settling all of them in the goodly land of Goshen, for which they paid nothing.

He was a prophetic interpreter of dreams, married in a priestly family, and ruled as a king over Egypt. He was thirty years old when he entered on his public ministry. He was the first-born son of Jacob and his favorite wife, Rachel, and received a double portion of his father's inheritance for Manasseh and Ephraim; and had from his father the blessings of the everlasting hills. (*Hassell's History ppg 75, 76*)

Josiah

JOSIAH: Sylvester Hassell: Josiah the last of the kings of pious Judah.... was crowned at the age of eight years, and at sixteen converted to God by his Spirit. He followed in the footsteps of Asa, Jehoshaphat, Hezekiah, and Manasseh, and in personal piety excelled them all. Saith the Holy Spirit, "And like unto him was there no king before him, that turned to the Lord with all his heart, and with

all his soul, and with all his might, according to all the law of Moses; neither after him arose there any like him' (II Kings 23:25).

He made a thorough purification of the temple and city of Jerusalem, of all the cities and high places in his own kingdom; and pushed his reformation into other cities and places where he might be allowed. Israel had been carried away, but there was a people substituted in their place called Samaritans, who offered no resistance, and Josiah purged the cities of Manasseh, Ephraim and Simeon and a portion of Naphtali; destroying the houses of the high places in the cities of Samaria which the kings of Israel had made, and slaying the priests who sacrificed thereon. He made thorough work of it; and during his reign the people had rest, and departed not from following the Lord God of their fathers.

Near the close of his reign he opposed the march of the king of Egypt through his territories toward the Euphrates. He made battle against him and was wounded. He was brought to Jerusalem and died in peace. All Judah and Jerusalem, especially the prophet Jeremiah, mourned for him. During his pious reign he enjoyed the ministry of the prophets Jeremiah, Zephaniah, Nahum, and Habakkuk (II Chronicles 34; 2Chr 35; II Kings 20; 2Ki 21; Lamentations 4:20).

God's threatened wrath and captivity against Judah and Jerusalem were delayed during Josiah's reign, but, as soon as he was gathered to his fathers, the vials were poured out." (*Hassell's History pg 131*)

Jotham

JOTHAM Jotham was son and successor to his father Uzziah. Sacrifice and burning of incense were yet tolerated in high places, though Jotham was a moderately good king, and followed the general policy of his father. He did not attempt to usurp the priesthood. In his latter days the Lord began more seriously to press Judah with her old enemies, Syria and Israel (II Chronicles 17; II Kings 15; Micah 1; 2)." (*Hassell's History pg 129*)

Judah, The Tribe Of

The Tribe of JUDAH Genesis 49:10, "The scepter shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come; and unto him shall the gathering of the people be."

Judah never ceased to be a tribe with at least a tribal scepter and lawgiver, Sanhedrim or Senators, until the destruction of Jerusalem, A.D. 70. The power of life and death is said to have been taken by the Roman procurators or

governors, about A.D. 30, or the time of the crucifixion of Christ (John 18:31-32).

The Idumean, Herod the Great, though appointed by the Roman Senate king of Judah, B.C. 40, ruled as a native sovereign, even rebuilding or extensively repairing and beautifying the temple, until his death, B.C. 4. (*Hassell*)

Judas Iscariot

JUDAS ISCARIOT: C. H. Cayce Judas was in the church, and was sent out by the Saviour with the other eleven to preach. Thus have we an example and the lesson that some bad folks get in the church, and even occupy the pulpit. But Judas was not in the sacramental supper. The Savior instituted the sacramental supper at the time He ate the last Passover supper with His disciples. Now get your Bible and turn to Matthew 26 and read verses 17 to 25 (Matthew 26:17-25) inclusive. Then turn to Mark 14 and read verses 12 to 21 (Mark 14:12-21) inclusive. These records show very clearly that while they were eating the Passover supper the conversation was engaged in as to who should betray the Savior. Now turn to John 13 and read verses 18 to 32 (John 13:18-32) inclusive.

In these verses John tells of the same conversation recorded by Matthew and Mark as to who should betray the Savior, and remember that this conversation was engaged in while they were eating the Passover supper. John has it recorded that Jesus told who it was that should betray Him by saying, “He it is, to whom I shall give a sop, when I have dipped it. And when He had dipped the sop, He gave it to Judas Iscariot, the son of Simon.”—John 13:26. There is no sop in the sacramental supper, but there was sop in the Passover supper. Then in verse 30 (John 13:30) John says, “He then having received the sop went immediately out: and it was night.” This makes the matter very clear that Judas left or went out while they were eating the Passover supper.

Then Jesus took the bread and wine, the substance of the Jewish Passover supper, and instituted the sacramental supper. Read now Matthew 26:26-29; Mark 14:22-25. Now go again to John 13 and read verses 1 to 17 (John 13:1-17) and you will find the account of what the Savior did, which account was omitted by the other writers. After giving the account of what the Savior did, John goes back and relates the conversation which took place, corroborating what the other writers had said concerning that conversation, which took place while they were eating the Passover. (*Cayce’s Editorials vol. 4, ppg 339, 340*)

Jude, The Book Of

The Book of JUDE: Sylvester Hassell Jude was a brother of James, a half-brother of Christ, and not probably an Apostle. Some, however, suppose that both James and Jude, the authors of the epistles, were Apostles. The epistle of Jude strongly resembles the second chapter of the second epistle of Peter. It is a solemn warning against the licentious tendencies of Gnosticism. The allusion to the remarkable Apocryphal book of Enoch gives an inspired sanction only to the truth of the passage quoted, not to the whole book. Jude fitly closes the epistle by exhorting his readers to contend earnestly for the holy heavenly faith once delivered to the saints by prophets and Apostles, looking unto him who is able to keep them from falling, and to present them faultless before the presence of his glory with exceeding joy. (*Hassell's History pg 212*)

Justification

JUSTIFICATION: Wilson Thompson: Justification is one of the most important points of doctrine in the whole system of Christian Theology. It embraces in it the four following considerations:

First: The judge who justifieth.

Second: The character of those who are justified.

Third: The principles upon which the Judge proceeds in justifying.

Fourth: The evidences by which we are brought to know our justification.

To these four general propositions I shall call the attention of the reader in the following discourse.

First: The Judge who justifieth. "It is God that justifieth," Romans 8:33; 3:30; Isaiah 50:8-9. In all these places God is spoken of as the Supreme Judge in the court of heaven; deciding on the case of his people, and pronouncing their justification. The word *justify*, or *justification*, is a forensic term, and is used in judicial affairs in a court of justice. It does

not mean an inward cleansing, but a legal, that is, a just and lawful proceeding of a judge, adjudging one to life.

Justification is the opposite of condemnation, and I perfectly agree with Dr. Gill, when he says, "The word *justify* is never used in a physical sense for producing any real internal change in men, but in a forensic sense, and stands opposed, not to a state of impurity and unholiness, but to a state of condemnation: it is a law term, and used of judicial affairs, transacted in a court of judicature; see Deuteronomy 25:1; Proverbs 17:15; Isaiah 5:22; Matthew 12:37, where justification stands opposed to condemnation; and this is the sense of the word whenever it is used in the doctrine under consideration; so in Job 9:2-3; 25:4; so by David; Psalms 143:2, and in Paul's epistles, where the doctrine of justification is treated of, respect is had to courts of judicature, and to a judicial process in them; men are represented as sinners, charged with sin, and pronounced guilty before God, and subject to condemnation and death; when, according to this evangelic doctrine, they are justified by the obedience and blood of Christ, cleared of all charges, acquitted and absolved, and freed from condemnation and death, and adjudged to eternal life; see Romans 3:9,19 and Romans 5:16,18-19; 8:1,33-34; Galatians 2:16-17; Titus 3:7."

Evangelic justification is not the work of the Spirit of God, on the heart of the sinner, implanting life in, and quickening the soul, but the work of God as a judge on a throne of justice, deciding on, and adjudging one to life, according to law and justice. **It is not the infusing of righteousness, nor a purging out of the inward evils of the heart,** but the pronouncing of one's justification with reference to the charge preferred against him.

I wish the reader to understand distinctly that **justification is an external act of God as a judge, acting in a court of justice,** on the case of the sinner, and not the internal work of the Spirit on the heart.

Thus God as the Supreme Judge of heaven and earth, acting upon the principles of justice, according to his most holy law,

justifieth "the ungodly," not because they have been renewed by the Spirit, not because they have repented and believed the gospel, nor because of any other evangelical obedience of theirs, or inward work of the Spirit, but **because of the obedience and blood of Christ**, as saith the apostle, Romans 8:33-34, Who can lay anything to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth. Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea, rather that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us."

As God, who is the Judge of all the earth will do right, and is just while he justifieth the ungodly, and these ungodly ones are justified as the elect of God, and because of the death of Christ, and so complete, that the apostle could challenge all opposers to lay anything to their charge, and declare, Acts 13:39, that they "are justified from all things." We shall consider,

Secondly: The character of those who are justified. We have seen already that they are the ungodly and God's elect; and that God as the judge justifies the elect, so that none can lay anything to their charge, and yet they are called ungodly.

The character of God's elect is set forth in scripture in two points of light; **1st**, as they are in themselves, and in relation to Adam, their earthly head and progenitor, and **2nd**, as they are in the sight of God as this elect, in Christ their spiritual head, in whom they were chosen, and by whom they were represented. In the first of these views they are spoken of as being condemned to death, and every charge may be justly preferred against them that can be brought against any other sinner; but in the last view they are spoken of as being justified and absolved from every charge, and adjudged to life.

In the first Adam there is no discrimination of elect and non-elect, but all his natural posterity without exception are considered in a condemned state, under guilt and sentence of death, by virtue of the offence of the first Adam, who acted for all his then unborn race; but in Christ the second Adam, all his elect seed are considered in a justified state, by virtue of the obedience of Christ, who acted for his unborn elect spiritual seed.

These two Adams are spoken of as the only two men who represented mankind, and Paul runs these as parallel in order to show both the condemnation of the world and the justification of the elect; see Romans 5.

In relation to Adam, the whole human family is condemned to death, and the sentence is gone forth, "Thou shalt surely die." "Wherefore as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all men have sinned." By this original sin, condemnation unto death came upon all mankind; see Romans 5:13, "By the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation." This offence armed death with power, and commissioned it to reign over the whole posterity of Adam, according to Romans 5:17, "By one man's offence death reigned by one." So we see from plain scripture language; that by the offence of Adam sin commenced its reign; and reigns unto death, agreeably to Romans 5:21.

We judge of the magnitude of a crime by the penalty which the law under which it is committed annexes to it. Death is the greatest possible penalty; the basest and most aggravated crime can be punished with no greater punishment. We are exposed to death as the penalty annexed to the offence of Adam; our first earthly head and progenitor; therefore we judge this to be a crime of the greatest atrocity. By this one offence the whole race of Adam have become condemned under the reign of sin, and the sentence of death, and are now naturally and mentally opposite to all good, and inclined to all evil. All men, therefore, without any distinction of elect or non-elect, as they stand related to Adam in his offence, are children of wrath, the servants of sin, the subjects of death, and stand as condemned criminals, under the just sentence of the just law of a holy God, who will by no means clear the guilty.

In this state of guilt and condemnation the whole human family lies, indisposed towards God, unreconciled to his law, opposed to his gospel, and disaffected to this government, enslaved to their own discordant passions, they hate the light, and love darkness; and choose the way to death, and under the influence

of an infernal infatuation, are rendered inflexible to every power but that which is irresistible.

I shall make no distinction here between the moral and physical powers of man, for the physical actions of men are under the dictation and government of the moral disposition; and until the latter be rectified by the Spirit of God, the former will always be averse to real good.

In this fallen condemned state where sin has placed us, it is impossible that we should ever be justified by our own good works. If all our powers, both moral and physical, were restored to their best state before the fall, we could never obtain justification by the exercise of them, for by the deeds of the law shall no flesh be justified. We are condemned already, judgment has come upon all men unto condemnation, and when condemnation unto death has past upon an offender, for a crime which he has previously committed, **no works which he may afterwards perform will ever clear him from the former sentence of condemnation,** which still stands in full force against the criminal.

We are already condemned, condemned to death by a just and holy law, for a capital offence, and future acts of obedience will never justify us, be they performed ever so promptly; nay, if our whole nature were renewed, and made as pure as Adam's was before the fall, and we were to live clear of all sin, to the age of Methuselah, we should yet be condemned; for when we have done all, we are unprofitable servants, we have done no more than our duty, and being previously condemned to death, this sentence would still stand against us.

Before a law is transgressed, it can only require obedience of those who are under it, but after it is transgressed, and its sentence of condemnation unto death has passed upon the transgressor, nothing less than the penalty will satisfy it. The natural obligations which men were under before the fall to love and serve God, to obey and worship him, etc., are in no sense relaxed by his indisposition to perform them, but men manifest the moral turpitude of their hearts by a habitual course of unreasonable rebellion against God. They love to walk in gaudy

show, with impious lips, a deceitful tongue, feet that are swift to shed blood, an inexorable heart, that is deceitful and desperately wicked above all things, and no fear of God before their eyes.

This is a faint representation of fallen men; eternity before, hell yawning with hideous and gloomy voracity, to receive him at his arrival, while satanic influence impels the willing captive down the dreadful dreary way that leads to the dark domain of eternal despair and remediless woe.

Should angels stand aghast, and weep in tears of blood, should all the cattle of a thousand hills, pour forth their blood, should rivers fill their channels with costly oil, and infants yield their lives in sacrifice for sin; all these could never revoke the sentence of the law. **Man has sinned, and man must die!** If wit and reason fail, angelic sympathy, and blood of lambs and bullocks with all the works of men, can never weigh one groat in the scale of our justification.

I cry, O propitious heaven, is there no gracious volume in thy salubrious clime to grant one ray of hope to fallen man? This is the character of those whom God justifies, when they are considered as they are in their fallen state, and in relation to the first Adam; and in this relation they are condemned, and **no work or sacrifice that either we or Adam can perform, will ever remove the curse or make us just with God.**

If we are not in a relation to the Second Adam, justification is impossible, for we have neither power nor merit to justify ourselves, and as I observed before, God's elect have two distinct standings, one in the first Adam, by which they with the rest of the world have fallen under condemnation unto death, and can never be justified by any work or sacrifice in the power of Adam or themselves; and another in the Second Adam, in and by whom alone justification is possible to any of the fallen race. This we shall further illustrate, while we consider,

Thirdly: The principles upon which the Judge proceeds in justifying. We have shown above, that justification is a law term, and is always used in scripture in a forensic sense, not for

an inward cleansing, nor in opposition to a state of defilement, but for the act of a judge in the court of justice, and in opposition to a state of condemnation. **The law and justice is the rule by which the judge proceeds, either to condemn, or justify the accused.**

̄
If the prosecution be brought legally against the offender, and the crime alleged be sufficiently proven, it becomes the duty of the judge to pronounce the sentence of condemnation and death upon the accused, and to appoint the time of execution, but if the proof should go to clear the accused, it becomes the duty of the judge to pronounce the justification of the accused.

The law will not allow the judge to clear the guilty on account of his repentance, reformation, tears, fair promises, or any change that may be effected in the man accused after the commission of an offence. Now, considering God as a judge in the court of heaven, man the accused, his guilt proven before the judge by ten thousand witnesses arising from the heart, and demonstrating it to be deceitful and desperately wicked above all things; full of murder, revenge, enmity, hatred, and every evil work; and the law says, "Thou shalt surely die."

God will not justify these rebels, unless it can be done in strict administration of justice; for David says, Psalms 9:8, "He shall judge the world in righteousness, he shall minister judgment to the people in uprightness." See Genesis 18:25, "Shall not the judge of all the earth do right?" Exodus 34:7, "He will by no means clear the guilty." Deuteronomy 7:10, "He will not be slack to him that hateth him; he will repay him to his face." Deuteronomy 32:4, "He is the Rock, his work is perfect; for all his ways are judgment; a God of truth, and without iniquity; just and right is he."

From all these passages and many others, we are taught, that as a judge God will administer strict justice; therefore in relation to the First Adam, and in ourselves considered, we shall never be justified, and if the judge proceeds with us in this relation, we are in a hopeless situation, for in this relation, "judgment has come upon all men to condemnation."

The scriptures present to us the blood and righteousness of Christ as our only justification; and this righteousness is declared, that God as judge might be just in the justifying of the sinner. See Romans 3:26-28. As condemnation has come upon all men, by virtue of their federal relation to the First Adam, so justification can only come upon any of the human race by a federal relation with Christ the Second Adam; and so justification is always taught in relation to Christ, and unless we are related to him as our righteous-ness, we shall never be justified; for **that is all the righteousness which the law will ever be satisfied with,** and God will never justify a sinner in any other way than in relation to Christ, and that relation must be that God as a just and equitable judge, in the ministration of justice, can act upon, and the law can recognize, so as to justify the sinner by the righteousness of Christ, **as if it were a righteousness which the sinner had of himself.**

See Romans 5:18-19, "By the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life." **The law is satisfied, God justifies and is just in so doing,** and none can condemn the soul which is in Jesus Christ; and so Paul says, Romans 8:1, "There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus," and this being in Christ Jesus is according to election, as Romans 8:33 shows, where the apostle speaks of the same people to whom there is no condemnation, and asks in a way of defiance, "Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect?"

In Christ they stand, as the elect of God, in relation to him as their righteousness. I Corinthians 1:30, "But of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom and righteousness," and so it is said, I Corinthians 6:11, "Ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus." I Corinthians 5:13, "For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.

From the above scriptures with many others, it is positively declared that the elect are in Christ, and being in him by the choice of God, they are made the righteousness of God in him;

he is the end of the law for righteousness to them, and so they are justified in his name.

Justification is not an act of the creature; nor does it depend on the knowledge of the creature, but it is the act of the judge, and bears date from the time the judge decides on the case.

God decided on the case of all his elect before all worlds, and chose them in Christ, and in his decision gave them every spiritual blessing in him, before the foundation of the world; and therefore, their sins were laid on Christ, Isaiah 53:6, and God will not impute their sins to them and these are they of whom David said (Psalms 32:1-2), "Blessed is he whose transgression is forgiven, and whose sin is covered.

Blessed is the man unto whom the Lord imputeth not iniquity." Compare with Romans 4:7-8; I Corinthians 5:13; John 1:47.

God will not impute sin to his elect, because he has laid their iniquities upon Christ, and so they are blessed, for he bears their iniquities, and they are clothed with his righteousness, according to Isaiah 61:10, "He hath clothed me with the garments of salvation; he hath covered me with the robe of righteousness." Jeremiah saw into this, and said of Christ, Jeremiah 23:6, "This is the name whereby he shall be called THE LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS."

Our iniquities being laid on Christ, and not on us, he must bear them, and so it devolved on him "to finish the transgression and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness." According to Daniel 9:21, and Isaiah 54:17, "their righteousness is of me, saith the Lord." In agreement with the above texts, we read in Numbers 23:21, "He [God] hath not beheld iniquity in Jacob, neither hath he seen perverseness in Israel."

Now from the scriptures above cited, with the whole Bible, it is plainly taught that God did lay the iniquities of his people on Christ, and therefore will not impute sin to his people, nor did he ever behold iniquity in Jacob, nor perverseness in Israel, but has decided a judge in the court of heaven, that their iniquities shall lay upon Christ, and be executed on him, and not on them,

and therefore, "by his stripes we are healed," for "he was [according to this decision] delivered for our offences, and raised again for our justification, according to Romans 4:25.

Now I have always thought that when the judge officially decided on the case of any man or number of men, and decided on their justification or condemnation, that the date of such decision is the date of the thing decided on. If so, when the reader will tell me, the date of God's decision on the case of Christ's suffering, and his church's justification thereby; I will set the same date to their justification; for justification is the act of the judge in thus deciding on their case; and **this he did, when he laid our iniquities on Christ, and determined never to impute sin to his people;** and therefore Christ was sentenced to death, and regarded [by virtue of this sentence] as a lamb slain from the foundation of the world, and that for the elect, and all this decided on by the judge, and recorded in the record of heaven's court; see Revelation 13:8; 17:8; and also Hebrews 10:7,9; Psalms 40:6-8, from which we see that the sentence had gone forth against Christ, and this sentence was written in God's book, or heaven's record, and that record not only contained the sentence against Christ, but the names of those in whose behalf he was sentenced to be slain; and so to them it was the book of life, because justification unto life was therein adjudged or recorded to them, but sacrifice and death was written against Christ, because our sins were adjudged to him, and he sentenced to death for them, and the very hour appointed for his execution, as he says, John 12:23; 17:1, "The hour is come," and the malice of men and devils could not take him any sooner; see John 7:30,44, "No man laid hands on him, for his hour was not yet come;" but when the appointed hour for him to suffer was come, he says, John 12:27, "Now is my soul troubled, and what shall I say? Father save me from this hour; but for this cause came I unto this hour. Father glorify thy name."

This was the hour which God had set for the execution of Christ when he was sentenced to death for the iniquities of his people, which God had laid upon him, and therefore would not impute iniquity to them, nor behold iniquity or perverseness in them,

but recorded their names in the book of life, and that from the foundation of the world.

And so Paul says, Romans 8:1, "There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus;" for his righteousness is declared (See Romans 3:26) that God might be just in the justification of the sinner, therefore, Paul believed that justification had come upon all God's elect in the past tense, as he says, Romans 5:18-19, and so he speaks (Romans 3:26), "Being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Jesus Christ."

Now if justification is a forensic term, and if it is used in a judicial sense, and is to be understood of the act of a judge adjudging one to life, and God be understood as the judge, then ever since he adjudged the elect to life, by virtue of their sins being laid on Christ, and not imputed to them, they have been justified; for the judge has acted and decided on their case, and placed their names in the Book of Life.

The apostle breaks forth into an ecstasy in viewing this exhilarating truth, and says, (Ephesians 1:3), "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places [or things] in Christ.

Justification is a spiritual blessing, and if we were blessed with all spiritual blessings in Christ, we were blessed with this among other blessings, and these blessings were not in consequence of our faith and repentance, but according to election before all worlds, as the next verse says, "According as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world," and the consequent effect of these blessings being according to this early choice is, "that we should be holy and without blame before God, is according, not to our faith, but to our election before the foundation of the world; so our justification must be; for if I be holy and without blame before God the judge, I am in a justified state, because holy and without blame before him in love.

The love of God, or his grace, which chose his people in Christ before the world, and blessed them with all spiritual blessings,

gave them such a relation to him, and standing in him that when God views them in Christ, according to this choice and these blessings, they are holy and without blame before him, and so they are "justified freely by his grace."

God viewed them without blame before him, (Ephesians 1:5), "Having predestinated us to the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself, according to the good pleasure of his will.

According to the good pleasure of his will, he chose us in Christ before the foundation of the world, and according to the same good pleasure of his will he laid our iniquities on Christ and consequently will not impute sin to his people, but gives them all spiritual blessings, and having laid their iniquities on Christ, he has not beheld iniquity in Jacob, nor perverseness in Israel; but they are holy and without blame before him in his love.

Now as all this is in Christ in whom they were chosen, blessed with all spiritual blessings, and regarded as being holy and without blame, so it is in him that God views them when he pronounces their justification; and as God had chosen them in him before the foundation of the world, and gave them all spiritual blessings in him according to that choice, so that in him considered they were holy, and without blame before God; and all this was in Christ, and before they had any knowledge of it, or sensible participation in it, they were secured to the preordination of God, and all this was by Jesus Christ, (see Ephesians 1:5-6, "Having predestinated us unto the adoption of children, by Jesus Christ to himself, according to the good pleasure of his will, to the praise of the glory of his grace, wherein he hath made us accepted in the beloved.")

Here in the grace of election we are chosen in Christ, and accordingly blessed with all spiritual blessings, (and justification is one) and to secure us to the sensible enjoyment of these blessings, God has predestinated us to the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself, and according to this glorious grace, and in it he hath made us accepted in the beloved; that is, in the electing and predestinating grace of God, we are accepted in Christ, and in him considered, we are holy and without blame before God in love, and all this to the praise of the glory of his

electing and predestinating grace, wherein he hath made us accepted in the beloved.

God the judge views us holy and without blame before him, on account of our iniquities being laid on Christ and not on us, and so we being in him by election, we are blessed with eternal redemption, and our sins laid on him, they are forgiven to us, or not imputed to us, (see Ephesians 1:7), "In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins according to the riches of his grace.

"O what rich grace is this, all spiritual blessings are made ours by it, and in it God hath abounded in all spiritual blessings to his chosen people; (see Ephesians 1:8), "Wherein he hath abounded toward us, in all wisdom and prudence." Every revelation of grace made to us is only a blessed consequence of this rich electing and predestinating grace, according to Ephesians 1:9-12. "Having made known unto us the mystery of his will according to his good pleasure, which he hath purposed in himself, that in the dispensation of the fulness of times, he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth, even in him; in whom also we have obtained an inheritance, being predestinated according to the purpose of him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will; that we should be to the praise of his glory, who first trusted in Christ."

- Some of my brethren understand all this to be only a decree to justify, that is, they think God has determined that he will at some future time, justify the elect, but that they are always condemned until they are renewed by the Spirit, and brought to act in faith on Christ, and then by their faith, as an act of reliance on him, the judge acts in their justification, and justifies them, because they have believed in Christ.

This is what I oppose, for if God proceeds to justify the sinner, because he believes in Christ, it is faith as an act of ours, and not the blood and righteousness of Christ, which is the cause of our justification; but the scripture everywhere teaches us, that as a judge God justifies us, because Christ died for us, or

because our sins were laid on him, and not because we believed it.

Faith is an evidence of justification, and not the cause of it. If a judge should determine or decree before to justify any man who should be brought before him, would not this predetermination such a judge to act on such a case? But if justification be an eminent act of God, passing upon the whole body of the elect in Christ, and by virtue of this act the sentence of death was passed upon Christ, and he regarded as slain for us, so we being made accepted in the beloved, are looked at by the judge as being holy and without blame before him.

The pardon of sin is very different from justification; the former is forgiving the guilty, but the latter is declaring one guiltless according to law.

Pardon of sin respects us as sinners in our fallen state, and was obtained for us by Christ before he rose from the dead; we are sinners, and forgiveness or non-imputation views us as such, and to us as guilty in ourselves, and self-condemned, the grace of pardon, or non-imputation, is revealed to us by the Spirit, when we are brought to experience an application of the blood of Christ.

Justification passed upon the elect by virtue of their sins being laid on Christ and not on them; and so they are justified as if they were innocent, and had never sinned; but pardon is a grace bestowed on them as sinners in themselves, and God freely forgives them through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus.

We are justified because we are holy and without blame before God; but as sinners before God we are pardoned and forgiven, through the interposition of Christ, and so while we rejoice that God will not impute sin to us, yet we are humbled under the sense of our being great sinners, to whom much is forgiven.

We can only be justified by the judge; because we are without blame before him; and we can only appear without blame before him in the beloved; in whom we were chose, before the foundation of the world; and being thus chosen in him, our case

was decided on, and our names were written in the Book of Life, according to Revelation 17:8, "The beast that thou sawest was, and is not, and shall ascend out of the bottomless pit, and go into perdition; and they that dwell on the earth shall wonder (whose names were not written in the Book of Life from the foundation) when they behold the beast that was, and is not, and yet is."

These names were written in the Book of Life from the foundation of the world, and therefore they were justified to life, or else their names would not have been written in the Book of Life, and he who wrote their names in the book did it, because Christ was sentenced to death for them, in agreement with Revelation 13:8, "And all that dwell upon the earth shall worship him [the beast] whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world."

Here the Book of Life, in which the names of God's people were written from the foundation of the world is called the Book of Life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world; from which we are taught that our names were written in the Book of Life at the same time that God decided on our case, and sentenced Christ to death, and us to life by him; and so our names were written in the Book of Life, and he was condemned to the slaughter at the same time, according to Psalms 40:7, "Then said, I, Lo I come; in the volume of the book it is written of me."

The speaker in this text is Christ, according to Hebrews 10:7-10, where the same words are expressed and explained. Both David and Paul speak of God's book, where the offering of the body of Christ was written, and as both these writers refer to such a book, and the Book of Life being the book of the Lamb slain, in which his death was recorded; David and Paul, no doubt, referred to this book when they quote the words of the above texts from the book where these things were written of him.

Nor were the names of the believers alone, all that were written in this book of life, but all the mystical body of Christ, whether born or unborn, were written in this book from the foundation of

the world (see Psalms 139:16), "Thine eyes did see my substance, [or body] yet being unperfect, and in thy book all my members were written, which in continuance were fashioned, when as yet there was none of them." And these whose names were written in the Book of Life are they who shall finally be saved, according to Revelation 20:12-15, "And whosoever was not found written in the Book of Life was cast into the lake of fire."

Now from all the above scriptures, the following facts are deducible and unquestionable.

1st. We [the elect] were chosen in Christ before the foundation.

2nd. God made them accepted in the beloved, and gave them all spiritual blessings in [justification among the rest] according to his choice.

3rd. Those who were thus chosen in Christ were his sheep, and when they went astray, their iniquities were laid on him, and not on them, and God as the supreme judge pronounced the sentence of death on him, and recorded it in this book, and adjudged them to life, and recorded their names in the Book of Life from the foundation of the world.

4th. The judge having thus decided the case, and all the sins of his elect being laid on Christ, he will never impute sin to the elect, nor behold iniquity in Jacob, nor perverseness in Israel, but they stand holy and without blame before him.

5th. In consequence of this irrevocable decision, the hour is set for Christ to be executed for them, and not us, and so we are justified by his blood from all things.

6th. As our sins were laid on Christ and not on us, so he was executed for them, and not us; and so we are justified by his blood from all things.

Hitherto I have been speaking of the justification as an official act of God as Judge; sitting on the case of his elect, and

deciding on their justification, and the death of Christ in their stead, and as I have fully proved from the positive declarations of scripture, that God did lay their iniquities on Christ, and declared them to be holy and without blame before him in love, and so their names were written in the Book of Life from the foundation of the world, and he adjudged to the slaughter from the same time, and the hour set for his execution, according to the determined counsel [or decision] and his foreknowledge of God.

It only remains for me to show the justice of God as a judge in thus deciding the case, since Christ was innocent, and we were guilty; and yet he was condemned, and we justified in the decision of the judge.

Election gave us a standing in Christ, and a relation to him which will fully justify all the ways of God to man; and we have above proved from scripture, that God did choose his people in Christ before the foundation of the world, and of course they were in relation to him, ever since they were chosen in him; and he is their head, and they are his members, and this doctrine is taught in the following manner: Romans 12:4-5, "As we have many members in one body, and all members have not the same office; so we, being many, are one body in Christ, and every one members one of another." I Corinthians 10:17, "For we, being many, are one bread, and one body." I Corinthians 12:20, "But now are they many members, yet but one body." I Corinthians 12:12, "For as the body is one and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body; so also is Christ." Ephesians 1:22-23, "Who gave him to be the head over all things to the church, which is his body, the fulness of him that worketh all in all."

These many members that make but one body, are the members spoken of in Psalms 139:16, and these many members make the church or mystical body of Christ, and these are they whose iniquities were laid on Christ, and for whom he was slain, by which they were redeemed or purchased; (see I Corinthians 6:19-20), "Ye are not your own, for ye are bought with a price; therefore glorify God in your body, and in your

spirit, which are God's." I Corinthians 7:23, "Ye are bought with a price." Galatians 1:4, "Who gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us from this present evil world according to the will of God, and our Father." See Galatians 2:20; Ephesians 5, from verse 22 (Ephesians 5:22) to the close, Romans 6:7-11, all of which prove beyond a doubt the existence of an union between Christ and his church. This union or relation existed before we believed, nay, before Christ died, for he loved the church, and gave himself for it, Ephesians 5:25-27; not that he might have it, but that he might present it a glorious church.

Now as the law will justify a judge in passing the sentence on the head, for the offence of the members of the body, so Christ the head of the church was sentenced for the offence of his offending members, and in this the justice of God appears in laying our sins on Christ.

This union or relation is illustrated in scripture by the union subsisting between the husband and wife. The church is called the bride, the Lamb's wife, Revelation 21:9; 19:7, and Christ is often called (in relation to his church) the bridegroom; and the apostles treats the subject in the following manner. I Corinthians 11:3, "I would have you know, that the head of every man is Christ, and the head of the woman is the man, and the head of Christ is God." Ephesians 5:23, "For the husband is the head of the wife; even as Christ is the head of the church; and he is the savior of the body." "For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall be joined unto his wife, and they two shall be one flesh; this is a great mystery, but I speak concerning Christ and the church."

Now the union between the husband and the wife is such, that the husband must satisfy the debts contracted by the wife; for the law demands it of him by virtue of the relation above demonstrated; so Christ must pay the contract of the church, which is his wife, and so God is just in laying her iniquities to him, and not to her, for he is her living husband.

This relation is illustrated by the prophet, and by Christ himself, by the figure of the shepherd and the sheep, which are in relation to each other, so that the shepherd, if he be the owner of the sheep, must be accountable for any

damage done by the sheep. Christ shows that he is not only the shepherd but the real owner of the sheep, John 10:11,14-15; and many of his sheep were then in unbelief, see verse 16; and **he will pay for all their trespasses, even if it costs him his life.**

This is what the prophet says, Isaiah 53:6, "All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all."

The sheep is the property of the shepherd, and he must in law answer for them. If I be the proper owner of a flock of sheep, and they should unlawfully break in and kill your orchard, would you bring suit against the sheep, and bring them as transgressors into court; or would you not rather bring suit against me, as the shepherd and owner of the offending sheep; and I must pay the damage, be it great or small; so Christ being the shepherd and owner of the sheep, is proceeded against in a legal way, and the Lord as a judge, lays the iniquity of the sheep to the shepherd, and assesses the damage to be the death of the shepherd.

So the sword must slumber, until the shepherd comes to the hour set for his execution, and then awake and smite the shepherd, who had been sentenced for the sheep, according to Zechariah 13:7, "Awake, O sword, against my shepherd, and against the man that is my fellow, saith the Lord of hosts; smite the shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered; and I will turn my hand upon the little ones." So Christ says, "I lay down my life for the sheep."

As he was prosecuted and executed as the shepherd of his sheep, and suffered for and under the iniquities of his sheep, so he is brought as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before his shearers is dumb, so he opened not his mouth," Isaiah 53:7. As Christ was the shepherd, so the sheep were God's elect people; see Isaiah 53:8, "For the transgressions of my people was he stricken," or was the stroke upon him.

Various are the figures employed in the scriptures to illustrate this gracious union; such as the vine and the branches, a king and subjects, etc.

Time would fail me to enter largely into this glorious grace, but from the scriptures already adduced on the relation between Christ and his people, the bond of which is love, this one point is established, that Christ and his church are in such a relation as to show how God is just in laying their iniquities to him, and justifying them by virtue of his blood.

We have hitherto showed that the elect of God and church of Christ have two distinct standings, one in Adam, and one in Christ; that in Adam they are condemned to death, and so must remain; but in Christ they are holy and without blame before God.

-
And so Adam was a figure of him that was to come; and these are the two heads. Condemnation came by the first, and justification came by the second. We feel under condemnation by the offence of the first, but we enjoy justification by the obedience of the second. Romans 5 shows these two Adams acting for their respective seeds, with these different effects, on their seeds; by the one came condemnation unto death, on all his seed, but by the other came justification unto life and all his seed, etc.

Now we have showed the principles upon which God as a judge proceeded to pass the sentence of death on Christ, and acquit the church, and so he must die and they must live thereby; so he came to the very hour appointed, and suffered and died for our sins; according to the scriptures he bare our sins in his own body on the tree; according to the sentence of the judge, he was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification.

As I have proved above, by positive scripture, that God will not impute sin to his people, having laid them on Christ, and that he is consequently regarded in the decision of God as a Lamb slain from the foundation of the world, and their names written from the same period in the Book of Life. So when he was actually

slain, they were actually justified, for the obedience of one man the free gift has come upon all men (that is, the elect of all nations) unto justification of life.

Just in the very same sense that the church was chosen in Christ before the world was, they were viewed in him without blame, and as his elect, he will behold no spot in them; this I sometimes call a virtual justification, and the enemies of the doctrine call it eternal justification, and then commence a war with the name, and make a wonderful ado about the name.

Well the truth will have its enemies, and they may give it all the hard names they please. I will not pretend to justify the term eternal justification, but the doctrine is generally buffeted under that name I esteem a precious truth, but with comfort to my poor soul, which I think could never be saved without it.

As God had decided on the justification of the elect by the death of Christ, so our justification is often ascribed to his blood; it is said Romans 3:24, "Being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Jesus Christ." So we see that we are justified by the grace of God as a judge, and that grace flows to us through the redemption that is in Christ; that is, when God freely adjudged us to life, and wrote our names in the Book of Life, he acted on the case, viewing us in relation to Christ, and through the redemption that is in him, he is just in the decision of our justification; as it is said, Romans 3:26, "To declare I say, at this time his righteousness, that he might be just, and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus;" that is to say, the righteousness of Christ, or his standing related to his church, as the end of the law for righteousness to her, God is just as a judge in justifying the church by the satisfaction made, or rendered to it by her head and husband.

Now we plainly see, that the sentence of death due to our offences, was executed on Christ according to God's determined purpose, and we are consequently justified thereby, in a way of justice. Christ bare the sins of many, and when he died for us, and suffered for our sins as a public head, acting and dying as the representative of many, his death is regarded as the death of all for whom he died, and this is what we read in II

Corinthians 5:14-15, "For the love of Christ constraineth us; because we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead; and that he died for all that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him, which died for them, and rose again."

As our sins were laid on Christ and we were in him by election, so he came to die in our stead, and **when he died for us, it was the same in the eye of the law as if all his members had then died**, and so Paul said, Galatians 2:20, "I am crucified with Christ;" and Romans 6:8, "Now if we be dead with Christ, " etc., Romans 7:4, "Ye are become dead to the law by the body of Christ."

From all of which it is plain that when Christ died for us, we were regarded as dead, or his death was looked upon as if it were the death of all he represented; for he died, not as a private individual; but as the public head and representative of all his members, and so when he, though but one; died for them all; the love of Christ constrains us to judge that they were all dead by him.

So when he rose from the dead he rose for our justification, and as he died in relation to the elect, so he rose in relation to them, and so it is said of him. Romans 4:25, "Who was delivered for our offences and was raised again for our justification."

We being thus interested in his resurrection as our representative, we are spoken of as rising with him; see Isaiah 26:19, "Thy dead men shall live together with my dead body shall they arise." Hosea 6:2, "After two days will he revive us, in the third day he will raise us up, and we shall live in his sight."

The sentence of God had gone forth against Christ, as in Isaiah 53:11, "By his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many, for he shall bear their iniquities," and according to this sentence it devolved on Christ to make an end of sin, according to Daniel 9:24, and **so there was a must needs be, for Christ to suffer and rise again;** in proof of this, see Acts 17:2-3, "And Paul, as his manner was, went in unto them, and

three Sabbath days reasoned with them out of the scriptures, opening and alleging that Christ must needs have suffered, and risen again from the dead.”

Luke 24:26,46, from which it appears plain, that **Christ was under the strongest obligation to die for his church; yet he suffered freely and willingly;** he was under obligation as the sentence of death had passed upon him, as the head, husband, and shepherd of his people, but he willingly and voluntarily stood in this relation, and so, while he loved the church and freely gave himself for it, **the law demanded his life, and he must suffer.**

-
So while his willingness to suffer for us, shows his grace and love to us, it is the obligation he is under to suffer that shows the justice of his suffering; and so both grace and justice shine with equal luster in our free justification; and so we are justified by grace as a free gift, for it is said, Romans 5:16, “The free gift is of many offences unto justification;” yet though justification is a free gift, it comes to us through and by the blood of Christ, which he shed to satisfy the sentence of the law, which was justly executed on him, as the head of the church; see Romans 5:9.

Now I have said above, that when Christ actually suffered for our sins, we were actually justified, and this is true, according to Romans 5:18, “As by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation, even so by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life.” The sentence of condemnation and death actually came upon all Adam’s unborn seed, when he offended, and so, they are heirs to corruption, condemnation and death, and as they are born by a natural birth, they begin to feel the weight of this sentence, and mortality.

So when Christ the second Adam fulfilled the law, put away our sins, finished the transgression, and brought in everlasting righteousness, all his unborn spiritual seed were actually justified, because the sentence of God was actually executed on him in our stead, and all our sins were put away by the sacrifice

of himself; and the law was satisfied to the full; and so he was raised for our justification, and we were justified by his blood.

So justification is not a consequence of faith, as an act of the creature, but a consequence of the death of, or in other word, justification is the decision of a judge, adjudging one to life.

God adjudged us to life, because all our sins were imputed to Christ, and on this account he never did view iniquity in Jacob, nor perverseness in Israel, and will not impute sin to his elect, but all their iniquities being laid on Christ, the sentence of death due to their offences was executed upon him, and the justification due to his righteousness was given to them; and now the gospel reveals this righteousness to faith, and faith is an evidence to the soul, of his free justification. This brings me to speak,

Fourthly: of the evidence by which we are brought to know our justification.

The prisoner in the dungeon can only know that he is justified by the judge in court by some messenger, who may be sent to him, with the tidings of it; and however long he may disbelieve the message, it cannot make it untrue, because the fact does not depend for its truth upon the prisoner's faith, but is a truth before he believes it, as certainly as afterwards, and **his faith adds nothing to the truth of the faith, but only to his comfort in the enjoyment of a knowledge of the fact.**

So justification is a fact before faith, and faith adds nothing to it, but only believes the fact as it is declared to it in the gospel. Romans 1:17, "For therein [in the gospel] is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith." This righteousness is our justification, faith is the eye to which it is revealed, and the gospel brings it to view; thus the gospel is called the word of faith, Romans 10:8; and faith cometh by hearing this word; see Romans 10:17, "So then, faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God."

The gospel is sent to men as sinners, lying in the ruins of the first Adam, lost and condemned under the sentence of death; and proclaims and reveals the righteousness of Christ, as the justification of the ungodly; but no eye but that of faith can see it, and on this account many are ignorant of the righteousness of God, and are going about to establish their own righteousness, and because faith is the eye to which this righteousness is revealed, it is called the righteousness of faith, Romans 10:6, and this righteousness is manifested, and the law and prophets attest it to be faultless; and warrants the faith of the sinner to trust in it.

Romans 3:31,31, "Now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ, unto all, and upon all them that believe, for there is no difference." This righteousness is of God, and we see it by faith, according to Philippians 3:9, where Paul desires above all things, "to be found in him, not having mine own righteousness, which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith."

Now this righteousness alone is our justification; and it is revealed or manifested to faith, well proved by the law and the prophets; therefore faith may safely venture on it.

A word on faith; faith is a fruit of the Spirit, Galatians 5:22, and so the Spirit is called the Spirit of faith, because we have no true faith without it; see II Corinthians 4:13, "We having the same spirit of faith," etc. This faith is peculiar to God's elect, Titus 1:1, because the gospel by which faith cometh and which is the word of faith, and which reveals the righteousness of God to faith, comes with power and the Spirit only to the elect, although the word be preached to all. See I Thessalonians 1:4-5, "Knowing, brethren beloved, your election of God; for our gospel came not unto you in word only, but also in power, and in the Holy Ghost, and in much assurance."

Christ taught the same where he said, "Ye believe not, because ye are not my sheep, as I said unto you, my sheep hear my voice," etc.

The faith of God's elect has Christ and his righteousness for its object, and so its object is our justifying righteousness, and so faith as to its object, is our justification; for in this sense Christ is called faith, see Galatians 3:23,25, and so faith is declared to be the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen, Hebrews 11:1, the substance, as to its object, and an evidence to the soul of its interest in that object; and when the apostle would show that we are justified by the righteousness of Christ, which is revealed by faith, and is the righteousness on which faith builds; and by which the sinner is justified, and this is faith's substance, and of which it bears evidence for the comfort of the soul; showing this free justification by the obedience of Christ, without the works of the law, he speaks of our being justified, not for faith, but by faith, by faith really as its object, CHRIST, and manifestively, as to its evidence of our interest in that object.

Justification is a grace, and faith never secured it, or made it ours; but by Christ we have access into this grace, and **faith is the eye by which we see our standing in this grace;** and from the evidence of faith we see our standing in Justification, and we rejoice in hope of the glory of God.

See Romans 5:2, "By whom also we have access by faith into this grace [the grace of justification] wherein we stand and rejoice in hope of the glory of God." So we see that by Christ we stand in the grace of justification, and by faith in him we see our standing in this grace, and so we rejoice in hope of the glory of God.

Justification by faith is taught in opposition to the notion of justification by works, not because our faith as an act of ours justifies us, but because faith receives or views our justification complete in Christ without our works, and so the apostle argues in Acts 13:39, "By him [Christ] all that believe are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses."

By Christ alone are we justified, and faith is the Spirit's evidence to the soul of his interest in this grace; and it is said, Romans 4:3, "Abraham believed God, and it was counted to him for righteousness." Galatians 3:6; James 2:23; Romans 4:5-8, all of which prove that it was the substance or object of faith that justified Abraham, and not barely the act of Abraham's faith, for the fact which he believed was not dependant on an act of his faith; but his faith believed the fact, and received such evidence of its truth, as to fill Abraham with an unshaken confidence in God, that what he had promised he was able to perform; and so he gave glory to God.

The same thing is declared, Romans 4:25, and Romans 5:1, where Christ is spoken of as he "who was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification." This verse ends the fourth chapter, and shows that Christ being delivered for our offences, had made full satisfaction for us, and so was raised again for our justification, and so justification is complete; then in Romans 5:1, he infers from this fact, that we may have peace, even the peace which a knowledge of our free justification will afford, by believing in the fact above settled, and says, "Therefore being justified, by faith we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ."

I have changed the comma in the last quotation, because the sense of the passage required it, and some other versions place it as I have, but whether it be changed or not, the meaning is the same, when we take the two verses together, for the last is an inference drawn from the other, and both together show, that we were justified when Christ was raised from the dead, and faith in this truth affords us peace with God, and that peace we enjoy through our Lord Jesus Christ, who was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification; and faith is an evidence of it to the soul.

This is the sense in which the scriptures speak of justification by faith, and all goes to prove that we are not justified by an act of faith in the creature, but by the righteousness of Christ, and this is the righteousness which faith

sees, and leads the soul to trust in; and this is what the poet sings,

“Faith pleads no merit of its own,
But looks for all in Christ.”

And so “faith receives a righteousness that makes the sinner just.” We see that faith is a fruit of the Spirit, and its office is to lead the soul to Christ, and as an eye to view the righteousness of Christ revealed to it in the gospel, and as a hand to take hold on that righteousness and build the soul on it, as a sure foundation, and cause it to rejoice in God through Christ, and say, who shall lay anything to the charge of God’s elect?

It is God that justifieth, who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, and so we see that justification is of the grace of God through the blood and righteousness of Christ, and faith is the Spirit’s evidence of it to and for the comfort of the soul; and this is according to the experience of every truly regenerated man or woman, and I shall now show something of the way in which the experience of the people of God agrees with the doctrine of this discourse.

I have showed that the elect of God have two standings, one in Christ, in relation to whom they are without blame before God; and another in Adam, in relation to whom, and in themselves considered, they are condemned to death. Now men do not feel their condemnation properly until they are quickened by the Spirit; but as soon as they are made alive they begin to feel and see, and so faith is one of the first fruits of the Spirit; it views the excellency of the divine character, and the beauty of holiness, and begins to pant for the living God.

Although the awakened sinner now has faith; its eye is not directed to Christ, but he now sees the glory and justice of God, and purity of the law, and by the law he has a knowledge of sin; and so he begins to abhor himself and repent; he looks at himself in his fallen state, in relation to the first Adam, and sees that he is a condemned criminal; he reads the law, it sentences him to death, and condemnation, and he is wedded to a covenant of works, and sees not his relation to Christ, he begins

to try to reform and keep the law, and work for life; and however long he may work under this legal persuasion, he finds but a poor reward, and at length he finds that all his plans are thwarted, and he is like the woman in the gospel that had spent all she had with physicians, and had got nothing better, but rather grew worse.

Now the quickened sinner sees what he is in himself, and in relation to the first Adam, and that in this relation he is condemned to death, and can never be justified by any work or sacrifice in his power; all his hope of obtaining salvation by the deeds of the law, gives up the ghost, for sin now appears exceedingly sinful, and it takes an occasion by the commandment to slay the sinner, who is ready to say, the commandment is holy, just and good, but I am carnal, sold under sin.

Sin works by that which is good, and the sinner dies to all hope of ever being justified by any works of his own, and as if cut off from every other refuge, he cries, "God be merciful to me a sinner." His expectation being cut off from everything else, he looks to God only, and falls a pensioner on his mercy and grace, filled with the deepest sense of his condemnation, and the impossibility of being justified by the works of the law.

This is his state as he stands in himself, and in relation to this first Adam, and this he clearly sees; but here the gospel reveals to faith the righteousness of God, and by faith the soul views his justification complete in the blood and righteousness of Christ; not that his faith hath justified him, but by faith he sees that which was a truth before he saw it; and his soul seems to melt like wax into the depth of humility, and yet he rejoices, he is amazed at the matchless grace of God, is almost ready to wonder he never saw this before; the fulness of Christ engages his confidence, and the sentiment of his soul is, "Now all this comfort flows from the evidence which faith bears to the soul, of its interest in and relation to Christ the second Adam; and from this view of his relation to Christ, in his death and resurrection, he builds his only hope for salvation in Christ, and this building is what is called the faith of reliance; and so it is written, "The just shall live by faith." To live by faith is to live relying on

Christ, looking to Christ, and trusting in his righteousness, faithfulness, and truth.

Faith as an act, has nothing in it to comfort the soul, but it brings all its comforts from its object, and so faith, though one of the first fruits which the Spirit produces in the soul, can afford no comfort to the soul until its eye is directed to Christ, and his blood and righteousness, which the gospel reveals to it, nor even then will it afford comfort to the soul, unless it views the relation in which the soul stands to that righteousness; for we may have strong faith in Christ, as one able to save, and yet have no comfortable assurance that he will save me; as the man in the gospel had a strong faith in the ability of Christ, and said, "If thou wilt, thou canst make me clean," but when faith views him, "The Lord our righteousness," the soul can rejoice, and say, "In the Lord have I righteousness."

Christian reader, is it not according to thy own experience? The awakened sinner has faith in God, and in Christ as being righteous, but sees not his own relation to that righteousness, and therefore he is not comforted, but hungers and thirsts after righteousness, and although the promise is positive, "He shall be comforted," yet the soul cannot see how this can be; but when by faith the soul receives an evidence that it is related to Christ as its righteousness, it is then that it is filled and can rejoice in hope of the glory of God, and puts no confidence in the flesh; and so says Paul, "The life which I now live in the flesh, I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me."

Justification By Works

JUSTIFICATION by works: *T.S. Dalton:* Therefore it must be a fact that James speaks of the *declarative justification*, and for this reason he can make the demand, "Show me thy faith without your works, and I will show you my faith by my works," not to produce faith by works, but *show* it, manifest it.

The idea is, Let me see such signs of it, that, in the judgment of charity (not infallibility) I may pronounce upon it, as the Lord did upon Abraham's, when he said, "Now I know that thou fearest God."

The only way we have of showing that our faith is in God, to our brethren and friend that surround us, is by our works. Therefore by our *works* we are justified in the sight of our brethren, and by our *works* we are condemned in their eyes. (*Zions Advocate Oct. 1897*)

Justinian

JUSTINIAN The dissolute but able Eastern Roman Emperor, Justinian (whose wife, Theodore, was of the same character), reconquers, by his generals Belisarius and Narses, a large part of the lost Western Empire in Africa and Spain, Sicily, and Italy, and wars with the Persians, and makes that celebrated digest of Roman Laws (the *Corpus juris civilis*) which has become the common law of all civilized nations; he also affects a life of austere piety, assume to regulate matters of faith, discipline and worship, and, by acts of extortion, oppression and corruption of justice, procures means for building magnificent church-houses and hospitals; he seeks to enforce general religious uniformity throughout his dominions, requiring all infants to be baptized, and enacts severe penalties against Pagans and *heretics* (by the latter meaning those who differed from him in religious views and practices); and the people of God flee for refuge into barbarous, or desert, or mountainous countries, especially into Northern Italy, Northern Spain, and Southern France.” (*Hassell’s History ppg 408, 409*)

Keys of the Kingdom, The

The KEYS of the Kingdom: *T.S. Dalton:* And I will give unto you *the keys of the kingdom of heaven*, and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven,” Matthew 16:19.

Keys signify authority as you will see by reference to Isaiah 22:22, “Eliakim who had the key of the house of David, was over the household, etc.” God’s ministers are called stewards in Titus 1:7, also I Corinthians 4:1. Jesus had made known to the apostles in this same chapter that he was going to build his church, and found it upon the grand truth as expressed by Peter. “Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God,” for Jesus said to him, “Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jona, for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father, which is in heaven. Upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.”

The church is not founded, then, on the idea that none but the literal seed of Abraham or national Israelites shall have its benefits, but it shall be founded upon the truth that God reveals to men, whether they be Jew or Gentile. And

Peter being one of the stewards of his church, and God having chosen, that the Gentiles by his mouth should hear the word of the gospel.

He now gives him the authority to open the door of truth to the Gentiles, which he did when he visited Cornelius.

We must confess that there has been considerable speculation on this subject, but we have come to the conclusion that the heaven referred in the text has reference to the Jewish church, and means that whosoever Peter shall bind or loose among the Gentiles shall be ratified by the saints among the Jews, and if you will call to mind, my brother, that after Peter had visited the Gentiles, and preached to them that the church at Jerusalem took him under dealings, and while they were consulting about this matter, James arose and said, "Men and brethren, hearken unto me, for I remember that Simon hath said that God shall visit the Gentiles to take out of them a people for his name," and when this truth was called to their mind, they all forgave Peter, or rather ratified his work, and said, "Now hath God granted repentance unto the Gentiles."

T.S. Dalton *Zion's Advocate* Jan. 1893

C.H. Cayce: We think the keys of the kingdom (or church) were delivered to Peter, and he used them to unlock the door and open the kingdom to the Gentiles when he went to the house of Cornelius and preached the gospel there. We do not think the door of the church is ever closed, or has been since it was opened to the Gentiles. It is always open to God's little children who give a reason of their hope in Jesus and ask for a home there. (*CAYCE vol. 1, ppg 378*)

Kiffin, William

William KIFFIN: *Sylvester Hassell*: "Great as was the authority (or influence, rather) of Bunyan with the Baptists," says Macaulay, "that of William Kiffin was greater. Kiffin was the first man among them in wealth and station." He was born in 1616, and died in 1701. He was an industrious, honest, skillful and successful merchant of London, and had great influence at the courts of Charles II. and James the Second., and took pleasure in using his wealth and influence for the relief and protection of his poor, persecuted brethren, like Mordecai at the Court of Ahaserus. He was himself arrested many times, and imprisoned once. He was for five years a member and minister in an Independent Church, and then joined the first Particular Baptist formed in England, of which Mr. Spilsbury was pastor. Two years afterwards he and those of his brethren who thought it improper to allow ministers that had not been immersed to preach to them, withdrew in 1640 and formed another church, which met in Devonshire Square; and of this church Mr. Kiffin was pastor sixty-one years, until his death, being

aided in his long pastorate, at different times, by three assistant pastors. He kept aloof from politics, and always tried to obey the powers that be, and he submitted with unmurmuring resignation to the most painful dispensations of Providence. “He left behind him a character of rare excellence, tried alike by the fire of prosperity and adversity in the most eventful times.” The only work he ever published was a defense of Close Communion.” (*Hassell’s History* ppg 531, 532)

One of his [William Kiffin’s] sons was poisoned in Venice by a Catholic priest for denouncing his religion. And two of his grandsons, the pious William and Benjamin Hewling, under the pretense of complicity in Monmouth’s rebellion, were sent to the gallows by the infamous Judge Jeffries, and hanged amid the lamentations of the spectators, including even the soldiers on guard. Chief Justice George Jeffries, whose name is “a synonym for a monster of bloodthirsty cruelty, blasphemous rage, and brutish intemperance,” whose yell on the bench sounded, it was said, like the thunder of the judgment day, and who was the fit tool of the bigoted and unfeeling Catholic King, James the Second., in his notorious circuit of 1685, sentenced 320 prisoners to be hanged, 841 to be sold into slavery beyond the sea, and a still larger number to be whipped and imprisoned. The sufferers were, for the most part, says Macaulay, blameless and pious, and regarded as martyrs to the truth of the Protestant religion.” (*Hassell’s History* ppg 532, 533)

Knights Templar, The Order Of

The Order of KNIGHTS TEMPLAR The wealthy Order of Knight Templars, founded early in the twelfth century, for war against the Saracens, was, in the early part of the fourteenth century, sacrificed by Pope Clement V. to King Philip’s avarice, to avert, if possible, the condemnation of the memory of Pope Boniface. Their number throughout “Christendom” was at this time fifteen thousand. They were charged with infidelity, idolatry and sensuality; large numbers in France were horribly tortured by the Inquisition, the confessions thus extorted from them being afterwards recanted; and a hundred and fifteen, including the Grand Master, James Du Molay, were burned alive in Paris alone. The order was dissolved by the Council of Vienne in 1311. King Philip obtained their vast wealth in France. But he and Pope Clement died in 1314, the next year after Du Molay was burned.” (*Hassell’s History* pg 453)

Knollys, Hanserd

Hanserd KNOLLYS Hanserd Knollys (1598-1691) was a graduate of the University of Cambridge, and experienced conversion while a student there. He

was first a Deacon and a priest in the “Church of England;” but, finding that infant baptism was not taught in the Scriptures, he gave up his salary, but continued preaching, and the subject of his discourses was “the doctrine of free grace, according to the tenor of the new and everlasting covenant.” In 1636 the High Commission Court, or Protestant Inquisition, arrested and imprisoned him; but, through the connivance of his jailor, he escaped, in 1638 with his wife to America. He arrived in Boston a penniless fugitive, and was treated as an Antinomian, and had to work with a hoe for his daily bread. Going to Dover, N.H., he preached there three years, and then, summoned by his aged father, returned to England. He settled in London, and gained his livelihood by teaching school till near the close of his life. Commanded by the Chairman of “The Westminster Assembly of Divines” to preach no more, he readily and boldly replied that he would preach the gospel publicly and from house to house. In 1645 he was ordained pastor of a Baptist Church in London, and he remained so till his death, though for a while a fugitive in Holland and Germany. He was frequently imprisoned for preaching, even in his eighty-fourth year being in jail six months. He was a strong predestinarian, a decided Baptist, and was a man of great learning and preaching abilities. He wrote eleven books, one of which was a grammar of the Latin, Greek and Hebrew languages. His learning was seasoned with Divine grace, so that it did not puff him up or lead him away from the simplicity of the gospel of Christ. (*Hassell’s History pg 533*)

Law of God, The

The LAW of God: Abridged from John Gill (Emphasis added)

It appears by what has been observed, that there was an intermixture of law and gospel under the former dispensation, as there also is in the present one. They are interspersed in both testaments; though the law was more largely held forth than the gospel, under the former dispensation; and therefore we commonly call it the legal dispensation. And there is more of the gospel than of the law under the present dispensation; for which reason we call it the gospel dispensation. Yet there are of each in both; and here will be a proper place to treat of law and gospel distinctly, which will connect what has been already said to what is yet to be said; and by the latter I shall be naturally led to the great and glorious truths of the gospel, I intend to treat distinctly of. And shall begin with the law.

The word law is variously used, sometimes for a part of the Scriptures only, the Pentateuch, or five books of Moses; as when it is mentioned in the division of the Scripture by Christ, and along with the prophets, and as distinct from them,

Luke 24:44 And he said unto them, These are the words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled, which were written in *the law of Moses*, and in the prophets, and in the psalms, concerning me.

John 1:45 Philip findeth Nathanael, and saith unto him, We have found him, of whom *Moses in the law*, and the prophets, did write, Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph.

John 8:5 Now *Moses in the law* commanded us, that such should be stoned: but what sayest thou?

Sometimes for all the books of the Old Testament, which in general go by the name of the Law, as does the book of Psalms on that account, as the places quoted out of it, or referred to in it, show,

John 10:34 Jesus answered them, Is it not written *in your law*, I said, Ye are gods?

John 12:34 The people answered him, We have heard *out of the law* that Christ abideth for ever: and how sayest thou, The Son of man must be lifted up? who is this Son of man?

John 15:25 But this cometh to pass, that the word might be fulfilled that is written *in their law*, They hated me without a cause.

Sometimes it signifies the doctrine of the Scriptures in general, both legal and evangelical, and the doctrine of the gospel in particular, even the doctrine of the Messiah, called in the New Testament *the law*, or doctrine of *faith*.

Psalms 19:7 *The law of the LORD* is perfect, converting the soul: the testimony of the LORD is sure, making wise the simple.

Isaiah 2:3 And many people shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the LORD, to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths: *for out of Zion shall go forth the law*, and the word of the LORD from Jerusalem.

Isaiah 42:4 He shall not fail nor be discouraged, till he have set judgment in the earth: and the isles shall wait for *his law*.

Romans 3:27 Where is boasting then? It is excluded. By what law? of works?
Nay: but by the law of faith.

And sometimes it signifies the whole body of laws given from God by Moses to the children of Israel, as distinct from the gospel of the grace of God.

John 1:17 For *the law* was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ.

[These] may be distinguished into the laws ceremonial, judicial, and moral.

1. The ceremonial law, of which little need be said, since much has been observed concerning it already. This concerns the ecclesiastical state of the Jews, their priests, sacrifices, feasts, fasts, washings, etc. and though some of these rites were before the times of Moses, as sacrifices, the distinction of clean and unclean creatures, circumcision, etc. Yet these were renewed and confirmed, and others added to them; and the whole digested into a body of laws by Moses, and given by him under a divine direction to the people of Israel.

This law was a shadow of good things to come by Christ, of evangelical things, and indeed was no other than the gospel veiled in types and figures. The priests served to the example and shadow of heavenly things. The sacrifices were typical of the sacrifice of Christ. The festivals were shadows, of which Christ was the body and substance. The ablutions typified cleansing by the blood of Christ. And the whole was a schoolmaster to the Jews, until he came.

But when faith came, that is, Christ, the object of faith, they were no longer under a schoolmaster, nor had they need of the law as such. There was a disannulling of it, because of its weakness and unprofitableness; for it became useless and unnecessary, having its accomplishment in Christ.

2. The judicial law, which respects the political state or civil government of the Jews, and consists of statutes and judgments, according to which the judges in Israel determined all causes brought before them, and passed sentence; in which sentence the people were to acquiesce,

Deuteronomy 17:8-11 If there arise a matter too hard for thee in judgment, between blood and blood, between plea and plea, and between stroke and stroke, being matters of controversy within thy gates: then shalt thou arise, and get thee up into the place which the LORD thy God shall choose; And thou shalt come unto the priests the Levites, and unto the judge that shall be in those days, and enquire; and they shall shew thee the sentence of judgment: And thou shalt do according to the sentence, which they of that place which the LORD shall choose

shall shew thee; and thou shalt observe to do according to all that they inform thee: According to the sentence of the law which they shall teach thee, and according to the judgment which they shall tell thee, thou shalt do: thou shalt not decline from the sentence which they shall shew thee, to the right hand, nor to the left.

Such as related to any injuries done to their persons or property, and to the punishment of offences, both of a greater and of a lesser kind. These were given by Moses, but not made by him; they were made by God himself.

The government of the Jews was a very particular form of government; it was a theocracy, a government immediately under God; though he is King of the whole world, and Governor among and over the nations of it. Yet he was in a special and peculiar manner King over Israel; and he made laws for them, by which they were to be ruled and governed. Nor had the commonwealth of Israel a power to make any new laws; nor any of their judges and rulers, not even Moses, their lawgiver under God. Therefore, when any matter came before him, not clearly determined by any law given by God, he suspended the determination of it until he knew the mind of God about it.

Leviticus 24:12 And they put him in ward, that the mind of the LORD might be shewed them.

Numbers 15:34 And they put him in ward, because it was not declared what should be done to him.

And when the people of Israel were desirous of a king, after the manner of neighboring nations, it was resented by the Lord, and reckoned by him as a rejection of him from being their King.

And though he gave them a king, or suffered them to have one, it was in anger; and so far he still kept the peculiar government of them in his hands, that their kings never had any power to make new laws. Nor did their best and wisest of kings make any, as David and Solomon. And when a reformation was made among them, as by Hezekiah and Josiah, it was not by making any new regulations, but by putting the old laws into execution; and by directing and requiring of the judges, and other officers, to act according to them.

It may be inquired, whether the judicial laws, or the laws respecting the Jewish polity, are now in force or not, and to be observed or not; which may be resolved by distinguish-ing between them.

There were some that were peculiar to the state of the Jews, their continuance in the land of Canaan, and while their polity lasted, and until the coming of the Messiah, when they were to cease, as is clear from

Genesis 49:10 The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come; and unto him shall the gathering of the people be.

[There were] such as related to inheritances, and the alienation of them by marriage or otherwise; the restoration of them when sold at the year of jubilee; the marrying of a brother's wife when he died without issue, etc., the design of which was, to keep the tribes distinct until the Messiah came, that it might be clearly known from what tribe he sprung.

And there were others that were peculiarly suited to the natural temper and disposition of that people, who were covetous, cruel, and oppressive of the poor, froward and perverse, jealous and revengeful. Hence the laws concerning the manumission of servants sold, at the end of the sixth year; the release of debts, and letting the land rest from tillage every seventh year; concerning lending on interest; leaving a corner in the field for the poor, and the forgotten sheaf; and others concerning divorces, and the trial of a suspected wife, and the cities of refuge to flee to from the avenger of blood. These, with others, ceased when the Jewish polity did, and are not binding on other nations.

But then there were other judicial laws, which were founded on the light of nature, on reason, and on justice and equity, and these remain in full force. And they must be wise as well as righteous laws, which were made by God himself, their King and Legislator.

Deuteronomy 4:6 Keep therefore and do them; for this is your wisdom and your understanding in the sight of the nations, which shall hear all these statutes, and say, Surely this great nation is a wise and understanding people.

Deuteronomy 4:8 And what nation is there so great, that hath statutes and judgments *so* righteous as all this law, which I set before you this day?

And they are, certainly, the best constituted and regulated governments that come nearest to the commonwealth of Israel, and the civil laws of it. And where they are acted up unto, there what is said by Wisdom is most truly verified, "By me kings reign, and princes decree judgment." And if these laws were more strictly attended to, which respect the punishment of offences, especially capital ones, things would be put upon a better footing than they are in some governments. And judges, in passing sentences, would be able to do that

part of their office with more certainty and safety, and with a better conscience. And whereas the commonwealth of Israel was governed by these laws for many hundreds of years, and needed no other in their civil polity, when, in such a course of time, every case that ordinarily happens, must arise, and be brought into a court of judicature; **I cannot but be of opinion, that a digest of civil laws might be made out of the Bible**, the law of the Lord that is perfect, either as lying in express words in it, or to be deduced by the analogy of things and cases, and by just consequence, as would be sufficient for the government of any nation.

Then there would be no need of so many law books, nor of so many lawyers; and perhaps there would be fewer law suits. However, we Christians, under whatsoever government we are, are directed to submit to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake, and for conscience sake; even to everyone that is not contrary to common sense and reason, and to religion and conscience.

Romans 13:1-7 Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation. For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power? do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same: For he is the minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain: for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil. Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience sake. For for this cause pay ye tribute also: for they are God's ministers, attending continually upon this very thing. Render therefore to all their dues: tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honor to whom honor.

Titus 3:1 Put them in mind to be subject to principalities and powers, to obey magistrates, to be ready to every good work.

I Peter 2:13-14 Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake: whether it be to the king, as supreme; Or unto governors, as unto them that are sent by him for the punishment of evildoers, and for the praise of them that do well.

3. The moral law, which lies chiefly in the Decalogue, or Ten Commandments.

Exodus 20:3-17 Thou shalt have no other gods before me. Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of any thing that is in heaven above,

or that is in the earth beneath, or that *is* in the water under the earth: Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them: for I the LORD thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me; And shewing mercy unto thousands of them that love me, and keep my commandments. Thou shalt not take the name of the LORD thy God in vain; for the LORD will not hold him guiltless that taketh his name in vain. Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work: But the seventh day *is* the Sabbath of the LORD thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates: For in six days the LORD made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the LORD blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it. Honor thy father and thy mother: that thy days may be long upon the land which the LORD thy God giveth thee. Thou shalt not kill. Thou shalt not commit adultery. Thou shalt not steal. Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor. Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's house, thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife, nor his manservant, nor his maidservant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor any thing that is thy neighbor's.

[These] our Lord has reduced, even both tables of the law, to two capital ones, love to God, and love to our neighbor, as the apostle has reduced the commands of the second table to one, that is, love, which he calls the fulfilling of the law.

Matthew 22:36-40 Master, which is the great commandment in the law? Jesus said unto him, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment. And the second *is* like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets.

Romans 13:9-10 For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Thou shalt not covet; and if there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. Love worketh no ill to his neighbor: therefore love is the fulfilling of the law.

And this law, to love God and our neighbor, is binding on every man, and is eternal, and remains invariable and unalterable; and concerning which I shall treat more largely. And shall consider,

First, The author and giver of this law. God was the author and maker of it; Moses the giver and minister of it from God. It was God that first spoke the ten words, or commands, to the children of Israel; and it was he that wrote and

engraved them on tables of stone. The writing was the writing of God, and the engraving was by the finger of God. It was from his right hand this fiery law went.

The ministry of angels was made use of in it. It is called, the word spoken by angels. It was given by the disposition of them; it was ordained by them in the hands of a mediator, who was Moses, who stood between God and the people, received the lively oracles from him, and delivered them to them.

There was a law in being before the times of Moses; or otherwise there would have been no transgression, no imputation of sin, no charge of guilt, nor any punishment inflicted; whereas death, the just demerit of sin, reigned from Adam to Moses. And besides the positive law, which forbid the eating of the fruit of the tree of knowledge of good and evil; and was given as a trial of man's obedience to the whole moral law, and in the form of a covenant, in which Adam stood as a federal head, to all his posterity; and which covenant he broke, and involved himself and his in misery and ruin.

Besides this, there was the law of nature, inscribed on his heart by his Maker, as the rule of his obedience to him; and by which he knew much of God, and of the nature of moral good and evil; and which, though much obliterated by the fall, some remains of it are to be discerned in Adam's posterity; and even in the Gentiles.

Romans 1:19-20 Because that which may be known of God is manifest in them; for God hath shewed it unto them. For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse:

Romans 2:14-15 For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves: Which shew the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the mean while accusing or else excusing one another;)

[This law] is reinscribed in the hearts of God's people in regeneration, according to the tenor of the covenant of grace.

Jeremiah 31:33 But this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel; After those days, saith the LORD, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and will be their God, and they shall be my people.

Now the law of Moses, for matter and substance, is the same with the law of nature, though differing in the form of administration; and this was renewed in the times of Moses, that it might be confirmed, and that it might not be forgotten, and be wholly lost out of the minds of men; of which there was great danger, through the great prevalence of corruption in the world. And it was written, that it might remain, “*litera scripta manet.*”

And it was written on tables of stone, that it might be the more durable. The apostle says, “it was added because of transgressions,” to forbid them, restrain them, and punish for them; and it “entered that the offence might abound,” the sin of Adam; that the heinousness of it might appear, and the justness of its imputation to all his posterity might be manifest; as well as all other offences might be seen by it to be exceeding sinful, and righteously punishable.

Galatians 3:19 Wherefore then serveth the law? It was added because of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made; and it was ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator.

Romans 5:20 Moreover the law entered, that the offence might abound. But where sin abounded, grace did much more abound:

Romans 7:13 Was then that which is good made death unto me? God forbid. But sin, that it might appear sin, working death in me by that which is good; that sin by the commandment might become exceeding sinful.

It was not delivered as a pure covenant of works, though the self-righteous Jews turned it into one, and sought for life and righteousness by it. And so it gendered to bondage, and became a killing letter; nor a pure covenant of grace, though it was given as a distinguishing favor to the people of Israel.

Deuteronomy 4:6 Keep therefore and do them; for this is your wisdom and your understanding in the sight of the nations, which shall hear all these statutes, and say, Surely this great nation is a wise and understanding people.

Deuteronomy 4:8 And what nation is there so great, that hath statutes and judgments so righteous as all this law, which I set before you this day?

Psalms 147:19-20 He sheweth his word unto Jacob, his statutes and his judgments unto Israel. He hath not dealt so with any nation: and as for his judgments, they have not known them. Praise ye the LORD.

Romans 9:4 Who are Israelites; to whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises;

- Much mercy and kindness are expressed in it; and it is prefaced with a declaration of the Lord being the God of Israel, who had, of his great goodness, brought them out of the land of Egypt.

Exodus 20:2 I am the LORD thy God, which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage.

Exodus 20:6 And shewing mercy unto thousands of them that love me, and keep my commandments.

Exodus 20:12 Honor thy father and thy mother: that thy days may be long upon the land which the LORD thy God giveth thee.

But it was a part and branch of the typical covenant, under which the covenant of grace was administered under the former dispensation; and of what it was typical, has been observed before; and a principal end of its being renewed was, that Christ, who was to come of the Jews, might appear to be made under the law, as the surety of his people, the righteousness of which he was to fulfil, and, indeed, all righteousness; being the end of the law, the scope at which it aimed, as well as the fulfiller of it.

Secondly, The epithets of this law, or the properties of it, may be next considered; such as the scriptures expressly give to it; and which will lead into the nature and quality of it. As,

- **1. That it is perfect. “The law of the Lord is perfect.” which is true of the moral law, by which men come to know “what is that good, and acceptable, and perfect will of God.”**

Psalms 19:7 The law of the LORD is perfect, converting the soul: the testimony of the LORD is sure, making wise the simple.

Romans 12:2 And be not conformed to this world: but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what *is* that good, and acceptable, and perfect, will of God.

[It reveals] what it is his will should be done, and what not be done; it takes in the whole duty of men, both to God and man; for to fear God, and keep his commandments, is the whole duty of man. It includes love to God, and love to

our neighbor; and which are comprehensive of every duty to both. It is very large and capacious; it is the commandment which is exceeding broad. It is so complete and perfect, that as nothing is to be detracted from it, so nothing is to be added to it, nor can be added to it, to make it more perfect.

The papists talk of counsels, exhortations, etc. as additions; but these belong either to law or gospel. And the Socinians say, that Christ came to make the law more perfect; which they infer from some passages in [Matthew 5](#), where Christ observes, that it had been said by some of the ancients of old, thus and thus; but he said, so and so; which is not to be understood of any new laws made by him, but as giving the true sense of the old laws, and vindicating them from the false glosses and interpretations of the Scribes and Pharisees.

And when the apostle John speaks of a new commandment, he means the old commandment to love one another, as he himself explains it, and which he calls new, because enforced by a new instance and example of Christ's love in dying for his people, and by new motives and arguments taken from the same.

[I John 2:7-8](#) Brethren, I write no new commandment unto you, but an old commandment which ye had from the beginning. The old commandment is the word which ye have heard from the beginning. Again, a new commandment I write unto you, which thing is true in him and in you: because the darkness is past, and the true light now shineth.

2. It is spiritual; We know that the law is spiritual, says the apostle,

[Romans 7:14](#) For we know that the law is spiritual: but I am carnal, sold under sin.

[This] is to be understood of the moral law; for as for the ceremonial law, that is called, "The law of a carnal commandment," and is said to stand in "carnal ordinances."

[Hebrews 7:16](#) Who is made, not after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an endless life.

[Hebrews 9:10](#) Which stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances, imposed on them until the time of reformation.

[The ceremonial law] only reached the flesh, and the sanctifying of that. But the moral law is so spiritual in its nature and requirements, that so holy and spiritual a man as the apostle Paul, when he compared himself with it, and viewed himself in the glass of it, thought himself "carnal, and sold under sin."

The law reaches to the thoughts and intents of the heart, and the affections of the mind, and forbids and checks all irregular and inordinate motions in it, and the lusts of it.

Thus, for instance, the sixth command not only forbids actual murder, but all undue heat, passion, anger, wrath, malice, resentment and revenge, conceived in the mind, and expressed by words.

So the seventh command not only prohibits the outward acts of uncleanness, as fornication, adultery, etc., but all unclean thoughts, impure desires, and unchaste affections, as well as looks and words.

The law directs, not only to an external worship of God, but to an internal, spiritual one; as to love the Lord, to fear him, and put trust and confidence in him, suitable to his nature as a Spirit. It requires of a man to serve it with his own mind and spirit, with his whole heart, as the apostle did.

-
Romans 7:25 I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord. So then with the mind I myself serve the law of God; but with the flesh the law of sin.

And the assistance of the Spirit of God is necessary to the observance of it; and God in covenant has promised his people, that he “will put his Spirit within them, and cause them to walk in his statutes,” and “keep his judgments, and do them.”

Ezekiel 36:27 And I will put my spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgments, and do *them*.

3. The law is “holy,” and the commandment holy. It comes from an holy God, from whom nothing unholy can proceed; for holiness is his nature, and he is holy in all his works.

Romans 7:12 Wherefore the law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good.

The law is a transcript of his holy will. The matter of it, or what it requires, is holy; even sanctification of heart and life. It directs to live holily, soberly, righteously, and godly, in this evil world.

4. It is also “just,” as well as holy and good. There are no laws so righteous as the laws of God; the judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether,

-

Romans 7:12 Wherefore the law *is* holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good.

Deuteronomy 4:8 And what nation is there so great, that hath statutes and judgments so righteous as all this law, which I set before you this day?

Psalms 19:9 The fear of the LORD is clean, enduring for ever: the judgments of the LORD are true and righteous altogether.

It is impartial unto all, and requires the same of one as of another, and renders to every man according to his works. It is just in condemning wicked men for sin, and in justifying those that have a righteousness answerable to its demands; for God is just, according to his law, while he is the justifier of those that believe in Jesus.

5. The law is good; the author of it is good only, essentially, originally good; from whom every good and perfect gift comes, and nothing that is evil and bad. The law is materially good, it is morally good; as God by the light of nature, so much more by the law of Moses, does he show to men that which is good. In it he sets before them the good they are to do; and the evil they are to avoid.

It is pleasantly good; not to an unregenerate man, whose carnal mind is enmity to all that is good, and so to the law of God; but to a regenerate man, who, as the apostle, delights in the law of God after the inner man, and loves it, as David did, and meditates on it, as every good man does.

Romans 7:22 For I delight in the law of God after the inward man.

Psalms 119:97 O how love I thy law! it is my meditation all the day.

Psalms 1:2 But his delight is in the law of the LORD; and in his law doth he meditate day and night.

And it is also profitably good; not to God, for when men have done all they can, they are, with respect to God, unprofitable servants, but to men, their fellow creatures, and fellow Christians, to whom they are serviceable, by their good works.

Luke 17:10 So likewise ye, when ye shall have done all those things which are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants: we have done that which was our duty to do.

Titus 3:8 This is a faithful saying, and these things I will that thou affirm constantly, that they which have believed in God might be careful to maintain good works. These things are good and profitable unto men, and also to themselves; for though not *for*, yet *in* keeping the commands there is great reward, as peace of conscience.

Psalms 19:11 Moreover by them is thy servant warned: *and* in keeping of them there is great reward.

Psalms 119:165 Great peace have they which love thy law: and nothing shall offend them.

The law is good, “if a man use it lawfully.”

I Timothy 1:8 But we know that the law *is* good, if a man use it lawfully;

There is a lawful and an unlawful use of the law. It is used unlawfully when men seek to obtain life and righteousness by it; for the law cannot give life, nor is righteousness by it; nor can men be justified by the works of it, in the sight of God; for no man can perfectly keep it. There is not a just man that does good and sins not.

But it is lawfully used when obeyed in faith, from a principle of love, with a view to the glory of God, without any selfish and sinister ends.

Which leads me to consider more particularly,

Thirdly, The uses of the law both to sinners and saints.

1. To sinners. (1.) To convince of sin. Sin is a transgression of the law, by which it is known that it is sin, being forbidden by the law. “By the law is the knowledge of sin;” not only of gross actual sins; but of the inward lusts of the mind. “I had not known lust,” says the apostle, “except the law had said, Thou shall not covet.”

Romans 3:20 Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight: for by the law *is* the knowledge of sin.

Romans 7:7 What shall we say then? Is the law sin? God forbid. Nay, I had not known sin, but by the law: for I had not known lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet.

Yet only as it is used by the Spirit of God, who holds it up to a mind enlightened by him, whereby it sees the sinfulness of it; for it is the Spirit's work savingly to convince of sin; which he does by means of the law.

(2.) To restrain from sin. Of this use are the laws of men; hence civil magistrates are terrors to evildoers. So the law, by its menaces, deters men from sin, when they are not truly convinced of the evil of it, nor humbled for it. Though by such restraints, it does but rise and swell, and rage the more within, like a flood of water stopped in its course.

(3.) To condemn and punish for sin. For sinners it is made, and against them it lies, to their condemnation, unless justified in Christ.

I Timothy 1:9-10 Knowing this, that the law is not made for a righteous man, but for the lawless and disobedient, for the ungodly and for sinners, for unholy and profane, for murderers of fathers and murderers of mothers, for manslayers, For whoremongers, for them that defile themselves with mankind, for menstealers, for liars, for perjured persons, and if there be any other thing that is contrary to sound doctrine.

It accuses of sin, charges with it; brings evidence of it; stops the sinner's mouth from pleading in his own cause; pronounces guilty before God; and curses and condemns. It is the ministration of condemnation and death; and its sentence takes place where the righteousness of Christ is not imputed.

2. It is of use to saints and true believers in Christ.

(1.) To point out the will of God unto them; what is to be done by them, and what to be avoided; to inform them of, and urge them to their duty, both towards God and man; for in that the whole of it lies.

(2.) To be a rule of life and conversation to them; not a rule to obtain life by; but to live according to; to guide their feet, to direct their steps, and preserve them from going into bye and crooked paths. The wise man says, "The commandment is a lamp, and the law is light."

Proverbs 6:23 For the commandment is a lamp; and the law is light; and reproofs of instruction are the way of life:

And the wise man's father says, "Thy word is a lamp unto my feet, and a light unto my path."

Psalms 119:105 Thy word is a lamp unto my feet, and a light unto my path.

(3.) It is as a glass, in which a believer, by the light of the Spirit of God, may see his own face, what manner of man he is; how deformed, how carnal and corrupt, when compared with this law; and how far short of perfection he is in himself. “I have seen an end of all perfection,” says David; “Thy commandment is exceeding broad;” to which the imperfect works of men are not commensurate. Hence good men are sensible that their own righteousness is insufficient to justify them before God, it being but as rags, and those filthy ones. Hence,

(4.) They are led to prize and value the righteousness of Christ, since that is perfectly agreeable to the holy and righteous law of God. Uea, by it the law is magnified and made honorable; wherefore they desire to be found in Christ, not having on their own righteousness, but his; who is the end of the law for righteousness, to everyone that believes. Now,

Fourthly, The law of God continues under the present dispensation for the said uses. Christ came not to destroy it, and loosen mens obligations to it; but to fulfil it. Nor is the law made null and void by faith; by the doctrine of justification by faith in the righteousness of Christ; so far from it, that it is established by it. **There is a sense in which the law is “done away,” and saints are “delivered” from it.** “that being dead wherein they were held,” as in a prison; and they “become dead to it by the body of Christ,” by his obedience and sufferings in it,

II Corinthians 3:11 For if that which is done away was glorious, much more that which remaineth is glorious.

Romans 7:4 Wherefore, my brethren, ye also are become dead to the law by the body of Christ; that ye should be married to another, even to him who is raised from the dead, that we should bring forth fruit unto God.

Romans 7:6 But now we are delivered from the law, that being dead wherein we were held; that we should serve in newness of spirit, and not in the oldness of the letter.

1. It does not continue as a covenant of works; and, indeed, it was not delivered to the children of Israel as such strictly and properly sneaking, only in a typical sense; though the Jews turned it to such a purpose, and sought righteousness and life by it. But God never made a covenant of works with men since the fall, in order to their obtaining life and salvation by it. It never was in the power of man since to perform the conditions of such a covenant. However, it is certain, believers are not under the law as a covenant of works; but under grace as a covenant of grace.

2. Nor does it continue as to the form of administration of it by Moses; it is now no longer in his hands, nor to be considered as such. The whole Mosaic economy is broke to pieces, and at an end, which was prefigured by Moses casting the two tables of stone out of his hands, and breaking them, when he came down from the mount.

The law, especially as it lies in the Decalogue; and as to the form of the administration of that by Moses, was peculiar to the Jews; as appears by the preface to it, which can agree with none but them; by the time of worship prescribed them in the fourth command, which was temporary and typical; and by the promise of long life in the land of Canaan, annexed to the fifth command.

3. It continues not as a terrifying law to believers, who are not come to mount Sinai, and are not under that stormy and terrible dispensation; but they are come to mount Sion, and to all the privileges of a gospel church state. Nor are they brought into bondage by its rigorous exactions; on a strict compliance to which, or perfect obedience thereunto, their peace and comfort do not depend. Nor are they awed and urged by its menaces and curses, to an observance of it; but are constrained, by the love of God and Christ, to run with cheerfulness the way of its commandments. They are made willing to serve it with their mind and spirit, through the power and efficacy of divine grace upon them. And they do serve it, not in the oldness of the letter but in the newness of the spirit; or, as they are renewed by the free Spirit of God.

4. Nor is it a cursing and condemning law to the saints. As sinners and transgressors of it, they are subject to its curses; but Christ has redeemed them from the curse of the law, being made a curse for them; and so there is no more curse to them here or hereafter. They are out of the reach of its curses, and of condemnation by it. There is none to them that are in Christ. Who shall condemn? it is Christ that died; and who by dying has borne their sentence of condemnation, and freed them from it; and having passed from death to life, they shall never enter into condemnation.

Galatians 3:10 For as many as are of the works of the law are under the curse: for it is written, Cursed *is* every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them.

Galatians 3:13 Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us: for it is written, Cursed *is* every one that hangeth on a tree:

Romans 8:1 There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.

Romans 8:33 Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth.

John 5:24 Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life.

5. Yet it continues as a rule of walk and conversation to them, as before observed; and is to be regarded by them as in the hands of Christ, by whom it is held forth as King and Lawgiver, in his church; and who, and not Moses, is to be heard, and his voice hearkened to, as the Son and Master, in his own house. Believers, though freed from the law, in the sense before declared, yet are “not without law to God, but under the law to Christ,” and obliged to regard it; and the rather, as it was in his heart, and he was made under it, and has fulfilled it; and therefore may be viewed and served with pleasure.

I Corinthians 9:21 To them that are without law, as without law, (being not without law to God, but under the law to Christ,) that I might gain them that are without law.

The Abrogation of the Old (LAW) Covenant: Abridged from John Gill: (Emphasis added)

When we speak of the Abrogation of the Covenant this is to be understood, not of the covenant of grace, as to the matter and substance of it, which remains invariably the same in all periods of time. It is an everlasting covenant; it is ordered in all things and sure; it can never be broken and made void; every promise of it is unalterable, and every blessing irreversible. The covenant of peace can never be removed; it will stand firm to all generations; but with respect to the form of the administration of it only, even the form of it, under the former, or Old Testament dispensation, before described.

In order to set this in its true and proper light,

First, Let it be observed, that it was never designed that the first administration of the covenant of grace should continue always in that form. It was foretold that there should be a cessation of it, and therefore it might be expected.

1. It was only intended to continue for a certain time, called, “The time of reformation.” when there would be a reform from burdensome rites and ceremonies; or “of correction,” when what was faulty and deficient would be corrected, amended, and become perfect, or “of direction,” when the saints

would be directed to look to Christ, the substance of types and figures, and for perfection in him, the same with “the time appointed of the Father,” until which time, children, though heirs, are under tutors and governors.

Hebrews 9:10 Which stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances, imposed on them *until the time of reformation*.

So the Israelites were under the elements of the world, the ceremonies of the former dispensation, under the tutorage and pedagogy of the law: for the *law*, the ceremonial law, was their “schoolmaster unto Christ,” that led them to him, and instructed them in him. But when he came, they were no longer under a schoolmaster; and this was when “the fulness of time was come,” agreed on between the Father and the Son; at which time the Son was sent, “that they might receive the adoption of children,” and be no more considered as in their nonage, and as needing the instructions of a schoolmaster.

-
Galatians 3:1-4 O foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you, that ye should not obey the truth, before whose eyes Jesus Christ hath been evidently set forth, crucified among you? This only would I learn of you, Received ye the Spirit by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith? Are ye so foolish? having begun in the Spirit, are ye now made perfect by the flesh? Have ye suffered so many things in vain? if it be yet in vain.

Galatians 3:24-25 Wherefore the law was *our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ*, that we might be justified by faith. But after that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster.

2. The ancient form of the administration of the covenant of grace, in a course of time, was limited to a certain people in a certain country, worshiping at a certain place, and sacrificing on the same altar. The word, worship and service of God, peculiarly belonged to the Jews, which was their distinguishing privilege above all the nations of the world.

Psalms 147:19-20 He sheweth his word unto Jacob, his statutes and his judgments unto Israel. *He hath not dealt so with any nation:* and as for his judgments, they have not known them. Praise ye the LORD.

Romans 3:1-2 What advantage then hath the Jew? or what profit is there of circumcision? Much every way: chiefly, because that unto them were committed the oracles of God.

-

Romans 9:4 Who are Israelites; to whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises.

All their males were obliged three times in the year to appear at Jerusalem and worship together; and all their offerings and sacrifices were to be brought and offered on the altar there, and no where else.

Deuteronomy 12:11 Then there shall be a place which the LORD your God shall choose to cause his name to dwell there; thither shall ye bring all that I command you; your burnt offerings, and your sacrifices, your tithes, and the heave offering of your hand, and all your choice vows which ye vow unto the LORD:

Deuteronomy 12:14 But in the place which the LORD shall choose in one of thy tribes, there thou shalt offer thy burnt offerings, and there thou shalt do all that I command thee.

Deuteronomy 16:16 Three times in a year shall all thy males appear before the LORD thy God in the place which he shall choose; in the feast of unleavened bread, and in the feast of weeks, and in the feast of tabernacles: and they shall not appear before the LORD empty:

Now such a state of things was never designed to continue always; since when Shiloh, the Messiah, should come, there would be a gathering of the people to him, of people out of all nations of the world, who were to be blessed in him. He was to be set up as an ensign to them, to whom they would seek. From the rising of the sun to the going down of the same, his name was to be great among the Gentiles, and incense to be offered to it in every place.

Genesis 49:10 The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come; and unto him shall the gathering of the people be.

Isaiah 11:10 And in that day there shall be a root of Jesse, which shall stand for an ensign of the people; to it shall the Gentiles seek: and his rest shall be glorious.

Malachi 1:11 For from the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same my name shall be great among the Gentiles; and in every place incense shall be offered unto my name, and a pure offering: for my name shall be great among the heathen, saith the LORD of hosts.

Now to such a dispensation the former state of things could never suit, and therefore could not be intended to be continued. The people of all nations could never be convened into one country, and worship at one place, and sacrifice on one altar.

3. It is expressly foretold, that there would be “a new covenant,” or a new administration of it; and that the former, in course, would cease, and it is upon this the apostle reasons, and proves the abrogation of the former covenant, “in that he saith a new covenant, he hath made the first old.”

- Jeremiah 31:31-32 Behold, the days come, saith the LORD, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah: Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; which my covenant they brake, although I was an husband unto them, saith the LORD:

Hebrews 8:8 For finding fault with them, he saith, Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah:

Hebrews 8:13 In that he saith, A new covenant, he hath made the first old. Now that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away.

Particularly it was foretold, that sacrifices should cease, and be no longer acceptable to God; which were a considerable branch of the administration of the old covenant. These were from the beginning, as early as the first manifestation of the covenant of grace to fallen man.

Indeed, while they were in use by divine appointment, they were not in such high esteem with God as moral obedience and spiritual services.

I Samuel 15:22 And Samuel said, Hath the LORD as great delight in burnt offerings and sacrifices, as in obeying the voice of the LORD? Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams.

- Psalms 69:30-31 I will praise the name of God with a song, and will magnify him with thanksgiving. This also shall please the LORD better than an ox or bullock that hath horns and hoofs.

Hosea 6:6 For I desired mercy, and not sacrifice; and the knowledge of God more than burnt offerings.

And plain hints were given, that the time would come when they should be no more practiced and regarded. David had knowledge, by the inspiration of the Spirit of God, of what Christ, the surety of his people, said to his divine Father in the council and covenant of peace, and what he would say again when he came into the world to be their Savior. “Sacrifice and offering thou didst not desire,” etc. “Then said I, Lo, I come,” etc.

Psalms 40:6-7 Sacrifice and offering thou didst not desire; mine ears hast thou opened: burnt offering and sin offering hast thou not required. Then said I, Lo, I come: in the volume of the book it is written of me.

Hebrews 10:5-7 Wherefore when he cometh into the world, he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a body hast thou prepared me: In burnt offerings and sacrifices for sin thou hast had no pleasure. Then said I, Lo, I come (in the volume of the book it is written of me,) to do thy will, O God.

Christ’s coming into the world to offer up himself a sacrifice for the sins of his people, was virtually saying, that God would have legal sacrifices no longer ordered up, and would no more accept of them. **And Daniel expressly says, that the Messiah would “cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease;”** the daily sacrifice, and every other offering according to the law.

Daniel 9:27 And he shall confirm the covenant with many for one week: and in the midst of the week *he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease*, and for the overspreading of abominations he shall make it desolate, even until the consummation, and that determined shall be poured upon the desolate.

And the Jews themselves say, “that all sacrifices will cease in time to come (in the time of their vainly expected Messiah) but the sacrifice of praise.”

According to prophecy, the Levitical priesthood, with which so many rites and ceremonies were connected, and upon which sacrifices were established, and in the exercise of which they were performed, was to be changed. The Messiah was to come, an High Priest of another order of priesthood than that of Aaron. “Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek,” which are the words of God the Father to Christ, and from whence the apostle argues the imperfection of the Levitical priesthood, and the change of it; and also of necessity the change of the whole law, on which it was founded.

Psalms 110:4 The LORD hath sworn, and will not repent, Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek.

Hebrews 7:11-12 If therefore 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? For the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law.

Hebrews 9:15-17 And for this cause he is the mediator of the new testament, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance. For where a testament is, there must also of necessity be the death of the testator. For a testament is of force after men are dead: otherwise it is of no strength at all while the testator liveth.

The ark was something very remarkable in the former dispensation; in it was the Decalogue, and on the side of it the whole body of the Jewish laws. It was a token, and indeed the place of the divine presence, and a type of Christ, a symbol of the covenant; and therefore called the ark of the covenant, and included the whole of the ceremonial law; and is put for the whole service and worship of that dispensation. **Now of this it is foretold, that there would be a time when it should be no more, and should not be so much as thought of any more.**

Jeremiah 3:16 And it shall come to pass, when ye be multiplied and increased in the land, in those days, saith the LORD, they shall say no more, The ark of the covenant of the LORD: neither shall it come to mind: neither shall they remember it; neither shall they visit it; neither shall that be done any more.

The ecclesiastical, as well as civil state of the Jews, was to be shaken and removed; the one is signified by the shaking of the heaven, as the other by the shaking of the earth, in Haggai 2:6, which the apostle explains of “the removing of things shaken, that those things which cannot be shaken may remain,” even of the immovable kingdom after spoken of; the second administration of the covenant of grace, which is to remain, and the ordinances of it, until the second coming of Christ; whereas the ordinances of divine service under the first covenant were so shaken as to be removed; and which were made to be removed, as they have been, according to the above prediction.

Haggai 2:6 For thus saith the LORD of hosts; Yet once, it is a little while, and I will shake the heavens, and the earth, and the sea, and the dry land;

Hebrews 12:26-27 Whose voice then shook the earth: 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 are shaken, as of things that are made, that those things which cannot be shaken may remain.

Prophecy was another considerable way and means by which the covenant of grace was administered, throughout the whole Old Testament dispensation; and it was foretold that this should be sealed up, finished, and cease. One part of the Messiah's work, when come, was to seal up the "vision and prophecy."

Daniel 9:24 Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and *to seal up the vision and prophecy*, and to anoint the most Holy.

All the visions and prophecies of the Old Testament were to have, and had their accomplishment in Christ; were to be sealed up and fulfilled in him, the sum and substance of them; or to "seal up the vision and prophet." The prophets were to be till John, the forerunner of Christ, and no longer. After Christ, the great Prophet to be raised up, like unto Moses, there was to be no other, he only is to be heard. Whatever scheme of things, either as to doctrine or worship, is set up, through pretended vision and prophecy, is to be disregarded. Nor has any prophet risen up since prophecy, as foretold, was at an end.

From all this now it might be expected, that the first and old administration of the covenant would in time cease.

Secondly, There are reasons to be given why the first covenant should and must cease.

1. It was a typical covenant; the people on whose account it was made, was a typical people, typical of the whole Israel of God, consisting of Jews and Gentiles; of the spiritual Israel, chosen of God, redeemed by Christ, and who shall be saved with an everlasting salvation. The works, duties, and services enjoined them, and required of them with so much strictness, rigor, and severity, were typical of the obedience of Christ, the surety of the spiritual Israel. Of that righteousness he was to fulfil and bring in, by which they are made righteous in the sight of God. The blessings promised unto them were typical ones; they were only shadows of good things, of spiritual blessings that were to come by Christ.

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

Hebrews 9:11 But Christ being come an high priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building;

As the earthly Canaan was a type of the heavenly inheritance, obtained in him; the sacrifices offered under that covenant were typical ones. The priests that offered them, the garments they offered them in, and the gifts and sacrifices offered by them, “served to the example and shadow of heavenly things.”

Hebrews 8:4-5 For if he were on earth, he should not be a priest, seeing that there are priests that offer gifts according to the law: Who serve unto the example and shadow of heavenly things, as Moses was admonished of God when he was about to make the tabernacle: for, See, saith he, *that* thou make all things according to the pattern shewed to thee in the mount.

Hebrews 9:23 It was therefore necessary that the patterns of things in the heavens should be purified with these; but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these.

The mediator of it, Moses, was a typical mediator, typical of Christ, the Mediator of the new covenant. The blood with which the first testament, or covenant, was dedicated and confirmed, was typical blood, typical of the blood of Christ, called, “The blood of the everlasting covenant.”

Hebrews 9:18 Whereupon neither the first testament was dedicated without blood.

Hebrews 13:20 Now the God of peace, that brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, that great shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant,

Now when the Antitype of all this came, the types must cease. When Christ, the body, the sum and substance appeared, these shadows must flee away, and disappear, in course,

Colossians 2:17 Which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ.

2. It was a faulty covenant, and therefore it was proper it should give way to a new and better covenant. So the apostle reasons; “for if that first covenant had been faultless, then should no place have been sought for the second.”

Hebrews 8:7-8 For if that first covenant had been faultless, then should no place have been sought for the second. For finding fault with them, he saith, Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah:

Not that there was anything sinful or criminal in the first covenant, but it was defective. There were some deficiencies in it, which made the abrogation of it necessary.

(1.) It did not exhibit Christ present, only in figure, in promise, and in prophecy. It only signified, that he would come and save his people; but it did not hold forth salvation as wrought out by him. **It gave an intimation of the righteousness of Christ, that he was to bring in, but not as brought in.** Under it the propitiation, reconciliation, and satisfaction for sin, were not made, nor redemption from it obtained. Wherefore Christ became the propitiation “for the remission of sins that are past,” and he suffered death “for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament.”

Romans 3:25 Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God.

Hebrews 9:15 And for this cause he is the mediator of the new testament, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance.

(2.) The sacrifices then offered were imperfect. For some sins there were no sacrifices appointed, as for Sabbath breaking, murder, adultery, etc. **And those that were appointed, could not really take away sin.** At most they only made a typical expiation, not a real one. They sanctified only “to the purifying of the flesh;” but could not remove sin from the conscience, and “purge that from dead works.” That only the blood of Christ could do.

Hebrews 9:13-14 For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh: How much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?

(3.) There was but a small measure of the gifts and graces of the Spirit bestowed on men under the first covenant. Though there were here and there one on whom great gifts, and much grace were bestowed, as Abraham and David, etc. yet in common, it was but a scanty measure of grace, light,

knowledge, and holiness, that was given to ordinary saints. And the communication was made, for the most part, only to Israelites, and but to a few among them, a remnant, according to the election of grace.

(4.) It was a state of darkness and obscurity under that covenant. It was like a night season, in which lamps are lighted, and torches used. Such was the sure word of prophecy. It was like a light or lamp in a dark place. There was light in some particular persons, as in the prophets, and it was held forth by them. But in general there was but little among the people, who “could not steadfastly look to the end of that which is abolished,” the ceremonial law; under which the mysteries of grace were couched, were clouded, and lay hid. They could not clearly see the end, design, and scope of them. Though there were glorious promises of grace, these were covered with the veil of ceremonies, of which the veil, on the glory of the face of Moses, was a type.

II Corinthians 3:7 But if the ministration of death, written and engraven in stones, was glorious, so that the children of Israel could not steadfastly behold the face of Moses for the glory of his countenance; which glory was to be done away.

II Corinthians 3:13 And not as Moses, which put a vail over his face, that the children of Israel could not steadfastly look to the end of that which is abolished.

(5.) It was a state of bondage. This covenant was signified by Hagar the bondwoman, and by mount Sinai, which gendered to bondage, and answered to Jerusalem, as it was in the apostle’s time; to the state of the Jews then, who were in bondage with their children. And the Israelites, while in their nonage, while children, were in bondage, under the elements of the world, which brought upon them a spirit of bondage to fear. Such a number of laws and ordinances being given them, to the breach of which death was annexed without mercy; and they so liable to break them, they, through fear of death, were all their lifetime subject to bondage.

Galatians 4:3 Even so we, when we were children, were *in bondage* under the elements of the world:

Galatians 4:24-25 Which things are an allegory: for these are the two covenants; the one from the mount Sinai, which *gendereth to bondage*, which is Agar. For this Agar is mount Sinai in Arabia, and answereth to Jerusalem which now is, and is *in bondage* with her children.

Romans 8:15 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.

Hebrews 2:15 And deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime *subject to bondage*.

(3.) The rites and ceremonies by which this covenant was greatly administered, are by the apostle called, “weak and beggarly elements,” and being “weak” and “unprofitable,” there was, therefore, a “disannulling” of them.

Galatians 4:9 But now, after that ye have known God, or rather are known of God, how turn ye again to the weak and beggarly elements, whereunto *ye desire again to be in bondage?*

Hebrews 7:18-19 For there is verily a disannulling of the commandment going before for the weakness and unprofitableness thereof. For the law made nothing perfect, but the bringing in of a better hope did; by the which we draw nigh unto God.

The sacrifices, which were a principal part of them, could not make, neither them that did them, nor the comers unto them, perfect, as to the conscience. They could not purge the worshipers, or those that attended ceremonial services, so as that they should have no more conscience of sin. They could not take away sin, neither from the sight of God, nor from the conscience of the sinner; nor so as that there should be no remembrance of them; for notwithstanding the daily sacrifices, morning and evening, and others on particular accounts, **there was an annual remembrance made of them all, on the day of atonement.**

Hebrews 9:9 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 the conscience.

Hebrews 10:1-4 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. For then would they not have ceased to be offered? because that the worshipers once purged should have had no more conscience of sins. But in those sacrifices there is a remembrance again made of sins every year. For it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins.

And especially when the great high priest was come, and his sacrifice was offered, they were quite impotent and useless, to answer any end at all: and therefore of right ought to cease, and be no more used; which leads,

Thirdly, To the abrogation of the first covenant, or of the administration of it; which was signified by the rending of the veil between the holy place and the holy of holies, at the death of Christ; whereby the way into the holiest of all was made manifest, and all within exposed to open view; as are the mysteries of grace, the veil of ceremonies being removed.

Now, with boldness and freedom, entrance is had into the holiest of all by the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way, consecrated through the veil of his flesh, which the former veil was a type of.

The abrogation of the old covenant is expressed by “breaking down the middle wall of partition,” which stood between Jews and Gentiles. Such the ceremonial law was, and is so called in allusion to the enclosure of the court of the Israelites, in the temple, over which the Gentiles might not pass. By abolishing and slaying the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances; the same ceremonial law, which had this name [enmity]; because it indicated the hatred of God against sin, and irritated the hatred of natural men to it, by its numerous and wearisome rites; and because it was the occasion of enmity between Jew and Gentile.

Ephesians 2:14-16 For he is our peace, who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us; Having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances; for to make in himself of twain one new man, *so* making peace; And that he might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby:

It is moreover expressed by a disannulling of the commandment, the commandment of the priesthood, and of sacrifices and rites belonging to it; and even the whole ceremonial law, as to be of no more force, nor any longer binding; so that no man, henceforward, ought to *judge* another, with respect to them, nor take upon him to command an observance of them, and require obedience to them.

Hebrews 7:19 For the law made nothing perfect, but the bringing in of a better hope did; by the which we draw nigh unto God.

Colossians 2:16-17 Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holyday, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath days: Which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ.

It is likewise expressed by “a blotting out the hand writing of ordinances that was against us;” being an accusation for sin, containing a charge of sin,

and implying an acknowledgment of it; as if they had given it under their hands, and showing and owning that satisfaction for sin, and that expiation were not yet made.

Wherefore when Christ came and paid the debt. He took up his bond, and cancelled it, and blotted out this handwriting against his people, that it might not be read any more, and nailed it to his cross; where law and justice are directed to go for satisfaction.

Colossians 2:14 Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross.

Once more, the abolition of the first covenant, and its form of administration, is signified by the fleeing away and disappearance of shadows. The law and its ceremonies were only shadows of good things to come by Christ. When he, the Sun of Righteousness, arose, these shadows fled. When he, the body, sum, and substance appeared, these disappeared: to this the church has respect.

Songs 2:17 Until the day break, and the shadows flee away, turn, my beloved, and be thou like a roe or a young hart upon the mountains of Bether.

Songs 4:6 Until the day break, and the shadows flee away, I will get me to the mountain of myrrh, and to the hill of frankincense.

Now the abrogation of the first and old covenant, or of that form of administration of the covenant of grace, was made, not at once, but gradually; and which the apostle suggests, when he says; “In that he saith a new covenant, he hath made the first old; now that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away.”

Hebrews 8:13 In that he saith, A new covenant, he hath made the first old. Now that which decayeth and waxeth old *is* ready to vanish away.

It began to decay, and there were some symptoms of a decay of it at the Babylonish captivity, and under the second temple; when the land of Canaan, a type of the heavenly inheritance, was seized upon by the Chaldeans, the inhabitants carried captive, a governor appointed over it by the king of Babylon, and people left in it to till it for his use; the temple was burnt, and temple worship and service ceased for many years, and the vessels of it were carried to Babylon.

And though after a term of years there was a return of the people to their own land, and the temple was rebuilt, and worship restored; yet, as the Jews themselves own, the ark and many other things were wanting in that temple. Great declensions there were, both in doctrine and worship. The sect of the Pharisees arose, and set up their own traditions upon a level with the written word, if not above it. And great confusion there was in the priesthood, that and the civil government being blended together; and men were put into it, especially towards the close of this period, that were very unfit for it; and oftentimes obtained it by corruption and bribery; all which showed a decay, and foreboded a change of things as near.

John the Baptist, the forerunner of Christ, came and proclaimed the near approach of the Messiah; he declared, that “the kingdom of heaven was at hand.”

Matthew 3:2 And saying, Repent ye: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand.

The gospel dispensation, the new administration of the covenant of grace, and the blessings of it. His father, at his birth, called him “the prophet of the Highest,” who was to prepare his way, and give knowledge of salvation to his people. And when he entered upon his office, he directed the people to believe on Christ, who was to come; and quickly pointed him to them, saying, “Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world,” which the lambs of the daily sacrifice, and all other sacrifices, could not do.

- John 1:29 The next day John seeth Jesus coming unto him, and saith, Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world.

Christ himself appeared, and preached the same as John had done, and began his ministry with the same words. But during his life the ceremonies of the law continued in use. He himself was circumcised the eighth day; his mother purified herself according to law, at the proper time, and presented him in the temple, according to the usual manner. At twelve years of age he went up with his parents to Jerusalem, to keep the Passover; and when he had entered on his public ministry, he attended synagogue and temple worship. When he healed the leper he sent him to the priest to offer his gift. And one of the last actions of his life, was keeping the Passover with his disciples.

But at his death, of right, though not in fact, all ceremonies ceased, and even the whole dispensation or administration of the covenant, as it had been before in use; all things now concerning him had an end; all types and figures, shadows, sacrifices, promises, and prophecies. **He by his sacrifice, by his sufferings and**

death, caused the sacrifice and oblation to cease, of right; nor should any afterwards have been offered up.

Luke 22:37 For I say unto you, that this that is written must yet be accomplished in me, And he was reckoned among the transgressors: for the things concerning me have an end.

Daniel 9:27 And he shall confirm the covenant with many for one week: and in the midst of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease, and for the overspreading of abominations he shall make it desolate, even until the consummation, and that determined shall be poured upon the desolate.

Nor any other rite and ceremony [have been] observed. Yet, through the influence of Judaizing teachers over weak minds, it was thought advisable to continue the use of some of the ceremonies, at least for a time; after it was known by Peter and others, that they were no longer in force.

Yet because of the many thousands of Jews, who were all zealous of the law, it was judged proper that compliances should be made, and charity and prudence to be exercised, that weak minds might not be offended, until they were better instructed in the doctrine of Christian liberty; which, when that was done, the use of them was strongly opposed against the obstinate and self-willed, who were resolved to retain them at any rate. And the saints were exhorted to stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ had made them free, and not to be entangled with the yoke of bondage; by which means the Christian churches were freed from those burdensome rites and ceremonies.

But still the carnal Jews continued them, and even sacrifices, until the destruction of Jerusalem, which put an end to them; for according to the law of God, no sacrifice might be offered but at Jerusalem, and upon the altar there; so that when the city, temple, and altar were destroyed, they ceased to offer any sacrifice, and never have offered any since; whereby that prophecy is remarkably fulfilled; “the children of Israel shall abide many days without a sacrifice,” as they have for nineteen hundred years, and still do.

Hosea 3:4 For the children of Israel shall abide many days without a king, and without a prince, and without a sacrifice, and without an image, and without an ephod, and *without* teraphim.

Not even a Passover lamb is slain by them, as well as no other sacrifice offered; which yet they would gladly offer, in defiance of Christ, the great Sacrifice, were it not for the above law, which stands in their way, and by which

they are awed; and which is no small instance of the wisdom and goodness of God in providence.

Now it was a little before the destruction of Jerusalem the apostle wrote the epistle to the Hebrews, and therefore, with great propriety, he says of the old covenant, that it was not only decayed, and waxen old, but was “ready to vanish away.”

Hebrews 8:13 In that he saith, A new covenant, he hath made the first old. Now that which decayeth and waxeth old *is* ready to vanish away.

Fourthly, The new covenant, or the new administration of the covenant of grace, took place; and as the one was gradually removed, the other was gradually introduced.

- **This observation will serve to reconcile the different eras fixed by different persons, for the beginning of the new dispensation;** some placing it at the birth of Christ; others at the ministry of John the Baptist; others at the death of Christ, and his resurrection from the dead; and others at his ascension, and the effusion of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost; whereas these were so many gradual manifestations of it.

At the birth of Christ, undoubtedly, “the fulness of time” was come for the redemption of his people from the law who were under it; and on which very day the gospel was first preached by the angels to the shepherds, and afterwards more clearly and fully by John, by Christ and his apostles. Mark the evangelist, seems to make the beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ the Son of God, to be with the ministry of John the Baptist.

Mark 1:1-3 The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God; As it is written in the prophets, Behold, I send my messenger before thy face, which shall prepare thy way before thee. The voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight.

[This] agrees with what Christ says; “the law and the prophets were until John.” They terminated in him; his ministry put a period to them. “Since that time the kingdom of God is preached” in a clearer manner, and attended to by more than it was before.

- Luke 16:16 The law and the prophets were until John: since that time the kingdom of God is preached, and every man presseth into it.

Christ appeared, and preached the gospel as never man did. Grace and truth came by him in a clearer and fuller manner than it ever had. He not only preached that the kingdom of heaven was at hand, as John did, but that it was already come; though not with pomp, with outward show and observation, and was actually among the people.

Luke 17:20-21 And when he was demanded of the Pharisees, when the kingdom of God should come, he answered them and said, The kingdom of God cometh not with observation: Neither shall they say, Lo here! or, lo there! for, behold, the kingdom of God is within you.

At his death, and by the shedding of his blood, the New Testament was sealed, ratified, and confirmed by him, as the Testator of it; and therefore called, “the blood of the New Testament, and the blood of the everlasting Covenant,” of that new administration of the covenant which should always continue;

Matthew 26:28 For this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins.

Hebrews 13:20 Now the God of peace, that brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, that great shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant,

But this new dispensation more clearly appeared at his ascension, and by the effusion of the Holy Spirit on the apostles at the day of Pentecost. At his resurrection he gave them a commission to go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature, and ordered them to wait at Jerusalem until they were endued with the Holy Spirit, as they were on the above day; whereby they were furnished and qualified to carry the gospel, and preach it among all nations, as they did. And now it may be observed, that the new administration of the covenant, under the gospel dispensation, lies in the following things:

1. In an exhibition of Christ as come, and as become the author of eternal salvation. In it he is set and held forth as incarnate; as having obeyed, suffered, and died, and has made peace and reconciliation, and full satisfaction for sin; and has obtained eternal redemption; has risen from the dead, and ascended to heaven, and has received for and given gifts to men to preach his gospel. These various articles of grace are comprised in the “great mystery of godliness.”

I Timothy 3:16 And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory.

And in those words, which are the sum of the gospel declaration, “this is a faithful saying,” etc.

1 Timothy 1:15 This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptance, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners; of whom I am chief.

2. In a more clear and extensive ministration of the gospel. It first began to be spoken by Christ in the clearest and fullest manner it possibly could be; and then by his apostles, who received it from him, and gifts to minister it; and who by his orders carried it throughout the world, and preached it to every creature under heaven, first to the Jews, and then to the Gentiles; and is, “according to the commandment of the everlasting God, made known to all nations, for the obedience of faith,” so that the administration of the covenant is no longer restrained to a certain people, but men of all nations have the benefit of it.

Romans 16:25-26 Now to him that is of power to stablish you according to my gospel, and the preaching of Jesus Christ, according to the revelation of the mystery, which was kept secret since the world began, But now is made manifest, and by the scriptures of the prophets, according to the commandment of the everlasting God, made known to all nations for the obedience of faith.

3. In a freedom from all bondage and servitude: not from the bondage of sin and Satan, common to all believers under every dispensation; but from the rigorous exaction of the law, as a covenant of works; from the yoke of the ceremonial law, and from the judicial laws, as peculiar to the Jews; and which further lies in the free use of things indifferent, and in the enjoyment of the privileges and immunities of the gospel church state.

This is the glorious liberty of the children of God, the liberty with which Christ has made them free; and who receive the Spirit of adoption, by whom they cry, Abba, Father; and who is a free Spirit, and where he is, there is liberty.

4. In a large communication of the gifts and graces of the Spirit: of extraordinary gifts, which in the first part of this administration were bestowed, not only upon the apostles, but upon common Christians, men and women, sons and daughters, servants and handmaids, according to the prophecy of Joel, of common and ordinary gifts, to fit men for the ordinary ministry of the word; and of the special graces of the Spirit, in a greater degree to saints in common; as a larger measure of faith, peace, joy, and comfort, and of light and knowledge; for according to this covenant, and the administration of it, all know the Lord from the least to the greatest; and though John was greater than the prophets, the least in this kingdom of heaven, or gospel dispensation, is greater than he.

Joel 2:28-29 And it shall come to pass afterward, that I will pour out my spirit upon all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, your old men shall dream dreams, your young men shall see visions: And also upon the servants and upon the handmaids in those days will I pour out my spirit.

-
Jeremiah 31:34 And they shall teach no more every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, Know the LORD: for they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the LORD: for I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more.

Matthew 11:11 Verily I say unto you, Among them that are born of women there hath not risen a greater than John the Baptist: notwithstanding he that is least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he.

4. In ordinances more spiritual than the ordinances of divine service under the first covenant were, which are called “carnal” ones. But these, which are Baptism and the Lord’s Supper, do in a very lively and spiritual manner represent the sufferings, death, burial, and resurrection of Christ; and hold forth the blessings of the covenant of grace in a comfortable way, and are the means of applying them to believers, to the increase of their joy and peace. And these will continue throughout the present administration of the covenant, even to the end of the world.

Matthew 28:19-20 Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world. Amen.

I Corinthians 11:26 For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord’s death till he come.

-
Now as the former administration of the covenant was carried through the various periods of time from the first exhibition, after the fall of Adam, to the first coming of Christ; so this second and new administration of the covenant is carried through various successive periods, unto his second coming.

Luther, Martin

See The Lost History of Calvinism by Elder Harold Hunt

Magna Charta, The

The MAGNA CHARTA: *Sylvester Hassell:* In 1215 **King John of England** was forced by his barons, at Runnymede, to sign the Magna Charta, the legal basis of English liberties, securing life, liberty and property from arbitrary spoliation— representation with taxation, the Habeas Corpus, and trial by jury. In 1265 “the knights, citizens and burgesses” were summoned to form the House of Commons, and thus, with the House of Lords, complete the organization of the British Parliament. (*Hassell’s History pg 447*)

Malachi

MALACHI: *Sylvester Hassell:* Malachi, the last prophet of the Old Testament, is believed to have lived at the same time with or just after Nehemiah; and his prophecy was probably composed about 420 B.C. Its canonicity is established by several New Testament quotations (Matthew 11:10; 17:12; Mark 1:2; 9:11-12; Luke 1:17, Romans 9:13). Like Nehemiah, Malachi censured the profane and mercenary spirit of the priests, the people’s marriages with foreigners, the non-payment of the tithes, and the rich men’s want of sympathy towards the poor. He predicts the coming of John the Baptist, the forerunner of Christ, under the name of Elijah, the prophet, and also the coming of Christ, as the Lord coming suddenly to his temple. He points to the great separating time between the righteous who serve God and the wicked who serve him not; and he represents God as the merciful and unchangeable Father of all that fear him and think upon his name, arising upon them as the Sun of Righteousness with healing in his wings, keeping their name in his book of remembrance, and finally gathering them as his jewels to himself; while he represents God as the righteous and terrible Judge of the proud and wicked, whom he will smite with a curse, and forever destroy with burning.

From the close of Nehemiah’s rule over Judea and the end of Malachi’s prophecy to the birth of our Savior, was about four hundred years; and the account of God’s chosen people during this long period must be gained from profane history, and a few items from the apocryphal writings of the Jews. These latter writings are, to a great extent, inconsistent and unreliable; and the history of the Jews by Josephus is, to some extent, unreliable during this and former periods. Events that came under the notice of Josephus during his life, including the last war with Rome, the destruction of the temple, and the city of Jerusalem, etc., are regarded as quite authentic.” (*Hassell’s History ppg 158, 159*)

Manasseh

MANASSEH: *Sylvester Hassell:* Manasseh, the son of Hezekiah, succeeded his father, and was crowned at the age of twelve years. Those who ruled him were sons of Belial, and plunged him into the commission of almost every crime. If the exact opposite of every good thing his father did was set down to his account it would reveal in part, but not in whole, the carnal and Satanic course of Manasseh. “He shed innocent blood very much, till he had filled Jerusalem from one end to another;” and finally succeeded in seducing and carrying the people along with him “to do more evils than did the nations whom the Lord destroyed before the children of Israel!” He reigned fifty-five years. But in the twentieth year of his wicked career he was taken captive by Esar-Haddon, the king of Assyria, and carried in chains to Babylon, then his capital. Manasseh was humbled by the Spirit of God, repented, and begged for mercy, and the Lord pardoned his sins and restored him to his kingdom again. He might have quoted Paul’s experience, wherein he says, “That in me, the chiefest of sinners, Jesus Christ might show forth all long-suffering for a pattern to them which should hereafter believe on him to life everlasting” (I Timothy 1:15-16). He devoted the remainder of his life to the service of God, and exhorted all the people to be zealous of the law.

Amon succeeded Manasseh, and imitated his father’s idolatry; but his life was suddenly terminated, in two years, by his assassination, in his palace, by conspirators, and he thus gave way to Josiah, the last of the pious kings of Judah. (*Hassell’s History* ppg 130, 131)

Manichaeism, Manichaeus and

Manichaeus and MANICHAISM: *Sylvester Hassell:* Mani, Manes, or Manichaeus, a Persian (Born A.D. 215, died 276), originated a dualistic religious system, deriving its theory chiefly from Parsism, its morals chiefly from Buddhism, and a few elements from a corruption of the New Testament. Manes taught that there are two original and independent principles of Light and Darkness, each presiding over his own kingdom, and in a state of perpetual conflict with the other, the principle of Light being God, and that of darkness being Demon or Matter; that God created Christ, and Demon created Adam; that Manes was the promised Paraclete, or Comforter; that by obedience to the precepts of Christ and Manes natural men became new men, but had to be additionally purified after death in the fire of the Sun and then in the water of the Moon; that less sanctified souls were to be tortured and purged by successive migrations in other bodies; that those persistently wicked would be chained to the burnt inert mass of the world, while the powers of darkness would be forever

confined to their own dismal region; and that the Sun and Moon were to be revered as the representatives of God.

He sent out twelve so-called apostles and seventy-two bishops, and under them a body of priests, Deacons, and itinerant evangelists. He either forbade or disesteemed baptism with water, and enjoined unction with oil. His followers were divided into two classes, called the "Perfect," who were required to be exceedingly abstemious, and the "Hearers," who enjoyed larger liberties.

Manichaeism prevailed over a great deal of the Roman Empire, but lost its most objectionable features as it came westward, and it continued to have adherents till the thirteenth, or, some say, till the sixteenth century. The Catharists, Paulicians, Bogomiles and Albigenses were probably (at least many of them) unjustly suspected of holding its tenets. (*Hassell's History pg 378*)

Marah, The Waters of

The Waters of MARAH: Sylvester Hassell: The Israelites, after giving thanks to God for their deliverance, took up their line of march for the mount of God. They thirsted and complained, and found the waters of Marah, which, being bitter and unpalatable, they murmured the more. These were sweetened by a tree which Moses threw into the waters, and then the people became contented. But great was their delight when they reached the beautiful oasis of Elim, where there were twelve wells of water and three score and ten palm trees, the trees to afford them shelter and the wells to afford them water, as a recompense for their weary journey over thirsty land and in the heat of the sun.

These were figurative of the twelve tribes and seventy elders, in the old dispensation, and the twelve apostles and seventy ministers of the gospel in the new..... Even so, as it has been beautifully remarked, the bitter waters of affliction are always sweetened by casting in the tree of the cross" (*Hassell's History pg 83*)

Martel, Charles

Charles MARTEL (*See under CHARLES MARTEL*)

Massachusetts, Persecution in

Persecution in MASSACHUSETTS: *Sylvester Hassell:* Bonds and imprisonment and scourging attended the Baptists in Massachusetts. A few came over with the first emigrants, but not making their sentiments public, were not molested for several years.

In 1635 Roger Williams was banished, and, leaving Massachusetts, founded Rhode Island. In 1639 several Baptists were fined, or imprisoned, or disenfranchised, or threatened with banishment (different penalties being inflicted on different ones), for attempting to found a church in Weymouth, a town about fourteen miles southeast of Boston. In 1644 a poor man named Painter, in Boston, was tied up and whipped for refusing to have his infant child baptized.

In July, 1651, upon the request of an aged Baptist, of Lynn, named William Witter, who was not able to travel and visit his church at Newport, Rhode Island, three members of the church, John Clark, Obadiah Holmes, and a John Crandall, came to Lynn, Massachusetts, twelve miles from Boston, to hold meeting with him. While Mr. Clarke was preaching from Revelation 3:10, two constables entered the house and arrested Clarke, Holmes and Crandall; and the Court sentenced Clarke to pay a fine of twenty pounds, Holmes thirty pounds, and Crandall five pounds, or be publicly whipped.

All conscientiously refused to pay the fine, and were sent back to prison. Some of Mr. Clarke's friends paid his fine without his consent. Mr. Crandall was released on a promise to appear at the next Court. Mr. Holmes was kept in prison at Boston until September, when, his fine not having been paid, he was brought out publicly and severely whipped, receiving thirty stripes with a three-corded whip, so that he could take no rest for some weeks except as he lay on his knees and elbows, not being able to suffer any other part of his body to touch the bed.

While he was undergoing the cruel strokes, the Lord gave him a more glorious manifestation of his presence than ever before, so that he scarcely felt the outward pain, and he told the magistrate that they had struck him as with roses, and he prayed the Lord not to lay this sin to their charge.

Warrants were issued against thirteen persons, whose only crime was showing some emotions of sympathy towards this innocent sufferer; but eleven escaped, and, while the other two were preparing to receive ten lashes apiece, some friends paid their fines.

Notwithstanding the Congregational persecutions, the Baptists increased in Massachusetts. A Baptist Church was formed in Boston in 1665, and for several years some of the members spent most of their time in courts and prisons. In 1643 the “Church of England” was established by law in Virginia. In 1653 Sir William Berkeley, royal governor of Virginia, strove, by whippings and brandings, to make the inhabitants of that colony conform to the Established “Church,” and thus drove out the Baptists and Quakers, who found a refuge in the Albemarle country of North Carolina, a colony which “was settled,” says Bancroft, “by the freest of the free, by men to whom the restraints of other colonies were too severe.” (*Hassell’s History* ppg 522, 523)

Mattaniah

MATTANIAH (*See under JEHOIAKIM*)

Mayflower, The

The MAYFLOWER (*See under The INDEPENDENTS*)

Melanchthon, Philip

MELANCHTHON, Philip Philip Melanchthon (1497-1560), the “Preceptor of Germany,” the scholarly, humble, ethical and conciliatory co-laborer of Luther, the lay theologian and second leader of the German Reformation, was, in nearly all respects the exact complement of Luther. He acknowledged that infant baptism was a weak point in Luther’s system. He was the author of the *Commonplaces of Theology*, the *Augsburg Confession*, and the *Apology of the Augsburg Confession*. Though, under Luther’s influence, at first a monergist, he made a gradual departure towards synergism, and, indeed, for the sake of peace, he seemed to be willing to yield everything except justification by faith. When the double marriage of Philip of Hesse became public, Melanchthon was so overcome by the pangs of conscience on account of his consent to that iniquity, that he sickened almost to death, and is said to have been “raised up by the powerful will and prayer of Luther, who thought that he could work miracles by his prayers, and who said, by way of comforting Melanchthon, that, while they could not justify the matter to man, they could to God, who knew all the circumstances!”

Melanchthon’s wife was a pious and devoted woman, and his domestic life was happy. He called his home “a little church,” and “always found there peace, and

showed a tender regard for his wife and children, and not infrequently was found rocking the cradle with one hand and holding a book with the other.” He lectured on the Scriptures at his home, which was a social center of the Wittenberg Reformation. In his public career he is said not to have sought honor or fame and wealth, but to have earnestly endeavored to serve the church and the cause of truth.” (*Hassell’s History* pg 488)

Melchizedek

MELCHIZEDEK: *Harold Hunt:* There is probably no other Old Testament character, whose identity has left more people guessing than Melchizedek. Who was he? Where did he come from? What is his place in the grand scheme of things?

Melchizedek is a mysterious character, who appears once on the pages of history, and then disappears. The one single historical reference to Melchizedek is in the fourteenth chapter of Genesis. Genesis 14:18-20, “And Melchizedek king of Salem brought forth bread and wine: and he was the priest of the most high God. And he blessed him, and said, Blessed be Abram of the most high God, possessor of heaven and earth: And blessed be the most high God, which hath delivered thine enemies into thine hand, and he gave him tithes of all.”

In Psalms, chapter one hundred and ten, David points back to Melchizedek, and prophesies that Christ will be a priest forever after the order of Melchizedek. Psalms 110:4, “The Lord hath sworn, and will not repent, Thou art a priest forever after the order of Melchizedek.” What does he mean by *the order of Melchizedek*? David does not say.

Paul mentions him several times in the Hebrew letter. Hebrews 5:6, “As he saith also in another place, Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedek.” Hebrews 5:10, “Called of God an high priest after the order of Melchisedek.” Hebrews 6:20, “Whither the forerunner is for us entered, even Jesus, made an high priest for ever after the order of Melchisedek” Hebrews 7:1-7, “For this Melchisedek, king of Salem, priest of the most high God, who met Abraham returning from the slaughter of the kings, and blessed him. To whom also Abraham gave a tenth part of all; first being by interpretation King of righteousness, and after that also King of Salem, which is, King of peace. Without father, without mother, without descent, having neither beginning of days, nor end of life; but made like unto the Son of God; abideth a priest continually. Now consider how great this man was, unto whom even the patriarch Abraham gave the tenth of the spoils. And verily they that are of the sons of Levi, who receive the office of the priesthood, have a commandment to

take tithes of the people according to the law, that is, of their brethren, though they come out of the loins of Abraham. But he whose descent is not counted from them received tithes of Abraham, and blessed him that had the promises. And without all contradiction the less is blessed of the better. Hebrews 7:10,11, “For he was yet in the loins of his father, when Melchisedek met him. If therefore 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 Melchisedek, and not be called after the order of Aaron?” Hebrews 7:15, “And it is yet far more evident: for that after the similitude of Melchisedek there ariseth another priest.” Hebrews 7:17, “For he testifieth, Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedek.” Hebrews 7:21, “(For those priests were made without an oath; but this with an oath by him that said unto him, The Lord sware and will not repent, Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedek:).”

The name appears eleven times in the Bible. In seven out of those eleven times, the name appears in the expression *the order of Melchizedek*. Who was Melchizedek? Where did he come from? What is his significance? What is meant by the expression *the order of Melchizedek*?

So far as the identity of Melchizedek is concerned, the classical theologians totally fail us. Most of them think he was some obscure Canaanite (Hamitic) prince, who lived in the region of Judea. That was John Gill’s opinion. The commentaries of Matthew Poole and Jamieson-Fausset-Brown take the same position. Matthew Henry and John Calvin talk about the subject, and mention several different theories, but neither of them ventures to present any opinion of his own. They had no idea who he was.

The one thing that seems to convince those theologians that Melchizedek was a Canaanite prince is that he lived in an area which is most commonly associated with the descendants of Canaan. He was surrounded by Canaanites, so he must be a Canaanite, or so the argument goes. But the argument does not hold. There can be no question that much of that land was associated with the Canaanites, but that does not apply to the entire region. Much of that region was also occupied by the descendants of Eber, the grandson of Shem. Eber was not a Canaanite, nor any other kind of Hamite. He was Semitic, a descendent of Shem. In Genesis chapter forty, when Joseph in an Egyptian prison was stating his plight to the butler and the baker, he told them, “For indeed I was stolen away out of **the land of the Hebrews**” (Genesis 40:15). Notice that he did not say I was stolen out of the land of the Canaanites.

Now bear in mind that at this time the descendants of Abraham had not yet come into possession of the land. At that time the entire family of Jacob consisted of

only seventy people (Genesis 46:27). There were far too few of them to possess that entire land, or to give it their name.

Canaan was one of the sons of Ham; he was Hamitic. The word *Hebrew* indicates a descendant of Eber, the great-grandson of Shem; he was Semitic, not Hamitic.

That raises the question; who was Eber? For eight generations Eber was the only descendant of Shem who outlived him. His name became the name most commonly attached to the descendants of Shem. There were obviously enough of Shem's Hebrew descendants living in that region for it to be commonly called *the land of the Hebrews*.

More than that, the one central theme with regard to Melchizedek is that Christ was made "a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek." How can we imagine that the Lord of Glory was made a priest after the *order* of some obscure Hamitic prince, who appeared once on the pages of history, and then vanished, never to be heard from again? How could some unknown Canaanite be such a clear figure of Christ that Paul spends so much time expounding on that connection, and yet we know nothing about him? If Christ was made a priest forever after the order of some Canaanite prince, what was that order? What was there about him that made him such a clear type of the Messiah? Gill and the others cannot produce their evidence.

Also, the descendants of Canaan were under a special curse. Genesis 9:25, "And he said, **cursed be Canaan**: a servant of servants shall he be to his brethren." That curse fell, not on Canaan alone, but on all his descendants. Would God choose a member of that race, which was cursed above their brethren, as a figure of Christ? No, rather, the Lord, whose very name is *Blessed* (Mark 14:61), came to redeem us from under the curse. He did not fashion his priesthood after the ministry of one who was himself under a curse.

Listen to the language of Paul, and see if it sounds like he was talking about some obscure person. Now consider **how great** this man was, unto whom **even the patriarch Abraham** gave the tenth of the spoils," Hebrews 7:4. Paul marvels at the greatness of this man, and tells us that *even the Patriarch Abraham* deferred to him and gave him tithes. That kind of homage is not usually given to some unknown, insignificant individual. Melchizedek was obviously a very prominent person, whose greatness, and whose claim to preeminence was readily recognized by Abraham.

Else, why would Abraham give him tithes? Why should it not have been the other way around? Why should Melchizedek not have rather given tithes to

Abraham? Melchizedek did not give tithes to Abraham because **Melchizedek was the greater of the two**. Paul makes that plain enough. Hebrews 7:6-7, But he whose descent is not counted from them received tithes of Abraham, and blessed him that had the promises, and without all contradiction **the less is blessed of the better.**” Abraham is the father of the nation of Israel. He is one of the most illustrious characters in all of the Old Testament, and by far one of the most notable characters in all of human history. There is no way we can imagine that Abraham received blessing from some obscure Canaanite prince, and that in so doing “the less was blessed of the better.” We cannot imagine that some obscure Canaanite prince was superior to Abraham.

I hope to show that, not only was Melchizedek a very prominent figure, whose importance was readily recognized by Abraham, but that Melchizedek was, at that time, probably the most widely known, and the most influential, person in the world. There was no reason anybody should challenge his authority, nor that Abraham should question his right to receive tithes.

I do not like to keep people guessing; so before we go any farther, let me say that I am firmly convinced **Melchizedek was another name for Noah’s middle son Shem**. I hope to present those reasons which convince me that Shem and Melchizedek were the same person. If those arguments do not convince you, I hope you will not feel hard at me for being as firmly convinced as I am in the matter.

Shem was one of Noah’s three sons. It was by those three men, and their sons, that the world was repopulated after the flood. Every human being in the world is a descendant of one or the other of those three men. So Shem stands alone as the ancestor of one of the three grand divisions of the human race. I hope to show that he was one of the most prominent characters in the history of the world, and one of the most prominent figures in the lineage of the Messiah.

Shem was Abraham's great-great-great-great-great-great-great-grandfather. Notice that he was his seven times (count them) great-grandfather. If we add those seven times to the forty two generations from Abraham to Christ (Matthew 1:17), we have forty nine generations. If seven is a significant number, forty nine— seven times seven—must be somewhat more significant.

I hope to show that Shem and Melchizedek were the same person, that Shem was a figure of Christ, and that his ministry resembled, or prefigured, the ministry of Christ as clearly as the type can ever resemble the antitype. And I hope to show that he was a figure of Christ in ways that no other person ever was or could be.

But, if Melchizedek and Shem were the same person, why does it call him Melchizedek? Why does it not just call him Shem? For whatever the reason, many of the characters in the Bible were called by more than one name. Jacob was often called Israel. Several times he was called Jeshurun (Deuteronomy 32:15; 33:5,26; Isaiah 15:9). Gideon was sometimes called Jerubbaal (Judges 6:32); sometimes he was Jerubbesheth (II Samuel 11:21). It would be hard to count all the characters in the Bible who had more than one name.

Melchizedek was the king of Salem. That was probably his kingly name. The suffix *-zedek* is also found in the name of Adonizedek (Joshua 10:1), the king of Jerusalem. We will notice later that Jerusalem and Salem were the same city. When we find two kings of **the same city** having **the same suffix** in their name, it indicates that the suffix might very well have been part of their royal title.

When we read the description Paul gives of Melchizedek, it is easy to get the idea that he could not be talking about any human who ever lived, neither Shem nor anybody else. Paul says that he was “without father, without mother, without descent, having neither beginning of days, nor end of life; but made like unto the Son of God; abideth a priest continually” Hebrews 7:3. How could any man fit all of those characteristics?

Quite a few Bible students have decided that Paul could not be talking about any mere mortal, and that Melchizedek was simply another name for the Lord himself. But that idea only looks like it solves the problem. First, the text says that Melchizedek was “made like unto the Son of God.” It does not make a lot of sense to say that somebody was like himself. That expression shows that Melchizedek was not the Lord—he was only like the Lord. Second, the Lord did have a mother. Mary was the mother of his human nature, and the Bible often refers to her as his mother (John 2:1,5; 19:25, etc), and in both his divine nature and his human nature God is his Father (John 20:17).

Also, if Melchizedek was simply another name for the Lord, and the Lord is “a priest after the order of Melchizedek,” then the priesthood of the Lord is the pattern after which the priesthood of the Lord is fashioned. It does not any kind of sense to say that a person is patterned after himself. No, Melchizedek was not the Lord, but he was like the Lord.

If you will bear with me, I hope to show that Shem is unique in all of history, and that those seven expressions do describe him. He is the only man in human history who fits the description given, and it is uncanny how very well he does fit.

-

The key to the question is in Hebrews 7:15, “And it is yet far more evident: for that after **the similitude of Melchizedek** there ariseth another priest.” The key word is *similitude*. Similitude indicates appearance or likeness. Christ is a priest after the similitude—after the likeness—of Melchizedek. The priesthood of the Lord is not the priesthood of Melchizedek; but it is like it. There is a clear similitude or resemblance.

We are dealing with a type, and it is the purpose of a type to resemble the antitype. When the text says that Melchizedek was “without father, without mother,” and so on, it is not saying that he absolutely did not have a father or mother. No one who ever lived was absolutely without parents, but within the limits of the type, **Melchizedek clearly resembled one who did not have a father or a mother.**” He resembled one without beginning of days, or end of life, and so on. When we accept the key provided by the text itself, and apply that key to the person of Shem, the problem resolves itself.

Shem appeared to be without father, and without mother. He appeared to be without descent, without beginning of days, or end of life. He appeared to have a perpetual, unchangeable priesthood. And he had those appearances as no other person ever did. I believe that all of this will become clear as we go along, and I believe that it will become clear that the type does fit the antitype.

Those of you who have read our little booklet on *The Sixteen Ancestors of All Mankind* are already acquainted with the argument I am about to present, but a lot of you have either not read it, or perhaps you have forgotten most of it, so I hope you will pardon me if I simply quote verbatim from that material.

“Before the flood men lived to be very old. If you will look at Genesis 5, you will discover that it was not at all uncommon for somebody to live to be almost a thousand years old. Adam lived to be nine hundred and thirty years old (Genesis 5:5). Methuselah lived to be nine hundred and sixty nine (Genesis 5:27), and Noah lived to be nine hundred and fifty (Genesis 9:29). But all of that changed after the flood. For the next several generations they still lived to be very old by our standards, but the life expectancy of each generation dropped rapidly. Genesis chapter eleven gives the ages of the first several generations after the flood. If those life spans, which are listed, are typical of those which are not listed, and we have no reason to believe they were any different, then, one strange fact becomes evident: for the next eight generations after the flood, the life expectancy of each generation was falling so rapidly, that it was the rule, rather than the exception, for the parents to outlive their children. And not only that, it was the rule for the grandparents to outlive their grandchildren, and for the great-grandparents to outlive their great-grandchildren, and so on. That went on for eight generations or more.”

“Let us take just a moment to see how that worked out. Genesis 11 records that ‘Shem was an hundred years old, and begat Arphaxad two years after the flood’ (Genesis 11:10). He lived ‘after he begat Arphaxad five hundred years’ (Genesis 11:11). So Arphaxad died 502 years (2 years plus 500 years) after the flood. ‘Arphaxad lived five and thirty years, and begat Salah’ (Genesis 11:12) 37 years (2 years plus 35 years) after the flood. Salah lived another 403 years (Genesis 11:15). So he died 440 years after the flood (2 years plus 35 years plus 403 years). Notice that he died 62 years before his father. Genesis 11 has all the numbers. You can work out the arithmetic for yourselves, but here is a listing of the date of death of each of the patriarchs up until the time of Abraham.”

“Shem died 502 years after the flood.
Arphaxad died 440 years after the flood.
Salah died 470 years after the flood.
Eber died 531 years after the flood.
Peleg died 340 years after the flood.
Serug died 393 years after the flood.
Nahor died 241 years after the flood.
Terah died 426 years after the flood.
Abraham died 527 years after the flood.”

“Except for Eber, Shem outlived all his descendants for the next eight generations. Abraham was the first to outlive Shem, and he only outlived him by 25 years.”

Now consider, if you will, the significance of all that. Shem outlived his children, his grandchildren, his great-grandchildren, his great-great-grandchildren, and so on down to his great-great-great-great-great-great-grandchildren. The text only lists one exception. That was his great-grandson Eber. Except for Eber, so far as the record shows, Shem outlived all his descendants until we get all the way down to his seven times great-grandson Abraham.

One of the characteristics of Melchizedek was that he had no end of life. Shem was not immortal. He did finally die. The type and the antitype never agree in every detail; else the type would be the antitype. They only look alike. But even though Shem was not immortal, he must have appeared to his descendants to be immortal. When an aged man stands all alone at the head of all his descendants, at the head of his extended family, **with eight generations entirely missing** between himself and his descendants, he certainly has an appearance of immortality. It looks for all the world like he is never going to die. Bearing in

mind that we are dealing with similitude—dealing with appearances— Shem exactly fits the description of one who had no end of life.

Another characteristic of Melchizedek was that he had no beginning of days. Here again, Shem fits the description. Shem had no beginning of days—not in this world, anyway. Shem had his beginning in another world. He was born in the world before the flood. The Bible consistently refers to the world before the flood as another world (*spared not the old world {II Peter 2:5}, the world that then was {II Peter 3:6}*). So Shem had no beginning of days—in this world. He had his beginning in another world, and he came (through the flood) from that world to this world. Again, Shem fits the description of Melchizedek, and he stands as a type of the Lord, who truly had no beginning of days, and who came to this world from another world. John 3:13, “And no man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man, which is in heaven.”

At the time Melchizedek met Abraham (and it is especially at that juncture that he stands as a type of Christ) he was *without father and without mother*. All of Shem’s ancestors died, either in the flood, or prior to it. His grandparents were dead: his great-grandparents were dead; all his aunts and uncles were dead. He outlived his father by one hundred and fifty years (Genesis 9:6,29; 11:10-11). So at the time he met Abraham, his father, and no doubt his mother, were dead.

Get the picture. Here is the man who stood at the head of a mighty family, which constituted the third part of the human race. And yet he stood all alone in the world. At the time he met Abraham, all his ancestors, including his father and mother were long since dead. His descendants for the next eight generations were dead. More than any other person in recorded history, he had the appearance of one with neither ancestors nor descendants.

Paul goes on to say that he was “made like unto the Son of God; abideth a priest continually” (Hebrews 7:3). He was like the Son of God in any number of ways, but the one thing Paul has most in mind is his perpetual priesthood. In Shem’s day the only established priesthood was the priesthood of the head of the house. The Mosaic Law and the Levitical Priesthood did not come along for another four hundred years. The Old Testament prophets did not appear on the scene for still another four hundred years. The gospel ministry would not arrive for two thousand years. The responsibility for religious instruction rested on the father as the head of the family.

Shem was the head of his immediate family, and he stood as the head over their families. Bear in mind that the extended family of Shem (they were all his descendants) constituted the third part of the human race. Considering the long

lives and the large families of that day, Shem was possibly the spiritual leader of millions of descendants.

Shem was the spiritual leader of his descendants, and in some sense, he was the spiritual leader, even of those other two families, the Japhethites, and the Hamites as well. He was their leader to the extent they had a spiritual leader. Neither Japheth nor Ham were able to give the dependable lead Shem provided. The Bible makes it clear enough that the responsibility of leadership rested on Shem, so far as the true worship of God was concerned. Genesis 9:25-27, “And he said, Cursed be Canaan; a servant of servants shall he be unto his brethren. And he said, **blessed be the Lord God of Shem**, and Canaan shall be his servant. God shall enlarge Japheth, and **he shall dwell in the tents of Shem**; and Canaan shall be his servant.”

It is obvious that in spiritual matters, Shem was the best known and the most influential man in the world. In that, he was clearly a type of the Lord.

God has never left himself without a witness. When there were only three people in the world, God sent a witness, a prophet. Read Matthew 23:29-35. In that passage the Lord complains about those who shed the blood of the prophets “from the blood of righteous Abel unto the blood of Zacharias, son of Barachias.” The text clearly implies that Abel was a prophet. Enoch, *the seventh from Adam*, prophesied (Jude 1:14). Notice that number seven again. Psalms 105:9-10,15 shows that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were all prophets. God has always had a witness. He has always provided for some kind of religious instruction. In Shem’s day that responsibility rested on the head of the house.

Living so long as he did, he stood as the head of the family for eight full generations. His children were born; they lived, and died, and all the while, he was the only priest they knew. His grandchildren were born; they lived and died, and they knew no other priest. That went on for eight generations, and for all that time, for all they could tell, there was never going to be another priest. It appeared that the priesthood of Shem would go on forever.

We are repeatedly told that Christ was “a priest for ever after the *order of Melchizedek*.” According to Webster *order* has to do with *arrangement* or *succession*. To all appearance, Shem was never going to have a successor. It appeared that he was going to go on forever. Again the type fits the antitype. The Lord Jesus Christ is our one and only high priest. He has no successors. His priesthood will never end.

Shem was the type; Christ is the antitype. For eight generations Shem appeared to his family to have a perpetual priesthood. He prefigured Christ who truly does

have the one and only perpetual priesthood. The Levitical priests were very different to Melchizedek. Theirs was a different *order*; they had successors. They lived out their normal lifespans; they died, and they were replaced. But the priesthood of Shem appeared to go on forever. He had *the appearance* of which Christ has *the reality*. Hebrews 7:23-26, “And they truly were many priests, because they were not suffered to continue by reason of death. But this man, because he continueth ever, hath an unchangeable priesthood. Wherefore he is able to save them to the uttermost, that come unto God by him, seeing **he ever liveth** to make intercession for them.”

The last thing we need to notice is that Melchizedek was *king of Salem*. Again, in this he is a clear type of the Lord Jesus Christ. Salem is the old name for Jerusalem. David refers to Jerusalem and calls it Salem in Psalms 76:2: “In Salem also is his tabernacle, and his dwelling place in Zion.” Sometimes *Zion* referred to the entire *old city* of Jerusalem; sometimes it referred to a hill in Jerusalem. Either way, it has reference to Jerusalem. So Jerusalem, or *Salem*, was the capital of the kingdom of Melchizedek, and it was the capital of the kingdom of David, and it is also one of the names of the New Testament church.

Melchizedek, with his apparently perpetual priesthood, reigning in that very ancient Jerusalem prefigured the Lord Jesus Christ with his truly perpetual priesthood reigning in that New Jerusalem which is above, which is the mother of us all (Galatians 4:26). When David claimed Jerusalem as his capital, he was simply reclaiming that old capital which had been the center of the government of Melchizedek many centuries before. And when the New Testament writers refer to the church as the *new Jerusalem*, the *holy Jerusalem*, or the *heavenly Jerusalem* (Hebrews 12:22; Revelation 3:12; 21:2,10), they connect the New Testament Church with both of those two Old Testament types, Melchizedek and David.

Psalms 110:4, “The Lord hath sworn, and will not repent, Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek.”

Menno Simmons

MENNO SIMMONS: *Sylvester Hassell:* Menno Simmons (1496-1561) was no doubt the most useful Baptist minister of the sixteenth century. While a Catholic priest, he saw an Anabaptist beheaded, and was led to inquire into the scriptural authority of infant baptism; and not being enabled by his Catholic superior or by Luther or Bucer or Bullinger to find such authority anywhere in the Bible, he was conscientiously led, at great worldly sacrifice, to renounce the custom, and to join the despised Anabaptists (in 1536). For twenty-five years he traveled in the Netherlands and Germany, with his wife and children, amid

perpetual sufferings and daily perils of his life, and proclaimed God's full and free salvation to all believing sinners, and he founded numerous churches.

He seemed, says Mosheim, to be "the common Bishop of all the Anabaptists." He earnestly warned his brethren against the Munster abominations; and he insisted upon strict discipline in all the churches, which were independent of each other in church government, and united only by a bond of love. Some practiced feet-washing, and some did not. The members of his churches were called Mennonites, and were plain, honest, industrious people, mostly farmers. (*Hassell's History* ppg 504, 505)

Mercy

MERCY: C. H. Cayce: If the death of Christ was based upon a principle of mercy, then He had a right to die for a part of the race without dying for others. If He did not have this sovereign right, then His death was not mercy, but an obligation which He was under to sinners. If He was under obligation to them to die for them, and if they are saved through what He accomplished in His death, then their salvation is not a matter of mercy, but a matter of obligation—something the Lord was under obligation to them to do for them. If the salvation of the sinner is not of God's mercy, then the Bible is a farce, and the whole thing is a delusion, a snare and a myth. Sinners are saved by mercy—grace—through what Christ accomplished in His death. Therefore, His death was an act of mercy. As it was an act of mercy, He had a sovereign right to die for a part of the race, without dying for others. (*Cayce's Editorials* vol. 1, ppg 319, 320)

Messiah, Old Testament Views Of The

Old Testament Views of the MESSIAH: Sylvester Hassell: Believers before the flood dimly beheld him as the suffering but victorious seed of the woman. Abraham rejoicingly saw him as his own seed in whom all the families of the earth were to be blessed. Jacob viewed him as the descendant of his son Judah, the Shiloh, unto whom the gathering of the people should be. Moses saw him as the prophet whom the Lord God would raise up like unto him, from among his brethren, to whom they were to give ear. Job, in the depth of his afflictions, beheld him as his Divine Redeemer, who should stand at the latter day upon the earth. David saw him as his own Son and the Son of God, the anointed King Of Zion, yet agonizing before God, and pierced in his hands and feet by the assembly of the wicked, and going down into the dust of death, but not seeing corruption, and rising from all the humiliation of his earthly life, and passing, as the King of Glory, within the everlasting gates, and sitting down on the right

hand of God, the almighty and gentle Shepherd of Israel, ruling in the midst of his enemies, making his people willing in the day of his power, making them lie down in green pastures, leading them beside the still waters, restoring their souls, leading them in the paths of righteousness for his name's sake, accompanying them all the days of their lives with his goodness and mercy, giving them the victory over every foe, even death, and making them dwell in the house of the Lord forever.

Isaiah beheld him as Immanuel, God with us, a child born, a son given, whose name was Wonderful, Counselor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father and the Prince of Peace, the Sure Foundation Stone laid in Zion, tried and precious, and as the man of sorrows and acquainted with grief, bruised for our iniquities and healing us with his stripes. Jeremiah saw him as the Lord our Righteousness. Ezekiel beheld him as a man and yet as the Lord, of a bright appearance, seated upon a sapphire throne, and encircled with a rainbow.

Daniel saw him as a little stone cut out of the mountain, breaking in pieces the iron, the brass, the clay, the silver, and the gold of Nebuchadnezzar's image, and as the Son of man coming with the clouds of heaven to the Ancient of Days, and acquiring universal and everlasting dominion, and as Messiah the Prince, who should come to the holy city, and be cut off but not for himself, and should make an end of sins, and bring in an everlasting righteousness, and seal up the vision and prophecy, a short time before the destruction of the city and sanctuary.

Micah beheld him as the Ruler of Israel, whose goings forth had been from everlasting, coming out of Bethlehem-Ephratah. Haggai saw him as the Desire of All Nations, coming to the second temple, and filling it with greater spiritual glory than the first temple, and in that place giving peace. Zechariah saw him as the King of Zion, just and having salvation, lowly and riding upon a colt the foal of an ass into Jerusalem, betrayed for thirty pieces of silver, pierced by the house of David and the inhabitants of Jerusalem, but bringing them to mourn with a great and solitary mourning for him, and opening to them a fountain for sin and for uncleanness—as the Shepherd of God, a man, and yet the equal of the Lord of Hosts, smitten by the sword of God, who then turns his hand of mercy upon the little ones. And Malachi beheld him as the Messenger of the Covenant, the Lord suddenly coming to his temple, and purifying the sons of Levi as gold and silver in the furnace, that they might offer unto the Lord an offering in righteousness, and as the Sun of Righteousness arising, unto all that fear his name, with healing in his wings.” (*Hassell's History*)

Messianic Prophecy

MESSIANIC Prophecy: *Sylvester Hassell:* All the Old Testament is one great type and prophecy, which finds and will find its full accomplishment in Jesus Christ. As he told his disciples both before and after his resurrection, “All things which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the Psalms, concerning me, must be fulfilled” (Luke 24:44). “Think not,” said he, in his sermon on the mount, “that I am come to destroy the law of the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill” (Matthew 5:17). Said the angel to John, “The testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy” (Revelation 19:10).

“Pure gold is not found in large masses; the value of the mass lies mostly in the small particles of the rich metal scattered through it.” The golden vein of Messianic prophecy runs through the Old Testament Scriptures, and gives them a Divine unity; and the New Testament, with the same unity, describes the fulfillment of these predictions in Jesus of Nazareth.

The Messiah (Daniel 9:25-26) was to be the seed of the woman (Genesis 3:15), of the family of Shem (Genesis 9:26), Abraham (Genesis 12:2-3), Isaac (Genesis 21:12), Jacob (Genesis 28:14), Judah (Genesis 49:10), Jesse (Isaiah 11:1-10), and David (Jeremiah 33:15). He was to be preceded by a messenger like Elijah (Malachi 3:1; 4:5), crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord (Isaiah 40:3-5). He was to be born of a virgin (Isaiah 7:14), in Bethlehem of Judea (Micah 5:2), just before the sceptre departed from Judah (Genesis 49:10), in the days of the fourth universal (Roman) empire (Daniel 2:44), about 460 years after the issuing of the Persian king’s decree for the restoration of Jerusalem (Daniel 9:24-27); Numbers 4:3; Luke 3:23), and before the destruction of the second temple (Haggai 2:6-9).

His earthly ministry therefore must have occurred more than 1,800 years ago; and, if it did not occur then, the Old Testament Scriptures must be false.

Rachel, who was buried near Bethlehem (Genesis 35:19), was poetically represented as weeping for her slaughtered children (Jeremiah 31:15), and God was to call back his Son out of Egypt (Hosea 11:10). That Son was to grow up before his Father as a tender plant, and as a root out of a dry ground (Isaiah 53:2). He was to be preeminently the Anointed One (Psalms 2:2), a Prophet like Moses (Deuteronomy 18:18), a Priest like Melchizedek (Psalms 110:4), a King like David (Isaiah 9:7), He was to be the King of Zion (Psalms 2:6; Zechariah 9:9), higher than the kings of the earth (Psalms 89:27), altogether lovely (Song of Solomon 5:16); the Ruler of Israel, whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting (Micah 5:2; the Maker, Redeemer, and Shepherd of Israel (Isaiah 54:5; Ezekiel 34; 24-31); the Shiloh, or Peace-Giver (Genesis 49:10); he

was to open the eyes of the blind, unstop the ears of the deaf, make the lame man leap as a hart, and the tongue of the dumb sing (Isaiah 35:4-6); he was to have the law of his God in his heart, and delight to do his will, and he was to preach righteousness (Psalms 40:6-10); He was to be the glory of Israel, and a light to the Gentiles (Isaiah 49:6; 60:1-3); the Star of Jacob and the Sceptre of Israel, who should smite his foes, and have dominion (Numbers 29:17,19); the Sun of Righteousness, arising, with healing in his wings, unto all that fear the Lord (Malachi 4:2; He was to be the Lord of the temple, the messenger of the covenant (Malachi 3:1); not only the son, but the Lord of David (Psalms 110:1); the son of man (Daniel 7:13), and yet the Son of God (Psalms 2:2,7,12); a man and yet the fellow or equal of God (Zechariah 13:7); identified with God (Zechariah 12:10); Immanuel, or God with us (Isaiah 7:14); the Lord our Righteousness (Jeremiah 23:6); the Divine Redeemer, who should stand at the latter day upon the earth (Job 19:25-27); who was to come with dyed garments, glorious in his apparel, traveling in the greatness of his strength, speaking in righteousness, mighty to save, treading the wine-press alone, perfectly able, without any help, to bring salvation to his redeemed, and to destroy all their enemies (Isaiah 63:1-9); the spiritual Zerubbabel, who would make the great mountain a plain, lay the foundation of the Lord's house, and also finish it, bringing forth the headstone with shoutings of Grace, grace unto it (Zechariah 4:6-10); though a child born, a son given to us, yet Wonderful, Counselor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, and the Prince of Peace, of the increase of whose government and peace there should be no end (Isaiah 9:6-7); His name to continue as long as the sun, and men to be blessed in Him (Psalms 72:17); His dominion to be universal and eternal (Daniel 7:14); His throne to be the throne of God, and endure forever and ever (Psalms 45:6-7); and yet—wonderful, indeed, according to His name—He was to be a servant of God, with visage more marred than any man (Isaiah 52:13-14); despised and rejected of men, a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief (Isaiah 53:3); He was to come to Jerusalem, as a lowly king of righteousness and salvation, riding upon the foal of an ass (Zechariah 9:9); He was to be conspired against by the kings and rulers of the earth (Psalms 2:2); though never guilty of fraud or violence (Isaiah 53:9), He was to be betrayed by his own familiar friend (Psalms 41:9) for thirty pieces of silver, which should be given to the potter for a field to bury strangers in (Zechariah 11:12-13; Jeremiah 7:32-33; 19; Matthew 27:3-10); He was to be derided by his ungodly enemies (Psalms 22:6-8); and, having been made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death (Psalms 8:5; Hebrews 2:9), and being doomed to have his heel bruised while he bruised the head of the serpent (Genesis 3:15), He was to be numbered with the transgressors (Isaiah 53:12), and pierced by the house of David and the inhabitants of Jerusalem, but be bitterly and privately mourned for by them, and open to them a fountain for sin and for uncleanness (Zechariah 12:10-14; 13:1); He was to have his hands and feet pierced, and his garments parted, and lots cast for his vesture (Psalms 22:16,18); be given gall

and vinegar to drink (Psalms 66:20); He was to be smitten by the sword of Divine Justice (Zechariah 13:7), the sun being turned into darkness (Joel 2:31; Amos 8:9; Acts 2:20); stricken for the transgression of his people (Isaiah 53:8); bruised, by God's appointment for their iniquities (Isaiah 53:5); cut off, but not for himself (Daniel 9:26); make an end of sins, make reconciliation for iniquity, and bring in everlasting righteousness (Daniel 9:24); make intercession for the transgressors (Isaiah 53:12); take from his people their filthy garments and clothe them with a change of raiment, and remove their iniquity in one day (Zechariah 3); by the blood of his covenant send forth his prisoners out of the pit wherein is no water (Zechariah 9:11); yield up his soul as an offering for sin (Isaiah 53:10); be forsaken of his God (Psalms 22:1); be with the rich in his death (Isaiah 53:9); not to see corruption (Psalms 16:10), but rise again the third day (Hosea 6:2; Jonah 1:17), prolong his days, see his seed, and pleasure of the Lord prosper in his hand (Isaiah 53:10); see the travail of his soul, and be satisfied, and by his knowledge justify many, because he shall have borne their iniquities (Isaiah 53:11); He should be a hiding place from the wind, and a covert from the tempest, as rivers of water in a dry place, as the shadow of a great rock in a weary land (Isaiah 32:1-2); He should come down like rain upon the mown grass, and as showers that water the earth (Psalms 72:6); not cry or lift up or cause his voice to be heard in the street, not break a bruised reed, nor quench the smoking flax (Isaiah 42:1-4); He should purify his people like gold and silver, that they might offer to the Lord an offering in righteousness (Malachi 3:3); He should be anointed immeasurably with the Spirit of God (as his very name, Messiah, or Christ, indicates) to preach good tidings to the meek, to bind up the broken-hearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound, to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord, and the day of vengeance of our God, to comfort all that mourn, to appoint unto them that mourn in Zion, to give unto them beauty for ashes, the oil of joy for mourning, the garment of praise for the spirit of heaviness, that they might be called trees of righteousness, the planting of the Lord, that he might be glorified (Isaiah 61:1-3).

Now reflect that these prophecies, as given by God to his people, were scattered through a period of about thirty-six hundred years, so that, if there had been any deception, it would have required the collusion of about seventy generations, and that, too, to bring about a belief of the human race in the most elevating spiritual blessings—a circumstance utterly incredible; remember that the Jews who persecuted Jesus Christ to death, and who still reject his claims, have handed down these prophetic writings to us as infallibly inspired of God, and are, many of them today willing to lay down their lives, if necessary, in defense of such inspiration; and then carefully read the New Testament, which was written more than four hundred years after the last Old Testament prophet; and see how these vastly complicated and seemingly inconsistent details were precisely fulfilled in the history of Jesus of Nazareth; and if you have not a darkened understanding, a

seared conscience, and a stony heart, you will prostrate your soul before the once incarnate and crucified Redeemer, with the impassioned exclamation of Thomas—My Lord and my God!

As has been well said, Jesus Christ is the only key in all the universe that fits the infinitely complicated Messianic prophecy. The Jewish rabbins thought some of the Messianic prophecies so inconsistent with others that they supposed there would be two Messiahs—a Messiah ben (or son of) Joseph, who should suffer, and a Messiah ben David, who should reign. But the Messianic prophecies of suffering and reigning are indissolubly blended. The principles of bleeding sorrow and holy triumph are eternally blended in him who is at once and forever the Lamb and the Son of God—the vicarious sufferer and the Divine bridegroom of his redeemed church. (Song of Solomon 5:10; Isaiah 53; 54:5; Ephesians 5:23-32; John 1:18,29; Psalms 2:7; Matthew 16:16; Mark 14:61-62; Acts 3:13; Romans 1:3-4; Hebrews 1:2-3; I Peter 1:3; Revelation 1:5; 19:7,9,13; 22:1).”
(*Hassell’s History* ppg 177-180)

Ministry, Support Of The

Support of the MINISTRY “By this occupation Paul supported himself during his Apostleship. His churches, like the Christians in general of the first and succeeding centuries, were of the lower and poorer classes in society; and he chose not to burden them, but to labor for his own necessities, as well as for those with him. He collected money for the poor Jewish Christians in Palestine, but not for himself. “Only as an exception did he receive gifts from the Philippian brethren, who were peculiarly dear to him.” Yet he enjoins upon the churches to care for the temporal needs of their spiritual teachers.” (*Hassell*)

Ministry, The Gospel

The Gospel MINISTRY: Lemuel Potter: There are two or three things in the work of the ministry that I have noticed among our brethren, and I would love to see them abandoned by our people. While I have been what our brethren usually term a doctrinal preacher, yet I am opposed to the idea of our brethren in setting forth and defending their distinguishing principles, pursuing a course that will wound the feelings of people of other denominations.

I have heard men preach who, I thought, were very rough in their expressions about other people. The idea of telling a man that the reason he does not understand the doctrine of the Bible as we do, is because he has no grace, is, in

my judgment, a mistake. And there is nothing in such a course as that to edify our people or convince our opponents as to the truth of our opinion.

I visited a little town, not long since, where our people had held an association, a few months before, and it was said that the different denominations in the little village opened the doors of their houses to our brethren and invited them to preach especially on Sunday, and that some of our brethren preached in such a manner, as to offend the people who owned the house in which they were preaching, that they refused to stay and listen to them.

Whenever a minister drives his congregation away, by being rough, he is doing no good for the cause of Christ. The ablest defenders of our doctrine are men who draw crowds to them, instead of driving them away, and I should take it as an evidence that I was wrong either in sentiment or in spirit, if good people would arise from my congregation and move out. Reasonable people, who are intelligent, will stay and listen to a man preach even if they do not endorse him, if they are respected as they should be by the speaker. I do not think it is an evidence of soundness in doctrine to call people by hard names who oppose what I believe, and I think that our ministers should preach for some other cause than to establish the fact that they are sound in the faith.

I would love to call the attention of the reader to this fact, that I think I have seen men who rejoice more under the voice of that minister who abuses other people, than of the one who describes the dependence and helplessness of the poor sinner, in his lost and ruined state, and the all-sufficiency of God's grace through Jesus Christ, as a remedy for the disease of sin and its plague in the heart. I do not know that it is always an evidence of grace in the heart, that a brother will smile and sanction me more when I am fighting Arminians than he will when I am preaching on experience and practice.

The Apostle says, "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." I have been afraid many times that our brethren live after the flesh too much, in wanting to hear a great deal said against their religious neighbors, by the minister in his sermon, and rejoicing at it when it is said. The Apostle Paul said, "I determined not to know anything among you save Jesus Christ and him crucified." I am of the opinion that every sentence of gospel must have Jesus in it, and every word be seasoned with grace if it does good to the people of God's cause and kingdom, and the glory of his name.

I once heard of a minister who was preaching for a church, only a short distance from a church of another denomination, and they got to reviewing each other's remarks, and the Baptist minister was so rough that when he would refer to the

other man he would say *that abominable hypocrite*. His brethren would chuckle and laugh at the idea of his *peeling* the other preacher so. My judgment is that there was no gospel or Spirit of Christ in that kind of a course. Perhaps Jesus was not at the meeting at all, and when the congregation dispersed if they had anything to say about the sermon at all, it was to rejoice at the manner in which our preacher had *skinned the other man*.

Brethren in the ministry, suppose we abandon that kind of course, if we have ever been guilty of it, and if we have to make any reference to any other minister, let us not treat him as if he were a criminal, and set him down with thieves, liars, hypocrites and everything abominable. I think brethren make a wonderful mistake in that line.

Making a Display of the Preacher

There is another thing I have noticed in my life, and that is, when we have an able minister come to see us, we think we would like to have him to preach in our little town. He is so able and so smart that we would love for our Arminian neighbors to hear him, and I fear it has often been the case that some of our preachers have been called on to go to a town to preach more to show the town people that the Old Baptists had a preacher that they were not ashamed of, than to have the gospel preached to those people.

I am opposed to a course of that kind, and would admonish the brethren never to undertake to make an exhibit of their preacher. The idea of a preacher going to a place for no other purpose than to make the people think he is smart, is very foreign to the calling of a gospel minister. I think it is time for our brethren who have been inclined to things of this sort, to stop and think: Is this right? Amos I living after the flesh, or is this the doings of God's Holy Spirit?

I once heard of a preacher who took for his text, "Beware of dogs." He told the congregation that there was a wonderful difference between a dog and a sheep, and his application of the two seemed to be that the sheep were Old School Baptists, and that the dog was the Arminian. He said that a sheep loved grass and could live on grass, that it could have nothing better, and he seemed to think that grass in his application was the truth, or Old School Baptist doctrine. He said a dog did not eat grass unless he wanted to vomit, and he was certain to vomit if he swallowed it.

The brethren under his voice chuckled and snickered and were ready to say at the close of his sermon, "I tell you, he is a good one. Did you ever hear a man that could beat him? Wonder what that Methodist man thought about it? If I was him, I would go home and crawl into my hole." Reader, what do you think of

that kind of a course for Christian people as they go home from their house of worship? The Lord deliver us from such a course of preaching as that. It is all wrong.

My judgment is that there is more of the flesh in such a meeting as that than anything else, and I feel to thank the Lord that, although my brethren have accused me of being rough and severe on Arminians, I have never called them hypocrites, neither have I ever unchristianized them. While I do not believe their doctrine, I believe they are as good as I am; and while I do not believe their institutions are of God, nor their doctrine true, yet I believe they do great good in the world, and are Christian people, and I believe they should be treated with all the respect due intelligent Christian men and women by our people.

No Apologies for the Truth

No reasonable man will expect our preachers to preach to please him, neither will a reasonable man fall out with one of our preachers if he, in the right spirit, preaches the Baptist doctrine, and presents, in the right kind of a manner, his objections to the doctrine of their people. I am aware of the fact that a great many people seem to think that it is very wrong to say anything about other people's views of religion, at all. I think that is a mistake. The truth is worth contending for, and if it is preached in its purity, and simplicity, it will commend itself and its preacher to other men's consciences in the sight of God, and it is certainly unnecessary to abuse those who do not believe it. It is too late to undertake to convince a man that he is wrong, and that you are right, after you have insulted him, but gain his good will and confidence, and then you have his ear, and if he is never convinced, he is as good as he was when you found him, and as long as he acts the gentleman, he deserves to be treated as such by you.

These are my convictions about fighting, but I am far from believing that, in order not to offend other people, we should keep our doctrine to ourselves. I believe that I have the right to preach the doctrine I believe and oppose the doctrine I do not believe, no matter who does not believe it, and the man, who falls out with me for it, simply meddles where he has no business to meddle.

This is a free country, and I do think that an Old Baptist preacher is in the very poorest business that he could be in, to go about apologizing to the Arminians for preaching the Baptist doctrine. If it is the truth and he believes it, there is no apology due for preaching it, and if it is not the truth and he does not believe it, he should not preach it, so in either case apologies are out of place. (*Lemuel Potter*)

Mohammed and Islam

MOHAMMED and ISLAM: *Sylvester Hassell:* “The seventh century,” says Milman, “beheld a new religious revolution, only inferior in the extent to its religious and social influence to Christianity itself. In an obscure district of a country esteemed by the civilized world as beyond its boundaries, a savage, desert and almost inaccessible region, suddenly arose an antagonistic religion (Mohammedanism) which was to reduce the followers of Zoroaster to a few scattered communities, to invade India, and tread under foot the ancient Brahminism, as well as the more wide-spread Buddhism, even beyond the Ganges; to wrest her most ancient and venerable provinces from (a corrupted nominal) Christianity; to subjugate by degrees the whole of her Eastern dominions, and Roman Africa to the Straits of Gibraltar; to assail Europe at its western extremity; to possess the greater part of Spain, and even to advance to the banks of the Loire; more than ever to make the elder Rome tremble for her security, and finally to establish itself in triumph within the new Rome of Constantine (Constantinople).”

“Asiatic *Christianity* sank more and more into obscurity. It dragged on its existence within the Mohammedan empire as a contemptuously tolerated religion; in the Byzantine empire it had still strength to give birth to new controversies—that of Iconoclasm, and even still later that concerning the Divine light. Yet its aggressive vigor had entirely departed, and it was happy to be allowed inglorious repose, to take no part in that great war waged by the two powers, now the only two active, dominant powers, which contested the dominion of the world—Mohammedanism and Latin *Christianity*.” “From the ninth to the thirteenth century the Mohammedans may be said to have been the enlightened teachers of barbarous Europe; and then Mohammedanism sank back into its primeval barbarism.”

Mohammed was born at Mecca, Arabia, about the year 570 A.D.; began preaching his religion in 610; fled from Mecca to Medina in 622; and died in 632. He had effected the conquest of Arabia, and was about to send a powerful army in Syria, when he died.

He was a descendent of Ishmael, and was related to the Korashites, the hereditary guardians of the irregular cubical building in Mecca called the Kaaba, which, long before Mohammed’s time, was the central shrine of Arabian idolatry. This building contained in its northeast corner, about five feet above the ground, a black stone, an irregular oval, seven inches in diameter, of volcanic basalt, sprinkled with colored crystals, (supposed to have been an aerolite, but) claimed to have been brought from Heaven by the angel Gabriel and given to Ishmael;

said at first to have been white, but now blackened by the kisses of sinful mortals.

Pilgrimages to Mecca, and traveling around the Kaaba, and kissing the black stone, are among the most solemn duties enjoined by Mohammed upon his followers. Though claiming to be a monotheist, he thus accommodated his religion to the previous idolatry of Arabia.

He restricted ordinary Mohammedans to four wives; but allowed chieftains as many as they wished; and the estimate of the number of his own wives varies from thirteen to twenty-five. His first wife, Kadijah, was a wealthy widow; and his favorite wife, Ayesha, was a beautiful girl but nine years old when he married her, he being fifty-three years of age.

He was subject to epileptic fits from his childhood, and was, in all probability, a partially insane religious fanatic, or monomaniac. He says that he never knew how to read or write. He pretended that his fits were interviews with the angel Gabriel; and the so-called revelations that he dictated were recorded and preserved by others after his death, gathered into a book called the Koran—the Mohammedan Bible.

Mohammed was a licentious, ambitious and vindictive man; and his religion was a strange compound of truth and error, of Judaism, Rabbinism, Christianity, heathenism and Fatalism. The most of the Arabs were heathens; but many Jews and professed Christians had gradually settled in Arabia. Mohammed's first wife's cousin, Waraka, originally a Jew, and subsequently a professor of Christianity, was the first man on record to translate parts of the Old and New Testaments into Arabic, and he gave Mohammed much information in regard to the Scriptures. Mohammed admitted that the Old and New Testaments were divinely inspired, but had become corrupted; that numerous prophets, including Adam, Noah, Abraham, Moses and Jesus, had preceded him, and that Jesus was the greatest before him, but not the Son of God.

He claimed that he himself was the last and greatest of the prophets—the Paraclete, or Comforter, predicted by Jesus in John 14:16; pretending that the genuine word in that passage was, not parakletos, but periklutos, the praised or renowned, equivalent to Mohammed in Arabic. His leading doctrine was, "There is no God but God, and Mohammed is his prophet."

He taught the utter dependence of all creatures upon the one, almighty, eternal, infinite, spiritual Creator; but he did not teach the loving, fatherly relationship and communion of God with his creatures. Though professing to teach the doctrines of the absolute predestination of all things, he certainly, inconsistently

taught the doctrine of salvation by outward works, such as formal prayers, fastings, alms, lustrations, festivals, pilgrimages, the subjugation of infidels and the extermination of idolaters; that prayer will carry a man half-way to God, and fasting will bring him to the door of his palace, and alms will gain him admittance.

He enjoined circumcision and the observance of Friday as the Sabbath. The fundamental feature of Christianity—man's indispensable need of salvation by the mediation of a spotless and almighty redeemer—was entirely omitted from the teaching of Mohammed.

He taught that there are degrees of reward in heaven and of punishment in hell, according to the actions of each person in this world; that, at the last day, a mighty balance will be poised by the angel Gabriel, and each human being will separately be tried by it, his good deeds being put in one scale, and his bad deeds in the other, and an atom or grain of mustard seed will suffice to turn the balance and decide the destiny of the person.

Like other founders of false religions, Mohammed described, in the fullest and grossest manner, the horrors of hell and the joys of Heaven; and he placed, among the latter, each believer's possession of seventy-two black-eyed maidens, of ravishing beauty and perpetual youth. "Under the shade of the scimitar," said he, to encourage his deluded soldiers, "is the gate of paradise; hell is behind you if you flee, and paradise before you if you fall."

The alternative of the Koran or death was offered to idolaters; but Jews and Christians might, by tribute, purchase a limited toleration.

Spiritous liquors, swine's flesh, gambling and picture-making were strictly prohibited by Mohammed; and he copied into his system many of the moral precepts of the Bible. No religion was ever less original. Mohammed-anism is a cosmopolitan, Christless, perverted, bastard, unspiritual Judaism, and, in many respects, bears a striking resemblance to Papal Babylon and her daughters.

The Koran, says Gibbon, is an "endless rhapsody of fable and precept and declamation, which seldom excites a sentiment or idea, which sometimes crawls in the dust, and is sometimes lost in the clouds. The Divine attributes exalt the fancy of the Arabian missionary; but his loftiest strains must yield to the sublime simplicity of the book of Job, composed in a remote age, in the same country, and in the same language."

Mohammed suffered great pain in his last moments, and his last words were: “The Lord destroy the Jews and Christians! O God! Pardon my sins. Yes, I come among my fellow-citizens on high.”

Two hundred million human beings today, it is estimated, base their eternal salvation on the intercession of this vindictive, licentious and deluded sinner. Of this number about one hundred millions are found in southern and western Asia and in Turkey in Europe; and about a hundred millions are found in Africa, composing one-half of the estimated population of that Grand Division of the globe; so that Mohammedanism may be fitly called the religion of the Dark Continent.

Its chief training theological school is the University of Cairo, with its ten thousand missionary students from all parts of the Mohammedan world. “In winning the inferior races, and training them to a fervent worship of its own and a certain low level of culture, it has shown an aptness, skill and zeal quite in advance of any *Christian* missions. Its bleak monotheism, its lifeless morality, its somber fatalism, its intolerant fanaticism, its gorgeous luxury, and its extreme profligacy, have contributed to its missionary success. Science it treats with ignorant scorn. The arts of modern life it takes at second hand, choosing always those of mere luxury, or else mere destruction. And so it has no hold upon the future, only the memory of a bloody and stormy past. While it may be an advance on heathenism, it is an advance which seems almost to exclude the further advance of Christianity. In substituting Mohammed for Christ—a principle similar to that of all false religions—it is of course essentially antichristian.”

“In thirteen distinct places in the Koran, Mohammed expressly disclaims the power of working miracles. He commanded his army in person in eight general engagements, and undertook, by himself or his lieutenants, fifty military enterprises. From the success of Mohammedanism no inference whatever can be justly drawn to the prejudice of Christianity. For what are we comparing? A Galilean peasant, accompanied by a few fishermen, without natural force, power or support, prevailing against the prejudices, learning, hierarchy, philosophy and authority of the Roman Empire in its most polished period—with a conquering chieftain, at the head of his army, bearing down opposition by military triumphs, in the darkest ages and countries of the world.”---*Wm Paley.*” (*Hassell’s History* ppg 413-417)

Monergism

MONERGISM: Sylvester Hassell: The monergistic or scriptural theory of regeneration teaches that there is but one efficient agent or actor in the renovation of the soul, namely, the Holy Spirit; that the will of fallen man is, like all his other faculties, utterly depraved, and has not the least ability or inclination to act holily until it has been renewed by Divine grace. This view was plainly set forth by Christ and his Apostles, as shown in the texts last quoted.

It was first in the Latin Catholic “Church” clearly and powerfully maintained by Augustine (born 353, died 430), the ablest and most spiritual-minded of the so-called “Latin Fathers,” who at first was an advocate of synergism, but was led by his deep experience and profound mind and intimate acquaintance with the scriptures to abandon synergism for monergism. He maintained that the entire human race sinned and fell in Adam, according to the Scriptures, and became utterly depraved, both in will and in all their other powers, the unrenewed will being able to work only external righteousness or morality, but not all internal righteousness or a spiritual conformity to the Divine law; that the activity of the human will, up to the point of regeneration, is hostile to God, and cannot cooperate with the Divine agency in the regenerating act, so that the Holy Spirit must take the initiative in the change from sin to holiness, and effect this change by his sovereign and almighty power, as well as preserve the spiritual life thus imparted, in accordance with God’s eternal decree of electing love, to its perfection in heavenly glory, to the praise of the divine mercy—while others, sinning of their own free-will, of which they so much boast, and not caused to sin by God, who is of purer eyes than to behold iniquity, and who is the sun of righteousness and not of unrighteousness, are justly left to go on and perish in their sins and pride, to the praise of the Divine Justice.” (*Hassell’s History* pg 329)

Monophysitism

MONOPHYSITISM (*See under NESTORIANISM*)

Montanism

MONTANISM: Sylvester Hassell: “The chief opposition to the Alexandrian School and to Gnosticism and to the substitution of philosophy was, in the second century, made by those called the *Montanists*, of whom Tertullian became in the third century, the ablest writer. They took their name from Montanus, a native of Phrygia in Asia Minor, and were hence also called

Cataphrygians, and Pepuzians, from Pepuza in Phrygia. They sought to emphasize the great importance of the spirituality and purity of the church, and especially the absolute *indispensability* of the work of the *Holy Ghost*, and the *dispensability* of *human philosophy*. Tertullian calls the Greek philosophers the patriarchs of all heresies, and scornfully asks, ‘what has the academy to do with the church? What has Christ to do with Plato— Jerusalem with Athens?’ His theology revolves about the great Pauline antithesis of sin and grace, and break the road to the Latin anthropology and soteriology, and afterwards developed by his like-minded , but clearer, calmer and more considerate countryman Augustin.”—Schaff.

He recognized the universal priesthood and equality of believers, and he defended the right of all men to worship God according to the dictates of their own consciences. Neander traces the anti-Gnosticism of the Montanists to the influence of the Apostle John in Asia Minor. In their reaction against Catholic corruptions some of them wandered off into asceticism, celibacy, prophetic ecstasies, divination and millenarism.

They spread through most of the provinces of the Roman Empire, and were found as late as the sixth century. Their general doctrinal orthodoxy is distinctly affirmed by those writers called the *Fathers*. (*Hassell’s History* pg. 367)

Moon, The

The MOON: Sylvester Hassell: The moon, representing the church, may apparently change, and is always thus changing; but the Sun of Righteousness, which arises with healing in his wings upon all that fear his name (Malachi 4:2), shines with the same resplendence forever. Having loved Israel with an everlasting love, God draws her with his loving-kindness, makes an everlasting covenant with her, ordered in all things and sure, put his fear and law in her mind and heart, forgives and forgets her sins, to the praise of his glorious grace, rejoices to do her good, and declares that with his whole heart and soul he will assuredly plant her in the heavenly Canaan (Jeremiah 31:3,31-40; 32:36-41).” (*Hassell*)

Notwithstanding the Moon’s phases, or changes of appearance, caused by her roundness, opacity, derivation of all her light from the Sun, and her monthly rotation upon her axis, she is probably the most fixed, unchanging conservative body in nature—so should the church be; notwithstanding her frequent changes of frames and feelings, still her doctrine and practice and devotion to the cause of God should be absolutely unchangeable. While the Sun causes the purifying currents of the air, the Moon is the chief cause of the tidal ocean waves which

constantly cleanse the inpouring rivers of their pollutions. This office of an ever-active sanitary commissioner is one of the most important functions that the Moon subserves towards the earth—so the church, like the salt of the earth, should keep her garments unspotted from the world, and thus exercise a salutary influence upon those without. Her light, which all comes from the Sun of Righteousness, should shine in the night of the world, so that men may see her good works, and glorify her Father in heaven.” (*Hassell*)

Moral Agent, Free

Free MORAL Agent (*See under FREE Moral Agency*)

Mordecai

MORDECAI: *Sylvester Hassell:* Mordecai was a man of wisdom and integrity, and although a captive, was faithful to his king. During the first year of Queen Esther he discovered a plot made by two of the king’s chamberlains to murder their royal master, and upon his making it known to the queen, the conspirators were hanged. The king commanded his prime minister Haman to dress up Mordecai in the royal apparel, place him on the king’s horse, lead the horse through the streets of the city, and proclaim to the multitude the honor thus conferred on Mordecai. This was done at the very time that Haman was about to obtain the King of Persia’s permission to hang Mordecai on a gallows fifty cubits high, that he had made for that purpose, because Mordecai rose not up when Haman approached him, nor did him reverence.

But the king, on learning that Haman was the author of the decree to have all the Jews in his empire destroyed, for the offence of Haman, ordered Haman to be hanged on the gallows which he had made for Mordecai. He also virtually reversed the decree which had been made against the Jews, and authorized them to slay their enemies on the very day that they were to have been slain by them, and made Mordecai prime minister in the place of Haman.

Thus we see that in the days of Ahashuerus there were a queen and a prime minister at court of the Jewish race, and, of course, friends of the Jews (From B.C. 458 to B.C. 446).” (*Hassell’s History pg 157*)

Moses

MOSES: *Sylvester Hassell:* His long and splendid human training in Egypt had not corrected his natural rashness and self-confidence; therefore God

disciplines him in humility forty years in the wilderness, apart from human habitations; and, as the result of his Divine schooling, Moses becomes the most meek, patient and self-distrustful of men, feeling himself, when he was really most qualified, to be least qualified for the great work of delivering and leading (Numbers 12:3; Exodus 4:1-17).

And so, about 1500 years afterwards, the rash and self-confident Saul of Tarsus, who was to become the great apostle of the Gentiles, was led by the providence and Spirit of God into this same Arabian desert, far from flesh and blood, and there effectually taught, not by men, but by God, the utter insufficiency of all human learning and all legal righteousness—even the strictest obedience to the law given by Moses—and the glorious freeness and almighty power of the gospel of the Son of God (Galatians 1; Philippians 3:3-11; Romans 1:15-16).”
(*Hassell*)

Munster Rebellion, The

The MUNSTER REBELLION: Sylvester Hassell: After most of the *Anabaptist* ministers had suffered martyrdom or died of the plague, the able but fanatical Melchior Hoffman, of Sweden (from 1529 to 1534), acquired great influence over the *Anabaptists* in the Netherlands and Germany, and instilled his false and exciting Manichaeian and Millenarian views into the minds of many. Two of his disciples, John Matthiesen, of Harlem, and John Bockhold, of Leydon, went, in 1533, to Munster, in Westphalia, converted large numbers of the people to their views, overturned the city government, and set up what they called the Kingdom of New Zion, and intended to proceed to the conquest of the world.

The city was besieged by an imperial army, and Matthiesen was killed in a sally from the walls. Bockhold made himself king, and inaugurated a diabolical reign of lust and blood, establishing a complete communism both of property and wives, and beheading, sometimes, more than fifty persons in a day. After fifteen months the city was taken; Bockhold and two of his leading associates, Knipperdolling and Krechting were tortured to death with red-hot pincers, and then hung up in iron cages, which are still preserved in Munster.

Similar revolutions were ineffectually attempted in Leyden and Amsterdam. The best historians agree that many of these people, in those times of great change and excitement—when the iron bondage of Roman priestcraft of a thousand years was being relaxed—were affected with religious mania or lunacy, and ought rather to have been confined in straight-waistcoats than to have been executed.

The vicious and criminal excesses of these new so-called *Anabaptists* were earnestly condemned and repudiated by true Baptists everywhere, who saw and declared that these false prophets who professed to be inspired of God were really inspired of the Devil. The true Baptists of this century, like their brethren of former centuries, were—not licentious and warlike madmen, but—peaceful, harmless, God-fearing, God-serving witnesses for the truth.

Why, in the very first year of the sixteenth century, when Luther and Zwingli were schoolboys, there were, besides the Waldenses in Italy, France and Holland, and the Wycliffites in England, two hundred churches of the Bobemian Brethren in Germany (to whom the careful and exact Gieseler and Keller trace the *Anabaptists*), who were not only virtuous and blameless, but such true and loyal subjects of the Prince of Peace that they were utterly opposed to war, and who, during this century, though grievously persecuted, by thousands, robbed, imprisoned, tortured, driven with their wives and children from their homes to woods and deserts, yet declared that they would rather die than raise a hand, much less a weapon, against their enemies. (*Hassell's History* pg 503)

Munzer, Thomas

Thomas MUNZER (*See under Martin LUTHER*)

Musical Instruments

MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS: C. H. Cayce: There is no New Testament authority for the use of the musical instrument in worship. As for the comfort some get out of exhortations in Psalms to use instruments in worship, that is completely nullified by the severe rebuke administered in Amos 6:1-6. As for the New Testament teaching, there is absolutely no authority given for the use of anything aside from the human voice and heart in the worship of the Creator, but much in line with “singing and making melody in the heart,” worshipping “in spirit and in truth.” The musical instrument as an aid to worship is as distinctly out of place as is the prayer wheel or string of beads. Any additions made to the heaven-created instruments of worship weakens the spirit of true worship.—D. K. in *Gospel Herald*.” (*CAYCE vol. 2, ppg 169,170*)

Natural Man, The

The NATURAL MAN: C. H. Cayce: Can the natural man keep the moral law? That is, can he tell the natural truth, pay his just and honest debts, attend to

his own business, refrain from profanity, from intoxication, fornication, adultery; and, in short live a clean moral life? Most assuredly men in nature, the unregenerate, can live a clean moral life. Men do not have to get drunk. If a man gets drunk, goes home and breaks his wife's dishes and furniture, and raises a general disturbance—if every man in the world were to tell us he could not help it, that he could do no better than that, we would not believe it. We know he could do better; and, if he does not do better without, he should be made to do better. A man does not have to steal, lie and cheat. He does not have to take the name of the Lord in vain. He can and should live a moral life. If all would do that we would have a much better world to live in. (*Cayce's Editorials vol. 4, ppg 393, 394*)

Nehemiah

NEHEMIAH: Sylvester Hassell: King Artaxerxes (Ahashuerus) appointed Nehemiah, his cup bearer, who was full of wisdom and courage, governor over Judea in the place of Ezra, who had been governor there twelve years (from B.C. 458 to B.C. 446). Nehemiah went up with a full military escort, authorized to rebuild the city and the walls around it. All engaged in building the walls, priests, princes, smiths, merchants, etc., and even females. It had to be done in troublous times (Daniel 9:25). For, by reason of the deadly opposition of the Samaritans, the workmen on the walls had to work with one hand and hold a weapon with the other. But the work progressed and was completed in fifty-two days.

Strange wives had to be put away again, and the people under Nehemiah and with Nehemiah confessed their sins and the sins of their fathers, and entered into a solemn covenant, under a curse and a oath, to walk in the law of the Lord—to observe the Sabbath and the Sabbatical years—to consecrate their sons—to pay tithes—to worship God, and never forsake his house. They wrote the covenant and sealed it (Nehemiah 8:9,10).

The Jews were now cured of gross idolatry. At last the vile passion, which had prevailed so fearfully for so many centuries, seemed to have disappeared. Nehemiah's government of Judea was long and prosperous, though he met with much opposition at times, in carrying out his noble reforms, from sinful and rebellious Jews. Nehemiah was alive after Joiada became priest (Nehemiah 8:18); but the termination of his government over Judea and the end of his noble and useful life are hidden in obscurity." (*Hassell's History ppg 157, 158*)

Neo-Platonism

NEO-PLATONISM: Sylvester Hassell: The precursor of the Neo-Platonists was the Alexandrian Jew, **Philo**, in the first century. He attempted to amalgamate the Platonic philosophy with the Old Testament, and his system is a heathenizing of Judaism. **Ammonius Saccas**, of Alexandria (who died there A.D. 241), is generally considered the founder of Neo-Platonism, “a philosophical theology, a pantheistic eclecticism, which sought to reconcile Platonic and Aristotelian philosophy with Oriental religion and theosophy, polytheism with monotheism, superstition with culture, and to hold, as with a convulsive grasp, the old popular (polytheistic) faith in a refined form.”

Among the pupils of Ammonius Saccas were *Origen*, the professed Christian, and the most famous president of the Alexandrian Catechetical School or Theological Seminary; and **Plotinus**, the most celebrated of the Neo-Platonic heathen philosophers, and the most transcendental of all ancient transcendentalists.

A pupil of Plotinus was **Porphry**, the *ablest infidel* of ancient times.—Now, if “*Gnosticism* laid the foundation of *Christian Science* or *rational Christian theology*’ (as the Encyclopedia Britannica says), and if *Neo-Platonism* educated the most famous professor in the first Theological Seminary of the “Christian” World, the facts just recited are a most forcible commentary upon the establishment of human institutions for the preparation of people to join the church and to preach the gospel of Christ; and Paul manifested Divine wisdom when he said: “I fear lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtlety, so your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ” (II Corinthians 11:3).

“Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the traditions of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ” (Colossians 2:8); “O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy trust, avoiding profane and vain babblings and oppositions of science (*gnosis*) falsely so called, which some professing, have erred concerning the faith” (I Timothy 6:20-21); “And I, brethren, when I came to you, came not with excellency of speech or of wisdom, declaring unto you the testimony of God: for I determined not to know anything among you save Jesus Christ and him crucified. That your faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God” (I Corinthians 2:1-5). (*Hassell’s History* pg 366)

Nero, The Roman Emperor

The Roman Emperor NERO: Sylvester Hassell: The Roman Empire, previously under Divine restraint (II Thessalonians 2:6-7), protected Christianity; but “openly assumed the character of Antichrist with fire and sword (Revelation 13-18) in the tenth year of Nero’s reign, A.D. 64, and by the instigation of that very emperor to whom Paul, as a Roman citizen, had appealed from the Jewish tribunal. It was, however, not a strictly religious persecution, like those under the later emperors; it originated in a public calamity which was wantonly charged upon the innocent Christians.

Nero, the last of the family of Julius Caesar, was an unsurpassed monster of iniquity. He murdered his brother (Britannicus), his mother (Agrippina), his wives (Octavia and Poppaea), his teacher (Seneca), and many eminent Romans, and finally himself, in the thirty-second year of his age.

On the night between 18th and 19th of June, A.D. 64, the most destructive fire that had ever occurred in history broke out in Rome. It lasted nine days and nights, and destroyed one-third of the city, including multitudes of lives. The eighteenth chapter of Revelation seems to have a primary allusion to this dreadful catastrophe

The cause of the conflagration was unknown, but, as recorded by contemporary historians, the people attributed it to Nero, “who wished to enjoy the lurid spectacle of burning Troy, and to gratify his ambition to rebuild Rome on a more magnificent scale, and to call it Neropolis.” Suetonius relates that several men of consular rank met Nero’s domestic servants with torches and combustibles, but did not dare to apprehend them; and Tacitus states that the report was universally current that, while the city was burning, Nero went upon the stage of his private theatre and sang (from Homer) “The Destruction of Troy.”

To divert from himself the general suspicion of incendiarism, and at the same time to furnish new entertainment for his diabolical cruelty, Nero wickedly cast the blame on the Christians, and inaugurated a carnival of blood such as heathen Rome never saw before or since. A “vast multitude” of Christians was put to death in the most shocking manner. Some were crucified, probably in mockery of the punishment of Christ; some were sewed up in the skins of wild beasts and exposed to the voracity of mad dogs in the arena. The Satanic tragedy reached its climax at night in the imperial gardens, on the slope of the Vatican: Christian men and women, covered with pitch or oil or resin, and nailed to posts of pine, were lighted and burned as torches for the amusement of the mob; while Nero, in fantastical dress, figured in a horse race, and displayed his art as a charioteer. Burning alive was the ordinary punishment of incendiaries; but only the cruel

ingenuity of this imperial monster, under the inspiration of the devil, could invent such a horrible system of illumination. It is probable that the Neronian persecution of Christians extended to the provinces; and it is believed that the Apostles Paul and Peter suffered martyrdom about this time, or soon after (the dates of their death varying from A.D. 64 to 69).” (*Hassell’s History* ppg 214, 215)

Nestorianism

See Nestorius and Nestorianism

Nestorius

See Nestorius and Nestorianism

Nestorius and Nestorianism

NESTORIUS and **NESTORIANISM: Sylvester Hassell:** Nestorius, “patriarch” of Constantinople, maintained that there is only a moral and not a substantial union between the human and Divine natures of Christ, and virtually affirmed that Christ was two persons (Nestorianism). This error was condemned by the Council of Ephesus, A.D. 431, which declared that in Christ there is a substantial union of two natures, human and Divine, in one person. **Eutyches**, of Constantinople, affirmed that, at the incarnation, the human nature of Christ was merged in the Divine, making only one nature, (**Monophysitism**). This error was condemned by a council at Constantinople, A.D. 448. The Fourth General Council at Chalcedon, A.D. 451 (the most numerous, and, next the first, the most important General Council), condemned both Nestorianism and **Eutychianism**, and declared that there is in Christ an unmixed but inseparable union of two natures in one person; that neither is Christ’s person to be divided nor his two natures confounded.” (*Hassell’s History* pg 417)

New Wine, New Bottles

NEW WINE: NEW BOTTLES: T.S. Dalton: In the days of the Savior’s advent here on earth, history informs us they used bottles made of leather, which after they had been used awhile and became old and worn, would not admit of being filled with any strong substance, and we think the Savior used this to illustrate the idea that he intended to convey, and if you will read the two preceding verses, you will see that Jesus was talking to John’s disciples on the subject of fasting. Matthew 9:14 says, “Then came to him John’s disciples,

saying, Why do we and the Pharisees fast oft, but thy disciples fast not?" Matthew 9:15, "And Jesus said unto them, can the children of the bride-chamber mourn as long as the bridegroom is with them? But the days will come, when the bridegroom shall be taken away from them, and then shall they fast."

This, we think, the Savior introduced to show that they (the Pharisees) were fasting, because it was in keeping with the tradition of their fathers, or in other words, because the Jewish law and the Jewish form of worship required it, simply showing them that they were still keeping up the forms of the old covenant. But now the bridegroom (Christ) is come and introduced the new covenant, in which his people are to worship (not in ceremonies, or formal fastings), but in spirit and in truth, for Jesus says, "he seeketh such to worship him, as do worship in spirit and in truth."

"Therefore," says the Savior, "we put new wine into new bottles." The idea is whatever belongs to the new covenant should not be put in the old, which necessarily cuts off every Arminian Creed from Dan to Beersheba, for they all take the stipulations of the old covenant, and try to bring them into the new, and every time they try to blend the new and old together, they make the rent worse.

Therefore we would suggest, that we all cease trying to mend the old garment with a new piece, but accept the new bottle (new covenant) in which is found the rich treasure of God's grace, which is freely and graciously bestowed upon the subjects of promise, and we are made the happy beneficiaries of it, without the performance of stipulated conditions on our part. The stipulations of the old covenant were, "if you will, I will." "If you are willing and obedient, ye shall eat of the good of the land," etc., etc. In the new covenant God says, "I will and you shall."

Oh! how different, and yet there are multiplied millions of people who have never yet discovered the difference and are still trying to mend the old garment with the new piece of goods, or to put the new wine into the old bottle; and I have been made to wonder why they could not see it. Oh! that God in his infinite goodness and mercy may open their eyes to the truth, and lead them out of Babylon into the green pastures of his grace, that they may feast their souls on the rich promises found in the "new and everlasting covenant, which is ordered in all things and sure." (*T.S. Dalton Zion's Advocate Sept 1893*)

Newton, Sir Isaac

NEWTON, Sir Isaac: Sylvester Hassell: True science is always modest. Sir Isaac Newton, the greatest scientist that ever lived, said, a short time before his

death, “I do not know what I may appear to the world; but to myself I seem to have been only like a boy playing on the seashore, and diverting myself in now and then finding a smoother pebble or a prettier shell than ordinary, while the great ocean of truth lay all undiscovered before me.” He did not seem to fear that, if he had been permitted to navigate that ocean, he would have been in danger of making shipwreck of his faith. He was a firm believer in the inspiration of the Scriptures.” (*Hassell’s History* pg 27)

Nice, Council of (or Nicea)

Council of NICE (or Nicea) (*See under Constantine*)

Ninety-Five Theses

NINETY-FIVE THESES (*See under Martin LUTHER*)

Northern Kingdom, The

The NORTHERN KINGDOM (*See under The Kingdom of ISRAEL*)

Novatian and the Novatianists

NOVATIAN and the NOVATIANISTS: Sylvester Hassell: Long before the times of which we now treat some Christians had seen it their duty to withdraw from the communion of the “church” of Rome. The first instance of this that we find on record is, after the Montanists, that of Tertullian, who left the *church* at Carthage A.D. 202, on account of its corruptions, and formed another on the plain, simple and sacred principles of the gospel; his followers were for 200 years called Tertullianists.

The second instance of importance is that of “Novation, an earnest, learned man, who had been led to faith through severe disease and inward struggles, and who, in the year 251, was, against his will or seeking, ordained the pastor of a church in the city of Rome, *which maintained no fellowship with the Catholic party.* Novatus quitted Carthage and joined Novation. Many, called from the latter Novations, followed his example; and, all over the empire, *Puritan Churches* were constituted and flourished through the succeeding two hundred years. Afterwards when penal laws (made by the Catholics) obliged them to lurk in corners, and worship God in private, they were distinguished by a variety of names, and a succession of them (it is supposed) continued until the Reformation.” — *Robinson’s Ecclesiastical Researches.*

“The same author,” says Jones, “afterwards adverting to the vile calumnies with which the Catholic writers have in all ages delighted to asperse the character of Novation, thus proceeds to vindicate him.”

“They say Novatian was the first antipope; and yet there was at that time no pope, in the modern sense of the word. They call Novatian the author of the heresy of Puritanism; and yet they know that Tertullian had quitted the church near fifty years before for the same reason, and Privatus, who was an old man in the time of Novatian, had, with several more, repeatedly remonstrated against the alterations taking place; and, as they could get no redress, had dissented and formed separate congregations. They tax Novatian with being the parent of an innumerable multitude of congregations of Puritans all over the empire; and yet he had no other influence over any than what his good example gave him. People everywhere saw the same cause of complaint and groaned for relief; and when one man made a stand for virtue the crisis had arrived; people saw the propriety of the cure and applied the same means to their own relief. They blame this man and all these churches for the severity of their discipline; yet this severe discipline was the only coercion of the primitive churches, and it was the exercise of this that rendered civil coercion unnecessary.

Some exclaimed that it was a barbarous discipline to refuse to readmit people into Christian communion, because they have relapsed into idolatry or vice. Others, finding the inconvenience of such a lax discipline, required a repentance of five, ten, or fifteen years; but the Novatians said, “You may be admitted among us by baptism; or, if any Catholic has baptized you before, by re-baptism; but, if you fall into idolatry, we shall separate you from our communion, and on no account readmit you. God forbid we should injure either your person, your property or your character, or even judge of the truth of your repentance or your future state; but you can never be readmitted to our community without our giving up the last and only coercive guardian we have of the purity of our fellowship.”

Whether these persons reasoned justly or not, as virtue was their object, they challenge respect; and he must be a weak man indeed who is frightened out of it because Cyprian is pleased to say, “They are the children of the devil.”

The doctrinal sentiments of the Novatians appear to have been very scriptural, and the discipline of their churches rigid in the extreme. They were the first class of Christians who obtained the name of (Cathari) Puritans, an appellation which doth not appear to have been chosen by themselves, but applied to them by their adversaries; from which we may reasonably conclude that their manners were simple and irreproachable. Some of them are said to have disapproved of second marriages, regarding them as sinful; but in this they erred in common

with Tertullian and many other eminent persons. A third charge against them was that they did not pay the due reverence to the martyrs, nor allow that there was any virtue in their relics!—a plain proof of their good sense. Novatian appears to have been possessed of considerable talents.

Mosheim terms him “a man of uncommon learning and eloquence”—and he wrote several works, of which only two are now extant. One of them is upon the subject of the Trinity. It is divided into thirty-one sections; the first eight relate to the Father, and treat of his nature, power, goodness, justice, etc., with the worship due him. The following twenty sections relate to Christ, the Old Testament prophecies concerning him, their actual accomplishment, his nature, how the scriptures prove his divinity, confutes the Sabellians, shows that it was Christ who appeared to the patriarchs—Abraham, Jacob, Moses, etc. The twenty-ninth section treats of the Holy Spirit, how promised, given by Christ, his offices and operations on the souls of men and in the church. The last two sections recapitulate the arguments before adduced.

The work appears to have been written in the year 257—six years after his separation from the Catholic *Church* (or rather the dominant party at Rome). The other tract is upon the subject of *Jewish Meats*, addressed in the form of a letter to his church, and written either during his banishment or retreat in the time of persecution. It opens up the typical nature of the law of Moses, and, while he proves its abolition, he is careful to guard his Christian brethren against supposing that they were therefore at liberty to eat things sacrificed to idols.

W. Jones says, “Lardner, in his *Credibility of the Gospel History* (Chap. 47), has been at considerable pains in comparing the various and contradictory representations that have been given of Novatian and his followers, and has exonerated them from a mass of obloquy cast upon them by the Catholic party.

Dionysius, Bishop of Alexandria, wrote many epistles or treatises respecting the sect of the Novatians, which afford abundant evidence that their rigid discipline was relished by many. Fabius, Bishop of Antioch, in particular, was their friend and favorer. Marcian, Bishop of Arles, was firm in the same principles in the time of Stephen, Bishop of Rome. A church was formed at Carthage for the Novatian party, of which Maximus was the pastor. Socrates, the historian, speaks of their churches at Constantinople, Nice, Nicomedia, and Cotioeus in Phrygia, all in the fourth century; these he mentions as their principal places in the East, and he supposes them to have been equally numerous in the West. What were their numbers in these cities does not appear, but he intimates that they had three churches in Constantinople.”

Though, therefore, Novatian and his principles were condemned by the Catholic party at the time that Dionysius wrote the forementioned letters concerning them to the Bishop of Rome, he still continued to be supported by a numerous party in various places, separated from the Catholic *Church*.

They had among them some persons of considerable note and of eminent talents. Among these were Agelius, Acesius, Sisinnius, and Marcian, all of Constantinople. Socrates mentions one Mark, Bishop of the Novatians in Scythia, who died in the year 439. In fact the pieces written against them by a great variety of authors of the Catholic Church—such as Ambrose, Pacian and others—the notice taken of them by Basil and Gregory Nazianzen, and the accounts given of them by Socrates and Sozomen in their ecclesiastical histories, are proofs of their being numerous, and that churches of this denomination were to be found in most parts of the world in the fourth and fifth centuries.

“The vast extent of this sect,” says Lardner, “is manifest from the names of the authors who have mentioned them or written against them, and from the several parts of the Roman empire in which they were found.’—Jones.” (*Hassell’s History* ppg 386-389)

Pantaenus

PANTAENUS (*See article on The School at ALEXANDRIA*)

Pardon of Sin, The

The PARDON of Sin: Abridged from John Gill (Emphasis added): The doctrine of pardon properly follows the doctrine of satisfaction; for pardon of sin proceeds upon satisfactory made for it. Forgiveness of sin, under the law, followed upon typical atonement for it. Four times, in one chapter, it is said, the priest shall make atonement for sin, and it shall be forgiven, and as often in the next chapter, (Leviticus 5:10,13,16,18) and in other places.

Leviticus 4:20 And he shall do with the bullock as he did with the bullock for a sin offering, so shall he do with this: and the priest shall make an *atonement* for them, and it shall be forgiven them.

Leviticus 4:26 And he shall burn all his fat upon the altar, as the fat of the sacrifice of peace offerings: and the priest shall make an *atonement* for him as concerning his sin, and it shall be forgiven him.

Leviticus 4:31 And he shall take away all the fat thereof, as the fat is taken away from off the sacrifice of peace offerings; and the priest shall burn it upon the altar for a sweet savor unto the LORD; and the priest shall make an *atonement* for him, and it shall be forgiven him.

Leviticus 4:35 And he shall take away all the fat thereof, as the fat of the lamb is taken away from the sacrifice of the peace offerings; and the priest shall burn them upon the altar, according to the offerings made by fire unto the LORD: and the priest shall make an *atonement* for his sin that he hath committed, and it shall be forgiven him.

This doctrine is of pure revelation; it is not to be known by the light of nature.

Romans 2:12 For as many as have sinned without law shall also perish without law: and as many as have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law.

For anything the light of nature suggests, concerning the pardon of it; men may fancy, from the goodness and mercy of God, that he will forgive their sins; but they cannot be certain of it that he will, since he is just as well as merciful. And how to reconcile justice and mercy in the pardon of sin the light of nature leaves men in the dark. They may conjecture, that because one man forgives another, upon repentance, God will do the same; but they cannot be sure of it.

Besides, grace must be given to a man to repent, as well as remission of sins, or else he never will repent.

Nor is this a doctrine of the law, which gives not the least hint of pardon, nor any encouragement to expect it. “As many as have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law,” condemned without any hope of pardon, Romans 2:12. “Every transgression and disobedience” of the law, or word spoken by angels, “received a just recompense of reward.” that is, proper and righteous punishment.

Hebrews 2:2 For if the word spoken by angels was steadfast, and every transgression and disobedience received a just recompense of reward.

Nor does the law regard a man's repentance, nor admit of any.

Hebrews 10:28 He that despised Moses' law died without mercy under two or three witnesses.

But the doctrine of pardon is a pure doctrine of the gospel, which Christ gave in commission to his disciples to preach, and which they preached in his name, and to which all the evangelic prophets bore witness.

Luke 24:47 And that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem.

Acts 13:38 Be it known unto you therefore, men and brethren, that through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins:

Acts 10:43 To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins.

Concerning which may be observed,

First, The proof that may be given of it, that there is such a thing as pardon of sin. This is asserted in express words by David; “There is forgiveness with thee.”

Psalms 130:4 But there is forgiveness with thee, that thou mayest be feared.

and by Daniel, “To the Lord our God belong mercies and forgivenesses,” full and free pardon of sin,

Daniel 9:9 To the Lord our God belong mercies and forgivenesses, though we have rebelled against him;

It is a blessing provided and promised in the covenant of grace, ordered in all things, which, without this, it would not be. This is a principal blessing in it; the promise of which runs thus:

Hebrews 8:12 For I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more.

It is in the gracious proclamation the Lord has made of his name, and makes a considerable part of it as “the Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, forgiving iniquity, transgression, and sin!”

Exodus 34:7 Keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin, and that will by no means clear the guilty; visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, and upon the children's children, unto the third and to the fourth generation.

Christ was “set forth,” in the purposes of God, to be a propitiation, through faith in his blood, for the remission of sins.” And he was sent forth, in the fulness of time, to shed his blood for it; and his blood has been “shed for many for the remission of sins!” and it is procured by it; or otherwise his bloodshed and death would be in vain,

Romans 3:25 Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God.

Matthew 26:28 For this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins.

Ephesians 1:7 In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace;

It is in his hands to bestow it; having ascended on high, he has received gifts for men, “even for the rebellious,” and among the gifts for them pardon of sin is one. Christ is “exalted to be a Prince and a Saviour, to give repentance unto Israel and forgiveness of sins.”

Acts 5:31 Him hath God exalted with his right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance to Israel, and forgiveness of sins.

It is by his orders, published in the gospel, as before observed. To which may be added, the numerous instances of it, both under the Old and under the New Testament; as of the Israelites, who, as they often sinned, God had compassion on them, and forgave their iniquities; even though he took vengeance on their inventions.

Psalms 78:38 But he, being full of compassion, forgave their iniquity, and destroyed them not: yea, many a time turned he his anger away, and did not stir up all his wrath.

Psalms 9:8 And he shall judge the world in righteousness, he shall minister judgment to the people in uprightness.

and of David, Manasseh, and others, and of Saul the blasphemer, the persecutor, and injurious person; and of other notorious sinners,

Psalms 32:5 I acknowledged my sin unto thee, and mine iniquity have I not hid. I said, I will confess my transgressions unto the LORD; and thou forgavest the iniquity of my sin. Selah.

Titus 1:13 This witness is true. Wherefore rebuke them sharply, that they may be sound in the faith;

Luke 7:37 And, behold, a woman in the city, which was a sinner, when she knew that Jesus sat at meat in the Pharisee's house, brought an alabaster box of ointment,

Luke 7:47 Wherefore I say unto thee, Her sins, which are many, are forgiven; for she loved much: but to whom little is forgiven, the same loveth little.

It is in this way God would have his people comforted, when burdened and distressed with the guilt of sin,

Isaiah 40:1-2 Comfort ye, comfort ye my people, saith your God. Speak ye comfortably to Jerusalem, and cry unto her, that her warfare is accomplished, that her iniquity is pardoned: for she hath received of the LORD'S hand double for all her sins.

Matthew 9:2 And, behold, they brought to him a man sick of the palsy, lying on a bed: and Jesus seeing their faith said unto the sick of the palsy; Son, be of good cheer; thy sins be forgiven thee.

And they are, at times, favored with a comfortable experience of it, and peace of soul from it,

Psalms 85:1-3 LORD, thou hast been favorable unto thy land: thou hast brought back the captivity of Jacob. Thou hast forgiven the iniquity of thy people, thou hast covered all their sin. Selah. Thou hast taken away all thy wrath: thou hast turned thyself from the fierceness of thine anger.

Romans 5:11 And not only so, but we also joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom we have now received the atonement.

They are directed to pray for it, and do pray for it; to which there would be no encouragement if there was no such thing.

Psalms 32:5 I acknowledged my sin unto thee, and mine iniquity have I not hid. I said, I will confess my transgressions unto the LORD; and thou forgavest the iniquity of my sin. Selah.

Psalms 51:1-2 Have mercy upon me, O God, according to thy lovingkindness: according unto the multitude of thy tender mercies blot out my transgressions. Wash me thoroughly from mine iniquity, and cleanse me from my sin.

Psalms 51:7-9 Purge me with hyssop, and I shall be clean: wash me, and I shall be whiter than snow. Make me to hear joy and gladness; *that* the bones *which* thou hast broken may rejoice. Hide thy face from my sins, and blot out all mine iniquities.

Daniel 9:19 O Lord, hear; O Lord, forgive; O Lord, hearken and do; defer not, for thine own sake, O my God: for thy city and thy people are called by thy name.

To add no more, forgiveness of sin is included in complete salvation, and is a part of it, and without which it would not be complete; nay, without it there could be no salvation.

Forgiveness of sin is a branch of redemption by the blood of Christ, which is explained by it.

Ephesians 1:7 In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace;

Secondly, The phrases by which the pardon of sin is expressed, and which will serve to lead into the nature of it.

1. By lifting it up, and taking it away, “Blessed he whose transgression is forgiven,” ywvn is “lifted up,” taken off from him, and carried away.

Psalms 32:1 Blessed is he whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin *is* covered.

Sin lies upon the sinner, and lays him under obligation to punishment, unless it is taken off. And the sins of God’s elect are taken off of them, and laid on Christ, and bore by him, and removed from them, as far as the East is from the West; so that when sought for they shall not be found, God having pardoned those he has reserved for himself; and sin lies upon the conscience of an awakened sinner as a burden too heavy for him to bear.

[This] is taken away by the application of the blood of Christ; and who gives orders to take away the filthy garments of his people, and clothe them with change of raiment, and puts away their sins, that they shall not die.

2. By the covering of it; “Blessed is he whose sin is covered”

Psalms 32:1 Blessed is he whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin is covered.

Psalms 85:2 Thou hast forgiven the iniquity of thy people, thou hast covered all their sin. Selah.

Sin is something impure, nauseous, and abominable, in the sight of God, and provoking to the eyes of his glory, and must be covered out of sight. And this cannot be done by anything of man's; not by his righteousness, which is but rags, a covering too narrow to be wrapped in, and can no more hide his nakedness than Adam's fig leaves could hide his.

Nay, it is no better than a spider's web; and of which it may be said:

Isaiah 59:6 Their webs shall not become garments, neither shall they cover themselves with their works: their works are works of iniquity, and the act of violence is in their hands.

Sin is only covered by Christ, who is the antitype of the mercy seat which was a lid or cover to the ark of the same dimensions with it, in which was the law, and prefigured Christ, as the covering of the transgressions of it by his people, from the sight of avenging Justice.

[His] blood is the purple covering in the chariot of the covenant of grace, under which his people ride safe to glory; all their iniquities being out of sight. [His] righteousness is unto and upon all that believe; a garment that reaches to the feet, that white raiment with which being clothed, the shame of their nakedness does not appear; yea, being clothed with this robe of righteousness and garments of salvation, are as ornamented as the bridegroom and bride on the wedding day. Hereby their sins are covered, so as not to be seen any more, and they appear unblameable and irreproveable in the sight of God.

3. By a non-imputation of it; “Blessed is the man to whom the Lord imputeth not iniquity,” does not reckon it, or place it to his account, or bring any charge against him for it, or punishes for it; but acquits him from it, having imputed it to Christ, placed it to his account. [God] charged him [Christ] with it, laid the chastisement of it on him, or the punishment of it on him, and received satisfaction from him for it.

Psalms 32:2 Blessed is the man unto whom the LORD imputeth not iniquity, and in whose spirit there is no guile.

4. By a blotting of it out: in such language David prays for the forgiveness of sin:

Psalms 51:1 Have mercy upon me, O God, according to thy lovingkindness: according unto the multitude of thy tender mercies blot out my transgressions.

Psalms 51:9 Hide thy face from my sins, and blot out all mine iniquities.

In the same way God declares his will to forgive the sins of his people, “I, even I, am he that blotteth out thy transgressions.”

Isaiah 43:25 I, even I, am he that blotteth out thy transgressions for mine own sake, and will not remember thy sins.

[This] language is used, either in allusion to the crossing of debt books, drawing a line over them; or to the blotting out a man’s handwriting to a bond or note, obliging to payment of money. Hence the phrase of “blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us.”

Colossians 2:14 Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross.

Sins are debts, and these are numerous, and sinners poor, and unable to pay them. Wherefore God, for Christ’s sake, freely forgives, and draws the line of Christ’s blood over them, and cancels the obligation to payment. Or else to the dissipation of a cloud, by the sun rising or breaking out through it.

Isaiah 44:22 I have blotted out, as a thick cloud, thy transgressions, and, as a cloud, thy sins: return unto me; for I have redeemed thee.

Sins may be compared to clouds for their quantity, their number being many; for their quality, being exhaled out of the earth and sea, and mount up to heaven, cause darkness, and intercept light. Sin rises out of the earthly minds of men, who mind earthly things. [They] are like the troubled sea which cannot rest; and the sins of some, like those of Babylon, reach up to heaven, and call for wrath and vengeance to come down from thence.

Sin causes the darkness of unregeneracy, and is often the reason of darkness to such who have been made light in the Lord. It intercepts the light of his countenance, and of Christ, the Sun of righteousness. Now as a cloud is dispersed and dissipated by the breaking forth of the sun, which, overcoming the cloud, scatters it, so as it is seen no more. In like manner, through the rising of the Sun of righteousness, with healing in his wings, an application of pardoning

grace is made for his sake. Darkness is dispersed, light and joy introduced, a serene heaven of peace and comfort follow.

As a cloud is so dispersed that it is seen no more, so sin is pardoned, in such sort as not to be seen any more, or to be set in the light of God's countenance unto condemnation; and though as fresh clouds may arise, so new sins may be committed, which yet are removed and cleansed from, by the blood of Christ, and the efficacy of it, for the continual pardon of it, through the application of that blood.

5. By a non-remembrance of it.

Hebrews 8:12 For I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more.

Isaiah 43:25 I, even I, am he that blotteth out thy transgressions for mine own sake, and will not remember thy sins.

God forgives and forgets. Having once forgiven them, he thinks of them no more; they are out of sight and out of mind. His thoughts are thoughts of peace, and not of evil. He remembers not former iniquities, but his tender mercies, which have been ever of old.

6. By making sin, or rather sinners, "white as snow." So the Lord promises, "Thy sins shall be as white as snow."

Psalms 51:7 Purge me with hyssop, and I shall be clean: wash me, and I shall be *whiter than snow*.

Isaiah 1:18 Come now, and let us reason together, saith the LORD: though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as *white as snow*; though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool.

Lamentations 4:7 Her Nazarites were *purer than snow*, they were whiter than milk, they were more ruddy in body than rubies, their polishing *was* of sapphire:

Being justified by the righteousness of Christ, clothed with that fine linen, clean and white, washed in his blood, and their garments made white therein, and all their sins forgiven for his sake, and so all fair without spot or blemish.

Thirdly, What sins are pardoned; sins both with respect to quality and quantity.

1st. For quality; they are called “trespasses.” Sin is a walking on forbidden ground, for which a man must suffer, unless forgiven: and *transgressions* of the law of God; a passing over and going beyond the bounds and limits prescribed by it: and *iniquities*, which are contrary to the rules of justice and equity; and sins, errors, aberrations, strayings from the rule of God's word.

When God is said to forgive “iniquity, transgression,” and “sin,” it takes in every kind and sort of sin. Every sin is against God, though some are more immediately against him than others. They are contrary to his nature, which is pure and holy; whereas, nothing is more impure and unholy than sin is. Therefore it is abominable to him, and hated by him; and hence sins are called abominations. Not that they are so to sinners, for they delight in them; but to God, to whom they are so very disagreeable: there is an enmity in sin, and in every sinner's heart, to God.

Every sin is an act of hostility against him, it is a stretching out the hand against God, and a strengthening a man's self against the Almighty. It strikes at his Deity, and is a contempt of his authority; and yet he forgives it.

It being committed against him, an infinite Being, it is objectively infinite, and requires an infinite satisfaction; and without it is punished “ad infinitum.” Sin is defined, “a transgression of the law,” a breach, a violation of it; which accuses of it, pronounces guilty for it, and curses and condemns; and is only forgiven by the Lawgiver, who is able to save and to destroy.

I John 3:4 Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law: for sin is the transgression of the law.

Sins are sometimes represented as “debts,” because, being committed, they oblige to the debt of punishment, which God remits. The sinner owing more than ten thousand talents, and not able to pay, he frankly forgives all for Christ's sake. The year of release from debts under the law was typical [of pardon].

Sins, with respect to men, are called diseases, and they are incurable, but by the grace of God and blood of Christ; and pardon of sin is expressed by healing them, “who forgiveth all thine iniquities, who healeth all thy diseases.”

Psalms 103:3 Who forgiveth all thine iniquities; who healeth all thy diseases.

Isaiah 33:24 And the inhabitant shall not say, I am sick: the people that dwell therein shall be forgiven their iniquity.

Malachi 4:2 But unto you that fear my name shall the Sun of righteousness arise with healing in his wings; and ye shall go forth, and grow up as calves of the stall.

2nd, for quantity; all trespasses, sins, and transgressions are forgiven.

Colossians 2:13 And you, being dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath he quickened together with him, having forgiven you *all trespasses*;

Psalms 103:3 Who forgiveth *all thine iniquities*; who healeth all thy diseases;

Original sin, the sin of the first man, and the sin of all men in him, by which all are made, constituted, and accounted sinners. [That] is the source and fountain of all sin, and is the iniquity of us all, which was laid on Christ, and he satisfied for, and is forgiven for his sake. Of all sin, it cannot be thought this should be left unforgiven.

All actual sins which spring from thence; the works of the flesh, which are many and manifest. Some are more secret, some more open, some lesser, others greater, more daring and presumptuous; some sins of commission, others sins of omission; but all are forgiven.

Isaiah 43:22-25 But thou hast not called upon me, O Jacob; but thou hast been weary of me, O Israel. Thou hast not brought me the small cattle of thy burnt offerings; neither hast thou honored me with thy sacrifices. I have not caused thee to serve with an offering, nor wearied thee with incense. Thou hast bought me no sweet cane with money, neither hast thou filled me with the fat of thy sacrifices: but thou hast made me to serve with thy sins, thou hast wearied me with thine iniquities. I, even I, am he that *blotteth out thy transgressions* for mine own sake, and *will not remember thy sins*.

Not only daily failings and infirmities, but all backslidings, revolts, and partial apostasies.

Jeremiah 3:12-14 Go and proclaim these words toward the north, and say, Return, thou backsliding Israel, saith the LORD; and I will not cause mine anger to fall upon you: for I am merciful, saith the LORD, and I will not keep anger for ever. Only acknowledge thine iniquity, that thou hast transgressed against the LORD thy God, and hast scattered thy ways to the strangers under every green tree, and ye have not obeyed my voice, saith the LORD. Turn, O backsliding children, saith the LORD; for I am married unto you: and I will take you one of a city, and two of a family, and I will bring you to Zion:

Jeremiah 3:22 Return, ye backsliding children, and I will heal your backslidings. Behold, we come unto thee; for thou art the LORD our God.

Hosea 14:4 I will heal their backsliding, I will love them freely: for mine anger is turned away from him.

Fourthly, The causes of the pardon of sin.

1st, The efficient cause is God, and not any creature, angels or men.

1. It is not in the power of men to forgive sin. One man may forgive another an offence, as committed against himself, but not as committed against God. Saints ought to forgive one another's offences that arise among them; as God, for Christ's sake, has forgiven them.

Ephesians 4:32 And be ye kind one to another, tenderhearted, forgiving one another, even as God for Christ's sake hath forgiven you.

Colossians 2:13 And you, being dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh hath he quickened together with him, having forgiven you all trespasses.

No man that goes under the name of a priest, or a minister of the word, has a power of absolution, or has authority to absolve men from their sins. All that a true and faithful preacher of the gospel can do is to preach remission of sins in the name of Christ; and to declare, that whoever repent of their sins, and believe in Christ, shall receive the forgiveness of them.

To assume a power to forgive sin, and absolve from it, is the height of antichristianism. It is with respect to this that antichrist is said to sit in the temple of God, "showing himself that he is God," by taking that to himself which belongs to God only; namely, to forgive sin. This is one of the blasphemies, and a principal one, which his mouth is opened to utter, to dispense with sin, grant indulgences of it, and pardons for it.

II Thessalonians 2:4 Who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshiped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God.

Revelation 13:5-6 And there was given unto him a mouth speaking great things and blasphemies; and power was given unto him to continue forty and two

months. And he opened his mouth in blasphemy against God, to blaspheme his name, and his tabernacle, and them that dwell in heaven.

The highest angel in heaven cannot forgive, nor procure the forgiveness, of one sin. They could not for those of their own kind that sinned; nor can they for any of the sons of men.

2. There is nothing a man has, or can do, by which he can procure the pardon of sin, either for himself or for others. No man, by his riches, and the multitude of his wealth, can give to God a ransom for himself, or his brother, make atonement and satisfaction for sin, and obtain the pardon of it. “Riches profit not in the day of wrath.” When God comes to deal with men for their sins, and pour out his wrath upon them for them, bags of gold and silver will be of no avail.

Nor is pardon of sin to be obtained by works of righteousness. Could it, it would not be of grace; for grace and works are opposed to each other. Men would be saved by works, contrary to the scriptures, since pardon is included in salvation, and that is by grace, and not works. Besides the blood of Christ would be shed in vain; for as if righteousness, or justification, came by the law, then Christ died in vain.

So if pardon of sin came by the works of the law, and obedience to it; in like manner Christ must have died in vain. Once more, the best works of men are due to God. He has a prior right unto them, and therefore cannot be meritorious of pardon. Nor is there any just proportion between them and pardon, and eternal life. One debt cannot be paid by another, or the debt of punishment be remitted by the debt of obedience.

Nor is pardon procured by repentance. They are both gifts of grace; and though given to the same persons, the one is not the cause of the other. At least, repentance is not the cause of remission; for true, evangelical repentance, flows from, and in the exercise of it is influenced by the discovery and application of pardoning grace.

(Ezekiel 16:63) That thou mayest remember, and be confounded, and never open thy mouth any more because of thy shame, when I am pacified toward thee for all that thou hast done, saith the Lord GOD.

British tears will not wash away sin, notwithstanding these, it will remain marked before God. The tears the woman, a sinner, shed, and with which she washed Christ’s feet, were not shed to procure the pardon of her sins; but flowed from a sense of pardoning love manifested to her.

Luke 7:37,47 And, behold, a woman in the city, which was a sinner, when she knew that Jesus sat at meat in the Pharisee's house, brought an alabaster box of ointment..... Wherefore I say unto thee, Her sins, which are many, are forgiven; for she loved much: but to whom little is forgiven, the same loveth little.

Nor is pardon procured by faith, as the cause of it. Faith does not obtain it by any virtue of its own, but receives it as obtained by the blood of Christ.

-
Acts 10:43 To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins.

Acts 26:18 To open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are sanctified by faith that is in me.

Nor is it procured by a submission to the ordinance of water baptism.

Baptism neither takes away original sin, nor actual sin. Not as to the guilt thereof, as the case of Simon Magus shows; for though the three thousand are directed to be "baptized in the name of Christ, for the remission of sins," and Saul was advised by Ananias, to "arise, and be baptized, and wash away his sins," yet the meaning is not, as if remission of sins was to be obtained by baptism, or sinners to be cleansed from them by it. But that by means of this ordinance, they might be led to the sufferings, death, and bloodshed of Christ, represented in it; for whose name's sake remission of sins is granted, and whose blood was shed for it, and cleanses from it.

Acts 2:38 Then Peter said unto 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.

Acts 22:16 And now why tarriest thou? arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord.

-
3. God only can forgive sin; it is his sole prerogative; it belongs to him, and to no other.

Mark 2:7 Why doth this man thus speak blasphemies? who can forgive sins but God only?

Isaiah 43:25 I, even I, am he that blotteth out thy transgressions for mine own sake, and will not remember thy sins.

Daniel 9:9 To the Lord our God belong mercies and forgivenesses, though we have rebelled against him;

And this appears from the nature of sin itself. It is committed against God; and none but he against whom it is committed can forgive it. It is a breach of his righteous law; and none but the Lawgiver, who is able to save and to destroy, can remit it, or free from obligation to punishment for it. Besides, if there was any other that could forgive sin, then there would be one equal to God.

Micah 7:18 Who *is* a God like unto thee, that pardoneth iniquity, and passeth by the transgression of the remnant of his heritage? he retaineth not his anger for ever, because he delighteth in mercy.

And it may be observed, that saints in all ages, under the Old and under the New Testament, never made their application to any other but to God for the forgiveness of sin. Nor are they ever directed to any other for it.

-
Psalms 51:1 Have mercy upon me, O God, according to thy lovingkindness: according unto the multitude of thy tender mercies blot out my transgressions.

Daniel 9:19 O Lord, hear; O Lord, forgive; O Lord, hearken and do; defer not, for thine own sake, O my God: for thy city and thy people are called by thy name.

Matthew 6:9 After this manner therefore pray ye: Our Father which art in heaven, Hallowed be thy name.

Matthew 6:12 And forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors.

Acts 8:22 Repent therefore of this thy wickedness, and pray God, if perhaps the thought of thine heart may be forgiven thee.

4. Yet all the three Persons, Father, Son, and Spirit, have a concern in it.

God the Father made an early provision of this blessing of pardon in his heart, in his purposes, in his council and covenant; and sent his Son to be the propitiation for it, and for the remission of it, through faith in his blood; and does bestow it for his sake; in which he shows, not only his grace, but his justice and faithfulness.

Upon the bloodshed of his Son for it, he is “just and faithful to forgive sin,” just, in that the blood of Christ is a sufficient atonement for it; and faithful to his counsels, covenant, and promises, concerning it.

-

Christ, as God, and the Son of God, has power to forgive sin, even as Immanuel, God with us, God in our nature, and when he was here on earth; of which he gave proof, by another act of his divine power, bidding a lame man take up his bed and walk.

Matthew 9:2 And, behold, they brought to him a man sick of the palsy, lying on a bed: and Jesus seeing their faith said unto the sick of the palsy; Son, be of good cheer; thy sins be forgiven thee.

Matthew 9:6 But that ye may know that the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins, (then saith he to the sick of the palsy,) Arise, take up thy bed, and go unto thine house.

As God man and Mediator, his blood was shed for the remission of sin; and by it it was obtained. As the Advocate of his people he calls for it, and demands and requires the application of it when it is wanted. And as the exalted Savior he gives it. And in his name it is preached, according to his orders, by the ministers of the gospel.

The Holy Spirit of God has also a concern in it. He convinces men of sin, and of their need of the pardon of it. He makes it manifest; he takes the blood of Christ, and applies it to the conscience, which speaks peace and pardon. He pronounces the sentence of it in the conscience of a sinner. He is the Holy Spirit of promise, and he seals up the pardon of sin in a promise; and witnesses to the spirits of God's people that they are pardoned ones.

2nd. The impulsive moving cause of pardon, is neither man's misery nor his merits. Not any works of righteousness done by him; nor even any of the graces of the Spirit in him; but the sovereign grace and mercy of God, through Christ.

Ephesians 1:7 In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace.

Psalms 51:1 Have mercy upon me, O God, according to thy lovingkindness: according unto the multitude of thy tender mercies blot out my transgressions.

Luke 1:77.78 To give knowledge of salvation unto his people by the remission of their sins, Through the tender mercy of our God; whereby the dayspring from on high hath visited us,

3rd. The procuring meritorious cause of it, is the blood of Christ, which was shed for it, has obtained it, and for the sake of which God forgives sin; which

virtue it has from the human nature being in union with the divine Person of the Son of God.

Hebrews 9:14 How much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?

I John 1:7 But 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.

Fifthly, The effects of pardon, that is, when applied; for the effects of it are not sensibly perceived unless applied; which are.

1. Peace of conscience: when sin is charged upon the conscience, and there is no sight and sense of pardon, there is no peace; but no sooner is there a view of interest in justification, by the righteousness of Christ, and pardon by his blood, but there is peace, which that blood speaks and gives; and which the world cannot take away; a peace that passeth all understanding, and is better experienced than expressed.

2. Cheerfulness of spirit: when sin lies as an heavy burden, without a view of pardon, the mind is depressed. It is filled with gloominess, and melancholy apprehensions of things, if not with despair, as in the case of Cain. A spirit, wounded with a sense of sin, and without a view of pardon, who can bear? But when the Lord says, "Son," or "daughter, be of good cheer, thy sins are forgiven thee!" cheerfulness takes place. The spirits, that were sunk, are raised. The head, that was bowed down, is lifted up. That countenance, that looked dejected, smiles. The soul is caused to hear joy and gladness. And the bones that were broken are made to rejoice.

3. Comfort of soul: while a gracious soul, under a sense of sin, apprehends that God is angry with him, he has no comfort. But when he manifests his pardoning grace, then he concludes his anger is turned away, and he is comforted. And this is one of the ways and means in which God would have his people comforted by his ministers, and when their ministry is accompanied by the Spirit of God, comfort is enjoyed.

Isaiah 40:1-2 Comfort ye, comfort ye my people, saith your God. Speak ye comfortably to Jerusalem, and cry unto her, that her warfare is accomplished, that her iniquity is pardoned: for she hath received of the LORD'S hand double for all her sins.

4. Access to God with boldness and confidence. A soul, under the weight and pressure of the guilt of sin, moves heavily to the throne of grace; and when it comes there cannot lift up his eyes, but looking downward, and smiting on his breast, says, “God be merciful,” or propitious, “to me, a sinner!” But when it has a view of the blood, righteousness, and sacrifice of Christ, it comes with liberty, boldness, and confidence. Particularly when it has a clear and comfortable sight of the pardon of sin, through the blood of Jesus, it has boldness to enter into the holiest of all, and come up to the seat of God, and claims interest in him.

5. Attendance on divine worship with pleasure and delight: this flows from a sense of forgiveness of sin, and is one end of it. “There is forgiveness with thee, that thou mayest be feared,” that is, worshiped; for fear is put for worship, both inward and outward; and especially denotes, serving the Lord with reverence and godly fear. And to have the conscience purged from dead works by the blood of Christ, both puts a soul into the best capacity, and into the most suitable frame to serve the living God.

Psalms 130:4 But there is forgiveness with thee, that thou mayest be feared.

Hebrews 12:28 Wherefore we receiving a kingdom which cannot be moved, let us have grace, whereby we may serve God acceptably with reverence and godly fear.

Hebrews 9:14 How much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?

6. Love to God and Christ is raised, promoted, and increased, by an application of pardon; which, as it is an evidence of the love of God to a sinner, it produces love again. The poor woman in the gospel, the notorious sinner as she had been, loved much, many sins having been forgiven her.

Luke 7:47 Wherefore I say unto thee, Her sins, which are many, are forgiven; for she loved much: but to whom little is forgiven, the same loveth little.

7. Evangelical repentance, and the exercise of it, are much influenced by pardon of sin being applied. The tears of repentance, shed by the poor woman before mentioned, flowed from a sense of pardoning grace and mercy. Sin never appears more odious than in the glass of forgiving love. Shame, confusion of face, and silence, are never more manifest, than when a soul knows that God is pacified towards it for all that it has done. This produces a godly sorrow, a sorrow after a godly sort, for sin committed against a God of love, grace, and

mercy. Faith first looks to Christ, and beholds pardon through him; and then evangelical mourning and repentance follow upon it.

(Ezekiel 16:63) That thou mayest remember, and be confounded, and never open thy mouth any more because of thy shame, when I am pacified toward thee for all that thou hast done, saith the Lord GOD.

Zechariah 12:10 And I will pour upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the spirit of grace and of supplications: and they shall look upon me whom they have pierced, and they shall mourn for him, as one mourneth for his only son, and shall be in bitterness for him, as one that is in bitterness for his firstborn.

8. Thankfulness of soul for such a mercy; than which there cannot be a greater. If a man is truly impressed with a sense of it, he will call upon his soul, and all within him, to bless and praise the Lord for all his benefits; and particularly for this, “who forgiveth all thine iniquities.”

Psalms 103:2-3 Bless the LORD, O my soul, and forget not all his benefits: Who forgiveth all thine iniquities; who healeth all thy diseases.

Think with what gratitude and thankfulness a condemned malefactor, and just ready to be executed, receives his pardon from the king! With that, and much more, souls sensible of sin, the demerit of it, and danger by it, receive pardon of all their sins, through the blood of Christ, from the King of kings.

Sixthly, The properties of pardon.

1. It is an act of God’s free grace. It is according to the *riches* of it; that is, the plenty of it, which is abundantly displayed in it; and according to the “multitude of his tender mercies,” mercy being richly shown forth in it.

Ephesians 1:7 In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace;

Psalms 51:1 Have mercy upon me, O God, according to thy lovingkindness: according unto the multitude of thy tender mercies blot out my transgressions.

It is an act of the Father’s grace, who has found the ransom; and, upon it, delivered men from going down to the pit of corruption; has set forth Christ to be the propitiation, through faith in his blood, for the remission of sins, and does, for his sake, freely forgive them.

-

And it is an act of the Son's grace, in shedding his blood for the remission of it. And it is an act of the Spirit's grace, to lead to the blood of Jesus, which speaks peace and pardon; to that fountain opened to wash in for sin and uncleanness; to take of the things of Christ, his blood, righteousness, and sacrifice, and show interest in them, and make application of them.

Pardon of sin is one of the things freely given of God, which the Spirit gives knowledge of. And it is an act of sovereign, unmerited, and distinguishing grace. God bestows it on whom he pleases, according to his sovereign will, and on persons altogether undeserving of it, who have been guilty of all manner of sin, of sins of omission and commission. And yet to such he says, "I, even I, am he that blotteth out thy transgressions for mine own sake."

Isaiah 43:25 I, even I, am he that blotteth out thy transgressions for mine own sake, and will not remember thy sins.

And it is bestowed on some, and not others, who are equally as bad as the others; and on men, and not angels; for to the angels that sinned no sparing pardoning mercy is extended; only to rebellious, sinful men.

2. It is a point of justice. God is just, while he pardons those that repent of their sins, confess them, and believe in Christ; "If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins," just on account of the blood of his Son being shed for the remission of sin, and faithful to his counsel, covenant, and promises, to grant it upon that footing. And hence also Christ, as an advocate, calls for it, and demands it in right of justice; that it be applied to his people, for whom he shed his blood; and became the propitiatory sacrifice for their sins; which he powerfully and effectually pleads on their behalf.

I John 1:9 If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness.

I John 2:1-2 My little children, these things write I unto you, that ye sin not. And if any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous: And he is the propitiation for our sins: and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world.

3. It is a complete act. It is a forgiveness of all the sins and trespasses of God's people, not one is left unforgiven; and it is done *simul* and *semel*, together and at once. Though the manifestation and application may be made at different times, as wanted by believers; yet in the mind of God it passed at once; even a full as well as free forgiveness of all sins, past, present, and to come.

Nor is it any objection to this, that then sins must be forgiven before they are committed. So they are, in virtue of Christ's suretyship engagements, and the performance of them.

4. It is an act that will never be repealed. It is one of those gifts of grace which are without repentance, and will never be revoked. It is a blessing God has given in covenant, and in and with his Son Jesus Christ, and it is irreversible. It is one of those things which God does, which are for ever. Sins once pardoned are always so. When sought for they shall not be found. They are removed from the pardoned sinner as far as the east is from the west. God has cast them behind his back, and will never set them more in the light of his countenance; he has cast them into the depths of the sea, and will never fetch them up again.

5. It is one of the chief articles of faith, and blessings of grace. It stands the first of those benefits, on account of which the Psalmist called upon his soul to bless God for,

Psalms 103:2-3 Bless the LORD, O my soul, and forget not all his benefits:
Who forgiveth all thine iniquities; who healeth all thy diseases;

Next to eternal election, it is reckoned among the spiritual blessings saints are blessed with in Christ; being a branch of redemption through his blood.

Ephesians 1:3-4 Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ:
According as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love:

Ephesians 1:7 In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace;

Happy is the man that has an interest in it. He has peace and comfort now, and may rejoice in hope of the glory of God hereafter!

Seventhly, Answer some questions relating to pardon of sin; which do not so naturally fall under any of the above points.

Qu. 1. Whether any sin is venial or pardonable in its own nature, and does not deserve eternal death? The reason of this question is, the distinction the Papists make between venial and mortal sins. Some sins, they say, are in their own nature venial, pardonable, or not deserving of eternal death, only some lesser chastisement, while others are mortal, and deserving of death. But there is no room nor reason for such a distinction. No sin is venial or pardonable in itself

but mortal, and deserving of death. There is a difference in sins, some are greater, others lesser.

John 19:11 Jesus answered, Thou couldest have no power at all against me, except it were given thee from above: therefore he that delivered me unto thee hath *the greater sin*.

Some are breaches of the more weightier matters, or precepts of the law, as those against the first table of it; others of the lesser matters, or precepts of it, as those against the second table. Some are attended with more aggravated circumstances than others, being committed against light and knowledge, and under the enjoyment of great blessings and privileges.

Luke 12:47-48 And that servant, which knew his lord's will, and prepared not himself, neither did according to his will, shall be beaten with many stripes. But he that knew not, and did commit things worthy of stripes, shall be beaten with few stripes. For unto whomsoever much is given, of him shall be much required: and to whom men have committed much, of him they will ask the more.

Matthew 11:22 But I say unto you, It shall be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon at the day of judgment, than for you.

Matthew 11:24 But I say unto you, That it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom in the day of judgment, than for thee.

While others are done ignorantly without knowledge of the Lord's will, and not favored with means that others have, yet every sin is mortal, or deserving of death. Death was threatened to sin before it was committed, in case it should. And the first sin brought death into the world with it, and the end of all other sins is death. Death is the wages and just demerit of sin.

Every sin is committed against God, and is objectively infinite, and deserving of infinite and everlasting punishment. It is a breach of his law, and every disobedience to that has a just recompense of reward annexed to it, righteous punishment, or the wrath of God it reveals and works. The breach of the least of the commands of it is liable to divine resentment; and he that offends in one point is guilty of all. The least sin leaves a stain which what is done or used by the sinner cannot remove. And such pollution excludes from the kingdom of God.

The least sin, even every sin of thought, word, and deed, will be brought into judgment, and must be accounted for, though all manner of sin is venial, or pardonable, or is pardoned through the grace of God and blood of Christ. God

forgives iniquity, transgression, and sin, which include all sorts of sin; sins of the greatest magnitude, and of the deepest die, are blotted out for Christ's sake. Such as are like crimson and scarlet become through him as white as wool, as white as snow. His blood cleanses from sin. Every sin is forgiven, but the sin against the Holy Ghost.

Qu. 3. Whether the sins of pardoned ones will be made known and exposed to others in the day of judgment! I think not; my reasons are, because none but their good works are taken notice of in Matthew 25, and because it does not seem consistent with the nature of pardon.

Pardon of sin is expressed by a covering of it; when God forgives sins he covers them, and he will never uncover them, or take off the blood and righteousness of his Son; And if he does not uncover them, who can? neither angels, nor men, nor devils. It is a blotting them as a cloud; and when a cloud is broke to pieces and scattered, it can never be collected together any more. Sins are cast behind the back of God, and into the depths of the sea; and are removed as far as the east is from the west, and can never, though sought for, be found more.

Nor does it consist with the state and condition of the pardoned ones that their sins should be exposed. Christ, who has taken so much pains to sanctify and cleanse his church, that he might present her to himself a glorious church, without spot or wrinkle or any such thing, will never suffer their sins ever more to appear.

The church will descend from heaven as a bride adorned and prepared for her husband, having the glory of God upon her, and clothed with the shining robes of immortality and glory, as well as with the fine linen, clean and white, the righteousness of her Lord. It will now be her open consummate marriage with the Lamb; and it seems quite out of all character, that he should suffer her faults, failings, sins, and transgressions, to be exposed on her wedding day; and which would, one would think, cause shame and blushing, which seems not consistent with that state of happiness.

Qu. 4. Whether it is now the duty of saints to pray for the pardon of sin?

Prayer itself is a moral duty, and incumbent on all; and the light of nature will direct persons in distress to pray to God for relief; and when they suppose they have offended Deity by sin, and he is angry with them, and his judgments are, or they fear will, come upon them. It is natural to them to pray unto him to forgive them, and deliver them out of present troubles, or what they fear are coming upon them; as may be observed in Jonah's mariners, who were heathens. And the apostle directed Simon Magus, an unregenerate man, and known by him to be so, to pray to God if perhaps "the thought of his heart" might be "forgiven" him.

Acts 8:22 Repent therefore of this thy wickedness, and pray God, if perhaps the thought of thine heart may be forgiven thee.

But this comes not up to the question, which is, Whether pardoned sinners should pray for the pardon of sin? to which it may be answered, That either these pardoned ones have a comfortable sense and perception of the pardon of their sins, or they have not. If they have, they have no need, at present at least, to pray even for the manifestation of it to them, since they have it already; if they have not a comfortable view of it, which is sometimes the case of pardoned ones, as it was of the church, when she said, “We have transgressed and rebelled, thou hast not pardoned,”

Lamentations 3:42 We have transgressed and have rebelled: thou hast not pardoned.

They will then see it both their duty, and privilege, and interest, to pray for a comfortable view and fresh manifestation of it. And whereas saints are daily sinning in thought, word, or deed, Christ has directed to make a daily petition of it, that when we pray that God would give us “day by day our daily bread,” that he would also “forgive us our sins.”

Luke 11:3-4 Give us day by day our daily bread. And forgive us our sins; for we also forgive every one that is indebted to us. And lead us not into temptation; but deliver us from evil.

And it appears to have been the practice of saints in all ages to pray for the pardon of sin in some sense, and as it seems in the sense suggested. So Moses prayed when the people of Israel had sinned at Sinai, “Pardon our iniquity and our sin.”

Exodus 34:9 And he said, If now I have found grace in thy sight, O Lord, let my Lord, I pray thee, go among us; for it *is* a stiffnecked people; and pardon our iniquity and our sin, and take us for thine inheritance.

So David prayed, “For thy name's sake, O Lord, pardon mine iniquity, for it is great.”

Psalms 25:11 For thy name's sake, O LORD, pardon mine iniquity; for it is great.

A strange plea this! a reason, one would think, why it should not be pardoned, than why it should be pardoned. And it was so great in his apprehension, that if

he had not a discovery and application of pardon made to him, he could not bear up under it. And as he prayed thus, and with success, he observes it for the encouragement of other saints to do so likewise.

“I said, I will confess my transgressions unto the Lord,” and so he did; “and thou forgavest the iniquity of my sin; for this shall everyone that is godly pray unto thee in a time when thou mayest be found,”

Psalms 32:5-6 I acknowledged my sin unto thee, and mine iniquity have I not hid. I said, I will confess my transgressions unto the LORD; and thou forgavest the iniquity of my sin. Selah. For this shall every one that is godly pray unto thee in a time when thou mayest be found: surely in the floods of great waters they shall not come nigh unto him.

That is, for the pardon of their sins, and the evidence of it, when they stood in need thereof. So Daniel prayed for himself and others, “O Lord hear, O Lord forgive.”

Daniel 9:19 O Lord, hear; O Lord, forgive; O Lord, hearken and do; defer not, for thine own sake, O my God: for thy city and thy people are called by thy name.

And so New Testament saints are directed by Christ to pray, as has been observed. But then it must be understood in an explained sense, consistent with the nature of pardon, as procured by Christ, and passed by God; it cannot be supposed that saints should pray that Christ’s blood may be shed again to procure fresh pardon for them; nor that any fresh act of pardon should be passed in the divine mind, since God has forgiven all trespasses through the blood of his Son, shed once for all; but that they might have fresh manifestations, discoveries, and application of pardon, as they stand in need of them, being continually sinning against God. In no other sense can I understand that pardon of sin can be prayed for by the saints. (*John Gill’s Divinity, ppg 354-360*)

Pascal, Blaise

Blaise PASCAL: Sylvester Hassell: “The most powerful enemy philosophy ever had,” says Victor Cousin, “was Blaise Pascal” (born 1623, died 1662), the greatest genius and the best man that France ever produced, the most evangelical and the most profound of all the uninspired defenders of Christianity, who proves, in his fragmentary and posthumous “Pensees” or “Thoughts,” that the revelation of Christ in the Scriptures and by His Spirit furnishes the only solution to the dark and countless mysteries of human life, the only antidote for its ills,

the only relief for its necessities. In his "Provincial Letters" he made the Jesuits' code of ethics the derision of all Europe. He was of that small and persecuted body of Catholics called Port Royalists, or Jansenists, or Augustinians, who heartily believed and advocated the two great Bible principles of the nothingness of fallen man and the omnipotence of Divine grace. He showed that all human philosophies, like all human religions, are full of vanity, follies, weakness, errors, extravagances and contradictions; and thus that it is the part of true wisdom to look away from all these *ignes-fatui*, which can lead only to destruction, to the true and saving light of the eternal Sun of righteousness.

"I find it true," says he, "that since the world began it has been constantly announced to men that they are in a state of universal corruption; but that a Restorer shall come. That it is not one man who says it, but a countless number of men, and an entire people, during four thousand years, prophesying thus, and made expressly for this purpose. Thus I extend my arms to my Liberator, who, having been foretold for four thousand years, came to suffer and to die for me on the earth, at the time and with all the circumstances which had been predicted; and, by his grace, I await death in peace, in the hope of being eternally united to him; and I live, nevertheless, with joy, either in the blessings which it may please him to give me, or in the ills which he may send for my good, and that he has taught me to endure by his example. I find the Christian religion as foreshadowed in the Old Testament, and unfolded in the New Testament, altogether Divine in its authority, in its duration, in its perpetuity, in its morality, in its government, in its doctrine and in its effects."

For more than half of his short life of thirty-nine years, Pascal was deeply affected with dyspepsia, or paralysis, or hypochondria, or all these combined; and from his eighteenth year he never passed a day without pain. Yet he bore his sufferings with exemplary patience; and, under the mournful darkness of Catholic superstition, he continually inflicted upon his poor body additional sufferings. For he wore an iron girdle next his skin, armed with sharp points, which he would drive into his flesh whenever he felt himself assailed by sinful thoughts." (*Hassell's History* ppg 511, 512)

Passover, The

The PASSOVER: Harold Hunt: Exodus 12:1-13 "And the LORD spake unto Moses and Aaron in the land of Egypt, saying, This month shall be unto you the beginning of months: it shall be the first month of the year to you.

Speak ye unto all the congregation of Israel, saying, In the tenth day of this month they shall take to them every man a lamb, according to the house of their

fathers, a lamb for an house: And if the household be too little for the lamb, let him and his neighbor next unto his house take it according to the number of the souls; every man according to his eating shall make your count for the lamb. Your lamb shall be without blemish, a male of the first year: ye shall take it out from the sheep, or from the goats: And ye shall keep it up until the fourteenth day of the same month: and the whole assembly of the congregation of Israel shall kill it in the evening. And they shall take of the blood, and strike it on the two side posts and on the upper door post of the houses, wherein they shall eat it. And they shall eat the flesh in that night, roast with fire, and unleavened bread; and with bitter herbs they shall eat it. Eat not of it raw, nor sodden at all with water, but roast with fire; his head with his legs, and with the purtenance thereof. And ye shall let nothing of it remain until the morning; and that which remaineth of it until the morning ye shall burn with fire. And thus shall ye eat it; with your loins girded, your shoes on your feet, and your staff in your hand; and ye shall eat it in haste: it *is* the LORD'S Passover. For I will pass through the land of Egypt this night, and will smite all the firstborn in the land of Egypt, both man and beast; and against all the gods of Egypt I will execute judgment: I am the LORD. And the blood shall be to you for a token upon the houses where ye are: and when I see the blood, I will pass over you, and the plague shall not be upon you to destroy you, when I smite the land of Egypt.”

The Old Testament Passover was a figure of the Lord Jesus Christ. We know that, because Paul refers to the Lord as *Christ our Passover*.

I Corinthians 5:7, “...for even Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us.”

The Law Service provides us with an entire system of types, and shadows, and figures, of Bible truth. Those figures served as a kind of prophecy for the children of Israel during the time of the Old Testament, and they still serve as illustrations of Bible truth in our day.

Those figures are found, in the feasts, and sacrifices, and ceremonies of the Law Service, and in many of the experiences of the saints of that day. They literally acted out divine truth, and it is amazing how clear, and how graphic, those figures can be. (*See notes under FIGURES Anthology Figures*)

Exodus 12:5, “Your lamb shall be without blemish, a male of the first year, ye shall take it out from the sheep or from the goats.”

The Passover lamb had to be without blemish. If the Lord Jesus Christ had not been a perfect sacrifice—a sinless sacrifice—he could not have paid our sin debt. He would have died for his own sins. Except for the Lord Jesus Christ,

every person, who ever died, died because he was a sinner. The Lord Jesus Christ is the only perfectly righteous, perfectly sinless, person who ever lived.

I Peter 2:22, “Who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth.”

I Peter 1:18-19, “Forasmuch as ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from your vain conversation, received by tradition from your fathers, but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot.”

It had to be a male of the first year. It could not be a newborn lamb, that might survive, and might not. And it could not be an old ram, broken down with age, that was going to die before long, anyway. It had to be in the full vigor of its strength.

In his divine nature, the Lord Jesus Christ is the eternal one. He always has been, and he always will be. But according to his human nature, when the Lord died on the cross, he was thirty three years old. He was in the full strength of his manhood.

Notice that in Exodus 12:3 it is *a lamb*. Then it is *the lamb*, and finally it is *your lamb*. It has been said that the sweetness of the gospel is in its personal pronouns, *my Lord, my Savior, my Redeemer*. I like to preach about the Lord, the Savior, the Redeemer, but he is most precious to my soul, when it is my Lord, my Savior, my Redeemer. I like to preach about election, and predestination, and redemption, and regeneration, and resurrection, but more than that I like to preach about the one who did the electing, and the predestinating.

I like to preach from John 3:16. “For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have everlasting life.” That is not an Arminian text; there is not an Arminian text in the Bible.

But more than that, I love to preach on Galatians 2:20, “I am crucified with Christ, nevertheless, I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me, and the life which I now live in the flesh, I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me.”

I love to preach about God’s love for *the world*, the vast world of his elect family; but, more than that, I love to preach about how he loved me, and chose me, and redeemed me. I discover that the longer I live, and the more I preach, the more personal my preaching becomes, the more I am amazed at the person of

the Lord Jesus Christ. True religion is more than a system of doctrines and religious principles.

True religion is rooted in a personal relationship with the Lord Jesus Christ. Paul says, "I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me: and the life I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me" Galatians 2:20. That is what makes religion vital and real. It is that close and personal, day to day relationship with my Lord. It is being able to feel that he lives in my heart, and that I am able to enjoy fellowship with him.

I believe it is possible to preach the truth, to be right on target, so far as the letter of the doctrine is concerned, and still be, for the most part, somewhat academic in our preaching. I read an article a few days ago that I really thought was doctrinally sound, but for all the fire there was in it, for all the passion you could discover, he could just as well have been writing about Napoleon Bonaparte. When somebody talks about my Lord, I want him to give me the idea that the Lord means all the world to him.

"And the whole assembly of the congregation of Israel shall kill *it* in the evening." God speaks as if there was only one lamb. And, indeed, they were considered as a unit.

Every Passover lamb pointed to that one Lamb of God. All of the Old Testament types and shadows, and feasts, and sacrifices, and all the Old Testament prophecies pointed to the one man, Christ Jesus.

Exodus 12:6, "And ye shall keep it up until the fourteenth day of the same month, and the whole assembly of the congregation of Israel shall kill *it* in the evening."

I have read articles where preachers just wore themselves out trying to explain why they kept up the Passover lamb for four days, but they did not keep it up four days. They kept it up for three days and a part of a day.

I know it says they put the lamb up on *the tenth day*, and they kept it up until *the fourteenth day at evening*, and it does sound like first grade arithmetic to say that they kept the lamb up for four days, but that is not right. Bear in mind that the evening preceded the morning of the Jewish day. You don't have to read Josephus or Edersheim to find that out. Just go to Genesis 1. That is one of the first lessons in the book.

Genesis 1:5, "And the evening and the morning were the first day."

Their day did not begin at midnight the way we count time; their day began at sundown of the previous day. They put the lamb up on the tenth day. They kept it up the remainder of that day, and the eleventh day, the twelfth day, and the thirteenth day. That makes three days and a part of a day.

The lamb was not kept up during any part of the fourteenth day. The evening of the fourteenth day began at sundown of the thirteenth day. That was when the Passover Lamb was killed. The Passover Lamb was a figure of the Lord Jesus Christ, and those three days, and a part of a day, correspond with his public ministry. His ministry lasted three years, and a part of a year.

That also corresponds with Daniel's prophecy. Daniel says the Messiah was to be cut off in the midst of that seventieth week (Daniel 9:24,27). He did not say that he was to be cut off in the precise middle of the week. That would have put us at exactly three years and six months into his public ministry. The lamb was kept up for somewhat more than three days, and the ministry of the Lord lasted for somewhat more than three years. That is as precise as we are able to be, and as precise as we need to be.

The Jewish priests began their public ministry at 30 years of age. But when the Lord Jesus Christ, our Great High Priest, began his public ministry, we are only told that he "began to be, as was supposed—about 30 years of age."

It appears to me that God has installed a double blind to prevent anyone from discovering the precise age of the Lord at the time of his crucifixion. If we could determine his precise age (according to his human nature) we could, then, better determine the precise day of his birth. But, far too much has already been made of the day of his birth, and the idea of any celebration of that day.

The Bible instructs us to celebrate, not the day of his birth, but the fact of his death and resurrection. If God had wanted us to know precisely when the Lord was born, he would have told us— or at least given us more to go on.

Exodus 12:7, "And they shall take of the blood, and strike it on the two side posts, and on the upper door posts of the houses, wherein they shall eat it."

That house with the blood applied symbolized the Lord Jesus Christ. Every symbol pointed to him; he is our all in all. They were safe, provided they were in that house. We are safe, because we are in him.

II Corinthians 5:17, "Therefore if any man be *in Christ*, he is a new creature."

Romans 8:1, “There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are *in Christ Jesus*.”

Exodus 12:8, “And they shall eat the flesh in that night, roast with fire, and with unleavened bread, and with bitter herbs shall they eat it.”

They were to eat the flesh of the Passover Lamb. The Lord Jesus Christ is our meat and drink. His sacrificial death is the ground of our life.

John 6:53, “Except ye *eat my flesh*, and drink my blood, ye have no life in you.”

The lamb was to be *roast with fire*. When he suffered and died on the cross, he stood as our substitute. On our behalf, he came through the raging fire of the wrath of God against sin.

They were to *eat the flesh with unleavened bread*, and with *bitter herbs*. Leaven is a symbol of human pride and conceit. So long as we are proud of ourselves, and satisfied with our own accomplishments, we will never be able to *eat the flesh* of this Passover Lamb.

We will never be able to see the Lord as high and lifted up, until we see ourselves as entirely lost and undone, we will never be able to see him as our one and only Savior.

Leaven puffs up the bread. We are to abstain from everything that feeds and puffs up the old carnal nature.

Pride is the mother of every sin. It was pride that tripped up Adam in the Garden of Eden, and pride has been man’s downfall ever since. More than that, leaven is a symbol of evil. Paul tells us to “Abstain from the very appearance of evil,” I Thessalonians 5:22.

A little boy was getting ready for school. He called downstairs, “Momma, is this shirt too dirty, do I need to get another one?” Now, his mother could not see that shirt; she could not know if was dirty or not, but she told him, “Yes, it is too dirty, get a clean one.”

When the little boy came downstairs, he said, “Momma, how did you know that shirt was dirty; you could not see it?” It makes you wonder why he asked, if he knew she could not see it, but that is not the point.

She said, “Son, if you have to ask, it is.” That is a very good rule for all of us. “If you have to ask, it is.” We are all faced with questions in our lives. “Is this

course of action all right, or not?" If you have to ask whether a particular course of action is morally wrong, it is. Paul gave the rule, "And he that doubteth is damned if he eat, because he eateth not of faith, for whatsoever is not of faith is sin," Romans 14:23.

I Corinthians 10:12. "Wherefore, let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall,"

It has been my observation that those who seem to do the most repenting are those who seem to have the least need to repent. And those who seem to do the least repenting are those who seem to have the greatest need for it.

It is one of the peculiarities of our carnal nature, that we can convince ourselves that most anything is alright, if we will just argue with ourselves long enough. We will convince ourselves that, at any other time, and under any other circumstances, this would probably be the wrong thing to do, but just this once, and under these circumstances, it will probably be alright.

And it is also one of our characteristics, that our conscience will often let us down at the very time we need it the most. Sometimes, at that very time, our conscience will be quiet until we have carried through on that wrong decision, and then our conscience wakes up with a vengeance.

It is then, when it is too late, that our conscience finally wakes up and begins to challenge us. Rather than depend on our faulty and undependable conscience, how much better it is to listen more closely to the Lord, and "abstain from all appearance of evil."

Exodus 12:9, "Eat not of it raw, nor sodden at all with water, but roast with fire, his head with his legs, and with the purtenance thereof."

The Passover Lamb could not be eaten *raw*, nor in any way *sodden with water*. It could not be boiled; it had to come into direct contact with the fire. When the Lord suffered on the cross, there could be nothing to diminish his suffering. He must suffer the full penalty of the wrath of God against sin. There could be nothing to diminish his mental anguish; in his agony he was forsaken by the Father. That was when he cried out, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" Matthew 27:46. And there could be nothing to diminish his physical suffering.

They were to use "his head with his legs, and the purtenance thereof." There was a use for every part of the Passover lamb. Our religion is to involve everything we say, and everything we do. It is to dominate our entire life.

I have heard it said that our religion is not a religion of the head; ours is a religion of the heart. Well, if ours is a religion of the head, as opposed to a religion of the heart, there is nothing to it. There is very much of religion that is purely lip service. It is words only. True religion affects the heart.

If Christ lives in the heart of a person, and if that person is trying to walk in a manner that pleases his Lord, he can experience the very presence of God in his heart.

Acts 17:27, “That they should seek the Lord, if haply they might feel after him and find him, though he be not far from every one of us.”

We feel after the Lord with our hearts, not with our hands. Our religion is, indeed, a religion of the heart. But, while our religion is clearly a religion of the heart, it is also just as clearly a religion of the head. The two are not mutually exclusive.

The doctrine of the Bible involves the most logical, the most reasonable, the most intelligent principles, man has ever known. The principles of the Bible not only stir the heart; those same principles are sufficient to challenge and satisfy both the simplest of minds—and the most brilliant minds that have ever lived. It is one of the beauties of the Bible that the little child and the adult can read the same texts, and both can be edified and instructed by what they read.

“His head with his legs, and with the purtenance thereof.” Our profession involves all we say, and all we do, and all that goes with it. If the way we walk does not reflect the way we talk, then all we say is a waste of time.

Long ago, someone challenged a half-hearted Christian, “Don’t tell me what you are, because what you do speaks so loud I cannot hear what you say.” If our life does not reflect our profession, our religion is a waste of time. There is no room in the life of the obedient child of God for any little cubby hole reserved for his favorite sin.

Vs. 10, “And ye shall let nothing of it remain until the morning; and that which remaineth of it until the morning, ye shall burn with fire.”

The rising sun was to see no trace of the slain lamb. That has to do with the finished work of the Lord Jesus Christ. The Lord himself announced, “It is finished,” John 19:30. the work is complete. Again he said, “I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do” John 17:4. Anytime God repeats himself, he does it for our benefit. He repeats himself, because it is important that we not

miss the point. Religious types have been arguing with the Lord ever since that time. They are sure the Lord's work will be complete, when they add the finishing touch. But, we have God's word for it, that his work is finished.

Exodus 12:11, "And thus shall ye eat it, with your loins girded, your shoes on your feet, and your staff in your hand, and ye shall eat it in haste, it is the Lord's Passover."

The Bible provides a better commentary on these expressions than any preacher can produce.

"Stand therefore, having your loins girt about with truth, and having on the breastplate of righteousness, and your feet shod with the preparation of the gospel of peace," Ephesians 6:14-15. "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." The *loins girded* have to do with the restraint, the self-control, that is necessary in our service toward God. If we would serve God acceptably, it is necessary that we restrain the wanderings, the imaginings, of our mind, and center our thoughts and our affections on Christ, and on him alone.

I love the way the Bible explains the Bible. I love the way these verses fit in with each other, and connect up with each other. They fit together and connect up with each other like the couplings on two train cars. No matter how sincere and how diligent you may be in your efforts, you will never be successful, unless your loins are girt about with truth.

He went on to tell them to have "your shoes on your feet." Shoes have to do with walking. Israel wore the same shoes for forty years in the wilderness. There is a particular walk God requires of his children, and he will be satisfied with no other. "It is not in man that walketh to direct his steps" Jeremiah 10:23.

The walk God requires of his children today is the walk he has always required. If any act was morally unacceptable to God one hundred years ago, that kind of conduct is still unacceptable.

If any kind of practice was unscriptural in the church one hundred years ago, that practice is unacceptable today. Moreover, they were to have their shoes on their feet in the sense that they were to be ready to travel. The call to leave Egypt was to come during the night, and they must be ready to answer the call.

II Timothy 4:2 "Preach the word; be instant in season, out of season."

“And your staff in your hand.” David prayed, “Thy rod and *thy staff*, they comfort me.” The Scriptures seem to be plain enough that the *rod*, the strait edge, or plumb line, is the Bible. It seems logical, then, to conclude that the *staff* must be the Spirit of God. That is what we lean on, and trust to support us, every moment of our lives.

“That by two immutable things, in which it was impossible for God to lie....” Hebrews 6:18. Those *two immutable* (unchangeable) *things* in which it was, and is, *impossible for God to lie* are the same *rod* and *staff*. They are still the two unchangeable, and always dependable supports for the faithful child of God.

“And ye shall eat it in haste, it is the Lord’s Passover.” Brethren, if we are going to do anything in the Lord’s service, we had best get busy, we are not going to be here long.

Sometimes some of our denominational friends want to know, “Why do you Old Baptists not believe in missions? Do you not believe you ought to go into all the world and preach the gospel?” And then we explain that we do believe in going, we just don’t believe God gave us the authority to send somebody else.

A large number of our ministers spend their time in little else except going. Some of them have been accused of *keeping the road hot* in their constantly going all over the country, preaching the gospel. Then somebody wants to know, “What is your hurry?”

Well, I confess that I am in a hurry. I don’t expect to be here long, and if I intend to do any preaching, I will have to hurry.

Exodus 12:11, “And thus shall ye eat it; with your loins girded, your shoes on your feet, and your staff in your hand; and ye shall eat it in haste: it is the Lord’s Passover.”

Paul, The Apostle

PAUL, the Apostle: *Sylvester Hassell:* Saul of Tarsus was of Jewish parents, both father and mother. His father was of the tribe of Benjamin, and a freeman of Rome. He was liberally educated. The rudiments he received in his native city, which was a rival of Athens and Alexandria in learning; and he then completed his studies in Jerusalem at the feet of Gamaliel, a noted doctor of the law of Moses and the traditions of the Elders.”

The three highest elements of human nobility met in Saul— Roman citizenship, Grecian culture, and Hebrew religion. He had, even by nature, a mind of the highest order, and a spirit of extraordinary mold. As Moses was learned in the wisdom of the Egyptians, so Paul was learned in the wisdom of the Greeks; being one of the “not many wise men called” to the service of Christ (I Corinthians 1:26). And a wonderful energy, resolution, zeal, fearlessness, sincerity, morality and devotion to the Mosaic law characterized him.

Next to the fall of man and the crucifixion of Christ, no incident occupies so much space in the Scriptures as the conversion of Saul of Tarsus. Besides being referred to several times in Paul’s epistles it is related three times in the Acts of the Apostles (Acts 6; 22 and Acts 26.); first by Luke, the historian, then by Paul to the Jews, and then by Paul to the Gentiles; and, next to the sin of Adam and the death of Christ, no other event in human history is so full of spiritual instruction. If no other conversion had been described in the Bible, and if no explicit statement of doctrine had been made, the simple record of the Divine and instantaneous and total transformation of the bitterest enemy to the most devoted servant of Christ on earth would have perfectly demonstrated, and written, as it were, upon the Heavens, in letters of living light, the sovereignty, the almightiness and irresistibility of the grace of God in the conviction and conversion of the sinner.

By the operation of this efficacious grace, the persecuting Pharisee, *who was all the while a chosen vessel unto God*, became the lifelong martyr of Jesus of Nazareth; and, next to incarnate Deity, Paul became—far more truly than Julius Caesar—“the foremost man of all the world”—the most richly endowed with the Spirit of God to proclaim the unsearchable riches of Christ to all the coming generations of the human race, the great Apostle of the Gentile world, the humblest as well as the most learned of the Apostles, the unselfish moral hero of humanity, the dauntless champion of divine sovereignty and spiritual religion, the greatest laborer and sufferer and witness for Christ that ever appeared in the annals of time, not only preaching, but living Christ “as the source and end of his whole being,” and surpassing all other men (excepting John) in the heights of spirituality and holiness to which he attained.

About two-thirds of the Acts of the Apostles are devoted to his career; and he himself wrote nearly one-third of the New Testament. All the greatness of Paul was due to the efficacious grace of God (I Corinthians 15:10); and one of the most striking effects of that grace was to make him feel to be ‘*the least of the Apostles*’ (I Corinthians 15:9); and, later in life, instead of feeling that he was getting better, he uses a still stronger expression of humility, and calls himself “*less than the least of all saints*” (Ephesians 3:8); and, still later in life, he felt constrained to confess himself “*the chief of sinners*” (I Timothy 1:15). Like John

the Baptist, he could say of Christ, “He must increase, but I must decrease” (John 3:30).

Abandoning the name *Saul* (meaning in Hebrew *asked*, and in Greek *conceited*), the proudest name in the tribe of Benjamin, he wears the Roman or Gentile name *Paul* (meaning *little*); and he continued, all his life long, to grow less in his own esteem, while Christ, the hope of glory, grew greater within him. The *humblest* in the kingdom of Heaven is the *greatest*, said our Lord (Matthew 18:4); and we know that no one was ever more meek and lowly, or ever more great than He (Matthew 11:30; Philippians 2:6-11). *Poverty of spirit* is the first beatitude (Matthew 5:3); and there is no richer or lovelier sign of grace (Numbers 12:3; Job 42:6; Psalms 8:2; 34:18; 51:17; Isaiah 57:15; 61:1; 65:2; Jeremiah 31:9,18-20; Daniel 5:21-22; Micah 6:8; Matthew 11; 25; Luke 4:18; 18:9-14; James 1:10; 2:5; 4:9-10).

The reality of the life and conversion of Paul, and the genuineness of his leading epistles, are unavoidably and frankly acknowledged by the most destructive and infidel historical critics of Germany. While those rationalists *futilely* attempt to prove that our canonical Gospels were all written in the second century of the Christian era, and are only corrupted copies of the originals, they admit that Paul’s epistles, especially those to the Romans, the Corinthians and Galatians (containing all the most important truths of Christianity), were certainly written by Paul in the first century; and that Paul himself was suddenly converted from a persecutor to a preacher of the Christian religion.

Nothing but the feeblest credulity can believe that this great change in such a mind as Paul’s was produced by a flash of lightning and his imagination.”

We will now notice the circumstances of the conversion of Saul of Tarsus, and of Cornelius the Roman centurion, the first described in Acts 9 and the second in Acts 10, as these are good examples of what are called the two classes of Christian conversion.

Saul was making havoc of the church (*elumaineto*, a term used nowhere else in the New Testament, and employed in the Septuagint and in classical Greek to describe the ravages of wild beasts), endeavoring, with all his might, to exterminate the last vestige of the Christian religion from the earth, not even sparing the helplessness and tenderness of the female sex (Acts 8:3), and doing all this in the name of religion, than which a more heinous crime cannot be imagined; and yet filled with Satanic malignity against God and his people, and breathing out threatenings and slaughter against the disciples of the Lord, he voluntarily applied to the high priest for letters addressed to the synagogues of Damascus (where were many Jews and some Christians), authorizing him to

arrest and bring bound to Jerusalem every Christian man and woman, for the purpose of trial and execution.

It was a journey of nearly 140 miles, and usually occupied six days. Saul was accompanied by several attendants. As they neared Damascus, one of the most beautiful and ancient cities in the world, the sun attained high noon; and suddenly there shone from heaven a brighter light than even the meridian splendor of a Syrian sun—the Shekinah, or excellent glory of the Divine presence. The whole company saw the light, and were prostrated to the ground; and all heard an awful sound, but Saul alone understood the words, because they were specially intended for him.

Saul also saw in the Heavens the ascended and glorified Redeemer (Acts 9:14,27); Acts 22:14; 26:16; I Corinthians 9:1; 15:8), who said to him in the Hebrew tongue, “Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me? It is hard for thee to kick against the goads.” The name of Saul was repeated to denote special solemnity, as in the case of Abraham (Genesis 22:11), Moses (Exodus 3:4), Martha (Luke 10:41), Simon (Luke 22:31), and Jerusalem (Matthew 23:37).

In Paul’s first spiritual lesson, Christ identifies himself with his poor persecuted people (Matthew 25:40,45; I Corinthians 12:27; Ephesians 1:22-23; 5:30; Colossians 2:19); and Christ reminds him that, while all his measures for crushing the church of God are in vain, still, like a stupid ox, he is, by his stubborn fury, continually injuring himself.

The moment Saul heard the voice of the Son of God he lived (John 5:25); from his death in trespasses and sins he was a new creature (II Corinthians 5:17); his stony heart was replaced by a fleshly heart (Ezekiel 36:26-27), his carnal mindedness by spiritual mindedness (Romans 8:6); and every thought was brought into captivity to the obedience of Christ (II Corinthians 10:5). In an instant and forever Saul was converted to God (John 17:3). “Out of the noonday God had struck him into darkness, only that he might kindle a noon in the midnight of his heart.” “It pleased God, who separated him from his mother’s womb, and called him by his grace, to reveal his Son in him” (Galatians 1:15-16). “God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness,” soon “shined in his heart, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ” (II Corinthians 4:6).

“Trembling and astonished, Saul said, Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?” From that moment obedience to Christ became the ruling principle in Paul’s life. His falling to the ground represented the fall of his pride and rebellion against God; his physical blindness denoted the utter spiritual blindness of his natural mind, notwithstanding his fine education, morality, and legalism.

Christ directed him to arise and go into the city, and it should be told him what he must do. This he did, being led by the hand in astonishment by his companions, who were themselves witnesses of the marvelous light and sound, though they understood nothing of the meaning. It was all done at noonday, when there could be no deception, and to the utter amazement of all.

And the strong-minded, educated, practical, truthful Apostle of the Gentiles knew, as well as he knew his own existence, that he had seen and conversed with the Lord Jesus Christ in glory. His whole future blameless, devoted, suffering, unworldly life is an unanswerable attestation of this fact. Though an angel from Heaven preached another gospel—which was not a gospel—from his, it was false; for he had his gospel directly from the Son of God (Galatians 1:8,12). And Paul was never ashamed of the gospel of Christ, nor of his experience of its saving power (Romans 1:18), relating that experience even before governors and kings (Acts 26).

For three days Saul neither saw nor ate nor drank. Then to a certain disciple in Damascus named Ananias, a devout man according to the law, and of good report among the Jews, the Lord appeared in a vision, and said, “Arise, and go into the street that is called Straight, and inquire in the house of Judas for one called Saul, of Tarsus: for, behold, he prayeth, and hath seen in a vision a man named Ananias coming in, and putting his hand on him, that he might receive his sight.” And to Ananias’s objection the Lord answered that Saul was a chosen vessel unto him, to bear his name before the Gentiles, and kings, and the children of Israel; for “I will shew him,” said he, “how great things he must suffer for my name’s sake.

And Ananias went his way, and entered into the house; and putting his hands on him said, Brother Saul, the Lord, even Jesus, that appeared unto thee in the way as thou camest, hath sent me, that thou mightest receive thy sight, and be filled with the Holy Ghost. And immediately there fell from his eyes as it had been scales: and he received his sight forthwith, and arose, and was baptized” (Acts 9:18).

Thus the Lord revealed his will to each of his servants in a vision (Acts 2:17-18); there was a perfect agreement in the two revelations; Saul was at once pointedly directed to the church, and commanded to enter it by baptism, which he did.

Saul, before his conversion, “verily thought that he ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth” (Acts 26:9). His sincerity by no means proved that he was right or acceptable with God; because it was the

sincerity of a carnal and darkened mind. The Hindoo is sincere in immolating himself under the car of Juggernaut; but such immolation is suicide.

While a Pharisee, Saul had no doubt uttered long and numerous forms of prayer, but he never truly prayed until quickened into spiritual life by the voice of the Son of God and the power of the Holy Ghost (Acts 9:11; John 5:25; Ephesians 2:1; John 6:63).

Paul, after his conversion, immediately preached in the synagogues at Damascus, confounding the Jews, and proving that Jesus is the Messiah and the Son of God. Then, as we learn from Galatians 1:17-18, he retired for about three years into Arabia, most probably the Sinaitic peninsula (Galatians 4:25; Hebrews 12:18-21), for the purpose, it would seem, of searching the Holy Scriptures, and, afar from the haunts of men, like Moses, in the backside of the desert (Exodus 3:1, etc.), to commune alone with God on that holy ground where the bush “had glowed in unconsuming fire, and the granite crags had trembled at the voice which uttered the fiery law.”

The God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, the God who communed there with Moses 1,500 years before, met his chosen and honored servant, and taught him the momentous lesson that he was to bear in his earthen vessel to the unborn generations of the people of God—the *spirituality of the Mosaic law* and *his own carnality*, that thus, *through the law, he might be dead to the law, and so might live unto God* (Acts 22:14; Romans 7:14; Galatians 2:19; II Corinthians 4:7).

While alive to the law, hoping for salvation by obeying it, and dreading condemnation by disobeying it, *he was dead unto God*; and it was only when he learned from God (Isaiah 54:13; John 6:45) how spiritual the law was, demanding perfect sinlessness of *thought* as well as of *word* and *deed*, and how carnal he was, sold under sin, and having *no good thing* dwelling in him, did he become dead to the law and all legal dependence, divorced from the legal covenant, delivered from the curse of the law, and truly alive unto God, united to Christ, crucified with Jesus to the sinful and perishing vanities of the world, and yet living, or rather Christ living in him, and he living the life that he now lived in the flesh by the faith of the Son of God, who loved him and gave himself for him (Galatians 2:19-20).

The outward miracle of the light and sound was a sign of the inward miracle wrought upon the heart of Saul by the Holy Spirit “delivering him from the power of darkness, and translating him into the kingdom of God’s dear Son” (Colossians 1:13); and he who denies that the conversion of the sinner is a miracle (that is, supernatural) point-blank denies the authority of inspiration (II

Corinthians 4:6; Genesis 1:3; II Corinthians 5:17-18; Ephesians 2:1-10; John 5:25; Acts 9:1-22).

If creation and resurrection are not miraculous or supernatural, then surely nothing can be; and such atheistic philosophy would thrust God out of both his natural and his spiritual universe.

In view of Saul's conversion, and the Scriptures, just cited, it is no wonder that even *Mr. John Wesley* wrote: "It may be allowed, that God acts as sovereign in convincing some souls of sin, arresting them in their mad career by his resistless power. It seems, also, that at the moment of our conversion, he acts irresistibly" (*Wesley's Works*, vol. 6., p. 136, as quoted in *Watson's Theological Institutes*, vol. 2., p. 444).

The conversion of Saul of Tarsus illustrates the saying of God quoted by Paul from Isaiah (Isaiah 45:1; Romans 10:20: "*I was found of them that sought me not; I was made manifest unto them that asked not after me.*") The case of Cornelius, the Roman centurion (Acts 10), illustrates what has been called the other class of conversions, which fulfill the promise: "*Ye shall seek me and find me, when ye shall search for me with all your heart*" (Jeremiah 29:13).

This language of the Lord by Jeremiah was addressed to *the chosen people of God* then in Babylonian captivity, and it was a most comforting prediction to them: "For thus saith the Lord, that after seventy years be accomplished at Babylon I will visit you, and perform my good word toward you, in causing you to return to this place. For I know the thoughts that I think toward you, saith the Lord, thoughts of peace, and not evil, to give you an expected end. Then shall ye call upon me, and ye shall go and pray unto me, and I will hearken unto you. And ye shall seek me, and find me, when ye shall search for me with all your heart. And I will be found of you, saith the Lord: and I will turn away your captivity, and I will gather you from all the nations, and from all the places whither I have driven you, saith the Lord: and I will bring you again into the place whence I caused you to be carried away captive" (Jeremiah 29:10-14).

These were the chosen people of God all the time, and it was certain, from this Divine prediction, that in the fullness of time they would call upon and seek the Lord with their whole heart, and be found of him, and be delivered from their captivity." (*Hassell's History* ppg195- 201)

E. Deuteronomy Pressense—quoted by Hassell: Every great truth which is to win a triumphal way must become incarnate in some one man, and derive, from a living, fervent heart, that passion and power which constrain and subdue. So long as it remains in the cold region of mere ideas, it exercises no mighty

influence over mankind. The truths of religion are not exceptions to this law. God, therefore, prepared a man who was to represent in the primitive church the great cause of the emancipation of Christianity, and whose mission it was to free it completely from the bonds of the synagogue.

This man was St. Paul, and never had noble truth a nobler organ. He brought to its service an heroic heart, in which fervent love was joined to indomitable courage, and a mind equally able to rise to the loftiest heights of speculation and to penetrate into the deepest recesses of the human soul. All these great qualities were enhanced by absolute devotedness to Jesus Christ, and a self-abnegation such as, apart from the sacrifice of the Redeemer, has had no parallel upon earth.

His life was one perpetual offering up of himself. His sufferings have contributed, no less than his indefatigable activity, to the triumph of his principles. Standing ever in the breach for their defense—subject to most painful contradictions, not only from the Jews, but from his brethren—execrated by his own nation—maligned by a fanatic and intolerant section of the church, and threatened with death by those Gentiles whose claims he so boldly advocated—he suffered as scarcely any other has suffered in the service of truth; but he left behind a testimony most weighty and powerful, every word sealed with the seal of a martyr.

With the exception of Peter in the case of Cornelius, Paul was the first Apostle to the Gentiles, and being more especially called to that work, he devoted his noble life to it, and visited many countries, and that repeatedly—preaching the unsearchable riches of Christ, and thus inaugurating, as it were, the universal triumph of Christianity.

It was needful that the door of the church should be opened to the thousands of proselytes from Corinth, Athens, Ephesus, and Rome, who came up to it and knocked. But the great Apostle to the Gentiles was not satisfied with this irresistible argument from facts; he added to it reasoning equally able and eloquent, and armed with dialectics perfectly adapted to the habits of mind of his opponents, he victoriously established his principles.

The epistles in which these reasonings have in part come down to us, bear in every page the impress of his heart and mind; they show us the whole man, and the very style depicts in vivid characters his moral physiognomy. His polemics are especially admirable, because with him a negative always leads to a weightier affirmation; he never destroys without replacing, and, like his Master, only abolishes by fulfilling.

He is not only an incomparable dialectician in the subversion of error, but he is able also to discern all consequences of a truth, and to grasp its marrow and inner substance. This great controversialist is, therefore, at the same time, the first representative of that true Christian mysticism which St. John was so fully to develop.

St. Paul triumphed over Judaism only by putting in its place Christianity in all its breadth and beauty. What holiness, strength, nobleness of character he displayed in the course of his ministry, his history shows. St. Paul is the type of the reformer in the church; in every fresh struggle for the church's freedom, his will be the track in which courageous Christians will follow. No true reformation can be wrought in any spirit other than that of Paul—a spirit equally removed from the timidity which preserves that which should be destroyed, and the rashness which destroys that which should be preserved.

When God is forming a powerful instrument for the accomplishment of his designs, the process of preparation is long and gradual. Every circumstance was brought to bear on the education of the chosen witness, and every experience, even of wrong and error, is made to enhance the power and completeness of the testimony rendered. When a man is called to effect some great religious reformation, it is important that he should himself have an experimental acquaintance with the order of things which he is to reverse or transform.

The education of Saul the Pharisee was to him what the convent of Erfurt was to Luther. It was well that he who was to break the yoke of Jewish legalism should himself have first suffered under its bondage. Thus while the question of the emancipation of Christianity had been stated by men belonging, like Stephen, to the most liberal section of Judaism, the Hellenist Jews, it was to receive its final solution from a man who had himself felt the full weight of the yoke.

Saul belonged to a Jewish family rigidly attached to the sect of the Pharisees. His name, which signifies "The desired one," had led some commentators to suppose that he being born like Samuel, after hope long delayed, was, like him, specially consecrated by his parents to the service of God, and therefore sent from his early childhood to Jerusalem to study the sacred writings in the most famous school of the age. However this may be, it is evident that his mind had a natural bent toward such studies.

He may have received some intellectual development in his own city. Strabo tells us that literary and philosophical studies had been carried so far at Tarsus that the schools of Cilicia eclipsed those of Athens and of Alexandria. It appears, however, from the evidence of Philostratus, that a light and rhetorical school of

learning predominated at Tarsus; more attention was paid to brilliance of expression than to depth of philosophical thought.

The life of the East there revealed in boundless luxury, and the corruption of manner reached its utmost length. The young Jew, endowed with a high-toned morality, may well have conceived a deep disgust for this Pagan civilization; and these first impressions may have tended to develop in him an excessive attachment to the religion of his fathers.

We may, probably, attribute to his abode at Tarsus the literary culture displayed in his writings. He familiarly quotes the Greek poets, and poets of the second order, such as Cleanthes or Aratus (Acts 17:28,) Menander (I Corinthians 15:33) and Epimenides (Titus 1:12). According to the custom of the rabbis of the time, he had learned a manual trade, and, as the Cilician fabrics of goat's hair were famous for their strength, he had chosen the calling of a tent-maker.

Jerusalem was the place of his religious education. He was placed in the school of Gamaliel, the most celebrated rabbi of his age (Acts 22:3). We know how fully the scholastic spirit was developed among the Jews at this period. To the companies of the prophets had succeeded the schools of the rabbis; the living productions of the Divine Spirit had been replaced by commentaries of the minutest detail, and the sacred text seemed in danger of being completely overgrown by rabbinical glosses, as by a parasitic vegetation. The Talmudic traditions fill twelve large folios and 2,947 leaves.

Whilst an ingenious and learned school, formed at Alexandria, had contrived, by a system of allegorical interpretation, to infuse Platonism into the Old Testament, the school at Jerusalem had been growing increasingly rigid, and interdicted any such daring exegesis. It clung with fanatic attachment to the letter of the Scriptures; but, failing to comprehend the spirit, it sank into all the puerilities of a narrow literalism. Its interpretations lacked both breadth and depth; it surrendered itself to the subtleties of purely verbal dialectics.

Cleverly to combine texts—to suspend on a single word the thin threads of an ingenious argument—such was the sole concern of the rabbis. Gamaliel appears to have been the most skilled of all the doctors of the law. He is still venerated in Jewish tradition under the title of “Gamaliel the Aged.” The “Mishna” quotes him as an authority. We are inclined to believe that he may have been less in bondage than the other doctors of his day to narrow literalism, and that he may have maintained a spirit more upright and elevated. His benevolent intervention on behalf of the church at Jerusalem distinguishes him honorably from those implacable Jews who were ready to defend their prejudices by bloody persecutions. The fact of his having had a disciple like Saul of tarsus, who must

have been through his whole life characterized by a grave moral earnestness, leads us to suppose a true superiority in the teaching of Gamaliel. He had not got beyond the standpoint of legalism, but this he at least presented in its unimpaired and unabated majesty. He was not a man to delude the conscience with subterfuges, and his disciples were therefore disposed to austerity of life, and were distinguished by a scrupulous fidelity to the religion of their fathers.

Saul of Tarsus embraced the teachings of his illustrious master with characteristic earnestness and ardor, and, it must be added, infused into it all the passionate vehemence belonging to his nature. At the feet of Gamaliel he became practiced in those skillful dialectics which were the pride of the rabbinical schools, and he thus received from Judaism itself the formidable weapon with which he was afterward to deal it such mortal blows.

Here he gained a profound knowledge of the Old Testament. Gifted with a strong and keen intellect, he in a few years acquired all the learning of his master. He thus amassed, without knowing it, precious materials for his future polemics; but his moral and religious development in this phase of his life is of more importance to us than his intellectual acquirements. With all his knowledge he might have become, at the most, the first of the Jewish doctors, surpassing even Gamaliel, and shedding some glory on the decadence of his people; but he could never have derived from that vast learning the spirit of the reformer, which was to make him immortal in the church.

It is in the depths of his inner life that we must seek the distinctive character of his early religion; he has himself accurately described it when he says, that being “taught according to the perfect manner of the law of the fathers,” he “was zealous toward God” (Acts 22:3). Saul was no hypocrite, and, therefore, the burning words of rebuke spoken to his sect in general by our Lord did not apply to him. He was conscientious and honest in all his devotional exercises, and verily thought that salvation was attainable by the strict observance of the Judaistic rites and ceremonies. He says himself that he was “as touching the law blameless” (Philippians 3:6). And again says: “I profited in the Jews’ religion above many my equals (in years) in mine own nation, being more exceedingly zealous of the traditions of my fathers” (Galatians 1:14).

Yet this is the same man who, by the grace of God, was made willing to count all things loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus his Lord. For, says he, “when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died; and the commandment which was ordained to life I found to be unto death” (Romans 7:9-10).

After his baptism he conferred not with flesh and blood, but went forth immediately preaching Jesus to the heathen (Galatians 1:16). Yea, saith he, “Unto me, who am less than the least of all saints, is this grace given, that I should preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ” (Ephesians 3:8). The spirit that was mighty in Peter to the circumcision, was powerful in Paul to the Gentiles (Galatians 2:8). He was the great Apostle of the Gentiles, and he magnified his office. He could not adduce any external connection with the Savior in the days of his flesh, as could the other Apostles; he had not seen the historic Christ, so to speak, but he had seen the ascended and glorified Christ. This sight of him, however, was not a mere vision; it was miraculous and positive, and it confers on St. Paul an authority in no way inferior to that of the twelve Apostles.

But it is equally true that, in this respect, he more nearly represents the numerous generations of Christians who have had no outward relations with the incarnate Savior. Again he stands apart from that symbolic number of the twelve, which points to the ancient tribes of Israel. He is the Apostle of the church as it bursts the confines of Judaism; the Apostle of mankind rather than that of a nation.

Lastly, he did not receive his office by transmission: Ananias, who laid his hands on him, was a simple believer. His Apostolate was conferred on him by direct revelation. It stands in no relation to any positive institution, but it carries its own glorious witness in its results. The revelation “which he received in the temple at Jerusalem bore directly on his mission to the Gentiles (Acts 22:21); and thus presupposed an enlargement of his religious views.—Pressense (*Hassell’s History* ppg 232- 236)

E. Stock—Quoted by Hassell: His journeys were extensive, and ranged in different and distant portions of the Roman Empire. He was usually accompanied by one or more brethren in these travels, and the labors, exposures and persecutions that they experienced were wonderful indeed. Paul made four principal journeys in the discharge of his Apostolic and ministerial duties among the Gentiles.

First Journey.—From Antioch in Syria by land to Seleucia; by sea to Salamis in Cyprus; by land to Paphos; by sea to Perga; to Antioch in Pisidia, Iconium, Lystra, Derbe; back from Derbe to Lystra, Iconium, Antioch in Pisidia, Perga, Attalia; by sea to Seleucia and Antioch in Syria (Acts 13; 14).

Second Journey.—From Antioch in Syria by land to Tarsus, Derbe, Lystra, Iconium, Antioch in Pisidia; through Phrygia, Galatia and Mysia, to Troas; by sea to Neapolis; to Philippi, Thessalonica, Berea; by sea to Athens; by land to

Corinth; by sea to Ephesus; by sea to Caesarea; by land to Jerusalem; back to Antioch in Syria (Acts 15:40-18:22).

Third Journey.—From Antioch in Syria, through Cilicia and Cappadocia to Galatia and Phrygia; through the province of Asia to Ephesus; from Ephesus to Macedonia (probably by sea); to Corinth (probably by land); by sea to Traos; by land to Assos; by sea along the coast to Asia to Miletus, Rhodes, Patara; by sea to Tyre; by land to Caesarea and Jerusalem (Acts 18:22-21:15).”

Fourth Journey.—From Caesarea by sea to Sidon and Myra (in Lycia); by sea round the south side of Crete, across the sea of Adria to Melita; by sea to Syracuse, Rhegium, Puteoli; by land to Rome.—*E. Stock. (Hassell's History pp 236, 237)*

Have the ministerial labors of any man ever surpassed those of the Apostle Paul? Because he was not chosen an Apostle by the other Apostles, and did not derive his authority as such from them or any institution in Judea, many doubted his Apostleship and caused divers accusations to be preferred against him; but it was absolutely certain that the signs of an Apostle attended his labors and ministry, and there were no reasonable grounds for disputing the same.

The first Apostles could point to the work in Jerusalem and in Samaria, but he could point to that which was done in Antioch, Paphos, Iconium, Derbe, Syltra, Philippi, Corinth, and to all the churches founded by him in various parts of the world. The council held by the Apostles and Elders in Jerusalem sanctioned the authority of Paul's Apostolate, his doctrine preached unto the Gentiles, and their release from the burdens of the Jewish ritual. (*Hassell's History pg 237*)

E. Deuteronomy Pressense—Quoted by Hassell: The Divine Spirit works not less mightily in Paul than in Peter, but the apostolic office is more distinctly observable. The thousands converted on the day of Pentecost and in Solomon's porch were acted upon together by a sudden and irresistible influence, produced by the first outpouring of the Holy Spirit.

Conversions in masses like these do not occur in this second period of the church. The proselytes are many, but they are made personally, one by one. When we come to examine Paul's teaching, we shall see how wise he was in the adaptation of his discourse to the circumstances of his hearers, and how admirably he sought and found the point of contact between those he addressed and the gospel he preached.

His ministry is accompanied with miracles, but he has less frequent recourse than earlier preachers to this method of persuasion. In many places he founded

churches without the aid of external miracles. In these missions of the Apostle to the Gentiles, therefore, the Divine Spirit works more directly upon the conscience and less by external manifestations. Man cannot derive any glory to himself from this fact; for though God's method of intervention assumes a different form, it is none the less to this sovereign intervention of grace that the most beautiful fruits of the Apostle's labor are to be ascribed.—Pressense. (*Hassell's History pg 238*)

PAUL: When was he born again? *C.H. Cayce:* He was regenerated while on his way from Jerusalem to Damascus to bind and cast in prison those who called on the name of the Lord. When he was brought before the king, Agrippa, for the doctrine he taught, and his teaching was there called in question, and he made his memorable defense before the king, the first thing he did was to relate his experience; he told what “great things the Lord had done for him.”

As he was on his way the Lord spoke to him. When the Lord speaks to the dead, He imparts life. Saul was in love with sin, and a hater of the Lord; but he was made alive to his condition. He saw that he was a great sinner, and cried out, “Who art thou, Lord?” The Lord did not need a preacher to introduce Him, or to make Him known to Saul. He said, “I am Jesus, whom thou persecutest.” This was equivalent to saying, “I am your Savior.” Saul now possessed a will which he did not have when he left Jerusalem.

When he started on the journey he had a will to persecute the saints of God; but now he had a will to know and do the Lord's will. Hence he said, “Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?” Will springs from life, and as he now has a righteous will—a will to serve the Lord—which he did not have before, it simply shows that he now has a life which he did not have before.” (*Cayce's Editorials vol. 2, ppg 360, 361*)

Peasants' War, The

The PEASANTS' WAR (*See under Martin LUTHER*)

Pelagianism

PELAGIANISM: Sylvester Hassell: As the remedy is determined by the disease, one's whole system of theology is decided by his view of original sin. Pelagianism (so called from Pelagius, a British monk of the fifth century), which is a form, not of Christianity, but of Rationalism, asserts that Adam's sin injured only himself; that men are born into the world in the same unfallen state in which Adam was created; that men may, and sometimes do, live without sin; that the law is as good a system

of salvation as the gospel; that men have no need of divine assistance in order to be holy; and that Christianity has no essential superiority over heathenism or natural religion.” (*Hassell’s History pg 51*)

Sylvester Hassell Among the fine products of Catholic Monasticism and Alexandrian Platonic Philosophy were Pelagianism and Semi-Pelagianism, against which unscriptural errors Augustine was, in the fifth century, the chief champion of the truth, and he is still regarded by many as the ablest advocate of the doctrine of grace since the days of the Apostles. His *Confessions* still extant, and written in his forty-sixth year, show that he had a deep Christian experience, a most remarkable Divine change from extraordinary sinfulness to extraordinary devotion, a translation from nature to grace, realized while in a passion of tears praying for deliverance from the bondage of his sins and opening the Bible at the passage, “Not in rioting and drunkenness, not in chambering and wantonness, not in strife and envying. But put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ, and make not provision for the flesh, to fulfill the lusts thereof” (Romans 13:13-14).

In his *Retractions*, written in his seventy-first year, he acknowledges his fallibility, and conscientiously seeks to withdraw every known error from his writings.

Pelagius, a British *monk* and legal moralist, and Coelestius, a Scotch or Irish Lawyer, residing at Rome, converted by Pelagius to *monasticism* (neither of them having, it would seem, any Christian experience), were the founders of Pelagianism. **John Cassian**, a Greek *monk*, either by birth or education, or both, a pupil of John Chrysostom (a convert to the Alexandrian Platonic anthropology), and a founder of convents for men and women at Massilia (or Marseilles) in Gaul, a Greek colony, was the founder of **Semi-Pelagianism**, or Cassianism, or Massilianism.

Both Pelagianism and Semi-Pelagianism are superficial, rationalistic, unchristian forms of self-righteousness, and they shade almost imperceptibly into each other; indeed, in their final analysis, they are really one. Pelagianism has been called human monergism—a system of salvation according to which man is represented as saving himself; Semi-Pelagianism has been called synergism—a system of salvation according to which divine grace and human free-will equally cooperate to effect man’s salvation; and Augustinianism has been called divine monergism—a system of salvation according to which God alone is represented as saving the sinner.

Pelagianism regards man as well and sound and strong, and able to do all he needs for himself; Semi-Pelagianism regards man as sick, but conscious and able to desire the help of a physician, and either accept or refuse such help when offered, and that, unless he cooperate with divine grace, he will be lost; Augustinianism regards man as dead in sin, and absolutely needing God to quicken and save him. Pelagianism and Semi-Pelagianism are one, in *referring the actual cause of salvation to man*; Augustinianism, on the contrary, refers *the actual cause of salvation to God*.

Pelagianism declares that Adam's fall hurt himself alone, and not his posterity; that all men are born in a sinless condition, and can keep the law of God and thus insure their own salvation; and thus that there is no need either of the atonement of Christ or the regeneration of the Holy Spirit. As will be plainly seen, *Pelagianism is paganism, being an utter denial of the Scriptures from beginning to end*; although Pelagius and Coelestius invented ingenious and plausible arguments to prove that their positions were *scriptural*, and that there was really *no difference* between them and their opponents.

Semi-Pelagianism declares that men, though born in sin, are not born *entirely* sinful, but have *some good* still remaining in them, and that this good must form a joint partnership with God in order to insure the sinner's salvation; that sometimes grace anticipates the human will, and draws it, though not irresistibly to God; but that *usually* the human will must take the initiative, and determine itself to conversion; that in no instance can divine grace operate independently of the free self-determination of man; that, as the husbandman must do his part, but all avails nothing without the divine blessing, so man must do his part, yet this profits nothing without divine grace, *neither does divine grace profit anything without the work of man*.

Semi-Pelagianism thus, in the same manner, if not to the same extent, as Pelagianism, depreciates the grace of God, the atonement of Christ, and the regeneration of the Holy Spirit, exalts the ability, pride and work of man not only to a level with, but, virtually, to a superiority over the work of God in salvation, since God does or offers to do the same for all men, and man himself does that which actually makes him to differ from the lost, and actually carries him to Heaven.

Thus Semi-Pelagianism strongly tends to Pelagianism, and ultimately and logically identifies itself with it, *making man his own Savior*. John Cassian, *the author of this system*, defends, in his Seventeenth "Conference of the Fathers," *occasional falsehood*; and, in his Twentieth "Conference," tries to show that there are "*several ways of obtaining remission of sins besides through the death and intercession of Christ*."

Arminianism differs from Semi-Pelagianism chiefly in declaring that all men are born *entirely corrupt*, and must have divine grace operate upon them before they can think or will any good thing; but it also affirms that *divine grace operates upon all men*, and that *each man's salvation actually depends upon the use which his own free-will makes of that grace*; so that Arminianism, like Pelagianism and Semi-Pelagianism, represents God as making salvation possible to all men but sure to none, and represents man as at last doing that which really saves him—*makes man his own Savior*. The great majority of the professedly Christian world are Arminians." (*Hassell's History* ppg 395-397)

Pentecost

PENTECOST: Sylvester Hassell: Pentecost was spoken of by Josephus as the feast of the great assembly. According to the Jewish tradition, it was the anniversary of the promulgation of the Jewish law. Never were there such wonders performed at the celebration of this feast in Jerusalem as when the Holy Ghost came down and filled the hearts of the disciples with the fire of heavenly love, and enabled them to proclaim the gospel in the various languages of the world.

The miracle of Pentecost was an enacted prophecy of the happy time, when all the diversities created by evil (among the redeemed) will be lost in the unity of love. Is not this prophecy receiving a constant fulfillment as Christianity masters, one after another, the languages of mankind, and makes them the media for conveying its immortal truths? “The church in her humility,” says the venerable Bede, “reforms the unity of language broken by pride.”

The Apostles had received the Holy Ghost before the Pentecostal tongues of fire were displayed, in a measure, but on that occasion they were completely filled with his presence. All the barriers between earth and heaven seemed to be removed.

Until this time the young church might be compared to a ship, ready to depart, its sails spread for the winds. The breath from on high now blows upon it; it is no longer an inert mass, it is an animated body; it may set forth on its flight over all seas, and be they stormy or calm, it shall be ever advancing towards its appointed haven. (*Hassell's History pg 228*)

Pentecostalism

PENTECOSTALISM: C.H. Cayce: They claim to heal the sick, drink poisons, get a second work of grace, speak with tongues, prophesy, and interpret tongues. I heard one of them state they had raised a man from the dead. Please send me Scripture, chapter and verse, that will forever fix their doctrine. This a broad request. It would be rather hard for us to find language to express our opinion fully concerning such teaching and such claims. If you wish to know how sincere these people are in making such claims, get some of them to go with you to a drug store, and then you get some carbolic acid, arsenic, or some deadly poison from the druggist, and then ask those hypocritical fanatics to swallow it. The way they will refuse will make you smile. If you have a cripple in your community, or one whose joints are all drawn with rheumatism, try to get them to prove their power in healing such cases. Their humbuggery will be exposed at once. Any fool can utter strange sounds with the tongue. When the disciples spoke with tongues, they uttered another language. These fanatics do not speak any language at all in this jargon. Hence, they do not speak with tongues. Get some man who understands and can speak Greek, Latin, German, French or Spanish, to give them a few sentences in

either of those languages, and see what kind of out they will make in trying to interpret tongues. If they do anything, they will make fools of themselves. As to their statement that they had raised a man from the dead, it is utterly and basely false. Ask them to prove it. Get them to go with you to a cemetery and try their hand in your presence. They will not go, but you can try to get them to go, and thereby prove that they are falsifying. As to their claims here mentioned, it seems to us that any person with ordinary intelligence would know better. But if some man should come along teaching that the devil is a goat, or a small fish in the deep blue sea, some people would have no better sense than to fall in with the notion. Concerning the claim of sinless perfection in this life, the following Scriptures forever silence that claim: I Kings 8:46; Ecclesiastes 7:20; I John 1:8-10.” (CAYCE vol. 2, ppg 237,238)

Pepin, The Donation Of

The Donation of PEPIN (See under CHARLEMAGNE)

Persecution by Roman Emperors

PERSECUTION by Roman Emperors: Sylvester Hassell: Considering the character which both the emperor and the proconsul sustained for mildness of disposition and gentleness of manners, it has occasioned no small perplexity to many, and even to some of our philosophic historians, how to account for the circumstance that such men should be found on the list of persecutors, and at the same time to admit the unoffending deportment of the Christians. Mr. Warburton has given a very satisfactory solution of this difficulty; and, though the passage be rather long, I shall transcribe the substance of it in this place.

“The Pagan world having early imbibed this inveterate prejudice concerning intercommunity of worship, men were too much accustomed to new revelations, when the Jewish appeared, not to acknowledge its superior pretensions. Accordingly we find, by the history of this people, that it was esteemed by its neighbors a true one; and therefore they proceeded to join it occasionally with their own as those did whom the King of Assyria sent into the cities of Israel in the place of the ten tribes. Whereby it happened, so great was the influence of this principle, that, in the same time and country, the Jews of Jerusalem added the Pagan idolatries to their religion, while the Pagans of Samaria added the Jewish religion to their idolatries.”

““But when these people of God, in consequence of having their dogmatic theology more carefully inculcated to them, after their return from the captivity, became rigid, in maintaining not only that their religion was true, but *the only true one*, then it was that they began to be treated by their neighbors, and afterward by the Greeks and Romans, with the utmost hatred and contempt for this their inhumanity and

unsociable temper. To this cause alone we are to ascribe all that spleen and rancor which appear in the histories of these later nations concerning them.”

“Celsus fairly reveals what lay at the bottom, and speaks out for them all: ‘If the Jews on these accounts,’ says he, ‘adhere to their own law, it is not for *that* they are to blame: I rather blame those who forsake their own country religion to embrace the Jewish. But if these people give themselves airs of sublimer wisdom than the rest of the world, and on that score refuse all communion with it, as not equally pure, I must tell them that it is not to be believed that they are more dear or agreeable to God than other nations.’”

“Hence, among the Pagans, the Jews came to be distinguished from all other people by the name of *a race of men odious to the gods*, and with good reason. This was the reception the Jews met with in the world.”

“When Christianity arose, though on the foundation of Judaism, it was at first received with great complacency by the Pagan world. The gospel was favorably heard, and the superior evidence with which it was enforced inclined men, long habituated to pretended revelations, to receive it into the number of the established religions. Accordingly, we find one Roman emperor introducing it among his closet religions; and another promising to the senate to give it a more public entertainment.”

“But when it was found to carry its pretensions higher, and, like the Jewish, to claim the title of *the only true one*, then it was that it began to incur the same hatred and contempt with the Jewish. But when it went still further, and urged the necessity of all men forsaking their own national religions and embracing the gospel, this so shocked the Pagans that it soon brought upon itself the bloody storm that followed. Thus you have the true origin of persecution for religion; a persecution not committed, but undergone, by the Christian Church.”

“Hence we see how it happened that such good emperors as Trajan and Mark Antonine came to be found in the first rank of persecutors; a difficulty that hath very much embarrassed the inquirers into ecclesiastical antiquity, and given a handle to the deists, who empoison everything, of pretending to suspect that there must have been something very much amiss in primitive Christianity, while such wise magistrates could become its persecutors.”

“But the reason is now manifest. The Christian pretensions overthrew a fundamental principle of paganism, which they thought founded in nature, namely the friendly intercommunity of worship. And thus the famous passage of Pliny the younger becomes intelligible. ‘For I did not in the least hesitate, but that whatever should appear on confession to be their faith, yet that their forwardness and inflexible obstinacy would certainly deserve punishment.’”

“What was the ‘inflexible obstinacy?’ It could not be in professing a new religion; that was a thing common enough. It was the refusing to throw a grain of incense on their altars. For we must not think, as is commonly imagined, that this was at first enforced by the magistrate to make them renounce their religion; but only to give a test of its hospitality and sociableness of temper. It was indeed, and rightly too, understood by the Christians to be a renouncing of their religion, and so accordingly abstained from.”

“The misfortune was that the Pagans did not consider the inflexibility as a mere error, but as an immorality likewise. The unsociable, uncommunicable temper, in matters of religious worship, was esteemed by the best of them as a hatred and aversion to mankind. Thus Tacitus, speaking of the burning of Rome, calls the Christians ‘persons *convicted* of hatred of all mankind.’ But how? The confession of the Pagans themselves, concerning the purity of the Christian morals, shows this could be no other than a being ‘convicted; of *rejecting all intercommunity of worship*; which, so great was their prejudice, they thought could proceed from nothing but hatred towards mankind.’”

“Universal prejudice had made men regard a refusal of this intercommunity as the most brutal of all dissociability. And the Emperor Julian, who understood this matter the best of any, fairly owns that the Jews and Christians brought the execration of the world upon them by their aversion to the gods of paganism, and their refusal of all communication with them.”

“From what took place in the province of Bithynia, under the government of the mild and amiable Pliny, a tolerably correct judgment may be formed of the state of Christianity during the reign of Trajan, *in every other part of the empire.*” One more instance it may suffice to mention. ‘While Pliny was thus conducting matters in Bithynia, the province of Syria was under the government of Tiberianus. There is still extant a letter which he addressed to Trajan, in which he says: ‘I am quite wearied with punishing and destroying the Galileans, or those of the sect called Christians, according to your orders. Yet they never cease to profess voluntarily what they are, and to offer themselves to death. Wherefore I have labored by exhortations and threats to discourage them from daring to confess to me that they are of that sect. Yet, in spite of all persecution, they continue still to do it. Be pleased therefore to inform me what your highness thinks proper to be done with them.’”

We have now given a minute description of the character and sufferings of Christians in the early part of the second century and wish the Primitive Baptists of the nineteenth century to look into this mirror well and see if they do not discover their own image reflected. Were they not there then as they are here now, surrounded by religionists, who hated and persecuted them because they would not consent to an intercommunity of worship?

The doctrine of salvation by grace from first to last, as entertained by the Primitive Baptists of nineteenth century, thought detested by some of the professed Christian denominations around them and disliked by others—the ordinances of Baptism and the Lord’s Supper, though entirely ignored by some and derided by others—would be no bar to fellowship, by the various denominations around them, if the Baptists desired such fellowship and would sanction and unite in the worship of their neighbors, and aid in building up and endowing the various and numerous societies and enterprises which they have invented and set up as a means of salvation of human souls from sin and from hell.

It is for their “obstinacy” they are hated, for their “selfishness,” for their want of “sociability,” for their refusing “intercommunity of worship” with the numerous establishments around them, that they are held to be unchristian, and ignorant and barbarous. It is not only because they refuse connection with all other denominations and will have nothing to do with their religious movements, but because they maintain that all others are *wrong* and they alone are *right*; that all others are *unscriptural*; that all others are *disregarding* the pattern given by the primitive saints, and they are the only people *copying and following* that pattern as clearly set forth in the first and second centuries. The early Christians did not believe that Jupiter or Mars, Venus or Diana, or even the image of Caligula, or Trajan, could save a sinner from sin and eternal punishment, and would not, therefore, *under forfeiture of their lives, throw one grain of incense upon their altars, or give any sign or speak one word in adoration of them.*

For this *unsociable temper* they would share the fate of their brethren in the days of Trajan and other Roman emperors, but for the civil and religious liberty which God has been pleased to confer upon them in England and the United States and some other portions of the earth.” (*Hassell’s History ppg361-365*) (*See also the article on PLINY*)

Peter Lombard

PETER LOMBARD (*See under The SACRAMENTS*)

Peter of Bruys and the Petrobrusians

PETER of Bruys and the PETROBRUSIANS: Sylvester Hassell: In the first years of the twelfth century Peter of Bruys (Petrobrusians) went forth like another John the Baptist, full of the Spirit and of power, and lived for twenty years as an evangelist in the south of France, which he seems to have filled completely with his doctrine, till he was overtaken by the wrath of the priesthood he had challenged, and was burned alive by a mob of monastics somewhere about 1120. Thus the seed was planted of what widened afterward into the famous and greatly dreaded “heresy of

the Waldenses and Albigenses.” Peter of Bruys was a strong Bible Baptist. The Catholic monk, **Peter the Venerable**, arraigns him on five charges, for denying infant baptism, respect for churches, the worship of the cross, transubstantiation and prayers, alms and oblations for the dead. He baptized all who joined his communion, whether they had ever been immersed or not. On one occasion he made a great bonfire of all the crosses he could find, and cooked meat over the fire, and distributed it to the congregation. The followers of Peter de Bruys were called **Petrobrusians**. Toward the end of his career Peter was joined by an ardent and eloquent younger disciple or fellow-laborer, Henry the Deacon, or Henry of Lausanne, who labored in the same spirit and country for nearly thirty years after the death of Peter de Bruys, and was at last (in 1147) for heresy by the Catholic authorities, and died in prison. His followers were called **Henricians**. **Arnold of Brescia** fearlessly and powerfully preached the same anti-sacerdotalism in Italy, and, for nine years, maintained in Rome itself a republic in open defiance of emperor and pope. Frederick Barbarossa and Adrian VI were united in their common dread and hatred of republicanism. Their forces captured Arnold, who was, by an officer of the pope, first strangled as a rebel and then burned as a heretic, and his ashes cast into the Tiber (1155). This is said to have been the first time when the Catholic “Church” put a man to death with its own hand, instead of delivering him for execution to the secular power. For its own *nominal* exculpation, it has generally preferred to wield the temporal sword through the carnal hand of some civil magistrate; but the guilt is as much its own in the one case as in the other.” (*Hassell’s History* pg 438)

Peter The Hermit

PETER The Hermit (*See under The CRUSADES*)

Peter The Venerable

PETER the Venerable (*See under PETER de Bruys*)

Peter, The Apostle

The Apostle PETER: Sylvester Hassell (Quoting Pressense: During all this early time the influence of the apostle Peter predominates. The part thus taken by him has been urged as a proof of his primacy. But on closer examination it will be seen that he does but exercise his native gifts, purified and ennobled by the Divine Spirit. Peter was the son of a fisherman named Jonas, of the village of Bethsaida, in Galilee (Matthew 16:17; John 1:44).

He was among the disciples of John the Baptist, and was thus prepared to respond favorably to the call of Jesus Christ. He soon received his vocation as an Apostle.

His disposition was quick and ardent, but his zeal was blended with presumption and pride. Living in constant contact with the Master as one of the three disciples who enjoyed his closest intimacy, he conceived for him a strong affection.

His impetuous nature was, however, far from being at once brought under control. He had noble impulses, like that which prompted his grand testimony to the Savior: "Thou art the Christ of God" (Matthew 16:16). But he was also actuated by many an earthly motive, which drew down upon him the Master's sharp reproach. Once, under the influence of Jewish prejudice, he repelled with indignation the idea of the humiliating death of Christ. At another time he was eager to appear more courageous than all the other disciples, and, again yielding to his natural impetuosity, he drew his sword to defend him whose "kingdom is not of this world."

It was needful that the yet incoherent elements of his moral nature should be thrown into the crucible of trial. His shameful fall resulted in a decisive moral crisis, which commenced in that moment when, pierced to the heart by the look of Christ, he went out of the court of the high priest and wept bitterly.

He appears entirely changed in the last interview he has with the Savior on the shores of Lake Tiberias. Jesus Christ restores him after his three-fold denial, by calling forth a threefold confession of his love (John 21:15).

Nothing but determined prejudice could construe the tender solicitude of the Master for this disciple into an official declaration of his primacy. We are here in the region of feeling alone, not on the standing ground of right and legal institutions.

Nor has the primacy of Peter any more legal foundation in the famous passage, "Thou art Peter." Jesus Christ admirably characterized by this image the ardent and generous nature of his disciple, and that courage of the pioneer which marked him out as the first laborer in the foundation of the primitive church. The son of Jonas was its most active, and, as it were, its first stone (laid on Christ, the chief cornerstone).

He was also the rock against which the first tempest from without spent its fury. Beyond this, the narrative of Saint Luke lends no countenance to any hierarchical notions. The church passed through an experience of three hundred years before any organized body of professed Christians attached the Romish sense to Matthew 16:18.

Everything is natural and spontaneous in the conduct of St. Peter. He is not official president of a sort of Apostolic college. He acts only with the concurrence of his brethren, whether in the choice of a new Apostle (Acts 1:15), or at Pentecost (Acts 2:14), or before the Sanhedrim.

Peter had been the most deeply humbled of the disciples, therefore he was the first to be exalted. John's part being at this time inconspicuous, no other Apostle is named with Peter, because he fills the whole scene with his irrepressible zeal and indefatigable activity.'—Pressense."

Even if Peter had been made by Christ the primate of the Apostles, there is not a shadow of Bible proof that Peter either had the right or attempted to confer such primacy upon a successor, still less upon the bishop of Rome, where there is no Bible proof of Peter's ever having been. The Catholic traditions about Peter's presence in Rome are irreconcilable contradictions.

Peter was married; the popes forbid clerical marriage. Peter had no silver or gold; the popes have their millions. In the council at Jerusalem Peter assumed no special authority, much less infallibility. Peter was publicly rebuked for his inconsistency by Paul, a younger Apostle, at Antioch; the popes are the lords of Catholicism. Peter in his epistles shows the deepest humility, and "prophetically warns against filthy avarice and lordly ambition, the besetting sins of the papacy." Peter emphatically teaches "the general priesthood and royalty of believers, obedience to God rather than man, condemnation of mental reservation in Ananias and Sapphira, and of simony in Simon Magus, opposition to the yoke of legal bondage, salvation in no other name but that of Jesus Christ." (*Hassell's History* ppg 228, 230)

Peter, The Books of 1st and 2nd

The Books of 1st and 2nd PETER: Sylvester Hassell: Peter, writing to the Pauline churches, confirms them in the Pauline faith. In the Gospels, the human nature of Simon appears most prominent; the Acts unfold the divine mission of Peter in the founding of the church, with a temporary relapse at Antioch (recorded in Galatians 2); in his epistles we see the complete triumph of Divine grace. Deeply humbled and softened, he gives the fruit of a rich spiritual experience. In no other epistles do the language and spirit come more directly home to the personal trials and wants and weaknesses of the Christian life. In his first epistle he warns against hierarchical ambition in prophetic anticipation of the abuse of his name among the Apostles (I Peter 5:1-4), calling himself simply "an Elder," and exhorting his fellow-Elders to "feed the flock of God, not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind; neither as being lords over God's heritage, but being ensamples to the flock." God overruled Peter's very sins and inconsistencies for his humiliation and spiritual progress.

Nowhere, except in Christ, do we find a spirit more humble, meek, gentle, tender, loving and lovely. Almost every word and incident in the gospel history connected with Peter left its impress upon his epistles in the way of humble or thankful reminiscence and allusion. Christ having prayed that his faith should not fail, and having looked upon him after his denial, Peter was enabled by Divine grace to weep bitterly and turn again to his Lord, and thus he is still strengthening his brethren.

Notwithstanding Paul's sharp rebuke of him before the church at Antioch, Peter, in his second epistle, makes an affectionate allusion to his "beloved brother Paul" and his profound writings, which he classes with the "other scriptures." Thus he proved how thoroughly the Spirit of Christ had, through experience, trained him to humility, meekness and self-denial. (*Hassell's History* ppg 211, 212)

Petrobrusians

PETROBRUSIANS (*See under PETER DE BRUYS*)

Pharisees

PHARISEES: Sylvester Hassell: The rulers in Judea were much troubled, about 100 years B.C., with dissensions, of a religious character, in their midst. The controversy between Pharisees and **Sadducees** increased, and the more rapidly as peace prevailed between Judea and other nations. Their views were quite opposite. "The Pharisees were moderate predestinarians; the Sadducees asserted free will. The Pharisees believed in the immortality of the soul and the existence of angels, though their creed on both these subjects was strongly tinged with Orientalism. The Sadducees denied both. The Pharisees received not merely the prophets, but the traditional law, likewise, as of equal authority with the books of Moses. The Sadducees, if they did not reject, considered the prophets greatly inferior to the law. The Sadducees are said to have derived their doctrine from Sadoc, the successor of Antigonus Socho in the presidency of the great Sanhedrim. Antigonus taught the lofty doctrine of pure and disinterested love and obedience to God, without regard to punishment or reward. Sadoc is said to have denied the latter, without maintaining the higher doctrine on which it was founded. Still, the Sadducees are far from what they are sometimes represented, the teachers of a loose and indulgent Epicureanism; they inculcated the belief in Divine Providence, and the just and certain administration of temporal rewards and punishments."

"The Pharisees had the multitude, ever led away by extravagant religious pretensions, entirely at their disposal: Sadduceism spread chiefly among the higher order. It would be unjust to the Sadducees to confound them with that unpatriotic and Hellenized party, which, during the whole of the noble struggles of the Maccabees, sided with the Syrian oppressors, for these are denounced as avowed apostates from Judaism; yet probably, after the establishment of the independent government, the latter might make common cause and become gradually mingled up with the Sadduceean party, as exposed alike to the severities of Pharisaic administration. During the rest of the Jewish history we shall find these parties as violently opposed to each other, and sometimes causing as fierce and dangerous dissensions as those which rent the commonwealths of Greece and Rome or the republican states of modern Europe" *Milman, quoted by Hassell (Hassell's History pg 165)*

Philemon, The Book Of

The Book of PHILEMON (See under *The Book of EPHESIANS*)

Philippians, The Book Of

The Book of PHILIPPIANS (See under *The Book of EPHESIANS*)

Philo

PHILO (See under *NEO-PLATONISM*)

Philpot, J. C.

J. C. PHILPOT: Sylvester Hassell: Joseph Charles Philpot (1802-69) was descended by both parents from Huguenot or French Calvinistic Protestant families. His health was always delicate. He was a distinguished graduate and fellow of Worcester College, Oxford University. In 1827, while acting as the private tutor of the sons of a wealthy gentleman in Ireland, the Lord sent him grievous affliction, and poured upon him the Spirit of grace and supplications, taught him his sinfulness, and blessed him with a sweet hope in Christ.

Returning to Oxford, he met, though still an Episcopalian, with contempt and persecution because of his inward, spiritual religion; so he left the University, and from 1828 to 1835 he was curate of Chislehampton and Stadhampton near Oxford. At this time "it was his custom on Sunday before the morning service to spend some time in the Sunday School, teaching the children the word of God, and then walk with them to meeting, where he preached extemporaneously about an hour; after the afternoon service he again went to the school and had the children assembled all around him to hear what they remembered of the sermon, and to explain to them what they could not understand of it, and then dismissed them with prayer. His day's labor was concluded by an exposition given on some portion of the Scriptures in his own sitting room, where often quite a goodly number of his parishioners assembled to hear him."

During the week he was unwearied in his daily walking from house to house to read and pray with his people, and to attend to the temporal as well as spiritual needs of the poor. In a letter written the last year of his life he declares that, while thus laboring in the Episcopal "Church," he was both a living man and a living minister, and that the Lord greatly blessed his ministry to the comfort of his people. But becoming satisfied of the great errors of the Establishment, he seceded from the "Church of England" in 1835, and left his income from the *Church*, and resigned his

University fellowship, giving up every worldly advantage for conscience's sake. "Like Abraham, he went forth, not knowing whither he went, but counting, with Moses, the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures of Egypt, and little foreseeing either what the Lord in his providence would do for him, or in his grace do by him."

About six months afterwards he was baptized by Mr. John Warburton into the fellowship of the Strict Baptist Church at Allington. From 1838 to 1864 he was pastor of the two Strict Baptist Churches at Stamford and Oakham; and from 1849 to 1869 editor of the *Gospel Standard*, a very laborious and responsible position, that monthly magazine having a circulation of about 10,000 copies.

He spent an hour every morning reading his Hebrew Bible, and an hour every evening reading his Greek Testament, greatly enjoying these moments; and he appreciated the writings of John Owen (especially his voluminous Commentary on the Hebrews) and of William Huntington, particularly the latter, as the most spiritual and profitable since the close of the canon of inspiration.

Removing to Croyden on account of his failing health, he was pastor of the church there the last five years of his life. He was more of an experimental than a doctrinal preacher. Viewing religion as a human body, he considered "the doctrines of the gospel the bones, experience the flesh, and the Holy Spirit the life of both bones and flesh. The dead Calvinists," said he, "have the bones without the flesh—a dry skeleton; the Arminians have the flesh without the bones—a shapeless and unsupported mass; and the daily experimentalists have the bones without life—a corpse. But the living family of God have bones and flesh and life; for they have truth in doctrine, truth in experience, and truth in life and power; and thus religion with them is a living body."

He was a strong and scriptural advocate of the eternal Sonship of Christ and of the Three-Oneness of Jehovah, and of the doctrine of predestination. "I fully believe," says he, "that the entrance of sin into the world, and of death by sin, was according to the permissive will of God, for without it it could not have entered; but not appointed by him in the same way as what is good, for such an assertion, reason how we may, would make God the author of sin. Sin is not a creature. Two things are very evident; first, that sin is a most dreadful evil, hateful to God, and calling down his displeasure and righteous punishment; and secondly, that there is no remedy for this dreadful evil, except through the incarnation and bloodshedding of the Son of God."

In November, 1869, he was taken severely ill with bronchitis, and suffered greatly with shortness of breath and sleeplessness. All remedies failed. As he was sinking fast, his children were called round his bed about midnight, Dec. 8th. He was perfectly conscious, knowing them all, and calmly bidding them goodby. To them he said, "Love one another. Be kind to your mother; she's been a good wife to me,

and a good mother to you all. Follow on to know the Lord. Goodness and mercy have followed me all the days of my life. Better to die than to live. Mighty to save! Mighty to save!" This he repeated several times. "I die in the faith I have preached and felt. The blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth from all sin. O, if I could depart, and be with Christ, which is far better. Praise the Lord: bless his holy name."

Just before he departed, he looked up earnestly, then closed his eyes, and said, "Beautiful!" His wife, who was close beside him, asked, "What is beautiful?" He made no direct answer; but presently said, with his failing voice, "Praise the Lord, O my soul!" These were his last words; and soon after this he gently passed away at half past three on the morning of Dec. 9, 1869. (*Hassell's History* ppg 618-620)

Pilgrim Fathers, The

The PILGRIM FATHERS (*See under The INDEPENDENTS*)

Pliny

PLINY: Sylvester Hassell: In order to show the bitter persecution endured by the Christians early in the second century, and the innocency and purity of their lives, we shall refer to a scene, presented by William Jones in his valuable History of the Christian Church, as having occurred about the year 107. Says Jones: "Trajan ascended the throne of the Caesars in the year 98, and soon afterwards conferred the government of the province of Bithynia upon his friend, the ingenious and celebrated Pliny."

"The character of the latter is one of the most amiable in all Pagan antiquity. In the exercise of his office as proconsul, the Christians, against whom the severe edicts which had been issued by preceding emperors seem to have been still in force, were brought before his tribunal. Having never had occasion to be present at any such examination before, the multitude of the criminals, and the severity of the laws against them, seemed to have greatly struck him, and caused him to hesitate how far it was proper to carry them into execution without first consulting Trajan upon the subject.

The letter which he wrote to Trajan upon this occasion, as well as the answer of the letter, are happily preserved, and are among the most valuable monuments of antiquity, on account of the light which they throw upon the state of the Christian profession at this splendid epoch. The letter is as follows: "C. Pliny to the Emperor Trajan wishes health. Sire! It is customary with me to consult you upon every doubtful occasion; for where my own judgment hesitates, who is more competent to direct me than yourself, or to instruct me where uninformed? I never had occasion to be present at any examination of the Christians before I came into this province; I am therefore ignorant to what extent it is usual to inflict punishment or urge

prosecution. I have also hesitated whether there should not be some distinction made between the young and the old, the tender and the robust; whether pardon should not be offered to penitence, or whether the guilt of an avowed profession of Christianity can be expiated by the most unequivocal retraction— whether the profession itself is to be regarded as a crime, however innocent in other respects the professor may be; or whether the crimes attached to the name must be proved before they are made liable to punishment. In the meantime, the method I have hitherto observed with the Christians, who have been accused as such, has been as follows: I interrogated them—Are you Christians? If they avowed it, I put the same question a second and a third time, threatening them with the punishment decreed by the law; if they still persisted, *I ordered them to be immediately executed; for of this I had no doubt, whatever was the nature of their religion, that such perverseness and inflexible obstinacy certainly deserved punishment.* Some that were infected with this madness, on account of their privilege as Roman citizens, I reserved to be sent to Rome, to be referred to your tribunal. In the discussion of this matter, accusations multiplying, a diversity of cases occurred. A schedule of names was sent me by an unknown accuser; but when I cited the persons before me, many denied the fact that they were or ever had been Christians; and they repeated after me an invocation of the gods and of your image, which for this purpose I had ordered to be brought with the statues of the other deities. They performed sacred rites with wine and frankincense, and execrated Christ; none of which things, I am assured, a real Christian can ever be compelled to do. These, therefore, I thought proper to discharge. Others, named by an informer, at first acknowledged themselves Christians, and then denied it, declaring that though they had been Christians, they had renounced their profession some three years ago, others, still longer, and some even twenty years ago. All these worshiped your image and the statues of the gods, and at the same execrated Christ. And this was the account which they gave me of the nature of the religion they once had professed, whether it deserves the name of crime or error; namely, that they are accustomed on a stated day to assemble before sunrise, and to join together in singing hymns to Christ as to a deity; binding themselves as with a solemn oath not to commit any kind of wickedness; to be guilty neither of theft, robbery nor adultery; never to break a promise, or to keep back a deposit when called upon. Their worship being concluded, it was their custom to separate, and met again for a repast, promiscuous indeed, and without any distinction of rank or sex, but perfectly harmless; and even from this they desisted, since the publication of my edict, in which, agreeable to your orders, I forbade any societies of that sort. For further information, I thought it necessary, in order to come at the truth, *to put to the torture* two females who were called deaconesses. But I could extort from them nothing, except the acknowledgment of an excessive and depraved superstition; and, therefore, desisting from further investigation, I determined to consult you; for the number of culprits is so great as to call for the most serious deliberation. Informations are pouring in against multitudes of every age, of all orders, and of both sexes, and more will be impeached; for the contagion of this superstition hath spread not only through cities, but villages also, and even reached the farm houses. I am of opinion, nevertheless, that it may be checked, and

the success of my endeavors hitherto forbids despondency; for the temples, once almost desolate, begin to be again frequented—the sacred solemnities, which had for some time been intermitted, are now attended afresh; and the sacrificial victims, which once could scarcely find a purchaser, now obtain a brisk sale. Whence I infer that many might be reclaimed, were the hope of pardon, on their repentance, absolutely confirmed.”

TRAJAN TO PLINY

“My Dear Pliny:—You have done perfectly right, in managing as you have, the matters which relate to the impeachment of the Christians. No one general rule can be laid down which will apply to all cases. These people are not to be hunted up by informers; but, if accused and convicted, let them be executed; yet with this restriction, that if any renounce the profession of Christianity, and give proof of it by offering supplication to our gods, however suspicious their past conduct may have been, they shall be pardoned on their repentance. But anonymous accusations should never be attended to, since it would be establishing a precedent of the worst kind, and altogether inconsistent with the maxims of my government.”

Our author continues:—“It is an obvious reflection from these letters, that at this early period Christianity had made an extraordinary progress in the empire; for Pliny acknowledges that the Pagan temples had become ‘almost desolate.’ Nor should we overlook the remarkable proof which they afford us of the state of the Christian profession, and the dreadful persecutions to which the disciples of Christ were then exposed. It is evident from them that, by the existing laws, it was a capital offense, punishable with death, for any one to avow himself a Christian. Nor did the humane Trajan and the philosophic Pliny entertain a doubt of the propriety of the law, or the wisdom and justice of executing it in its fullest extent. Pliny confesses that he had commanded such capital punishments to be inflicted on many, chargeable with no crime but their profession of Christianity; and Trajan not only confirms the equity of the sentence, but enjoins the continuance of such executions, without any exceptions, unless it be of those who apostatized from their profession, denied their Lord and Savior, and did homage to the idols of paganism.”

“These letters also give us a pleasing view of the holy and exemplary lives of the first Christians. For it appears by the confession of apostates themselves that no man could continue a member of their communion whose deportment in the world did not correspond with his holy profession. Even delicate women are put to the torture, to try if their weakness would not betray them into accusations of their brethren; but not a word, not a charge can be extorted from them capable of bearing the semblance of deceit or crime. To meet for prayer, praise, and mutual instruction; to worship Christ as their God; to exhort one another to abstain from every evil word and work; to unite in commemorating the shed blood in the ordinance of the supper—these things constitute what Pliny calls the ‘depraved superstition!; the ‘execrable crimes!’ which could only be expiated by the blood of the Christians!”

“We should not overlook the proof, which these letters afford, of the peaceableness of the Christians in those days, and their readiness to submit even to the most unjust requisitions rather than disturb the peace of society. They knew the edicts that were in force against them; and to avoid giving offense they assembled before break of day for the worship of their God and Savior. And when Pliny issued his edict to that effect they, for a while, yielded to the storm, and desisted from the observance of the Agapae, or feast of charity. This view of things abundantly justifies the encomium of Hegeppus, one of the earliest Christian writers, ‘that the church continued until these times as a virgin, pure and uncorrupted.’” (*Hassell’s History ppg 358-361*) (*See also the article on PERSECUTION by Roman Emperors*)

Plotinus

PLOTINUS: Sylvester Hassell: Plotinus, the chief Neo-Platonic philosopher, taught at Rome, and died there A.D. 270. Porphyry, of Tyre, a pupil of Plotinus, and also of Origen (born 233, died 304), edited and improved the writings of Plotinus, taught that philosophy was the means of the salvation of the soul, and, by a treatise of fifteen books (written in Sicily about A.D. 270), he made the greatest and most determined attempt of the ancient heathen world to disprove and destroy the Christian religion. He was a much more refined and powerful antagonist of Christianity than was Celsus in the second century. “He is the very prototype of the skeptics of modern times, both in his critical objections and in his professions of respect for the pure teachings of Jesus, as contrasted with the corrupt doctrines of the apostles.” (*Hassell’s History pg 378*) *See also the article on NEOPLATONISM*

Pope Eugenius III

POPE EUGENIUS III (*See under The CRUSADES*)

Pope of Rome, The

The POPE of Rome: Sylvester Hassell: Also about 1150, Rome, in the codification of her canon law, went beyond even the Pseudo-Isodorian positions,—maintaining not only that the pope is the vicar of Peter, but also that Bishops are only vicars of the pope, and that all the greater or more important causes are to be brought before the papal tribunal.” (*Hassell’s History pg 435*)

Pope, The Temporal Power Of The

The Temporal Power of the POPE: Sylvester Hassell: (*See also under CHARLEMAGNE and HILDEBRAND*) The great era of papal power covers two centuries and a half, beginning (about 1050) with **Gregory VII.**, and ending with the Jubilee of Boniface VIII., A.D. 1299. We see, in the Roman Catholic Church, a body which, after a thousand years of various fortune, has reached at length a height of power, the like of which was never held in human hands, nor, it is likely, conceived in human thought, elsewhere. It is a power resting on the invisible foundations of conscience, conviction, and religious fear. To the popular belief, it holds literally the keys of Heaven and hell. It spans like an arch the dreadful guilt between the worlds seen and unseen. Its priesthood (professedly) rules by express Divine appointment; and its chief is addressed in language such as it seems impious to address to any other than to Almighty God.

We see this *church* in the person of its priesthood, present absolutely everywhere. It carries in its hand the threads that govern every province of human life. It offers or withholds, on its own terms, the soul's peace on earth and its salvation in eternity. We see it, in the persons of its Pontiffs, maintaining conflict or alliance, on equal terms, with the powers of the world. We see it, in the person of its Religious Orders, penetrating to every nook and hamlet, ruling the passion and imagination no less than the counsel of courts by its imperious wealth. The terrors of a death-bed, the popular fear of the approaching Day of Judgment, the enthusiasm that equips the ranks of the Crusaders, and the disorders of their impoverished estates—all are skillfully wrought upon to fill the treasuries of the *church*.

It turns its doctrine of purgatory into a source of profit, and sets a fixed price on its masses for the dead. It makes a traffic of penance and indulgences. It seizes lands under forged charters and deeds, and claims the administration of intestate estates. It owns half the landed property of England, a nearly like proportion of France and Germany. It profits even by the violence of robbers and plunderers.

We see its pomp of priests, with chant and lighted taper and silver bell, striking the rude mind of barbaric ignorance with awe, as some holy spell or oracle. We see its hermits, in their austere seclusion; its trains of Pilgrims, with bead and cockle-shell; its Palmers, journeying from shrine to shrine, and bearing the fragrant memory of the Holy Land; its barefoot Friars, sworn to beggary, and wrangling whether Jesus and his disciples held in common any goods at all.

We see its secluded Abbey, its stately Cathedral, its statuary and painting, and its universities, thronged by great armies of young men, as many as twenty thousand at once, it is said, in a single place. Lastly, we see its monstrous enginery of despotic power, exercised through **Inquisition, Excommunication and Interdict**. By its secret spies, by the ambush of its **Confessional**, it seeks to lay bare every private thought or chance breath of opinion hostile to its imperious claim.

No husband, father, brother, is safe from the betrayal that may become the pious duty of sister, daughter, bride. No place of hiding is sufficiently close, or far enough away, to escape its ubiquitous, stealthy, masked police. No soldierly valor, no public service, no nobility of intellect, no purity of heart, is a defense from that most terrible of tribunals, which mocks the suspected heretic with a show of investigation, which wrenches his limbs on the rack or bursts his veins with the torturing wedge, and under a hideous mask of mercy—since the *church* may shed no blood—delivers him over to the secular arm to be “dealt with gently” as his flesh crackles and his blood simmers at the accursed stake.

That is the Inquisition, the *church*’s remedy for free thought. For simple disobedience, it has in its hand the threat of **Excommunication**. Shut out from all *church* privilege; shunned like a leper by servants, family and friends; incapable of giving testimony, or of claiming any rights before a court; the very meats he has touched thrown away as pollution; a bier sometimes set at his door, and stones thrown in at his casement; his dead body cast out unburied—emperor, prince, priest, or peasant, the excommunicated man is met every moment, at every hand, by the shadow of a Curse that is worse than death.

The **Interdict** excommunicates a whole people for the guilt of a sovereign’s rebellion. No church may be opened, no bell tolled. The dead lie unburied; no pious rite can be performed but baptism of babes and absolution of the dying. The gloom of an awful Fear hangs over the silent street and the somber home; and not till the *church*’s ban is taken off can the people be free from the ghastly apparitions of supernatural horror.

Nay, more. The interdict, in the last resort, “dissolved all law, annulled all privilege, abrogated all rights, rescinded all obligations, and reduced society to a chaos, until it should please the high priest of Rome to reinstate order on the terms most conducive to his own glory and the pecuniary profit of the chief and his agents.” These are the *ultima ratio*, the final appeal of ecclesiastical sway.

“From the moment these interdicts and excommunications had been tried,” says Hallam, “the powers of the earth may be said to have existed only by sufferance.”—J.H. Allen, in *Christian History*.” (*Hassell’s History* ppg 430- 432)

Porphyry

PORPHYRY (*See the article on NEOPLATONISM*)

Preservation of the Saints, The

The PRESERVATION of the Saints: Harold Hunt: “My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me. And I give unto them eternal life, and they shall never perish; neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand. My Father which gave them me is greater than all, and no man is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand,” John 10:27-29.

There is an old saying, “Never say, Never; never is a mighty long time.” When somebody says, “I will never do thus and so,” about as often as not, he finally gets around to doing it. And it has been my observation that when somebody says, “Such and such will never happen,” about as often as not, he is trying harder to convince himself than he is to convince you. But when God says, “Never,” he means, “Never.” And when God says, “I give unto them eternal life, and they shall never perish,” you can be sure that his sheep, his people, are eternally secure in him.

I have heard it said that we do not actually have eternal life yet; we only have eternal life in prospect; we will receive eternal life at the resurrection. Well, that is not what the Bible says. “And this is the record that God *hath given* to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son,” I John 5:11. The gospel *record* is that God has already given us eternal life; we are already saved, already born of his Spirit.

Notice the words, “This is the record.” In other words, “This is the gospel.” John was giving the definition of the gospel. I believe everybody ought to own a good dictionary. Our dictionary gets a lot of use. It is falling apart; you have to pick it up with both hands. I have to look up the definition of a lot of words. It is not uncommon for me to pop out of bed just about the time I ought to be going to sleep, and go to the dictionary to look up a word. My wife usually wants to know, “Won't it wait until morning?” and my usual answer is, “In the morning I won't remember what the word was.”

It is important to know the meanings of words if you are going to use them. You can get in trouble using words, if you do not know what they mean. You might say something you did not mean to say at all.

If a person is going to preach the gospel, he, at least, ought to know what the gospel is. If a person spends four years in college and three years in seminary, and still does not know the definition of the gospel, I think he ought to ask for his money back. They did not teach him what he needs to know.

While a dictionary is a great benefit, the Bible defines its own terms better than the dictionary does. That is no reflection on those who compile dictionaries. All they try to do is to tell us what people mean when they use a particular word. The problem is that, especially in matters of religion, most people do not mean the same thing God does when he uses certain words. *Gospel* is one of those words that most

people use to mean something entirely different than the Bible means when it uses the word.

Most religious people seem to think the gospel is an offer, a proposition. That is not the case at all. “These things have I written unto you, that believe on the name of the Son of God, *that ye may know that ye have eternal life*, and that ye may believe on the name of the Son of God.” By definition *gospel* means good news. It is the good news of what God has done on behalf of his people. It is not a proposition of what he will do is they come to terms.

Most people have it just backwards. They think the gospel gives instructions on how to get eternal life. The text teaches that the gospel is given to teach us that we already have eternal life, and it gives us the signs and characteristics of those who do have eternal life. It provides assurances for those who are born again that heaven is their home.

A few years ago a well known evangelist wrote a book entitled *How to be Born Again*. That is not the first time anybody ever wrote a book on a subject he did not know anything about. The good brother had not learned the definition of the gospel. It is not the purpose of the gospel to teach people how to be born again. It is the purpose of the gospel to teach them to know that they are already born of God’s Spirit.

How do you know if you are born again? For one thing, if you have a genuine love for your fellow man, it is evidence that you are a child of God. The wicked do not have any such love. “Beloved, let us love one another: for love is of God; and *everyone that loveth is born of God, and knoweth God*,” I John 4:7. That ought to be plain enough; if you love your fellow man, it is evidence that you love God, and that you are a child of God.

If you feel the Spirit of God stirring in your heart, it is evidence that you have been born again. “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 Jesus Christ; if so be that we suffer with him, that we may be also glorified together,” Romans 8:16-17. God’s Spirit does not reside in the heart of the wicked. If God’s Spirit is in your heart, you are already heaven bought, heaven born, and heaven bound. But it is not our intention to write on the evidences of life; we will write more about that at another time. Our subject at the moment is the eternal security of the children of God.

A few years ago I was talking to a man on the job where I worked. He was not a religious man. Going to church and reading the Bible had never been part of his experience. But he was the sort of person you enjoy working with. If everybody on the job was as easy to get along with as he was, it would be a lot easier place to earn a living.

Finally, the subject got around to religion. That usually happens with me. He really did not know anything about religion, but he wanted to carry his end of the conversation, and, for want of anything better to say, he said, "Harold, do you believe that doctrine, once saved, always saved?" I told him I did, and he said, "Well, I don't believe it." I am sure he did not have any idea what he believed, but he was sure he did not believe in eternal security.

I don't like to argue about religion, but he had challenged one of our most cherished principles, and I felt like I had to respond. I was sure it would be a waste of time to quote a list of proof texts. Most people believe you can prove anything you want to prove by the Bible, if you just find the right proof text. They believe every denomination has their own favorite proof texts, and those texts prove the doctrines of that denomination. That is not right; the only thing you can prove by the Bible is the truth of the Bible, and that truth is entirely consistent. There is not one verse that contradicts any other verse. You can lift a verse out of context, and make it look like it says something it does not say at all, but if you apply the verse properly, it will not prove anything but the truth.

I knew I could not prove anything to him by quoting the Bible, but I knew that he and his wife had four children, and I asked him, "If one of your children were to wind up in the flames of eternal damnation, and it is within your power to get him out, what would you do? Now, there is no doubt that he deserves to be there, but he still your child; what would you do?" I said, "You don't have to answer me today; think about it a few days, and tell me what you would do."

He said, "You dummy, you know I don't have to think about that; I would get him out." I said, "You believe in *once saved, always saved*; you just did not know it. That is all we insist on. If one of God's children ever wound up in that terrible place, God would take that place apart to get his child out. Do you believe you love your children more than God loves his children? Do you believe your love for your children is more constant and more unconditional than God's love is?"

"My Father which gave them me is greater than all, and no man is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand," [John 10:29](#). Did you ever try to take anything away from somebody, when he had it clutched in his hand? You mothers, did you ever have to take anything away from one of the children, when he had it clutched in his hand? Perhaps, he had a marble in his hand, and you knew that if you did not take it away, it would not be long till he would try to swallow it. It is in the nature of children to put everything they get hold of in their mouth. It was no real problem for you to take the marble away from him, but there is one thing necessary if you are going to take away anything somebody has clutched in his hand: you have to be bigger and stronger than he is. And if anybody ever takes away one that God has in his hand, it will have to be somebody bigger and stronger than God is.

I love the types and comparisons and parallels of the Bible. The Bible teaches us about things we do not understand by showing how they are like things we do understand. The Bible uses figurative language to call up images in our minds to make the thought more clear to us. The Bible refers to the Lord as the Water of Life, the Bread of Life, the Tree of Life, the Good Shepherd, the Great Physician, and so on. That is figurative language, and it teaches us by making comparisons. We all know what water is like, what bread is like, and so on. Well, the Lord is like all those things, and those expressions impress that fact on our minds.

There are also some lessons to be learned from the contrasts of the Bible. To the heaven born soul, three of the most beautiful words in the language are, "HE IS ABLE." "For our conversation is in heaven, from whence also 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, according to the working whereby HE IS ABLE even to subdue all things to himself," Philippians 2:20-21. "Wherefore HE IS ABLE to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them."

I would like to stand in every pulpit in the land; I would like to preach on every radio station in America, and preach that simple message, "He is able—he is able—he is able." "Wherefore HE IS ABLE to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them," Hebrews 7:25. And here is the contrast, "My Father which gave them me is greater than all, and NO MAN IS ABLE to pluck them out of my Father's hand" (John 10:29). God is able to save them to the uttermost, and no man is able to pluck them out of his hand.

That is the big difference between the doctrine of the Bible and the doctrine of the world and the world's religion. The Bible says, "He is able," and the doctrine of the world says, "He is doing the best he can with the help he gets." Did anybody ever ask you for an explanation of the difference between the Primitive Baptists and other Baptists. When somebody asks that question, they usually do not want an hour long lecture; they just want a short statement of the difference. I cannot think of a shorter explanation, and it hits the nail right on the head. The doctrine of the Bible says, "He is able," and the doctrine of the world says, "He is doing the best he can with the help he gets."

The life of God is the ground, the foundation, of our life. Because he lives, we live. John 14:19, "Yet a little while, and the world seeth me no more, but ye see me, because I live, ye shall live also." This verse indicates a cause and effect relationship. His life is the cause; our life is the effect. You will have to remove the cause, if you are going to remove the effect. You will have to destroy the life of God, if you intend to destroy the spiritual life of one of his children. Because he lives, and we are, by grace, joined to him, we live.

There was an evil professor at Emory University, many years ago, who circulated the notion that God is dead. That does not surprise me. His god may be dead; his god was never really alive; but our God lives forever more. I like a little bumper sticker I saw a few days ago. It read: “You say that God is dead? Sorry to hear that; but my God is alive; I talked to him just this morning.”

God provided Israel with six Cities of Refuge. When anybody fled to one of the Cities of Refuge, he could live there *as long as the high priest lived*. The Lord Jesus Christ is our Great High Priest. You and I are eternally secure *as long as he lives*. Hebrews 7:23-25, “And they truly were many priests, because they were not suffered to continue by reason of death. But this man, because he continueth ever, hath an unchangeable priesthood. Wherefore he is able to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, *seeing he ever liveth* to make intercession for them.”

Somehow, some people have gotten the idea that the doctrine of salvation by the sovereign grace of God is a hard doctrine. There were those who believed that in the Lord’s day. In John 6 the Lord had preached the most beautiful sermon on the sovereignty of God. That chapter is just filled with good proof texts on sovereignty. But when the Lord finished that beautiful sermon on salvation by grace, a lot of the people said, “This is a hard saying; who can hear it” (John 6:60). If they did not believe that doctrine when the Lord preached it, you can be sure that a lot of people will not believe it when we preach it in this day. Far from being a hard doctrine, the doctrine of salvation by the sovereign grace of God is the sweetest, the most comforting, the most soul cheering doctrine, that has ever entertained the hearts and minds of poor sinners of Adam’s race.

But I will tell you what is hard doctrine: that doctrine that says a person may be born of the Spirit of God, and for thirty or forty years he does the best he can to serve the Lord. For thirty or forty years he lives in prospect of seeing the face of his Maker, and for all that time, the prospect of living with God, and with all the family of God, is the one thing that lifts him up, and gives him strength to endure his darkest hours. And then to think that in the last years, or even the last weeks of his life, he might sin and lose it all—to think that God would mock his children, and tantalize them, by holding out the prospect of eternal heaven, and then at the last moment that he would snatch it away and plunge them off into the flames of eternal damnation—I tell you, that is hard doctrine; that is cruel doctrine. I would not accuse my worst enemy of treating his children the way those people who preach that doctrine accuse God of treating his own.

Over the years I have tried to come up with illustrations to explain these principles, and the best I can come up with is this: Suppose a man is out in the middle of the lake in a little boat, and a storm comes up. Before long the waves start to lap over the sides of the boat, and it goes down. He is in the water about to go under for the last time. He is half drowned and half conscious. At one moment his head is above

the water, and the next moment it is below the water. It looks like any moment is going to be his last. About this time, two men come along in the biggest cabin cruiser you ever saw. They turn their boat and go over to where the man is. One of them throws him a life preserver. They tell me a drowning man will grab at anything, and he grabs the life preserver. He gets his hand on it, and works his arm through it, and as soon as he gets the life preserver up under his arm, one of the men says, "Hang on, fellow, I believe you will be alright now," and he turns the boat and goes speeding on across the lake.

I really don't think that is what he ought to have done, do you? Let me ask you, when the good people in town hear about that, do you believe they might criticize those men? I think I might have some mean things to say about them, don't you? I believe they ought to have fished him out of the water and carried him to the other side of the lake, don't you? That is what the Lord does. He says, "He bare them, and carried them, all the days of old" (Isaiah 63:9). And yet I hear people talk as if God saves somebody, and then says, "Hang on, fellow, I will be back in thirty or forty years to see how you made out."

Now you may object that nobody really preaches any such thing as that, but, quite the contrary, that seems to be the majority opinion among most religious people. It does not make any sense at all, but ever so many people believe it.

Several years ago, two other preachers and I were on our way to a special meeting. We stopped at a grocery store, and another car pulled in beside us, pulling a boat. One of the preachers said, "Brother Hunt, did you see the sign on that boat?" I had, and I said, "I have an idea I will preach on that before the day is out." On the back of that boat was a little four by six sign saying, "I am saved, can I throw you a line?" One of their hymns is entitled "Throw Out the Life Line." But God does not just throw out a life line, and he does not depend on careless sinners to throw out a life line to other sinners. He is the one and only Savior, and he does the saving himself. He does not depend on others to do the work for him.

When he saves somebody, they are safe. If a person is not safe, he is not saved, and if a person is forever in danger of falling away, losing his salvation, and suffering in eternal damnation, he is not safe—he is not saved.

Those who are born of the Spirit of God are not in danger of being lost. They are not in danger of eternal damnation. They are the children of God; they are the objects of his love, and he will not allow the objects of his love to suffer eternally.

Psalms 89:30,31, "If his children forsake my law, and walk not in my judgments; if they break my statutes, and keep not my commandments."

He is talking about the children doing wrong. He says the same thing four different ways, so there can be no doubt as to what he is saying. I have heard people say, "I

wish the Bible was easier to understand.” I wonder how plain they want it to be? How easy to understand does it need to be? He says the same thing four different ways, so that if we might not understand one expression, we could not possibly misunderstand all the others.

Then when he declares the security of his children in Christ Jesus, in spite of all the failures on our part, he says that four different times in four different ways. Psalms 89:32-34, “Then will I visit their transgression with the rod, and their iniquity with stripes; nevertheless, my lovingkindness will I not utterly take away from them, nor suffer my faithfulness to fail. My covenant will I not break, nor alter the thing that is gone out of my lips.”

He says that if his children disobey, he will chasten them, but that chastening will not in any way alter his lovingkindness toward them, and it will not alter the covenant he has made on their behalf. I sit here wondering what comment I should make on those four expressions he uses to declare the constancy of his love toward his children, and his determination to do all he has promised to do on their behalf. But I realize that no comment is necessary. The language is too clear to be misunderstood. God loves his own; that love is eternal and unchangeable, and nothing in time or eternity can interfere with it. God will do all he has promised to do for his children; he will have every one of them with him in eternal heaven.

God gave his Son as the redemption price to pay the sin debt of his people. That chain of redemption is a golden chain which reaches all the way from eternity past to eternity to come.

Romans 8:28-30, “And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them that are called according to his purpose. For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the firstborn among many brethren. Moreover, whom he did predestinate, them he also called, and whom he called, them he also justified, and whom he justified, them he also glorified.”

Notice that those who were chosen in eternity past are exactly the same people who will be glorified in eternity to come. Notice how Paul traces these same people from their being foreknown to their being glorified. No distinction is made between them; they are the same people.

One of the worst faults most people have is in failing to carry through with what they start. I have certainly had that problem. If I had carried through with all the sales campaigns I ever started, I would have made a lot more money than I ever did make. If I had carried through on all the study plans I ever started, I would probably preach a lot better than I do. But you can be sure that God carries through on what he starts. The religious world does not believe that. They believe he redeemed a lot more people than he will ever glorify. They believe he is doing the best he can with

help he gets, but he would do a lot better if he could get more help, if he could get better organized, if he could get more financial backing. But not so, God finishes what he starts.

Philippians 1:6, “Being confident of this very thing, that he which hath begun a good work in you will perform it until the day of Jesus Christ.” If God redeemed you by his grace, and quickened you by his Spirit, you can be sure that, one day, by his grace, he will finish the work. One day he will carry you home to glory. He does not begin a work, and never finish. He does not promise and never deliver.

Romans 8:35-36, “Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? Shall tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword? As it is written, For thy sake we are killed all the day long, we are accounted as sheep for the slaughter. Nay, in all these things we are more than conquerors through him that loved us.”

Paul lists seven terrible calamities, and shows that none of them is able to separate any child of God from his love. Seven is a complete number. It signifies all of whatever is under consideration. If none of these great tragedies can separate any child of God from his love, there is nothing that can do it, because there is nothing bad that ever happened to anybody that is not contained in one or more of these expressions.

Tribulation: that is all the worst things that ever happened to anybody.

Distress: that is when you are in such trouble you don't know what to do, nor which way to turn.

Persecution: that is when people are mean to you, because of who you are, or what you stand for.

Famine: that is when you cannot provide yourself and those near and dear to you with sufficient food to sustain life.

Nakedness: that is when you cannot obtain the bare material necessities of life.

Peril: that just means danger, danger of being harmed, or danger of suffering great loss.

Sword: that goes beyond danger; it signifies actual bodily injury.

Paul could not paint a darker picture of great and terrible tragedies, and he assures us that none of these things can separate God's children from his love.

Having said all of that, you would think Paul had made his argument as strong as it could possibly be made. There is nothing bad that ever happened to anybody that is not covered by one or more of those seven expressions. But then he makes his argument even stronger.

Romans 8:38-39. “For I am persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.”

Sometimes human language is not sufficient to carry the burden that is loaded on it. This is one such case. Human language groans under the load, and cannot entirely support it, but it does sufficiently express the thought, that there should be no doubt in anybody's mind as to what is being said. There is absolutely nothing which “shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.” If this language does not make the point, the point cannot be made.

Neither life nor death: nothing living nor dead can do it. That covers a lot of territory.

Nor angels: no one on earth knows how powerful the angels are, but they cannot do it.

Nor principalities nor powers: no organization of men can do it. No coalition of men can do it. No government of men can do it.

We hear a lot nowadays about world-wide conspiracies, occult conspiracies, conspiracies of international bankers to rule the world, and so on. Somebody is forever asking me, “Do you believe there is any such conspiracy.” Of course there is a conspiracy to rule the world. That has been the motive of every conqueror and empire builder in every age of time. Name as many of them as you will: Nebuchadnezzar, Alexander the Great, the Roman Caesars (they came closer than anybody else ever did), Napoleon Bonaparte, Adolph Hitler, Worldwide Communism, the United Nations. They all have and have had the same goal. They want to rule the world. But men can put together as many organizations and coalitions as they will, but all their combined efforts can never separate one little child of God from his love.

Nor things present nor things to come: nothing that is, nothing that ever has been, and nothing that ever will be, can do it.

Nor height nor depth: nothing above us and nothing below us can do it.

Nor any other creature: that is the catch all. God is the one and only Creator. Everything outside of him is a creature. If the other expressions do not cover the ground (but they do) then this one does. There is nothing that can separate any child of God from his love.

In the last five verses of this chapter Paul is very nearly on shouting ground, and he builds to a crescendo, talking about the grace of God. I can almost see him now, as his chin begins to tremble, his hand shakes, and his eyes run over. Paul, the chief of sinners, has his eyes firmly fixed on his Redeemer. He cannot find any ground of hope in himself, and he will not even try. He knows, as every sinner should, that if he receives what he deserves, he will suffer eternally. Not one of us deserves a home in heaven, and if we were judged on our own merit, not one of us would ever be there. But Paul is not looking to himself, nor to any merit of his own. That is not the ground of his hope. He is looking to Christ, and his unchangeable, unwavering love of his own, as the basis of his hope of heaven.

Priesthood, The Mosaic

The Mosaic PRIESTHOOD: Sylvester Hassell: The priests typified all spiritual Israelites, while the High Priest typified Christ. The priests (the family of Aaron) were especially chosen of God; the peculiar property of God; holy to God; and offered gifts to God, and received gifts from God. Their ceremonial holiness was indicated by their original consecration by the holy anointing oil (representing the Holy Spirit in every believer); by their constant purification by water; by their clean linen robes; by the completeness of their bodily parts, and by their avoidance of bodily defilement, they were to devote themselves to the service of the Lord, and were to have no earthly inheritance, but the Lord was to be their portion, and to supply all their needs.

All elect saints are priests unto God (I Peter 2:5,9; Revelation 1:6; 5:10), specially chosen by the Father, specially redeemed by the Son, and specially purified by the Spirit; qualified to offer up to God the acceptable sacrifices of humble, broken and thankful hearts, and to receive assurances of his pardoning love; and they should always keep their garments unspotted from the world; and feel deeply to rejoice, whatever temporal ills may betide them, that the Lord is their all-sufficient and everlasting portion.

The High Priest was anointed far more abundantly than the priests with the holy anointing oil, which was poured upon his head, so that it ran down upon his beard, and even to the skirts of his garments; just as Christ was anointed (the very name means anointed) with the Holy Spirit without measure, and this Spirit of holiness and love streams down from him upon all, even the lowest members of his mystical body (John 3:34; Psalms 138; Matthew 9:20; John 1:16).

The rich, gorgeous, variegated ephod of the High Priest, with its sky-blue robe, typified the glorious, heavenly righteousness of Christ. “The skirt of the robe was ornamented with pomegranates of blue, purple, and scarlet, a small golden bell being attached between each two of the pomegranates; the bells’ sound heard from within the veil by those outside assured them that the High Priest, though out of sight, was still alive, and was ministering in their behalf, acceptably before God. These sweet-sounding bells typified the gospel’s joyful sound (Psalms 139:15); and the pomegranates represented the spiritual fruits which accompany gospel preaching (Ephesians 5:22-23). On the two shoulders of the High Priest were two onyx stones engraved with the names of the twelve tribes of Israel; and on his breastplate were twelve precious stones, in four rows, also engraved with the names of the twelve tribes; just as the names of the twelve tribes are on the twelve pearl gates of the New Jerusalem, and the names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb in the twelve foundations of precious stones. Thus was it forcibly declared that the weight of our salvation, if we are spiritual Israelites, rests upon the shoulders of Christ, and our names are always on his heart before God, not one name being wanting (Isaiah 49:16; John 10:3; Revelation 2:17; 3:12).”

If any of our readers wish to know whether their names are on the jewelled breastplate and shoulder of the antitypical High Priest, in the Lamb’s Book of Life, let them tremblingly and prayerfully read the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth verses of the third chapter of the prophecy of Malachi (Malachi 3:16-18). In the breastplate of judgment were the Urim and Thummim (lights and perfections), by which the High Priest consulted the will of God in reference to Israel. (Exodus 28:30; Leviticus 8:8; Deuteronomy 33:8). It is not known what these were. Some suppose that they were two stones, engraved with these two Divine attributes and placed in the folds of the breastplate, by gazing upon which the High Priest was absorbed in heavenly ecstatic contemplation, and enabled to declare the Divine will; others think that one of these stones taken out by him at random indicated the answer of God; others, that the High Priest heard the voice of God from within the veil; and others think that the Urim and Thummim were simply a change in the appearance of the twelve stones in the breastplate, indicating the Divine answer.

After David’s time the higher revelation by prophets superceded the Urim and Thummin. Christ is the perfect revelation of God’s will. “Like the High Priest, Christ sacrificed for, prays for, blesses, instructs, oversees the service of his people in the spiritual temple, blows the gospel trumpet, and judges. Having such a “High Priest” passed into the heavens,” “over the house of God,” we ought to “hold fast our profession,” “without wavering,” ever “drawing near with a true heart, in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience” (Hebrews 4:14; 10:21-23).

During 1560 years, from 1491 B.C. to 70 A.D., there were seventy-six High Priests. Then, at the destruction of Jerusalem, the God of Providence removes the needless

type, as the God of grace had already sent the eternal antitype in the person of his Son.” (*Hassell’s History*)

Progressivism

PROGRESSIVISM: the organ: C.H. Cayce: I do not want to be an extreme alarmist, but if this progressive spirit should prevail among us so that our people should use the organ in time of service, I think serious injury will be the result. From my heart I suppose it as a serious and dangerous innovation. It is a compromise with the world, a being “conformed the this world.” It is turning from the “fountain of living waters,” and hewing out cisterns, broken cisterns, that can hold no water.

I realize my imperfection, but I regard it as an awful state of things among Primitive Baptists when there is a spirit of tolerance or forbearance for this innovation. A Primitive Baptist Church with an organ preacher in its pulpit is a self-contradiction. It is not primitive to have organs in church, but it is primitive not to have organs, especially for our people. An organ preacher will produce an organ party; and in fact when a church wants an organ preacher it proves there is an organ party there, even before the preacher gets there. When Baptists look with favor on the organ as a help in the worship, it indicates that they are tired of the “old ruts,” and are ready to contrive some way to relieve our people of their unpopularity.

“Remove not the ancient landmark which thy fathers have set.” To move the corner stone so as to make your field bigger is a sin. Our fathers understood that the organ was not included in the ancient survey. Should we now remove it so as to take it in? or, in God’s name, should Baptists be silent and quiet while it is being done? “Remove not the old landmark, and enter not into the fields of the fatherless.” Who ever heard of a contention among our people till the last year or two that the ancient deeds and “the faith once delivered to the saints” included the organ?

It is new and recent that such a claim was set up. Where is the spirit of Hume, of Potter, of E. D. Thomas, and of Lampton? How was it that they failed to see the organ included in the old landmarks? It was not included in them, and the desire to set back the corner stone is of men. “In vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men.” “Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded.” Here is the line, and who is at liberty to go beyond this line? Or who can in good conscience be satisfied and silent while others are removing and obliterating this line? Let us quit ourselves like men and be faithful to Him that called us to the ministry.

“Some remove the landmarks; they violently take away the flocks and feed thereof.” In this mad effort to favor the organ the flocks are taken away and driven away, and the feed too. The milk of the word and the milk of His service is taken

away, and instead thereof is carnal, flesh-pleasing and world-pleasing music, not included in the ancient landmarks. It is new and not ancient, and those who press it know that it will divide and scatter the flock. They know this and yet they press it, or meekly and tamely be still while others remove the corner stone.

The prophet said, “His watchmen are blind—they are all dumb dogs; they cannot bark, sleeping, lying down, loving to slumber.” “Yea, they are greedy dogs that can never have enough.” If the dog is silent, the intruder is satisfied with the dog, I am sure. Is it a little thing to divide churches? We are told to “mark them that cause division.” Who is causing it in this case? Let us mark them if they love a carnal music better than they love the peace of God’s house. To “mark” them, as here required, is to attribute them the strife, the distress and the heartaches that go with division. They are responsible for it.

The organ in church is Catholic in origin, and copied by the other churches. It wields its influence over the light-minded especially. It has been worn out by the fashionable churches, and their most intelligent ones are sick and disgusted with it, and now Primitive Baptists are talking for it. I said “Primitive Baptists.” I had better not have said this. True Primitive Baptists are satisfied without it, and weep to see this restless, world-pleasing spirit in our midst.

The prophet drew a sad picture when he said, “Woe be to the shepherds of Israel that do feed themselves. Should not the shepherds feed the flocks?.....The diseased have ye not strengthened; neither have ye healed that which was sick; neither have ye bound up that which was broken, nor brought again that which was driven away....But with force and cruelty have ye ruled them.”

Who could think that the organ could be urged on our people without causing division? It has divided others; the Campbellites are divided all over the country on account of it; yet with absolute certainty that division will result elders press it, and others urge that we quietly let it alone; let it grow, and grow; we don’t want it ourselves, but are willing not to meddle with it.

I do not believe that Primitive Baptists will do this; they will oppose it, reject it and keep it out of their pulpits. If they do tamely submit, and go along with it, I will feel that I have never known the dear Old Baptists. I have lived with them, labored with them, and suffered with them over forty-two years; and I do not believe they will tolerate this departure, or act the part of “dumb dogs that cannot bark.” My time is near its close, and I desire to be true the inch of time I am yet to stay here. I have been with our people in their trials, and where they were forced to speak out, I want still to stand with them and oppose this last innovation with firmness, unyielding, and yet in kindness.

Brethren, let us be kind, and speak the truth in love. Let us be ready to make peace, “easy to be entreated;” but let us humbly and patiently speak out on this subject and

encourage our tried elders that we are in the right in this matter, and God will bless us in our earnest efforts to preserve the truth in the world. Our dear children will love us all the better to see us stand up for the time-honored principles of our fathers. The world can see when Primitive Baptists yield up their principles and turn their backs on the practice of our fathers; they can see it, and our children can see it. Let us keep this world pleasing thing out of our pulpits, and pray for dear, faithful and tried elders, that the Lord may bless them, and bless their labors and churches. It is sweet at times to think that a few more stormy winters and we shall enter our eternal home; all our tears shall be dried, and we shall sweetly rest from our labors. Affectionately.” (*Cayce’s Editorials vol. 2, ppg 75-78*)

Prophets, The

The PROPHETS: Sylvester Hassell: The priests were at first Israel’s teachers in God’s statutes by types, acts and words (Leviticus 10:11). But when under the judges the nation repeatedly apostatized, and no longer regarded the dumb acted lessons of the ceremonial law, God sent a new order—the prophets—to witness for him in plainer warnings. They were bold reformers, and reprovers of idolatry, iniquity, and hypocrisy; they called the attention of the people to the moral law, the standard of true holiness; they showed the inefficacy of ceremonial observances, without the obedience of faith and love; and they kept up and encouraged the expectation of the promised Messiah, and more fully declared the sufferings of Christ and the glory which should follow.

Their claims to be considered as God’s appointed servants were demonstrated by the unimpeachable integrity of their characters, by the intrinsic excellence and tendency of their instructions, and by the disinterested zeal and undaunted fortitude with which they persevered in their great design. These were still further confirmed by the miraculous proofs which they gave of divine support, and by the immediate completion of many smaller predictions which they uttered. Their grandest object was to declare the spirituality of God’s religion, the necessity of repentance, and the fullness and freeness of the divine salvation, which was to be wrought out by the coming Messiah; we see the truth of this remark especially in Isaiah and in the last and greatest of the prophets before Christ, John the Baptist.

The ancient Jews always acknowledged that the chief design of the prophets was to foretell the times of the Messiah. The dress of the prophets was a hairy garment with a leathern girdle (Isaiah 20:2; Zechariah 13:4; Matthew 3:4); and their diet was the simplest (II Kings 4:10,38; I Kings 19:6), a virtual protest against abounding luxury. The absence of greater clearness in their predictions is due to God’s purpose to give light enough to guide the spiritual, and to leave darkness enough to confound the carnal mind. Many of the prophecies have a temporary and local, fulfillment foreshadowing their final Messianic fulfillment. The prophets were the poets and historians of their people.” (*Hassell’s History*)

Propitiation, Atonement, and Reconciliation

PROPITIATION, Atonement, and Reconciliation: Abridged from John Gill:

Having observed, that though the word *satisfaction* is not syllabically used in scripture, when the doctrine of Christ's satisfaction is spoken of; yet that there are words and terms equivalent to it, and synonymous with it; as *propitiation*, *atonement*, and *reconciliation*. It may be proper to explain these terms, and give the sense of them; which may serve the more to clear and confirm the doctrine of satisfaction; and to begin,

First, with Propitiation, the first time we meet with this word, and as applied to Christ, is in

Romans 3:25 Whom God hath set forth *to be a propitiation* through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God.

“Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation,” either to be the author of propitiation; for whose sake, and on account of what he was to do and suffer, God would be propitious to men—his justice be appeased—and he be at peace with them; laying aside all marks of displeasure, anger, and resentment against them: for this was Christ's work as Mediator. He drew nigh to God, and treated with him about terms of peace, and entered into measures of peace with him; interposed between justice and them, became a Mediator between God and man, to bring them together.

Hence he has the names of Shiloh, the Prince of peace, the Man the Peace, and Jesus our peace, who has made both one. Or else to be the propitiatory sacrifice for sin; such hilastic, propitiatory, and expiatory sacrifices there were under the law. [They were] typical of the expiatory and propitiatory sacrifice of Christ; and as God in them smelled a sweet savor of rest, as types of Christ. So his sacrifice was an offering of a sweet smelling savor to him. He was well pleased with it, it gave him content and satisfaction, because his justice was appeased by it, and the demands of his law were answered. Yea, it was magnified and made honorable; the word used in the above text *ilasthrion*, [hilasterion, pronounced he-las-tay-ree-ohn] is the same which the Greek version of Exodus 25:21, and which the apostle in Hebrews 9:5 uses of the mercy seat; which, with the cherubim upon it, and the ark, with the law therein under it, to which it was a lid or cover, formed a seat for the divine Majesty.

Exodus 25:21 And thou shalt put *the mercy seat* above upon the ark; and in the ark thou shalt put the testimony that I shall give thee.

Hebrews 9:5 And over it the cherubims of glory shadowing *the mercyseat*; of which we cannot now speak particularly.

[It] was an emblem of his mercy and justice shining in the atonement made by Christ, which this exhibited to view; and gave encouragement to draw nigh to this mercy seat, or throne of grace, in hope of finding grace and mercy, and enjoying communion with God.

A glimpse of this the poor publican had, when he said, “God be merciful,” *ilasyhti* [hilasteti, pronounced he-las-tay-ti], “propitious, to me a sinner!” or be merciful to me, through the propitiation of the Messiah.

Now Christ was “set forth” to be the propitiation in the purposes and decrees of God, proeyeto [proetheto, pronounced pro-eh-theh-to]. God *foreordained* him, as he was foreordained to be the Lamb slain, as the ransom price and propitiatory sacrifice; whose sufferings and death, which were the sacrifice, were according to the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God.

I Peter 1:19 But with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot:

Acts 2:23 Him, being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain:

Acts 4:28 For to do whatsoever thy hand and thy counsel determined before to be done.

And he was set forth in the promises and prophecies spoken of by all the holy prophets that were from the beginning of the world; as the seed of the woman that should bruise the serpents head, destroy him and his works, among which this is a principal one, making an end of sin, by a complete atonement for it. And he was set forth as such in the types and shadows of the law, the trespass offerings, and sin offerings. [These] are said to bear the sins of the congregation, and to make atonement for them; which were typical of Christ, who was made an offering for sin, bore the sins of many, and made atonement for them.

Leviticus 10:17 Wherefore have ye not eaten the sin offering in the holy place, seeing it *is* most holy, and God hath given it you to bear the iniquity of the congregation, to make *atonement* for them before the LORD?

And he has been set forth, in the fulness of time, in the exhibition of him, in human nature, in which he was manifested to take away sin; and he has put it away, and even abolished it, by *the propitiatory sacrifice of himself*. And he is still set forth in the gospel, as the sin bearing and sin atoning Savior who has satisfied law and justice, and made peace by the blood of his cross. Therefore it is called *the word of*

reconciliation, the gospel of peace, and the word preaching peace by Jesus Christ, who is Lord of all.

There are two other places where Christ is spoken of as *ilasmov* [*hilasmos* pronounced he-las-mos], the *propitiation*, and these are in the first epistle of the apostle John; in one of them

I John 4:10 Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the *propitiation* for our sins.

It is said, "God sent his Son to be the propitiation of our sins," that is, sent him in human nature, to offer up soul and body as a sacrifice, and thereby make expiation of sin, and full atonement for it; and in the other it is said:

I John 2:2 And he is *the propitiation* for our sins: and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world.

"And he is the propitiation for our sins," the sins both of Jews and Gentiles; for which he is become a propitiatory sacrifice; upon which God is "merciful," *ilewv* [*hileos*, pronounced he-leh-os], *propitious* to his people, notwithstanding all their "unrighteousness, sins, and transgressions," or is "pacified towards them for all that they have done."

Hebrews 8:12 For I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more.

(Ezekiel 16:63 That thou mayest remember, and be confounded, and never open thy mouth any more because of thy shame, when *I am pacified toward thee* for all that thou hast done, saith the Lord GOD.

2. Secondly, the word atonement, though often used in the Old Testament, of typical sacrifices, making expiation of sin.

Leviticus 4:20 And he shall do with the bullock as he did with the bullock for a sin offering, so shall he do with this: and the priest shall make an *atonement* for them, and it shall be forgiven them.

Leviticus 4:26 And he shall burn all his fat upon the altar, as the fat of the sacrifice of peace offerings: and the priest shall make an *atonement* for him as concerning his sin, and it shall be forgiven him.

Leviticus 4:31 And he shall take away all the fat thereof, as the fat is taken away from off the sacrifice of peace offerings; and the priest shall burn it upon the altar for a sweet savor unto the LORD; and the priest shall make an *atonement* for him, and it shall be forgiven him.

Leviticus 4:35 And he shall take away all the fat thereof, as the fat of the lamb is taken away from the sacrifice of the peace offerings; and the priest shall burn them upon the altar, according to the offerings made by fire unto the LORD: and the priest shall make an *atonement* for his sin that he hath committed, and it shall be forgiven him.

[See also] Leviticus 5:6,18; 16:6,10-11,16-18,27,30,32-34.

Leviticus 17:11 For the life of the flesh *is* in the blood: and I have given it to you upon the altar to make an *atonement* for your souls: for it *is* the blood that maketh an *atonement* for the soul.

where the word rpk [kaphar, pronounced kaw-fahr] is used, which signifies to *cover*, and Christ, by his sacrifice, the antitype of these, is a covering to his people, from the curses of the law they have broken—from the wrath of God they have deserved—and from avenging justice their sins exposed them to.

Yet it [the word atonement] is but once used in the New Testament

Romans 5:11 And not only *so*, but we also joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom we have now received the *atonement*.

“By whom we have received the atonement” made for them by Christ their surety, head, and representative; that is, the benefit of it, the application of it by the Spirit of God, who takes the blood, righteousness, and sacrifice of Christ, and applies to his people, and shows them their interest therein; the effect of which is joy, peace, and comfort.

The word [propitiation] used properly signifies reconciliation, and so it is elsewhere translated; and the Hebrew word rpk is sometimes rendered to *reconcile*

Leviticus 6:30 And no sin offering, whereof any of the blood is brought into the tabernacle of the congregation *to reconcile* withal in the holy place, shall be eaten: it shall be burnt in the fire.

Atonement and reconciliation for sin, design the same thing, and both satisfaction for it. Which leads to observe,

3. Thirdly, that the word reconciliation is frequently used with respect to this doctrine. Reconciliation began with God himself; “All things are of God,” originally, in nature, providence, and grace; particularly this,

II Corinthians 5:18 And all things are of God, *who hath reconciled us* to himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation; It began in the thoughts of his heart, which were thoughts of peace. It was brought into council and

settled in covenant, called the council and covenant of peace. It was carried into execution by Christ, who is frequently represented as the author of it, by his death, and the blood of his cross.

Colossians 1:20-22 And, having made peace through the blood of his cross, by him to *reconcile* all things unto himself; by him, I say, whether they be things in earth, or things in heaven. And you, that were sometime alienated and enemies in *your* mind by wicked works, yet now hath he *reconciled* In the body of his flesh through death, to present you holy and unblameable and unreprieveable in his sight: **And it was made unto God, against whom sin is committed, whose law is broken, and his justice offended; and who is the Lawgiver, who is able to save and to destroy.**

Romans 5:10 For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, being *reconciled*, we shall be saved by his life.

Ephesians 2:16 And that he might *reconcile* both unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby:

It is a reconciliation for sin, to make atonement for it, and of sinners and enemies in their minds to God.

Daniel 9:24 Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to *make reconciliation for iniquity*, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the most Holy.

Hebrews 2:17 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.

Romans 5:10 For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life.

Colossians 1:21 And you, that were sometime alienated and enemies in your mind by wicked works, yet now hath he reconciled.

Which may be further illustrated, 1st, by observing the character of the persons reconciled; which will show the cause, reason, and necessity of a reconciliation to be made. They are *enemies*, and in one of the texts referred to, they are said to be “enemies in their minds by wicked works,” which is expressive,

1. Of the internal enmity there is in their minds and hearts; the carnal mind, as every man's mind is naturally carnal, is not only an enemy, but *enmity* itself, *against God*

Romans 8:7 Because the carnal mind *is enmity* against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be.

to the Being of God—wishing there was no God—to the nature and perfections of God, denying some of them, misrepresenting others, and framing him in their minds, as altogether such an one as themselves—to the purposes and decrees of God, which they cannot bear, and to which they insolently reply; and to the providence of God, they charge with inequality and unrighteousness.

And they are inwardly and secretly enemies to Christ, to his person and offices; particularly his kingly office, being unwilling that he should reign over them; and to his gospel, and the special doctrines of it; and to his ordinances, they care not to be subject unto.

And so they are to the Spirit, to his Person, whom they know not, nor can receive; to his operations, which they deride and ridicule. The things of the Spirit of God are foolishness to them.

And they are enemies to the people of God, there is an old and implacable enmity between the seed of the woman and the seed of the serpent. The saints are hated by the world, because chosen and called out of the world. God's elect themselves, while in a state of nature, are hateful, and hating one another. Paul, a chosen vessel of salvation, was, while unregenerate, exceeding mad against the saints. But,

2. There is an external enmity, which appears by wicked works and sinful actions openly committed: which are acts of hostility against God, are contrary to his nature and will are abominable in his sight provoke the eyes of his glory, excite his wrath, and cause it to be revealed from heaven, and for which it comes on the children of disobedience; and all are deserving of it.

Sins are breaches of the law of God, render men liable to the curses of it, and to death itself, the sanction of it. They not only fill with enmity to God, and show it to him, but set men at a distance from him; so that they have no communion with him, are far off, are without him, and separate from him. But,

3. Men are not only enemies internally, and externally to God, but there is an enmity on the part of God to them. There is a law enmity, or an enmity declared in the law against them. They are declared by the law of God as enemies; traitors, and rebels to him; and as such God's elect were considered, when Christ died to make reconciliation for them; for it is said, "while they were sinners Christ died for them, and when they were enemies they were reconciled to God, the death of his Son."

Romans 5:8 But God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us.

Romans 5:10 For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life.

There is a two fold reconciliation, one of which is the work of Christ, and was made at his death: the other the work of his Spirit, at conversion; when, by his grace, men are reconciled to the way of salvation by Christ; and both may be seen in one text.

If there had been no other enmity than what is in the hearts of men against God, there would have been no need of the sufferings and death of Christ to make reconciliation; but **there was a law enmity on the part of God, and his justice, which required the death of Christ to take it away.**

Not that there was any enmity in the heart of God to his elect. That would be inconsistent with his everlasting and unchangeable love, which appeared strongly towards them at the time Christ died for them, reconciled them, and became the propitiation for their sins.

Romans 5:8 But God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us.

Romans 5:10 For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life.

Titus 3:3-4 For we ourselves also were sometimes foolish, disobedient, deceived, serving divers lusts and pleasures, living in malice and envy, hateful, and hating one another. But after that the kindness and love of God our Savior toward man appeared.

I John 4:10 Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins.

But they were, according to the law, and in the view of justice, deemed and declared as the enemies of God. So when the subjects of a king rise up in rebellion against him, there may be no enmity in his heart to them; yet they are, according to law, proclaimed rebels, and enemies to him, and may be treated as such, and proceeded against in due form of law, yet, after all, be pardoned by him.

There was, in some sense, a reciprocal enmity between God and men, which made a reconciliation necessary; and which was brought about by the bloodshed, sufferings, and death of Christ, when he slew the enmity of the law, and blotted out the handwriting of ordinances that were against sinners, so making peace.

Ephesians 2:14-16 For he is our peace, who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition *between us*; Having abolished in his flesh the

enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances; for to make in himself of twain one new man, so making peace; 16 And that he might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby:

Colossians 2:14 Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross.

Which will further appear, by observing what reconciliation signifies and imports: there is something similar and analogous in a case when it is made between man and man, though not altogether the same; and some caution must be taken, lest we go into mistakes. Reconciliation between man and man, supposes a former state of friendship subsisting between them, a breach of that friendship, and a renewing and restoration of it; and there is something like it in reconciliation between God and man.

Man, in his primeval state, was in strict friendship with God, not only Adam personally being made after the image, and in the likeness of God, having dominion over all the creatures, made for his use, and which were brought to him, to be named by him; and having an habitation in a most delightful garden, where he was allowed to eat of all kind of fruit in it, but one; and where he enjoyed communion with God: in all this honour he was; and not he only. But all his posterity, considered in him, as their head and representative, were in a state of friendship with God. Hence the covenant made with him, in which he was their federal head, is rightly called by divines, *foedus amicitiae*, a covenant of friendship.

But man abode not long in this state. Sin, that whisperer and agitator, soon separated chief friends; alienated man from the life of God, caused him to apostatize from him, and to become a traitor to him; filled him with enmity to him, and set him at a distance from him. And in this state of alienation and enmity, all his posterity naturally are; with respect to the elect of God among them.

Christ has interposed, appeased justice, satisfied the law, and made reconciliation for them, and brought them into an open state of friendship with God. **So that they are considered, in consequence of this, as Abraham was, the friends of God, and are treated as such.**

James 2:23 And the scripture was fulfilled which saith, Abraham believed God, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness: and *he was called the Friend of God.*

Song of Solomon 5:1 I am come into my garden, my sister, my spouse: I have gathered my myrrh with my spice; I have eaten my honeycomb with my honey; I have drunk my wine with my milk: eat, O friends; drink, yea, drink abundantly, O beloved.

John 15:15 Henceforth I call you not servants; for the servant knoweth not what his lord doeth: *but I have called you friends*; for all things that I have heard of my Father I have made known unto you.

[They] have the blessings of divine favor bestowed upon them, and rich communications of grace made unto them. But here we must proceed warily, and observe some things to prevent mistakes and misrepresentations; for perhaps there is not one thing in the whole scheme of evangelical truths more difficult rightly to fix than this. It should be considered, that properly speaking there are no passions nor perturbations of mind in God, who is a spirit, simple and uncompounded, and not capable of such things.

When therefore displeasure, anger, provocation, resentment, etc. are ascribed to him, it must be understood after the manner of men; that he says something in his word, and does something in his providence, and the outward dispensations of it, which is somewhat similar to what men say and do, when the above is the case with them.

Otherwise we are not to conceive that God is in a passion, and is ruffled, and his mind disturbed, as they are. Nor are we to imagine there is any change in God, as in men, who are sometimes friends, then enemies, and then friends again. **He changes not, there is no variableness nor shadow of turning in him.**

He may change his voice to his people, and speak comfortably to them in his gospel, who before spoke terribly to them in his law. He may change his outward conduct and behavior towards them, and carry it friendly to them, when before as at a distance. But he never changes his mind, counsel and affections to them. His love is everlasting and invariable. He ever rested in it, and nothing can separate from it. His love is never changed to enmity, and from enmity to love again. His special secret favor, as it is never lost, needed no recovery.

Nor did Christ, by making satisfaction and reconciliation for sin, procure the love and favor of God to his people; for Christ's being sent to be the propitiation, his sufferings and death, sacrifice and satisfaction, were the fruit and effect of the love of God, and not the cause of it.

John 3:16 For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.

Romans 5:8 But God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us.

I John 4:10 Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son *to be* the propitiation for our sins.

The reconciliation made by Christ was not to the love of God, which was never lost, but to the justice of God, offended by sin; the flaming sword, which turned every way and threatened vengeance, was plunged into the heart of Christ, the surety of his people. [This] was done to declare the righteousness and satisfy the justice of God; and to open a way for mercy to display itself, and turn its hand upon the little ones. Thus justice and mercy happily met together, and were reconciled to one another in their different pleas and demands.

Zechariah 13:7 Awake, O sword, against my shepherd, and against the man that is my fellow, saith the LORD of hosts: smite the shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered: and I will turn mine hand upon the little ones.

Romans 3:25-26 Whom God hath set forth *to be a propitiation* through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God To declare, I say, at this time his righteousness: that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus.

Psalms 85:10 Mercy and truth are met together; righteousness and peace have kissed *each other*.

The reconciliation made by Christ is for sin, to make satisfaction for it.

Daniel 9:24 Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, and *to make reconciliation for iniquity*, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the most Holy.

Hebrews 2:17 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.

And on that account it is a reconciliation of sinners to God, he being thereby pacified towards them for all that they have done; being well pleased with what Christ has done and suffered for them. He is well pleased with him, and with all that are considered in him, who are accepted in him the beloved, and are admitted into an open state of favor; which is meant by their having access through Christ into the grace wherein they stand.

Matthew 3:17 And lo a voice from heaven, saying, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.

Ephesians 1:6 To the praise of the glory of his grace, wherein he hath made us accepted in the beloved.

Romans 5:2 By whom also we have access by faith into this grace wherein we stand, and rejoice in hope of the glory of God.

Though the love of God to his elect is invariable and unchangeable in itself, yet the manifestation of it is different; and it may be distinguished into secret and open love. There are obstructions by sin thrown in the way of love, which must be removed, in order to enjoy open favor and the blessings of it, and which are removed by Christ. Thus Christ was made under the law, to redeem his people, that they might receive the adoption of children; and was made a curse for them, that the blessings of grace love had provided in covenant for them, might come upon them. He was made sin, and a sin offering for them, that they might be made the righteousness of God in him; and be brought into a state of open fellowship and communion with him, who before were kept at a distance.

Thus David, though he most affectionately loved his son Absalom, and longed for him, when for an offence he fled. And though through the mediation of Joab he was allowed to return to Jerusalem, yet the king would not suffer him to see his face for the space of full two years; when by the mediation of the same person he was admitted into the king's presence, taken into open favor, and kissed by him.

II Samuel 13:39 And the soul of king David longed to go forth unto Absalom: for he was comforted concerning Amnon, seeing he was dead.

II Samuel 14:1 Now Joab the son of Zeruiah perceived that the king's heart was toward Absalom.

II Samuel 14:21 And the king said unto Joab, Behold now, I have done this thing: go therefore, bring the young man Absalom again.

II Samuel 14:24 And the king said, Let him turn to his own house, and let him not see my face. So Absalom returned to his own house, and saw not the king's face.

II Samuel 14:33 So Joab came to the king, and told him: and when he had called for Absalom, he came to the king, and bowed himself on his face to the ground before the king: and the king kissed Absalom.

The means by which this reconciliation is made, are the bloodshed and death of Christ. He only is the reconciler and peace maker. A sinner cannot make peace with God or reconciliation, that is, satisfaction for his sins; not by his works of righteousness, which are impure and imperfect; nor by repentance, which the law does not admit of. Nor is it any satisfaction to it; nor by faith, for that does not make, only receives the atonement made by Christ. There is nothing a sinner can do, will make peace and reconciliation for him. And what will, he cannot do; which is no less than fulfilling the whole law, and answering all the demands of law and justice.

Romans 8:3-4 For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh: That the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.

Death being the sanction of the law, and the wages of sin, there is no reconciliation to be made but by death.

Not by the death of slain beasts, which could not take away sin; nor by the death of the sinner himself. The Jews having lost the true notion of the atonement by the Messiah, fancy that a man's death atones for his sins. But it is a false notion; there is no other way of peace, reconciliation, and atonement being made, but by the death of the Son of God; who being God as well as man, could and did give virtue and efficacy to his blood, sufferings, and death in human nature united to his person, as to make them adequate to the said purposes. (*John Gill's Divinity, ppg 350-354*)

Protestant Reformation, The

The PROTESTANT Reformation: Sylvester Hassell: The Protestant Reformation was born, apparently, of an intense conviction of the utter sinfulness of man and his radical need of Divine regeneration. As the only antidote to the theoretical Semi-Pelagianism and the practical Pelagianism and the innumerable unspeakable pharisaical abominations of Catholicism, Luther, and Calvin, in the sixteenth century, proclaimed anew, in trumpet tones, to the priest-ridden millions of Europe, the great Pauline and Augustinian doctrine of sin and grace—the entire natural equality and total depravity of all men in the eyes of an Infinitely Holy God, the absolute dependence of fallen man upon the sovereign mercy of the Most High, justification by faith alone (solifidianism)— nothing like this old Bible doctrine, when believed, to cut up human pride and merit and pharisaism by the roots, to humble man in the dust before God, to stir him up to heartfelt gratitude for the Divine salvation, to cause him to serve God in spirit from an inward principle of filial love, and to comfort him in trial and despondency.

The severest denunciations of the Spirit of God had been uttered by the mouths of his prophets in the Old Testament, against a proud, heartless ceremonialism and legalism, and by Christ and his Apostles, in the New testament, against a hypocritical pharisaical formalism. Something of the same burning and purifying Spirit doubtless animated the Protestant Reformers, and, under Divine Providence, and in connection with other events, made that great movement the transition from medieval to modern history, and the national dawn of universal civil and religious liberty (always advocated by the Baptists); so that today, after the lapse of four centuries, the direct influence of Rome upon the laws and governments of the civilized world is almost totally annihilated for a season.

But, instead of a defective *reformation*, merely, the utter apostasy of Rome, carnalizing and defiling the pure spiritual religion of Christ, and repudiating him when it set over itself another head, and made its kingdom a worldly one, needed a *thorough-going renovation*. Rome had become plainly-developed Anti-Christ, and should not have been acknowledged in any sense as a church of Christ. Her subjection to tradition and human authority is a repudiation of Scripture and Divine authority. Choosing to obey man rather than God, she can in no respect be considered a church of Christ, and any derivation or succession from her is a *prima facie* evidence of the radical unscripturalness of any religious organization.

The Protestant Reformers, though real heroes of some great doctrinal truths, were not endowed with sufficient grace or penetration or boldness to recognize *this basal truth*, and therefore conceded to Rome the attributes of a church of Christ, and retained many of her fatal, unscriptural doctrinal errors and practices—her traditionalism (an unauthorized departure from the written word of God, to which departure there can be no logical limit), her infant baptism, her national membership, her alliance with the State and consequent corruption and exercise of persecution for the purpose of enforcing religious uniformity, her hierarchism, her sacramentalism (the sealing and saving power of ordinances), her substitution of forms for personal piety, and of the authority of the “church” for the authority of the Bible.

All these features are perfectly consistent and congenial with papal synergism, Semi-Pelagianism, pharisaism, but totally irreconcilable with the great monergistic, Pauline, Christian doctrine of Divine predestination and election, justification by faith alone, salvation by grace alone. The military followers of the Protestant princes wore embroidered on their right sleeves these letters, V.D.M.I.Ae (standing for Verbum Dei Manet Aeternum, *The Word of the Lord endureth forever*), to which pure and noble motto it is deeply to be regretted that they did not yield *complete* fealty.

Baptist Churches have no succession from Rome; they are conformed to and derived from the pure, spiritual, apostolic models presented in the New Testament; their leading principles were held by poor, humble, despised, unchurchy, persecuted sects (like their New Testament prototypes, I Corinthians 1:26-31; James 2:5; Matthew 5:3-12; Acts 4:14; 24:14; 28:22); and it is admitted by candid Romanists, and it is perfectly obvious, that “Baptists are the only consistent and thorough antagonists of their creed, and that Baptist principles are necessary in their totality for the final overthrow of Romanism.”

The inconsistency and defectiveness of the principles of the original Protestant Reformers have, in a spiritual point of view, become more apparent and pronounced with the lapse of time, because seeds of error develop and grow and strengthen, so that very high Protestant authorities have declared Protestantism (like

Catholicism) a failure. Sir William Hamilton, of the University of Edinburgh, the inexorable logician and common-sense philosopher, declares that Protestantism has gravitated back toward Catholicism, until the differences are only *nominal*. Professor Philip Schaff, of New York, the ablest American church historian, and one of the first Presbyterian scholars of the United States, affirms that so many churchy and Catholic elements were retained by the Reformers that, as a growing consequence, much of present Protestantism must be considered an apostasy from the position of Luther, Melancthon and Calvin. Prof. A.A. Hodge, of Princeton, New Jersey, a distinguished Presbyterian theologian, makes the strong remark that the Protestant pulpit of today is as much in need of a thorough reformation as was the catholic pulpit of four hundred years ago.

Of the three leading Protestant communions, the Anglican was the least reformed, the Lutheran next, and the Presbyterian the most. As Augustine, by his principal doctrine, is a heretic in the Catholic communion, says Prof. Schaff, so Luther, by the same doctrine is a heretic in the Lutheran communion. Many of the Lutheran clergy have, during the present century, gone back to Rome. The Anglican body, ignoring Scripture and their own early history, have, for the last 250 years, been gradually growing more exclusive, more High-Church, and more Arminian, a strong and increasing party in that communion fondly styling themselves *Anglo-Catholics*, and many, not satisfied with this, actually deserting to Rome during the last fifty years (since the issuance of the scholastic, sacramentarian, and churchy Oxford Tracts, 1833-1841).

A small daughter of the Anglican body, the (Whitefieldian) Welsh Calvinistic Methodists, though retaining some Catholic errors, advocate the Bible doctrine of salvation by grace alone; but a very large daughter, the Wesleyan Methodists, have in the main abandoned the cautious doctrinal reserve of the Semi-Calvinists, James Arminius and Richard Watson, their ablest theologians, and have dangerously approximated a Pelagian anthropology and soteriology, and adopted numerous worldly innovations, so that it has become a common remark that the new-fashioned Methodists are very different from the old.

The Presbyterians, except the comparatively small Arminian Cumberland body, have remarkably adhered, by profession, to the scriptural doctrine of human depravity and Divine salvation and Christ's sole headship of the church; but they have also continued to hold, inconsistently, to the fundamental errors of Catholic infant baptism (or rather *rhantism*)—a complicated system of church government founded upon worldly wisdom, instead of being founded upon the simple spiritual plan of the New Testament—affiliation with all professed Christians, even with Catholics—and, in Europe, the unspiritual, corrupting alliance between *church* and State, though, in their ranks, this alliance is greatly weakening.

Presbyterian Scotland, being further from Rome than are Germany and England, and being a poorer and rougher and less inviting country, and inhabited by a more

independent people, suffered from papal interference less than Germany and England. It is not for the lack of sense that the Scotch are predestinarians, for they are noted as the most common-sense and largest brained people in Europe. (*Hassell's History* ppg 330-333)

Protestant, The Term

The Term PROTESTANT The name of “Protestants” originated from the solemn “Protest” (April 19, 1529) made by the evangelical princes of Germany against the intolerant decree of the second Diet of Spire---the Protest reciting, in defense of its position, the Scriptures, the inalienable rights of conscience, and the decree of the first Diet of Spire (in 1526), which left each State to its own discretion concerning the question of reform until a general council should settle it for all.” (*Hassell's History* pg 472)

Pseudo-Isodorian Decretals, The

The PSEUDO-ISODORIAN DECRETALS: Sylvester Hassell: The popes strove continually to decrease the power of the emperors and the *Bishops*, and to increase their own power. The feuds attending the dissolution of the Charlemagne monarchy favored these attempts. The ungodly ambition of the popes was further and very greatly favored by the Pseudo-Isodorian Decretals—the grandest forgery of ancient or modern times; a compilation made about 850 by some Frankish ecclesiastic, from the Bible, from his own inventions, from patristic, monkish, papal, legal and historical writers (thirty-five, or one third, of the Decretals, in reference to the acts of the first pretended popes, being the compiler’s invention), for the purpose of advancing the claims of sacerdotalism, sacramentalism and papalism—to legitimate the authority of the priesthood, to make the church independent of secular control, and to vindicate the claims of Rome. “Upon these spurious decretals,” says Hallam, “was built the great fabric of papal supremacy over the different national churches—a fabric which has stood after its foundation crumbled beneath it; for no one has pretended to deny, for the last two centuries, that the imposture is too palpable for any but the most ignorant ages to credit.” The forgery is detected by the glaring anachronisms and monstrous ignorance of history; and yet the hypocritical sanctimoniousness of Rome pervades the work, “the whole being composed with an air of profound piety and reverence, a specious purity, and occasional beauty, in the moral and religious tone,” says Milman. Nowhere was the work better known to have been a forgery than in Rome, and yet Pope Nicholas I. (858-869) and his successors unblushingly appealed to these fabrications to sustain their unparalleled pretensions to universal supremacy. (*Hassell's History* pg 423)

Public Offences

PUBLIC OFFENCES: Lemuel Potter: Among other things that Elder Paine preached, besides the no-soul doctrine, as I have stated in another chapter, was that the flesh and bones of Christ and his human nature had existed in heaven from all eternity.....I could not conscientiously be still, and hold my peace, and let that doctrine overrun our part of the country....At the supper table he made the remark to me that he had one request to make, and that was that if he should preach anything that night that I did not endorse, I should speak to him privately about it, and say nothing publicly upon the subject. I told him that we had tried that course with some of those men who denied the resurrection until they had greatly the advantage of us, and that **I had concluded that if a man preached anything in my pulpit, to my people, that I did not believe to be true, I should expose it at once publicly**, so that the Baptists might be aware of the fact that I did not believe it. (*Lemuel Potter emphasis added*).

Public Opinion

PUBLIC OPINION We spend too much time worrying about what people think about us. But most of those people you worry so much about will not even come to see you off, when you leave this old world. I have noticed that, if you want somebody to attend your funeral, it works out best if manage to die about Thursday or Friday. That way, they can bury you on the weekend. hlh

I have heard that there are three ages of man. At twenty a man does not care what people think of him. At forty he does care what people think of him. And at sixty he finds out that nobody was thinking about him.

hlh

In 1885, Sylvester Hassell published the best church history that we have any access to. I don't believe it will ever be surpassed. When his youngest son died several years ago, the minister who preached his funeral mentioned the book his father had written. Some of Elder Hassell's own grandchildren had never even heard of the book. hlh

Punishment, Eternal

Eternal PUNISHMENT (*See under Eternal HELL*)

Puritans, The

The PURITANS (*See under The INDEPENDENTS*)

Quakers, The

The QUAKERS: Sylvester Hassell: The Friends or Quakers originated in 1647. They were, in some respects, the successors of the Mystics of the Middle Ages, and the predecessors of the Methodists of the Eighteenth century. George Fox (1624-1690), a moral, meek, odd, uneducated, bold and poor man, was their founder; Robert Barclay (1648-1690) their apologist and theologian; and William Penn (1644-1718) their statesman and politician. They claimed, not to be founders of a new sect, but revivers of primitive Christianity. They taught the spirituality of true religion; the indispensable need of “the inner light” or the Spirit of Christ for the understanding of the Scriptures; the privilege of direct access to God without the intervention of human priest or ceremony; entire freedom of conscience and worship for all men; that the ministry need no human education or theological training, but only the preparation afforded by the Holy Spirit, and that they ought to preach without hire or bargaining, though they may receive voluntary contributions from those to whom they administer in spiritual things. They steadfastly opposed tithes, oaths, infant baptism, war, slavery, intemperance, vain fashions, corrupting amusements and flattering titles; and these eccentricities brought upon them the terrible vengeance of the “State Church.”

It is said that, from 1650 to 1689, 13,258 Quakers suffered fine, imprisonment, torture and mutilation in the British Isles, 219 were banished, and 360 perished in prisons, some almost literally rotting in pestilential cells; and, in New England, 170 cases of hard usage are enumerated, 47 were banished, and four (including one woman) were hanged. These sufferings they bore with exemplary patience and heroism, leaving their enemies to the correction of the Lord, and meekly saying that it was better than to do wrong.

But, with their wonderful light, they had much spiritual darkness. They taught that the ordinances of baptism and the Lord’s Supper were not designed by Christ and his Apostles to be observed *outwardly* by the church, but only inwardly; that Christ died for every individual of the human race, and that the inner light or grace of his Spirit is given in sufficient measure to every human being, in all ages and countries of the world, to save all if they obey it, and condemn them if they reject it (the Quakers thus being the most Arminian of Arminians, and surpassing all other denominations in their latitudinarian view of the Spirit’s influence); that men are justified *in* their works, though not on account of their works; and that it is possible, in the present world, to reach a state of sinless perfection.

Their four *grades* of meetings for discipline—the preparative, the monthly, the quarterly and the yearly, the latter exercising exclusive legislative and finally appellate power over a large collection of Societies—somewhat resemble the polity of Presbyterianism; the system has too much worldly wisdom, and too little New Testament authority. Some of their writers, even in the seventeenth century,

approached very near to Socinianism, denying the Trinity, the divinity of Christ, the vicarious nature of the atonement, and imputed righteousness.

And in 1827 a schism took place among the American Quakers, Elias Hicks, of New York (1768-1830), openly advocating Socinianism, and drawing off into a separate body (called Hicksite Quakers) the most of the Quakers in the Atlantic States; while this movement caused those called the Orthodox Quakers to adhere more closely to the Scriptures. Each party professes to hold the view of the founders of the Society in the seventeenth century—the name which they have given themselves not being the church, but “The Religious Society of Friends.” (*Hassell’s History* ppg 519, 520)

Redemption

REDEMPTION: Abridged from John Gill: Having, in the preceding book, gone through the twofold state of Christ, his humiliation and exaltation; and considered each of the offices of Prophet, Priest, and King, sustained and exercised by him therein; I shall now proceed to consider the blessings of grace, which come by him, through the exercise of them; and especially his priestly office; for he is “come an High Priest of good things to come.”

Hebrews 9:11 But Christ being come an high priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building.

[These were] future; under the former dispensation, were promised, prophesied of, and prefigured in it; but not accomplished; for “the law” had only a shadow of these good things to come.

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

But now they are come, and are actually obtained, through Christ's coming in the flesh; and through what he has done and suffered in it; as redemption, satisfaction, and reconciliation for sin, remission of sin, justification, adoption, etc.

And as redemption stands in the first place; and is a principal and most important blessing and doctrine of grace, I shall begin with that.

1. First, I shall settle the meaning of the word; and show what it supposes, includes, and is designed by it.

Our English word *redemption*, is from the Latin tongue, and signifies, buying again.

Several words in the Greek language of the New Testament are used in the affair of our Redemption, which signify the obtaining of something by paying a proper price for it.

Sometimes the simple verb **agorazw** [pronounced ah-go-rahd-zo], *to buy*, is used: so the redeemed are said to be “bought unto God” by the blood of Christ; and to be “bought” from the earth; and to be “bought” from among men; and to be “bought” with a price; that is, with the price of Christ's blood.

Revelation 5:9 And they sung a new song, saying, Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof: for thou wast slain, and hast *redeemed us* to God by thy blood *out of* every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation;

Revelation 14:3-4 And they sung as it were a new song before the throne, and before the four beasts, and the elders: and no man could learn that song but the hundred *and* forty *and* four thousand, which were *redeemed from the earth*. These are they which were not defiled with women; for they are virgins. These are they which follow the Lamb whithersoever he goeth. These were *redeemed from among men, being* the firstfruits unto God and to the Lamb.

I Corinthians 6:20 For ye are *bought with a price*: therefore glorify God in your body, and in your spirit, which are God's.

Hence the church of God is said to be purchased with it [with Christ's blood].

Acts 20:28 Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which he hath *purchased with his own blood*.

Sometimes the compound word **exagorazw** [pronounced ex-ah-go-rahd-zo], is used; which signifies, to buy again, or out of the hands of another; as the redeemed are bought out of the hands of justice; as in

Galatians 3:13 Christ hath *redeemed us* from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us: for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree:

Galatians 4:5 *To redeem them* that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons.

In other places **lutrow** [pronounced loo-troh-oh], is used, or others derived from it; which signifies, the deliverance of a slave, or captive, from his thralldom, by paying a ransom price for him.

So the saints are said to be redeemed, not with silver or gold, the usual price paid for a ransom; but with a far greater one, the blood and life of Christ, which he came into this world to give, as a ransom price for many; and even himself, which is **antilutron** [ahn-tee-loo-trohn], an answerable, adequate, and full price for them.

I Peter 1:18 Forasmuch as ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, *as* silver and gold, from your vain conversation received by tradition from your fathers.

Matthew 20:28 Even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life *a ransom for many*.

I Timothy 2:6 Who gave himself *a ransom for all*, to be testified in due time.

There are various typical redemptions, and that are of a civil nature, which may serve to illustrate our spiritual and eternal redemption by Christ. As,

1. The deliverances of the people of Israel out of their captivities, Egyptian and Babylonian.

The latter I shall not much insist upon; since, though the Jews were exiles in Babylon, they did not appear to be in much slavery and thralldom; but built houses, planted gardens, and had many privileges; insomuch that some of them, when they might have had their liberty, chose rather to continue where they were. And though their deliverance is sometimes called a redemption, yet sparingly, and in an improper sense.

Jeremiah 15:21 And I will *deliver* thee out of the hand of the wicked, and I will *redeem* thee out of the hand of the terrible.

They were redeemed without money; and Cyrus, their deliverer, neither gave, nor took, a price for them; and is never called a redeemer.

Isaiah 45:13 I have raised him up in righteousness, and I will direct all his ways: he shall build my city, and he shall let go my captives, *not for price nor reward*, saith the LORD of hosts.

Isaiah 52:3 For thus saith the LORD, Ye have sold yourselves for nought; and ye shall be *redeemed without money*.

But the deliverance of the people of Israel out of Egypt, was a very special and remarkable type of redemption by Christ, out of a worse state of bondage than that of Egypt.

The Israelites were made to serve with rigor, and their lives were made bitter with hard bondage, in brick and mortar, and service in the field. And they cried to God, by reason of their bondage, it was so intolerable; and it was aggravated by the taskmasters set over them; who, by the order of Pharaoh, obliged them to provide themselves with straw, and yet bring in the full tale of brick as before.

[This] fitly expresses the state and condition that men are in; who, through sin, are weak and unable to fulfil the law. Yet is it as regardless of want of strength, as the Egyptian taskmasters were of want of straw. [The law] requires sinless and perfect obedience to it; and curses and condemns such as continue not in all things to do it.

The deliverance of the people of Israel, is called a redemption. God promised to rid them out of their bondage, and to *redeem* them with a stretched out arm; and when they were delivered, he is said to have led forth the people he had *redeemed*. And the bringing them out of the house of bondage, or redeeming them out of the house of bondmen, is used as an argument to engage them to regard the commandments of God.

Exodus 6:6 Wherefore say unto the children of Israel, I am the LORD, and I will bring you out from under the burdens of the Egyptians, and I will rid you out of their bondage, and *I will redeem you* with a stretched out arm, and with great judgments:

Exodus 15:13 Thou in thy mercy hast led forth the people which thou hast *redeemed*: thou hast guided them in thy strength unto thy holy habitation.

Deuteronomy 7:8 But because the LORD loved you, and because he would keep the oath which he had sworn unto your fathers, hath the LORD brought you out with a mighty hand, and *redeemed you* out of the house of bondmen, from the hand of Pharaoh king of Egypt.

Exodus 20:2 I am the LORD thy God, which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage.

And which redemption by Christ, from sin, the law, and death, lay the redeemed under a still greater obligation to do. Moses, who was the instrument God raised up, and whom he called and sent to redeem Israel, is said to be a *deliverer*, or as it should be rendered, a *redeemer*.

Acts 7:35 This Moses whom they refused, saying, Who made thee a ruler and a judge? the same did God send *to be a ruler and a deliverer [redeemer]* by the hand of the angel which appeared to him in the bush.

In which he was a type of Christ, whom God raised up, called, and sent to be a Redeemer of his spiritual Israel.

And there was, in some sense, a price paid for the redemption of literal Israel; since they are expressly said to be a purchased people, bought by the Lord.

Exodus 15:16 Fear and dread shall fall upon them; by the greatness of thine arm they shall be as still as a stone; till thy people pass over, O LORD, till the people pass over, *which thou hast purchased.*

Deuteronomy 32:6 Do ye thus requite the LORD, O foolish people and unwise? *is* not he thy father that hath *bought thee?* hath he not made thee, and established thee?

And their deliverance was owing to blood, the blood of the passover lamb, sprinkled on their door posts; typical of the blood of Christ, the price of our redemption.

Besides, as it has been observed by some, the redemption of the people of Israel, being the Lord's people, was by virtue of their future redemption by Christ; whose sufferings and death were for the "redemption of transgressions," or of transgressors, who were "under the first testament."

The temporal deliverance of none but the Lord's people, is called a redemption, not that of his and their enemies.

2. The ransom of the people of Israel, when numbered, was typical of the ransom by Christ; which was made by paying half a shekel, called the atonement money for their souls.

[This] was paid alike for a rich man, as a poor man; whereby they were preserved from any plague among them.

Exodus 30:12-16 When thou takest the sum of the children of Israel after their number, then shall they give every man *a ransom for his soul* unto the LORD, when thou numberest them; that there be no plague among them, when thou numberest them. This they shall give, every one that passeth among them that are numbered, half a shekel after the shekel of the sanctuary: (a shekel *is* twenty gerahs:) an half shekel *shall be* the offering of the LORD. Every one that passeth among them that are numbered, from twenty years old and above, shall give an offering unto the LORD. The rich shall not give more, and the poor shall not give less than half a shekel, when *they* give an offering unto the LORD, *to make an atonement for your souls.* And thou shalt take the atonement money of the children of Israel, and shalt appoint it for the service of the tabernacle of the congregation; that it may be a memorial unto the children of Israel before the LORD, *to make an atonement for your souls.*

None but Israelites were ransomed; and none are ransomed by Christ, but the spiritual Israel of God, whom he has chosen, Christ has redeemed, and who shall

be saved with an everlasting salvation; even the whole Israel of God, Jews and Gentiles.

They were a numbered people for whom the ransom was paid. And so are they that are redeemed and ransomed by Christ; whose names are written in the Lamb's book of life.

[They] have passed under the hands of him that telleth them, and have been told into the hands of Christ; and are particularly and distinctly known by him, even by name. [They are] the sheep for whom he has laid down his life; and are a special and peculiar people. The half shekel was paid alike for rich and poor, for one neither more nor less. Christ's people, though some may be redeemed from more and greater sins than others.

Yet they are all redeemed from all their sins, and with the same price, the price of his blood; and which is, as the half shekel was, an atonement for their souls; by which peace and reconciliation, and full satisfaction are made for sin.

So that no plague shall come nigh them; they are delivered from going down to the pit of destruction; and are saved from the second death.

Job 33:24 Then he is gracious unto him, and saith, *Deliver him* from going down to the pit: I have found *a ransom*.

3. The buying again of an Israelite, waxen poor, and sold to another, by any near akin to him; is a lively representation of the purchase and redemption of the Lord's poor people.

Leviticus 25:47-49 And if a sojourner or stranger wax rich by thee, and thy brother *that dwelleth* by him wax poor, and sell himself unto the stranger *or* sojourner by thee, or to the stock of the stranger's family: After that he is sold *he may be redeemed again*; one of his brethren may redeem him: Either his uncle, or his uncle's son, *may redeem him*, or *any* that is nigh of kin unto him of his family may redeem him; or if he be able, *he may redeem himself*.

[They] in a state of nature, are poor, and wretched, and miserable; even so as to be like beggars on the dunghill; when such was the grace of Christ, who, though rich, for their sakes became poor, that they, through his poverty might be made rich, and to such a degree, as to be raised from the dunghill and sit among princes, and inherit the throne of glory.

Though some may not sell themselves to work wickedness, as Ahab did, yet all are sold under sin; for if this was the case of the apostle Paul, though regenerate, much more must it be the case of an unregenerate man; who, through sin, is brought into subjection to it, a servant of it, and a slave to it.

As the poor Israelite, sold to a stranger, was a bondman to him: and such an one cannot redeem himself, being without strength, unable to fulfil the law, and to make atonement for sin; nor can any of his friends, though ever so rich, redeem him, or give to God a ransom for him.

Such may redeem a poor relation, or friend from a prison, by paying his pecuniary debts for him; but cannot redeem his soul from hell and destruction. [He] may give a ransom price to man for one in slavery and bondage; but cannot give to God a ransom to deliver from wrath to come. Only Christ, the near Kinsman of his people, can do this, and has done it.

He that is their *Gaol*, their near *Kinsman*, partaker of the same flesh and blood with them, is their Redeemer, who has given himself a ransom for them.

4. The delivery of a debtor from prison, by paying his debts for him, is an emblem of deliverance and redemption by Christ.

A man that is in debt, is liable to be arrested, and cast into prison, as is often the case; where he must lie till the debt is discharged, by himself or another. Sins are debts; and a sinner owes more than ten thousand talents, and has nothing to pay. He cannot answer to the justice of God for one debt of a thousand. Nor can he, by paying a debt of obedience he owes to God, pay off one debt of sin, or obligation to punishment; and so is liable to a prison, and is in one; is concluded under sin, under the guilt of it, which exposes him to punishment. He is held with the cords and fetters of it; which he cannot loose himself from; and he is shut up under the law, in which he is held, until delivered and released by Christ.

He has engaged to pay the debts of his people, has paid them, cleared the whole score, and blotted out the hand writing that was against them; in consequence of which is proclaimed, in the gospel, liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound.

5. The ransoming of persons out of slavery, by paying a ransom price for them, serves to give an idea of the redemption of the Lord's people by Christ.

They are in a state of slavery, out of which they cannot deliver themselves. Christ is the ransomer of them out of the hands of such that are stronger than they. His life and blood are the ransom price he has paid for them; and they are called, the ransomed of the Lord. Their deliverance from present bondage, and future ruin and destruction, is in consequence of a ransom found and given; "Deliver him from going down to the pit; I have found a ransom"

Job 33:24 Then he is gracious unto him, and saith, Deliver him from going down to the pit: I have found a ransom.

Zechariah 9:11 As for thee also, by the blood of thy covenant I have sent forth thy prisoners out of the pit wherein *is* no water.

In which there is an allusion to a custom in the eastern countries, to put their slaves in an evening into a pit, where they are close shut up till the morning, and then taken out, to be put to their slavish employments; but not delivered, unless a sufficient ransom is given for them. And such is the blood of the covenant. Now all these views of redemption plainly point out to us the following things with respect to the redemption of the Lord's people.

1. That they are previous to their redemption, and which that supposes, in a state of captivity and bondage. They are sinners in Adam, and by actual transgressions; and so come into the hands of vindictive justice, offended by sin; and which will not clear the guilty without satisfaction given to it; which is made by paying a price.

Redemption by Christ is nothing more nor less than buying his people out of the hands of justice, in which they are held for sin; and that is with the price of his blood; which is therefore paid into the hands of justice for them. Hence they are said to be redeemed, or bought unto God by his blood.

Revelation 5:9 And they sung a new song, saying, Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof: for thou wast slain, and *hast redeemed us to God* by thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation;

Being sinners, and offenders of the justice of God, that holds under sin; under the guilt of it, which binds over to punishment, unless delivered from it; it holds them under the sentence of the law, transgressed by them. [It] not only accuses of and charges with sin, but pronounces guilty, and condemns and curses. It holds them in subjection to death, even eternal death; which is the wages and just demerit of sin. The law threatened with it in case of sin; sin being committed, the sentence of death passed upon all men; all having sinned, judgment, or the judicial sentence, came upon all men to condemnation in a legal way.

Sin reigned unto death in a tyrannical manner; or, in other words, man became not only deserving of wrath, but obnoxious to it. The wrath of God was revealed from heaven against all unrighteousness and ungodliness of men; and indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish, come upon every soul of man, as upon the children of disobedience, unless delivered from it, through the redemption that is by Christ. In such an enthralled state are men to sin, to the justice of God, to death, and wrath to come.

3. That redemption by Christ is a deliverance from all this. It is a redemption from sin; from all iniquities whatever, original and actual.

Psalms 130:8 And he shall redeem Israel *from all his iniquities*.

Titus 2:14 Who gave himself for us, that he might *redeem us from all iniquity*, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works.

[He redeemed us] from avenging justice, on account of sin; from the guilt of sin; for there is no condemnation by it to them that are interested in redemption by Christ. “Who shall condemn? it is Christ that died!” and by dying, has redeemed his people from sin, and secured them from condemnation.

Romans 8:1 There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.

Romans 8:33 Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth.

In virtue of this they are delivered from the dominion of sin; for though this is done in the effectual calling, by the power of divine grace, it is in virtue of redemption by Christ, by whom sin is crucified, and the body of it destroyed; so that it shall not reign in them, or have dominion over them.

One branch of redemption lies in being delivered from a vain conversation; and, ere long, the redeemed shall be delivered from the very being of sin; when their redemption, as to the application of it, will be complete; as it will be in the resurrection. [Then] the soul will not only be among the spirits of just men made perfect; but the body will be clear of sin, mortality, and death. [This is] called redemption that draws near, the redemption of the body waited for, and the day of redemption.

Luke 21:28 And when these things begin to come to pass, then look up, and lift up your heads; *for your redemption draweth nigh*.

Romans 8:23 And not only they, but ourselves also, which have the firstfruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, *to wit, the redemption of our body*.

Ephesians 1:14 Which is the earnest of our inheritance until *the redemption of the purchased possession*, unto the praise of his glory.

Ephesians 4:30 And grieve not the holy Spirit of God, whereby ye are sealed unto *the day of redemption*.

Redemption is a deliverance from the law, from the bondage of it, and from the curse and condemnation by it; so that there shall be no more curse; and from eternal death and wrath to come. Life is forfeited into the hands of justice by sin; which life is redeemed from destruction by Christ, giving his life a ransom for it. He, by redeeming his people, has delivered them from wrath to come; being justified through the redemption that is in Christ. By his blood, they are, and shall be saved, from everlasting wrath, ruin, and destruction.

3. That redemption by Christ is such a deliverance, as that it is setting persons quite free and at entire liberty.

Such who are dead to sin by Christ are freed from it, from the damning power of it, and from its dominion and tyranny. Though, not as yet, from the being of it; yet, ere long, they will be; when, with the rest of the members of the church, they will be presented glorious, without spot or wrinkle, or any such thing.

Such are free from the law; though not from obedience to it, yet from the bondage of it; they are delivered from it, and are no longer held in it, as in a prison; but are directed and exhorted to stand fast in the liberty from it, with which Christ has made them free. This will have its full completion on all accounts, when the saints shall be delivered from every degree of bondage into the glorious liberty of the children of God.

Redemption, Arguments Against Universal

Arguments Against Universal REDEMPTION: J. Gill: What may be further necessary, will be to produce some reasons, or arguments, against universal redemption; and to give answer to such scriptures as are brought in favor of it.

It should be observed, that it is agreed on both sides, that all are not eventually saved. Could universal salvation be established, there would be no objection to universal redemption. The former not being the case the latter cannot be true.

Christ certainly saves all whom he redeems.

First, I shall give some reasons, or produce some arguments against the universal scheme of redemption. And,

First, The first set of arguments shall be taken from hence, that universal redemption reflects highly on the perfections of God; and what is contrary to the divine perfections, cannot be true. God cannot deny himself, nor say, nor do anything contrary to his nature and attributes.

1. The universal scheme greatly reflects on the love of God to men. It may, at first sight, seem to magnify it, since it extends it to all. But it will not appear so; it lessens it, and reduces it to nothing. The scriptures highly commend the love of God, as displayed in the death of his Son, and in redemption by him; but what kind of love must that be, which does not secure the salvation of any by it?

It is not that love which God bears to his own people, which is special and distinguishing; when, **according to the universal scheme, God loved Peter no more than he did Judas**; nor the saints now in heaven, any more than those that are damned in hell. They were both loved alike, and equally redeemed by Christ.

Nor is it that love of God, which is immutable, invariable, and unalterable; since, according to this scheme, God loves men with so intense a love, at one time, as to give his Son to die for them, and wills that they all should be saved. **And afterwards this love is turned into wrath and fury**; and he is determined to punish them with everlasting destruction.

What sort of love must this be in God, not to spare his Son, but deliver him up to death for all the individuals of mankind, for their redemption; and **yet, to multitudes of them, does not send them so much as the gospel**, to acquaint them with the blessing of redemption by Christ; and much less his Spirit, to apply the benefit of redemption to them; nor give them faith to lay hold upon it for themselves? Such love as this is unworthy of God, and of no service to the creature.

2. The universal scheme, highly reflects on the wisdom of God.

It is certain, God is “wonderful in counsel,” in contriving the scheme of redemption; and is “excellent in working,” in the execution of it. He is the wise God, and our Saviour; and is wise as such. **But where is his wisdom in forming a scheme, in which he fails of his end?** there must be some deficiency in it; a want of wisdom, to concert a scheme, which is not, or cannot be carried into execution, at least as to some considerable part of it.

Should it be said, that the failure is owing to some men’s not performing the conditions of their redemption required of them. It may be observed, either God did know, or did not know, that these men would not perform the conditions required. If he did not know, this ascribes want of knowledge to him; which surely ought not to be ascribed to him that knows all things. If he did know they would not perform them, where is his wisdom, to provide the blessing of redemption, which he knew beforehand, would be of no service to them? **Let not such a charge of folly, be brought against infinite Wisdom.**

3. The universal scheme, highly reflects on the justice of God.

God is righteous in all his ways and works; and so in this of redemption by Christ. And, indeed, one principal end of it is, “To declare the righteousness of God, that he might be just,” or appear to be just, “and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus.” But if Christ died for the sins of all men, and the punishment of their sins is inflicted on him, and bore by him, and yet multitudes of them are everlastingly punished for them, where is the justice of God?

It is reckoned unjust with men, to punish twice for the same act of offence: if one man pays another man’s debts, would it be just with the creditor to exact, require, and receive payment again at the hands of the debtor? If Christ has paid the debts of all men, can it be just with God to arrest such persons, and cast them into the prison of hell, till they have paid the uttermost farthing? Far be it from the Judge of all the earth to do so, who will do right.

4. The universal scheme, reflects on the power of God, as if he was not able to carry his designs into execution; whereas, “The Lord's hand is not shortened, that it cannot save.”

But, according to this scheme, it seems as if it was; for if Christ has redeemed all men, and all men are not saved, it must be either from want of will in God to save them, or from want of power. Not from want of will; for, according to this scheme, it is the will of God that every individual man should be saved.

It must be therefore for want of power; and so he is not omnipotent. Should it be said, that some men not being saved, is owing to evil dispositions in them, obstructing the kind influences and intentions of God towards them; to the perverseness of their wills, and the strength of their unbelief.

But, is man mightier than his Maker? Are the kind influences of God, and his gracious intentions, to be obstructed by the corrupt dispositions of men? **Is he not be able to work in them, both to will and to do, of his good pleasure?** Cannot he remove the perverseness of their wills, and the hardness of their hearts? Cannot he, by his power, take away their unbelief, and work faith in them, to believe in a living Redeemer? Far be it to think otherwise of him, with whom nothing is too hard, nor anything impossible.

6. The universal scheme reflects on the immutability of God, of his love, and of his counsel.

God, in the scripture, says, “I am the Lord, I change not; therefore ye sons of Jacob are not consumed.”

Malachi 3:6 For I am the LORD, I change not; therefore ye sons of Jacob are not consumed.

But, according to this scheme, it should be, rather, I am the Lord, I change; and therefore the sons of men, or at least some of them, are consumed, are lost and perish, though redeemed by Christ.

The love of God, as has been observed, is changeable with respect unto them. One while he loves them, so that he wills their salvation, [but] at another time his love is changed into hatred, and he is resolved to stir up his wrath to the uttermost against them. He is said to be “in one mind, and who can turn him?” **and yet, according to this scheme, he is sometimes in one mind, and sometimes in another.**

Sometimes his mind is to save them; and at another time his mind is to damn them. But let not this be said of him, “with whom there is no variableness, nor shadow of turning.”

6. The universal scheme disappoints God of his chief end, and robs him of his glory.

The ultimate end of God, in the redemption of men; as has been observed; is his own glory, the glory of his rich grace and mercy; and of his righteousness, truth, and faithfulness.

But if men, any of them who are redeemed, are not saved, so far God loses his end, and is deprived of his glory. Should this be the case, where would be the glory of God the Father, in forming a scheme which does not succeed, at least with respect to multitudes? Where would be the glory of the Son of God, the Redeemer, in working out the redemption of men, and yet they not saved by him? Where would be the glory of the Spirit of God, if the redemption wrought out, is not effectually applied by him? But, on the contrary, the “glory of God,” Father, Son, and Spirit, “is great in the salvation” of all the redeemed ones.

Psalms 21:5 His glory *is* great in thy salvation: honor and majesty hast thou laid upon him.

Secondly, Another set of arguments against universal redemption, might be taken from its reflecting on the grace and work of Christ.

Whatever obscures, or lessens, the grace of Christ in redemption, or depreciates his work as a Redeemer, can never be true.

1. The universal scheme reflects on the love and grace of Christ.

The scripture speaks highly of the love of Christ, as displayed in redemption. Christ himself intimates, that he was about to give the greatest instance of his love to his people, by dying for them, that could be given; even though and while they were enemies to him.

John 15:13 Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends.

2. The universal scheme reflects upon the work of Christ; particularly his work of satisfaction, which was to finish transgression, to make an end of sin, by satisfying divine justice for it; by putting away sin by the sacrifice of himself.

Now, either he has made satisfaction for every man, or he has not. If he has, then they ought to be set free, and fully discharged, and not punishment inflicted on them, or their debts exacted of them. If he has not made satisfaction by redeeming them, this lessens the value of Christ's work, and makes it of no use, and ineffectual. Indeed, generally, if not always, the advocates for general redemption deny the proper satisfaction, and real atonement by Christ; plainly discerning, that if he has made full satisfaction for the sins of all men, they must all be saved. So the work of reconciliation, which is closely connected with, and involved in satisfaction, is not perfect according to the scriptures.

Christ, by redeeming them with the price of his blood, has made satisfaction to justice for them, and thereby has procured their reconciliation. They are said to be reconciled unto God by the death of his Son; and peace is said to be made by the blood of his cross, which is the redemption price for them. He is pacified towards them for all that they have done; which is meant by Christ being a propitiation for sin, whereby justice is appeased.

But, according to the universal scheme, God is only made reconcilable, not reconciled, nor men reconciled to him.

Notwithstanding what Christ has done, there may be no peace to them, not any being actually made for them.

And, indeed, the work of redemption must be very incomplete; though Christ is a *Rock*, as a Savior and Redeemer, and his work is *perfect*, his work of redemption; and hence called a *plenteous* one; and Christ is said to have obtained “eternal redemption” for us. Yet if all are not saved through it, it must be imperfect; it cannot be a full redemption, nor of eternal efficacy. The benefit of it, can at most, be only for a time to some, if any at all, and not be for ever; which is greatly to depreciate the efficacy of this work of Christ.

3. According to the universal scheme, the death of Christ, with respect to multitudes, for whom he is said to die, must be in vain.

If Christ died to redeem all men, and all men are not saved by his death, so far his death must be in vain. If he paid a ransom for all, and all are not ransomed; or if he has paid the debts of all, and they are not discharged, the price is given, and the payment made, in vain.

According to this scheme, the death of Christ is no security against condemnation; though the apostle says, “Who shall condemn? It is Christ that died!” So that there is no condemnation to them whose sins are condemned in Christ; and he has condemned them in the flesh. Yet there is a world of men that will be condemned.

Romans 8:1 There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.

Romans 8:33 Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God’s elect? It is God that justifieth.

I Corinthians 11:32 But when we are judged, we are chastened of the Lord, that we should not be condemned with the world.

Therefore it may be concluded, that Christ did not die for them, or otherwise they would not come into condemnation. Or else Christ’s death has no efficacy against condemnation.

4. The universal scheme separates the works of Christ, the work of redemption, and the work of intercession; and makes them to belong to different persons.

Whereas they are of equal extent, and belong to the same; for whom Christ died, for them he rose again from the dead; and that was for their justification. [This] is not true of all men: for those he ascended to heaven, to God, as their God and Father, for the same he entered into heaven, as their forerunner, and appears in the presence of God for them and ever lives to make intercession for them.

And for the same for whom he is an advocate, he is the propitiation; for his advocacy is founded upon his propitiatory sacrifice. Now those for whom he prays and intercedes, are not all men, himself being witness; “I pray for them; I pray not for the world,”

John 17:9 I pray for them: I pray not for the world, but for them which thou hast given me; for they are thine.

Yet, according to the universal scheme, he died for them for whom he would not pray; which is absurd and incredible.

5. If Christ died for all men, and all men are not saved, Christ will not see of the travail of his soul and be satisfied; as was promised him.

What satisfaction can he have to see his labor, with respect to multitudes, all lost labor, or labor in vain? It was the joy that was set before him, of having those for whom he suffered and died, with him in heaven. But what joy can he have, and

what a disappointment must it be to him, to see thousands and millions whom he so loved as to give himself for, howling in hell, under the everlasting displeasure and wrath of God?

Thirdly, Other arguments against universal redemption, may be taken from the uselessness of it to great numbers of men. As,

1. There were multitudes in hell at the time when Christ died; and it cannot be thought that he died for those, as he must, if he died for all the individuals of mankind.

The men of Sodom, who were then, as Jude says, “suffering the vengeance of eternal fire,” and the inhabitants of the whole world, the world of the ungodly, destroyed by the flood. [There were] those that were disobedient in the times of Noah; whose spirits, as the apostle Peter says, were, in his time, in the prison of hell.

Jude 1:7 Even as Sodom and Gomorrha, and the cities about them in like manner, giving themselves over to fornication, and going after strange flesh, are set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire.

I Peter 3:20 Which sometime were disobedient, when once the longsuffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls were saved by water.

If he died for these, his death must be fruitless and useless; unless it can be thought, that a jail delivery was made at his death, and the dominions and regions of hell were cleared of their subjects.

2. The universal scheme affords no encouragement to faith and hope in Christ.

Redemption, as it ascertains salvation to some, it encourages sensible sinners to hope in Christ for it; “Let Israel hope in the Lord, for with him is plenteous redemption.”

Psalms 130:7 Let Israel hope in the LORD: for with the LORD there is mercy, and with him is plenteous redemption.

A redemption full of salvation; and which secures that blessing to all that believe. But, according to the universal scheme, men may be redeemed by Christ, and yet not saved, but eternally perish. What hope of salvation can a man have upon such a scheme? It requires no great discernment, nor judgment of things, to determine, which is most eligible of the two schemes, that which makes the salvation of some certain; or that which leaves the salvation of all precarious and uncertain; which, though it asserts a redemption of all; yet it is possible none may be saved.

3. Hence, even to those who are redeemed and saved, it lays no foundation for, nor does it furnish with any argument to engage to love Christ, to be thankful to him, and to praise him for the redemption of them.

The difference between them and others, is not owing to the efficacy of Christ's death, but to their own wills and works. They are not beholden to Christ, who has done no more for them than for those that perish. They are not, from any such consideration, obliged to walk in love, as Christ has loved them, and given himself for them; since he has loved them no more, and given himself for them no otherwise, than for them that are lost. Nor are they under obligation to be thankful to him, and bless his name, that he has redeemed their lives from destruction; since, notwithstanding his redemption of them, they might have been destroyed with an everlasting destruction.

It is not owing to what Christ has done, but to what they have done themselves, performing the conditions of salvation required, that they are saved from destruction, if ever they are, according to this scheme. Nor can they indeed sing the song of praise to the Lamb, for their redemption; saying, "Thou art worthy—for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by that blood, out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation!" since, according to this scheme, Christ has redeemed every kindred, every tongue, every people, and every nation.

Redemption, Particular

Particular REDEMPTION: C.H. Cayce: My first argument is that all for whom Christ died will be saved for heaven, because their iniquity was laid on him. In support of that argument, I call attention to Isaiah 53:6-8. "All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all. He was oppressed, and he was afflicted, yet he opened not his mouth; he is brought as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before her shearers is dumb, so he openeth not his mouth. He was taken from prison and judgment: and who shall declare his generation? For he was cut off out of the land of the living: for the transgression of my people was he stricken."

As to the term *us*, it does not devolve upon me to say how many there are. Let it be one half the race, or three fourths of the race, or all of the race—let it be many or few—just so many as the term *us all* embraces, just that many had their iniquities laid on the Lord Jesus Christ. So that you may understand that in arguing this passage, I shall argue, not the extent of the atonement, but the sufficiency of it.

If Brother Penick wishes to argue in the negative of the proposition that Christ died for all of Adam's posterity, and that all the iniquities of all Adam's posterity were laid upon Christ, then I would call upon him to tell us what can send one of Adam's

race to hell. It could not possibly be iniquity. All their iniquities, the number that is embraced in this text, were taken off them and laid on the Lord Jesus Christ.

“The Lord hath laid on him the iniquities of us all.”

If their iniquities were laid on Christ, their iniquities were taken off them and laid on the Lord Jesus Christ, I argue that iniquity could not send one of them to hell. If so be that iniquity could send them to hell, their iniquities must be taken off the Lord Jesus Christ, and shifted back upon them, and that would involve the brother in the doctrine of apostasy, and, of course, he does not believe that.

Then it must necessarily follow that every one of these characters whose iniquities were laid on the Lord Jesus Christ will be saved. Otherwise, they go to hell without iniquity. Their iniquities are taken off them.

If you start to look for one who is without iniquity, you would not think about going toward the lower regions..... These characters for whom the Lord Jesus Christ died had their iniquities taken off them.....Their iniquities all being laid on Jesus Christ, all of them will be finally landed on the sunny banks of sweet deliverance, without a single exception. *Cayce: Penick Debate 1907*

Redemption, The Causes Of

The Causes of REDEMPTION: Abridged from John Gill: *Secondly, The next thing to be considered are the causes of redemption;* what it springs from, by whom, and by what means it is obtained; and for what ends and purposes it is wrought out.

1st, the moving cause of it, or from whence it springs and flows; and that is, the everlasting love of God; which, as it is the source and spring of every blessing of grace; as of election, regeneration, and effectual calling; so of redemption.

The gift of Christ to be the Redeemer of his people flows from this love. Christ was given to be a Redeemer before he was sent; when he was given for a covenant to the people he was given in covenant to be the Redeemer of them. And this gift was the effect of love; to this Christ himself ascribes it; “God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son;” that is, to be their Redeemer.

Hence, before he came, Job had knowledge of him as his living Redeemer; and all the Old Testament saints waited for him as such. The mission of Christ in the fulness of time, to be the propitiation for the sins of men, and to redeem them from

them, is given as a manifest, clear, and undoubted instance of his love; “In this was manifested the love of God,” etc. “Herein is love,” etc.

I John 4:9-10 In this was manifested *the love of God* toward us, because that God sent his only begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him. *Herein is love*, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son *to be* the propitiation for our sins.

And God’s not sparing his Son, but delivering him into the hands of justice and death, to die in the room and stead of sinners, while they were such, is a full demonstration and high commendation of his great love unto them.

Romans 5:8 But God commendeth *his love toward us*, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us.

Grace, if it is not altogether free is not grace; and which is no other than unmerited love, clear of all conditions, merit and motives in the creature. It is at the bottom of our redemption by Christ; for we are “justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Jesus Christ.” So that redemption that is in and by Christ is of free grace; the gift of Christ is a free grace gift; his being sent and delivered up to death are owing to the grace of God.

It is “by the grace of God he tasted death for everyone,” for everyone of the sons of God. This cannot be attributed to any merit or desert in those for whom Christ died; since they were without strength, ungodly wicked sinners, the chief of sinners, and enemies in their minds, by wicked works.

Romans 5:6-8 For when we were yet without strength, in due time Christ died for the ungodly. For scarcely for a righteous man will one die: yet peradventure for a good man some would even dare to die. But God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us.

Romans 5:10 For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life.

Mercy, which is no other than the love and grace of God, exercised towards miserable creatures, gives rise to this blessing of redemption. God first resolved to have mercy on sinful men; and then determined to redeem and save them by his Son. And it is through the tender mercy of our God, that Christ, the dayspring from on high, visited and redeemed his people; and so performed the mercy promised to men.

Luke 1:68-69 Blessed *be* the Lord God of Israel; for he hath visited and redeemed his people, and hath raised up an horn of salvation for us in the house of his servant David;

Luke 1:72 To perform the mercy *promised* to our fathers, and to remember his holy covenant;

Luke 1:78 Through the tender mercy of our God; whereby the dayspring from on high hath visited us,

Hence God is said to save men according to his mercy; and mercy is glorified in their salvation and redemption by Christ; and they are under obligation to sing of mercy, to praise the Lord, and give thanks unto him, on account of it.

Titus 3:5 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;

Psalms 107:1-2 O give thanks unto the LORD, for *he is good*: for his mercy *endureth* for ever. Let the redeemed of the LORD say *so*, whom he hath redeemed from the hand of the enemy;

Psalms 136:23-24 Who remembered us in our low estate: for his mercy *endureth* for ever: And hath redeemed us from our enemies: for his mercy *endureth* for ever.

It is now, by the love, grace, and mercy of God to sinful men, that his will is determined, and his resolution fixed, to redeem them; for redemption is according to an eternal purpose he has purposed in Christ. [He] was foreordained before the foundation of the world, to redeem men from a vain conversation, with his precious blood. [He] was set forth, in the decrees and purposes of God, to be the propitiation for sin. God appointed him to be the Redeemer and Savior; and appointed men, not unto wrath, which they deserved, but to obtain salvation by him. [They are] the vessels of mercy afore prepared for glory; and being moved, from his love, grace, and mercy, within himself, to determine upon the redemption of them.

His wisdom was set to work to find out the best way and method of doing it.

Upon this a council was held; God was, in Christ, forming a scheme of peace, reconciliation, and redemption; in which he has “abounded toward us in all wisdom and prudence,” in fixing upon the most proper person, and the most proper means, whereby to effect it. Hence the scheme of redemption, as formed in the eternal mind and council of God, is called “the manifold wisdom of God.”

Ephesians 1:7-8 In whom we have *redemption* through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace; Wherein he hath abounded toward us in *all wisdom and prudence*;

Ephesians 3:10 To the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places might be known by the church *the manifold wisdom of God*,

But of the wisdom of God, as it appears in redemption by Christ, I have more largely treated when on the attribute of Wisdom.

All these workings in the heart and will of God, issued in a covenant between him and his Son; in which he proposed to his Son, that he should be the Raiser up, Restorer, and Redeemer of his people, both among Jews and Gentiles. He agreed, and said, "Lo, I come to do thy will!" which was no other, than to work out the redemption of his people.

Isaiah 49:5-6 And now, saith the LORD that formed me from the womb to be his servant, to bring Jacob again to him, Though Israel be not gathered, yet shall I be glorious in the eyes of the LORD, and my God shall be my strength. And he said, It is a light thing that thou shouldest be my servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and to restore the preserved of Israel: I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that thou mayest be my salvation unto the end of the earth.

Psalms 40:7-8 Then said I, Lo, I come: in the volume of the book it is written of me, I delight to do thy will, O my God: yea, thy law *is* within my heart.

Hence this covenant is by some called, the covenant of redemption, in which this great affair was settled and secured. Now upon all this, the love, grace, and mercy of God, the good will and purpose of his heart, his council and covenant, the plot of man's redemption is formed; this is the source and spring of it.

2. Secondly, The procuring cause, or author of redemption, is Christ, the Son of God.

He was appointed to it, and assented to it; was prophesied of as the Redeemer that should come to Zion. He was sent to redeem them that were under the law; and he has obtained eternal redemption; and in him believers have it, through his blood. He is of God made redemption to them. If it be asked, how Christ came to be the Redeemer? It may be answered, as the love, grace, and mercy of God the Father moved him to resolve upon redemption, and appoint his Son, and call him to this work; so like love, grace, and mercy, wrought in the heart of the Son of God to accept of this call, and engage in this work.

The love of Christ, which was in his heart from everlasting, and was a love of complacency and delight.

This showed itself in various acts, and especially in giving himself for his people to redeem them; in giving himself an offering and a sacrifice for their sins; in laying down his life for them, all which is frequently ascribed to his love.

Titus 2:14 Who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works.

Ephesians 5:2 And walk in love, as Christ also hath loved us, and hath given himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweetsmelling savour.

Ephesians 5:25 Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it;

I John 3:16 Hereby perceive we the love of God, because he laid down his life for us: and we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren.

This love is unmerited, as appears from the characters of the persons for whom he died, observed before; and so is called the grace of Christ, free grace, unmoved and unmerited by anything in the creature. To this is attributed the whole affair of our redemption and salvation by Christ. Pity and compassion in his heart towards his people in their miserable and enthralled state, moved him to undertake and perform the work of their redemption; “in his love and in his pity he redeemed them,” as he did Israel of old.

Isaiah 63:9 In all their affliction he was afflicted, and the angel of his presence saved them: in his love and in his pity he redeemed them; and he bare them, and carried them all the days of old.

This love, grace, and mercy, influenced and engaged him to resolve upon the redemption of them; hence he said, “I will ransom them, I will redeem them,” as from the grave and death, so from every other enemy.

Hosea 13:14 I will ransom them from the power of the grave; I will redeem them from death: O death, I will be thy plagues; O grave, I will be thy destruction: repentance shall be hid from mine eyes.

As he entered into covenant engagements with his Father from everlasting, he considered himself as under obligation to perform this work, and therefore spoke in language which imports the same. [He says] that he must work the works of him that sent him, of which this is the principal; that he “ought” to suffer and die as he did; and that he “must” bring in those the Father gave him, and he undertook for, and bring them safe to glory.

The fitness of Christ to be a Redeemer of his people is worthy of notice.

As he engaged in it he was every way fit for it; none so fit as he, none fit for it but himself; no creature, man or angel: no man, for all have sinned, and so everyone needs a redeemer from sin, and can neither redeem himself nor any other. Nor could an angel redeem any of the sons of men; God has put no trust of this kind in those his servants the angels, knowing that they were unequal to it. The angel Jacob speaks of, that redeemed him from all evil, was not a created but the uncreated angel; the angel and messenger of the covenant, the Messiah.

Now Christ's fitness for the work of redemption lies in his being God and man in one person. It was the Son of God that was sent to redeem men.

[He] is of the same nature, and possessed of the same perfections his divine Father is; the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person. [He] was in the form of God, and thought it no robbery to be equal to him. This Son of God is the true God, the great God, and so fit to be the Redeemer and Saviour of men; and a mighty redeemer he must be, since he is Jehovah, the Lord of hosts, and therefore equal to such a work as this.

Galatians 4:4 But when the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, *made of a woman*, made under the law,

I John 5:20 And we know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we may know him that is true, and we are in him that is true, *even in his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God*, and eternal life.

Titus 2:13 Looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of *the great God* and our Saviour Jesus Christ;

Jeremiah 50:34 Their Redeemer is strong; *the LORD of hosts is his name*: he shall thoroughly plead their cause, that he may give rest to the land, and disquiet the inhabitants of Babylon.

He is both God and man; he is the child born, as man, and the son given, as a divine person.

He is Immanuel, God with us, God in our nature, God manifest in the flesh, and so fit to be a mediator between God and man; and to be an umpire, a daysman to lay hands on both; and to do the work required of a redeemer of men, to make reconciliation for their sins, and to take care of things pertaining to the glory of God, his justice and holiness.

As man he could be made, as he was made, under the law, and so capable of yielding obedience to it, and of bearing the penalty of it; which it was necessary he should, as the surety and redeemer of men. As man, he had blood to shed, with which most precious blood he could redeem them unto God. [He] had a life to lay down, a sufficient ransom price for his people, and was capable of suffering and dying in their room and stead, and so of making full satisfaction for them.

As God, he would be zealously concerned for the glory of the divine perfections, and secure the honour of them in the redemption wrought out by him. **As such, he could put an infinite virtue into his blood**, and make it a full and adequate price for the purchase of his church, and the redemption of it. **As such, he could support**

the human nature under the load of sin and of sufferings for it, and of carrying it through the work, otherwise insupportable. **And as both God and man he had a right to redeem.**

As Lord of all, he had a right as well as power to redeem them that were his. And being, as man, their near kinsman, the right of redemption belonged to him, and therefore bears the name of Gaol which signifies a redeemer, and a near kinsman; see the law in Leviticus 25:47-49.

Leviticus 25:47-49 And if a sojourner or stranger wax rich by thee, and thy brother *that dwelleth* by him wax poor, and sell himself unto the stranger *or* sojourner by thee, or to the stock of the stranger's family: After that he is sold he may be redeemed again; one of his brethren may redeem him: Either his uncle, or his uncle's son, may redeem him, or *any* that is nigh of kin unto him of his family may redeem him; or if he be able, he may redeem himself.

And who so fit to be the redeemer of the church as he who is her head and her husband? The means by which redemption is wrought out by Christ; and that is by his blood, his life, to which it is often ascribed,

Ephesians 1:7 In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace;

I Peter 1:18-19 Forasmuch as ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, *as* silver and gold, from your vain conversation *received* by tradition from your fathers; But with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot:

Revelation 5:9 And they sung a new song, saying, Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof: for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation.

This was shed, and shed freely, for the remission of sins, and for the redemption of men.

Had it been shed involuntarily, by accident, or by force, against his will, it would not have been a proper redemption price, or have answered such an end.

But it was purposely and voluntarily shed, and with full consent; Christ, as he had the full disposal of his own life, freely gave his life a ransom price for many. "I lay down my life for the sheep," says he, as a ransom price for them; "I lay it down of myself,"

Matthew 20:28 Even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many.

John 10:15 As the Father knoweth me, even so know I the Father: and I lay down my life for the sheep.

John 10:18 No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This commandment have I received of my Father.

And the blood that was thus freely shed was the same with that of those for whom it was shed, which was necessary; not the blood of bulls and goats, which could not be an adequate price of redemption, but human blood. Christ partook of the same flesh and blood with the children for whom he died; only with this difference, it was not tainted with sin as theirs is.

[This] is another requisite of the ransom price; it must be the blood of an innocent person, as Christ was. Much notice is taken in scripture of the innocence, holiness, and righteousness of the Redeemer; that he was holy in his nature, blameless in life, knew no sin, nor ever committed any. He, the just and Holy One, suffered for the unjust. A great emphasis is put upon this, that the price with which men are redeemed is “the precious blood of Christ, as of a Lamb without blemish and without spot.”

I Peter 1:18-19 Forasmuch as ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from your vain conversation received by tradition from your fathers; But with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb *without blemish and without spot*:

If he had had any sin in him, he could not have been a redeemer from sin, nor his blood the price of redemption.

Yet more than all this, it is necessary to make this price a full and adequate one, it must not be the blood of a mere creature, but of one that is God as well as man.

Such is Christ; hence God, who is Christ, is said to “purchase the church with his own blood,” being God and man in one person, this gave his blood a sufficient virtue to make such a purchase. A peculiar emphasis is put upon his blood, being the “blood of” Jesus Christ “the Son of God,” which cleanses from all sin.

Acts 20:28 Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, *which he hath purchased with his own blood*.

I John 1:7 But 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.

Now this price is paid into the hands of God, whose justice is offended, whose law is broken, and who is the lawgiver. [He] is able to save and to destroy; and against [him] all sin is committed: and [he] will not clear the guilty unless his justice is satisfied. He is the judge of all the earth, who will do right. Wherefore Christ is said “to redeem” men “unto God by his blood.”

Revelation 5:9 And they sung a new song, saying, Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof: for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation;

The price of redemption, which is the blood of Christ, was paid unto God, whereby redemption from vindictive justice was obtained. It was not paid into the hands of Satan, or any other enemy that had power over the redeemed. The power of Satan was only an usurpation; he had no legal right to hold them captives. **Therefore the delivery of them out of his hand is by power and not by price.**

The justice of God had a legal right to shut them up, and detain them as prisoners, till satisfaction was given. Therefore redemption from avenging justice, which is properly the redemption that is by Christ, is by a price paid to justice for the ransom of them.

3rd, *The final cause, or causes,* or ends, for which redemption was wrought out and obtained by Christ in this way; and they are these.

That the justice of God might be satisfied in the salvation of a sinner; that God might appear to be just, while he is the justifier of him that believes in Jesus; and be just and faithful in forgiving sins, and cleansing from all unrighteousness; that the attributes of his justice, holiness, truth, and faithfulness, might be glorified in the redemption of men, as well as the other perfections of his.

Romans 3:25-26 Whom God hath set forth *to be* a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; To declare, I say, at this time his righteousness: *that he might be just, and the justifier* of him which believeth in Jesus.

I John 1:9 If we confess our sins, *he is faithful and just* to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness.

Psalms 85:10 Mercy and truth are met together; righteousness and peace have kissed *each other*.

That the people of God might be reconciled unto him, and have peace with him, and joy through believing in Christ. The price of redemption being paid for them, and satisfaction given, they are reconciled to God by the death of his Son; **even to his justice**, as they always stood in his love and favour. Peace being made by the

blood of Christ on such a footing, they may joy in God through Christ, by whom they have received the atonement.

Romans 4:10-11 How was it then reckoned? when he was in circumcision, or in uncircumcision? Not in circumcision, but in uncircumcision. And he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which *he had yet* being uncircumcised: that he might be the father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised; that righteousness might be imputed unto them also.

Another end of redemption by Christ is, that the redeemed might enjoy the blessing of adoption.

So it is said, that God sent his Son “to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons.”

Galatians 4:4-5 But when the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, To redeem them that were under the law, *that we might receive the adoption of sons.*

The saints are predestinated to the adoption of children in the purpose of God from everlasting; and this blessing is provided and secured in the covenant of grace. Yet sin [threw] an obstruction in the way of the enjoyment of it in their own persons, consistent with the holiness and justice of God. This is removed by the redemption which is through Christ.

The sanctification of God's elect is another end of redemption by Christ; “who gave himself for them, that he might redeem them from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people zealous of good works.”

Titus 2:14 Who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works.

Again, Christ is said to love the church, and give himself for it, a ransom price for it, “that he might sanctify and cleanse it.”

Ephesians 5:25-26 Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it; That he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word,

The redeemed are said to be redeemed by his blood “from a vain conversation.”

I Peter 1:18 Forasmuch as ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from your vain conversation received by tradition from your fathers;

In consequence of redemption by Christ, the Spirit of Christ comes as a Spirit of sanctification, and begins and carries on that work in the souls of God's people. By applying the grace and benefit of redemption, lays them under the highest obligation to holiness of life and conversation.

Galatians 3:14 That the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ; that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith.

In a word, the end of Christ's redeeming his people is, that they might be freed from all evil, from every enemy, and all that is hurtful, sin, Satan, the world, law, hell, and death; and that they might be put into the possession of every good thing. "Christ has redeemed them from the curse of the law, being made a curse for them, that the blessing of Abraham," even all the blessings of the covenant of grace, in which Abraham was interested, "might come on them through Jesus Christ."

Galatians 3:13-14 Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us: for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree: That the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ; that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith.

And lastly, The subordinate end of redemption is the everlasting salvation of God's elect, and their eternal life and happiness; and the ultimate end is the glory of God, of his grace and justice, and of all the perfections of his nature.

Redemption, The Objects Of

The Objects of REDEMPTION: Abridged from John Gill: Thirdly, the objects of redemption come next under consideration.

These are a special and distinct people; they are said to be "redeemed from the earth," that is, from among the inhabitants of the earth, as after explained, "redeemed from among men," and one end of Christ's redemption of them is, "to purify to himself a peculiar people."

Revelation 14:3-4 And they sung as it were a new song before the throne, and before the four beasts, and the elders: and no man could learn that song but the hundred *and* forty *and* four thousand, which were *redeemed from the earth*. These are they which were not defiled with women; for they are virgins. These are they which follow the Lamb whithersoever he goeth. These were *redeemed from among men, being* the firstfruits unto God and to the Lamb.

Titus 2:14 *Who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works.*

The inspired writers seem to delight in using the pronoun “us,” when speaking of the death of Christ, and redemption by it; thereby pointing at a particular people, as the context shows. “Christ died for us;” God “delivered him up for us all; who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us; hath redeemed us unto God by thy blood.”

Romans 5:8 But God commendeth *his love toward us*, in that, while we were yet sinners, *Christ died for us*.

Romans 8:32 He that spared not his own Son, but *delivered him up for us all*, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things?

Revelation 5:9 And they sung a new song, saying, Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof: for thou wast slain, and *hast redeemed us* to God by thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation;

They are many indeed for whom Christ has given “his life a ransom,” a ransom price, the price of their redemption.

Matthew 20:28 Even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life *a ransom for many*.

But then these are so described as show they are a peculiar people. They are the “many” who are ordained unto eternal life; the *many* the Father has given to Christ; the many whose sins he bore on the cross; the *many* for whom his blood was shed for the remission of their sins; the *many* who are made righteous by his obedience; the *many* sons, he, the Captain of their salvation, brings to glory.

That the objects of redemption are a special people, will appear by the following observations.

1. The objects of redemption are such who are the objects of God's love; for redemption, as has been observed, flows from the love of God and Christ.

[This] love is not that general kindness shown in providence to all men, as the creatures of God; but is special and discriminating. The favour which he bears to his own people, as distinct from others. “Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated.” The love which Christ has expressed in redemption is towards his own that were in the world, whom he has a special right and property in, “his” people, “his” sheep, “his” church; as will be seen hereafter.

2. The objects of election and redemption are the same; “Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect?—it is Christ that died!” died for the elect. So the same, us all, for whom God delivered up his Son, are those whom he foreknew,

and whom he predestinated; and whose calling, justification, and glorification are secured thereby.

Romans 8:30-33 Moreover whom he did predestinate, them he also called: and whom he called, them he also justified: and whom he justified, them he also glorified. What shall we then say to these things? If God be for us, who can be against us? He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things? Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth.

The same *us*, who are said to be chosen in Christ, before the foundation of the world, have redemption in him through his blood.

Ephesians 1:4 According as *he hath chosen us* in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love:

Ephesians 1:7 In whom *we* have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace;

Election and redemption are of equal extent; no more are redeemed by Christ than are chosen in him.

And these are a special people: what is said of the objects of the one is true of the objects of the other. Are the elect the beloved of the Lord? And does the act of election spring from love? Election presupposes love: so the redeemed are the beloved of God and Christ; and their redemption flows from love. Are the elect a people whom God has chosen for his peculiar treasure? The redeemed are purified by Christ, to be a peculiar people to himself.

Do the vessels of mercy, afore prepared for glory, consist of Jews and Gentiles; even of them who are called of both? So Christ is the propitiation, not for the sins of the Jews only, or the Redeemer of them only; but for the sins of the Gentile world also, or the Redeemer of his people among them.

Are the elect of God a great number, of all nations, kindreds, people, and tongues? Christ has redeemed those he has redeemed unto God, out of every kindred, tongue, people, and nation. Is it true of the elect, that they cannot be totally and finally deceived and perish? it is true of the ransomed of the Lord, that they shall come to Zion with everlasting joy; Christ will never lose any part of the purchase of his blood.

3. Those for whom Christ has died, and has redeemed by his blood, are no other than those for whom he became a Surety.

Now Christ was the Surety of the better testament, or covenant of grace; and of course became a Surety for those, and for no other, than who were interested in that covenant, in which he engaged to be the Redeemer:

Christ's suretyship is the ground and foundation of redemption; the true reason of the sin of his people, and the punishment of it, being laid upon him, and of his bearing it; of the payment of the debts of his people, and of redeeming them out of the hands of justice; was because he engaged as a Surety, and laid himself under obligation to do all this.

But for those for whom he did not become a Surety, he was not obliged to pay their debts, nor to suffer and die in their room and stead.

Christ's suretyship and redemption are of equal extent, and reach to the same objects. **They are the Lord's Benjamins, the sons of his right hand, his beloved sons, that Christ, the antitype of Judah, became a surety for,** and laid himself under obligation to bring them safe to glory, and present them to his divine Father.

4. The objects of redemption are described by such characters as show them to be a special and distinct people.

Particularly they are called, the people of God and Christ; "for the transgressions of my people," saith the Lord, "was he stricken." That is, Christ was, or would be, stricken by the rod of justice, to make satisfaction for their sins, and thereby redeem them from them.

Isaiah 53:8 He was taken from prison and from judgment: and who shall declare his generation? for he was cut off out of the land of the living: *for the transgression of my people* was he stricken.

When he was about to come and redeem them, Zacharias, the father of John the Baptist, at his birth said, "Blessed be the Lord God of Israel! for he hath visited and redeemed his people," by sending Christ, the dayspring from on high, as he afterwards calls him, to visit them, and redeem them by his blood.

Luke 1:68 Blessed *be* the Lord God of Israel; for he hath visited and *redeemed his people,*

Luke 1:78 Through the tender mercy of our God; whereby the dayspring from on high hath visited us.

Hence, also, the angel that appeared to Joseph, and instructed him to call the Son that should be born of his wife by the name of Jesus, gives this reason, "for he shall save his people from their sins."

Matthew 1:21 And she shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call his name JESUS: for *he shall save his people* from their sins.

Now though all men are, in a sense, the people of God, as they are his creatures, and the care of his providence; yet they are not all redeemed by Christ. Those that are redeemed by Christ are redeemed “out of every people,” and therefore cannot be every or all people,

Revelation 5:9 And they sung a new song, saying, Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof: for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood *out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation;*

The redeemed are God’s covenant people; of whom he says, “They shall be my people, and I will be their God.” They are his portion and his inheritance; a people near unto him, both with respect to union and communion; a people given to Christ, to be redeemed and saved by him; of whom it is said, “Thy people shall be willing,” etc.

5. The objects of redemption; or those for whom Christ laid down his life a ransom price, are described as sheep, as the sheep of Christ, in whom he has a special property, being given him of his Father. [They] are represented as distinct from others, who are not his sheep.

John 10:15 As the Father knoweth me, even so know I the Father: and *I lay down my life for the sheep.*

John 10:26 But ye believe not, because *ye are not of my sheep,* as I said unto you.

John 10:29 My Father, which gave them me, is greater than all; and no man is able to pluck them out of my Father’s hand.

Such things are said of them as can only agree with some particular persons; as, that they are known by Christ; “I know my sheep,” not merely by his omniscience, so he knows all men. But he knows them distinctly as his own; “the Lord knows them that are his,” from others. He has knowledge of them, joined with special love and affection for them; as he has not others, to whom he will say, “Depart from me: I know you not.” Likewise Christ is *known* by those sheep of his he has laid down his life for. They know him in his person, offices, and grace; whereas there are some that neither know the Father nor the Son;

6. The objects of redemption are the sons of God; redemption and adoption belong to the same persons.

According to the prophecy of Caiaphas, Christ was to die, not for the nation of the Jews only, but to “gather together in one the children of God that were scattered abroad” throughout the Gentile world.

John 11:52 And not for that nation only, but that also he should gather together in one *the children of God* that were scattered abroad.

Those who are predestinated to adoption by Christ are said to have redemption in him, through his blood.

Ephesians 1:5-7 Having predestinated us unto *the adoption of children* by Jesus Christ to himself, according to the good pleasure of his will, To the praise of the glory of his grace, wherein he hath made us accepted in the beloved. In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace.

The blessing of adoption, in the full enjoyment of it, in the resurrection, is called “the redemption of the body,” when redemption, as to the application of it, will be complete.

Romans 8:23 And not only they, but ourselves also, which have the firstfruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, *waiting for the adoption, to wit*, the redemption of our body.

Now these sons, or children of God, are a peculiar number of men, who are given of God to Christ, to redeem; the seed promised to him in covenant, that he should see and enjoy; and to whom he stands in the relation of the everlasting Father. These are they on whose account he became incarnate, “took part of the same flesh and blood;” and these are the many sons he brings to glory.

Hebrews 2:10 For it became him, for whom *are* all things, and by whom are all things, in bringing *many sons* unto glory, to make the captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings.

Hebrews 2:13-14 And again, I will put my trust in him. And again, Behold I and *the children* which God hath given me. Forasmuch then as *the children* are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil.

Romans 9:8 That is, They which are the children of the flesh, these *are* not the children of God: but the children of the promise are counted for the seed.

Galatians 3:26 For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus.

John 1:12 But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, *even* to them that believe on his name.

I John 3:1 Behold, what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the sons of God: therefore the world knoweth us not, because it knew him not.

7. The objects of redemption are the church and spouse of Christ. It is the church he has loved, and given himself as a sacrifice and ransom price for.

It is the church he has purchased with his blood; even the general assembly, the church of the firstborn, whose names are written in heaven; that is, the elect of God, whose names are written in the Lamb's book of life.

Ephesians 5:25 Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it;

Acts 20:28 Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood.

Of that church of which Christ is the head and husband, he is the Redeemer; “thy Maker is thine husband; and thy Redeemer the Holy One of Israel!”

Isaiah 54:5 For thy Maker *is* thine husband; the LORD of hosts *is* his name; and thy Redeemer the Holy One of Israel; The God of the whole earth shall he be called.

Though there may be “threescore queens, and fourscore concubines,” of this sort; yet, says Christ, “my dove, my undefiled, is but one,” and who only is redeemed by Christ, and espoused to him.

Song of Solomon 6:9 My dove, my undefiled *is but one*; she *is* the *only* one of her mother, she *is* the choice *one* of her that bare her. The daughters saw her, and blessed her; yea, the queens and the concubines, and they praised her.

Now from all this it appears, that redemption is not universal, is not of all men; for though they are many for whom the ransom price is paid. Yet though all are many, many are not all. If the redeemed are such who are the objects of God's special love and favor, then not all men.

Isaiah 27:11 When the boughs thereof are withered, they shall be broken off: the women come, and set them on fire: for it is a people of no understanding: therefore he that made them will not have mercy on them, and he that formed them will shew them no favor.

If they are the elect of God who are redeemed by Christ, and them only, then not all men; for all are not chosen.

Romans 11:7 What then? Israel hath not obtained that which he seeketh for; but the election hath obtained it, and the rest were blinded.

If only those are redeemed for whom Christ became a surety, then not all men; since Christ did not engage to pay the debts of all men. And if they are the people of God and Christ, then not all; since there are some on whom God writes a “loammi,” saying, “Ye are not my people; and I will not be your God.”

Hosea 1:9 Then said God, Call his name Loammi: for ye *are* not my people, and I will not be your *God*.

And if they are the sheep of Christ, to whom he gives eternal life; then not the goats, who will go into everlasting punishment. And if they are the children of God, and the church and spouse of Christ; then not all men; for all do not bear these characters, nor stand in these relations.

Regeneration

REGENERATION: C. H. Cayce: A wonderful change is wrought in the sinner in the work of regeneration. Saul of Tarsus was a great man in his own estimation before regeneration. In those days names meant something. His name was Saul, and that name meant great. He was a Pharisee of the Pharisees. He was indeed a great man from a worldly point of view, in regard to worldly wisdom, or worldly attainments. He was not only great from that standpoint, but he was great in his own estimation; he was a self-righteous Pharisee. But while he was on his way from Jerusalem to Damascus with letters of authority to bind and cast in prison those who were calling on the name of the Lord, the Lord of glory spoke to him and said, “Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me? And he said, Who art thou, Lord? And the Lord said, I am Jesus whom thou persecutest.”—Acts 9:4-5.

The Lord there made him alive from the dead; he was raised up out of a state of death in trespasses and sins into a state of life in Christ. When the Lord speaks to a sinner who is dead in trespasses and sins, He makes him alive from that state. See John 5:25: “Verily, verily, I say unto you, The hour is coming, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God: and they that hear shall live.” Saul heard that voice and was made alive from that dead state. “Suddenly there shined round about him a light from heaven: and he fell to the earth,” etc.—Acts 9:3-4.

Prior to this time he was very erect—he was great in his self-righteousness; but now he is brought low before the throne of grace and mercy. His cry was, “Who art thou,

Lord?” He now realized something he had never before realized. He is found lying prostrate on the ground. Perhaps some of our readers can remember that they felt unworthy to kneel on God’s foot-stool, and you prostrated yourself on the ground, and placed your face and lips in the dust, and plead for mercy. It was an evidence of the quickening or regenerating power of the Spirit of God in his heart.

After this, his name was called Paul. His name was changed—why? Because names meant something. The name Paul means little. He is no longer great, but is now little. The grace of God in the heart always makes the sinner little. It never causes one to be self-exalted; but makes him feel and realize his own unworthiness. When he follows the influence of that grace after regeneration he feels his own imperfections, and he does not desire to make his brother an offender for a word, and he will not do so. He is not so particular about the words used to convey an idea; his desire is to get the truth and the sentiment. The sentiment is what he desires, more than the words used to convey sentiment. “Love suffers long, and is kind; envieth not; vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up, doth not behave itself unseemly, seeketh not her own, is not easily provoked, thinketh no evil; rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth; beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things.”—I Corinthians 13:4-7. (*Cayce’s Editorials vol. 2, ppg 413, 414*)

C.H. Cayce: In regeneration the man is made good in heart. His heart is made good, and the man is then a good man, because he has a good heart. The Savior says, in Matthew 12:33-35: “Either make the tree good, and his fruit good; or else make the tree corrupt, and his fruit corrupt: for the tree is known by his fruit. O generation of vipers, how can ye, being evil, speak good things? for out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh. A good man out of the good treasure of the heart bringeth forth good things: and an evil man out of the evil treasure bringeth forth evil things.”

Why were these people not good? Because their hearts were not good. That is the reason. How is the heart made good? The Lord gives a good heart. He takes away the stony heart, and gives a heart of flesh. This makes the man good. If not, the Savior would not have said, in the very next verse, “A good man out of the good treasure of the heart bringeth forth good things.” The man having a good heart makes him a good man, but that does not make his body spiritual, nor remove the nature he had before. It gives him another nature, which is a divine nature; and that divine nature is implanted in his heart.

If that does not make a man a better man, we confess that we do not know what would make him better. If it does not make him better, we do not see how a tree can be known by his fruit. We know a tree is a good tree because it produces good fruit. We know the man is a good man, because he brings forth good things. Regeneration gives him a good heart, and then the Savior calls him a good man.

Having been made a good man, he manifests the same by his life. He then brings forth good fruit. (*Cayce's Editorials vol. 2, ppg 415, 416*)

REGENERATION: When does a person become a child of God? C.H. Cayce: In answer to the above question will say, most positively and emphatically, without fear of successful contradiction from any quarter, that the Adam sinner becomes a child of God by birth or by being born again, or from above. If one is a child of God before being born of God, then when he is born of God he is no more a child of God than without regeneration.

It is true the Scriptures teach that the heirs of immortal glory are God's children in purpose before the ages of time began, but to be a child in purpose and to be divinely related to the heavenly Father are two different things. When one is born from above, or born of God, it is but the manifestation of the purpose which God had before time; hence one is made a child of God by being born of the heavenly parentage. We are "saved by the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Ghost." This is what the apostle says about this matter, and we have been of the opinion, and our opinion yet is, that he knew what he was talking about, if the sinner is saved by the washing of regeneration, then he is not saved before regeneration. It is true that the sinner is saved by the washing of regeneration, "according to God's purpose and grace"—so says the apostle. If the sinner is saved before regeneration, then he is not saved by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost according to God's purpose and grace.

If the elect are saved eternally without being born of God, then we see no reason why one should be made to partake of the divine nature by the new birth in order that he be prepared to live in and enjoy the spiritual realm. If any person could be saved eternally without being born of God, we see no reason why the infant could not be saved that way; but our people have always said that the infant is saved the same way that the adult is saved, and have always contended that infants that die in infancy are regenerated by the operation of God's Holy Spirit, and that, therefore, they are saved in heaven. If it is necessary that the infant be regenerated, it is just as necessary that the adult be regenerated. (*Cayce's Editorials vol. 3, ppg 330-331*)

Rehoboam

REHOBAM: Sylvester Hassell: Rehoboam, the son of Solomon, did well for a few years of his reign. He ruled wisely, and walked in the way of the better days of his father and grandfather. His reign was honored and revered, and so devotional

was he that numbers of the priests, Levites and people of Israel, moved into Judea away from the idolatry and oppression of their own rulers.

But a sudden change came over the mind of Rehoboam. So soon as he felt established on his throne and everything seemed prosperous around him, he forsook the law of the Lord and plunged into idolatry and almost every vice, and drew most of his subjects with him. God brought down his high looks and defiant attitude by sending Shishak, king of Egypt, to look after him. He invaded Judah, took the fenced cities, and approached Jerusalem.

He and his princes came down at once, at the preaching of the prophet Shemaiah and the approach of Shishak's army, confessed their faults and pleaded for mercy, as did the Ninevites at the preaching of Jonah. The Lord hearkened and saved them from destruction by causing the invading forces to turn away after they had taken the treasures of the house of the Lord and the treasures of the king's house and Solomon's shields of Gold.

There was strong opposition by God's spiritual children in Judea all the time to the wicked devices of the king; but they were in the minority, as usual, and could not prevail. Rehoboah did better after this, but never altogether reformed (II Chronicles 11:5-23; 12; I Kings 14:22-24). (*Hassell's History ppg 124, 125*)

Remonstrants, The

The REMONSTRANTS (*See under James ARMINIUS*)

Repentance

REPENTANCE: C.H. Cayce: There is a legal repentance required of every violator of law. If one is guilty of the violation of law—let it be God's moral law, or any other righteous law—it is his duty to repent; it is his duty to turn from such violation or wrong doing, and live in obedience to the law. Then there is a gospel repentance required if gospel subjects. (*Cayce's Editorials vol. 3, ppg 184, 185*)

Representative Principle, The

The REPRESENTATIVE Principle: Sylvester Hassell: The mysterious principle of representation pervades both Scripture and nature (Genesis 9:22,25; 25:34, compared with Obadiah 1:19; Exodus 20:5; 34:6-7; Numbers 16:32-33; Joshua 6:25; 7:24-25; I Samuel 3:14; 15:2-3; II Samuel 12:10; 21:1-9; I Kings 14:9-10; II Kings 5:27; Jeremiah 32:18; Matthew 23:35, etc.) The God of nature visits the crimes and vices of individuals in many ways upon their posterity. By finite

minds God's "judgments are unsearchable, and his ways past finding out" (Romans 11:33). But, though "clouds and darkness are round about him," his children know that "justice and judgment are the habitation of his throne." (Psalms 97:2). We cannot understand the doctrine of representation or imputation any more than we can understand why an infinitely wise, powerful, holy and benevolent Being should have ever permitted the existence of sin and misery in the universe." (*Hassell*)

Resurrection, The

The RESURRECTION J. T. Oliphant: The Christian hope earnestly expects the vile *bodies* of men now in their graves, sleeping the sleep of death, to be awakened from the dead and made to live. For God has said: "Thy *dead* men shall *live*, together with my *dead body* shall they arise." Again, "The hour is coming when *all* that are in the *graves* shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation," John 5:28. By these words of our blessed Savior, we learn three things, viz:

- 1st. The dead will be raised to life.
- 2nd. The time in which they are raised from their graves.
- 3rd. *Who* will be raised.

Hearing God, who cannot lie, in his Word say, all in their graves shall hear his voice and *come forth*, we believe him, and fondly expect it will be so. "Some have erred, saying the resurrection is passed." Erred as to the time. The *time* of resurrection from the graves is not in the past, but future; the hour is *coming*. There is such an hour, or set time, and it will be here with certainty. The persons who being dead shall live, are *they* that have done good, and *they* that have done evil. "The just and the unjust." The righteous, and the poor ungodly of all mankind will be included in the resurrection.

To further prove abundantly by God's own word in the blessed Bible, that resurrection of the bodies of the dead is truth, read Daniel 12:2, "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."

Also, Acts 24:14, "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." This was Paul's hope explained. The enemies of his faith also "allowed," or admitted the truth of his hope in that one particular. (Compare Acts 23:6).

Paul again asserts and affirms this hope before King Agrippa. Acts 26:6-8. And he asked him the forcible question, viz; "Why should it be thought a thing incredible

with you, that God should *raise* the dead?" God is almighty. "Nothing" good in his sight "is impossible with him."

Considering who and what God is, what is incredible or in any way inconsistent with the nature of things? God is sufficient as a *cause*, to produce that *effect*. God made all dust out of nothing, and formed man out of that dust. By reason of man's sin he dies, and now returns to the dust from whence he is taken. The same God that made man have one existence, can make him to have a second living existence. And surely God, who has made both angels and men, is able to reproduce the bodies of all dead men, some to one state (of life), and some to another state (of damnation).

When God tells us by his Bible that his purpose is: there shall be a resurrection *both* of the just and unjust; then who dares or has any right to *deny* it, or to even *disbelieve* that word? And so "make God a *liar*," I John 5:10.

Annihilation of all men, old and young, us and our children, is a thought so dreadfully withering to our minds, that to sensible, thoughtful men and women, it is unbearable. Then how dreadful, aye, how *miserable* life would be, if no hope carried us beyond the grave! To have no sure prospect of meeting, seeing and associating with any of our fathers, mothers, children, and loved kindred whom we have buried in the grave, and with them buried our present happiness of their company.

O! how intolerable it would be to endure by any of us! Yet, more sad would it be that no soul of man would ever see and rejoice in the heavenly glory of its Maker above! None to live among angels and learn the bliss of God and godliness? Who is able to rejoice in *non-resurrection*? If there *is* no resurrection, then Jesus is yet dead. Death holds forever Jesus and all now sleeping in the earth and sea, so that we have no living Savior and High Priest to remove our sins and save us, if resurrection is not true. "But now *is* Christ risen from the dead, and become the *first fruits* of them that slept," I Corinthians 15:20. So there *is* some resurrection done now. Jesus body is already raised. And John saw with this Lamb, Jesus, (Revelation 14:1-4) standing on the Mount Zion, with a hundred, forty and four thousand redeemed from the earth. "These were redeemed from among men, being the *first fruits* unto God and to the Lamb."

Now, dear reader, consider these *first fruits*. God has received them up in heaven to himself from the earth. "First fruits of them that slept," of all the dead. Read your Bible and answer this question; Did God ever *receive* an offering of *first fruits* from the vineyard, orchard, or wheat field in the hands of a high priest in Moses' tabernacle or Solomon's temple, and not *preserve*, *mature*, and *save* the CROP from which that offering was taken? No. The first fruits *received*, then the crop was *safe*, and harvested in due time in good maturity. In that was seen the principle of the resurrection. The law of first fruits (Exodus 22:29; and Proverbs 3:9-10), is the law of the resurrection.

So God having *received* the body of Jesus and those of a hundred, forty and four thousand of his church as *first fruits* of all the dead; this secures and makes safe the “harvest that truly is great of gathering in the entire crop remaining in the field” (the world). And just so sure as his crucified body was raised from the new sepulcher, with nail prints in its hands and a spear-wound in its side, and so exhibited to Thomas and the rest of his disciples, and afterward it was received up from Mount Olivet to heaven, even so sure will the *bodies* of all saints be raised like his.

Jesus is the pattern like unto which all saved must be fashioned. Yes, even our poor bodies. For it is written, Philippians 3:20-21, “For our conversation is in heaven; from whence also 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,” etc. Mark, our vile body is the thing he shall change. Change the vile or sinful body to a *glorious* body. Into a body all filled and clothed with *glory*. Not glory of earth, nor of stars and planets, but the glory of our ever blessed Jesus in heaven. Also Romans 8:11.

O what a change to be made in a vile human body! God can make it easily, I suppose. I have thought it would be no difficult work to the omnipotent, eternal, ever blessed God to make this change in our bodies, for he will do it so quickly. To him it is the work of a moment. The entire change can be made by him in the twinkling of an eye. Strange it is that what is done by him so very quickly and hence so easily, should be so very difficult to men to even believe.

Why is only the believing so difficult to men of brains, common sense and scholarship? Let Jesus’s words answer, Matthew 22:29, “Ye do *err*, not knowing the scriptures, nor the power of God.” Ignorance of God’s power, and of the Bible, is why men live in error about this change.

Then in I Corinthians 15:52, read how it is done, “Behold, I show 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.”

To further disperse the clouds, fog and smoke of ignorance from our minds, and aid in ridding us of error on this subject, read I Thessalonians 4:13-18, “But I would not have you ignorant, brethren, concerning them which are asleep, that ye sorrow not, even as others which have no hope.” Remove the ignorance on this subject and it lessens sorrow about the dead. The light of truth as relates to when, and how, the dead will be made alive, increases hope in the soul. Hope saves from grief and sweetens even our tears. This rests on Jesus being raised. “For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him.” Believe God did raise Jesus from the dead, and it will be difficult to believe those in him will not also be raised.

Christ is raised for us. Its effect must also be seen in us. “The Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God; and the dead in Christ shall rise first; then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air; and so shall we ever be with the Lord.”

All this is said to those *in* Christ, new creatures in spirit and born again. The new birth is a change, a miraculous resurrection of the soul. The body must be born again when it comes from the grave, even as Christ is “the *first* born from the dead.” Both the change of soul and body is a miracle of God’s power, and display of his reigning grace.

The natural soul and body must be made spiritual, to live and dwell in a spiritual world. Earth is a natural world; heaven is a supernatural or spiritual world; the glory of one is not the glory of the other; hence, those who live on earth must be changed in their state or condition, to another state, to live in and enjoy heaven. Fish could not survive in the open air, nor birds in the water, unless God who made change their state by recreation. So is illustrated (I Corinthians 15:39) that mysterious change God makes in men to fit them for his heavenly kingdom.

By his creative power, they “are created anew.” By the “renewing” power of his Spirit they are made “*new* creatures” for a new world, a new home. To effect this great work in us none but God our Savior is able. “Jesus is the resurrection and the life; he that believeth in him, though he were dead, yet shall he live.” He then is the fullness and power, the life and essence of the resurrection. Examples were given on earth showing forth this power in the resurrection of Lazarus of Bethany, the widow’s son, the ruler’s daughter, and, in fact, in all the miracles he wrought. He that changed water to best wine, is able to change an earthly body into a heavenly body. For we read, “As we have born the image of the earthy, (the first Adam) we shall also bear the image of the heavenly,” (of Christ). I Corinthians 15:49.

Again, in I Corinthians 15:53-54, “For this incorruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality.” So when this is done, then what will be? “*Death* swallowed up in victory.” The last and all enemies destroyed. Yes, even death destroyed. “There shall be no more death,” Revelation 21:4. If there shall be no more death, and death is ever destroyed, then I ask, can there be any remaining dead: How death can be destroyed and the dead not released and raised, we cannot see.

By the fullness, power and grace in Christ, those who *dwell* in, and die *in* the Lord, shall also “in Christ be made alive.” For *in* him they possess eternal life. Not so of those *out* of Christ. Out of Christ, the wrath of God abideth on them. The law worketh wrath; it takes its due course on those out of Christ, out of the “hiding place, the “covert” of saints, and they have no shelter from wrath, no cloak or covering for their sins. Then how blessed is that soul whose “life is *hid* with Christ

in God.” So that “when he who *is* our life shall appear, then shall we also *appear* with him in glory.” Here is seen “good hope and everlasting consolation given us through grace.”

Perhaps you often try to imagine in your minds the glory of the scene when Christ and the saints all appear in glory together. Survey his transfiguration on the mount. He is suddenly covered by a bright cloud, his countenance is as the sun, his garments shining exceeding white as no fuller could white them, then heavenly visitors with him. Let this scene aid our weak minds in looking for the glorious appearing of the great God and our Savior in this world, with his people, at his second coming, for he will come again in like manner as he ascended up from Mount Olivet in a bright cloud of glory.

Remember his promise, “I will not leave you comfortless, I will come unto you.” “Behold I come quickly.” Unexpectedly to most men on earth, he will come as a thief in the night. Many, unprepared for his coming, shall wail because of his sudden presence, to judge and reward all men. Paul certifies, “As it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment; so Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many. But unto them that look for him will he appear the second time without sin unto salvation.”

When he came before, he bore our sins in his body. When he comes again he will come without sin and make us like him; to make us sinless, immortal and all-glorious and heavenly, fit for a new home in heaven with God. Now, our sure and steadfast hope in Christ causes us to expect all this, will soon come to pass. We look for and greatly desire the glorious coming of Jesus, our adorable and blessed Savior, when we shall meet all redeemed souls of every age— patriarchs and prophets, apostles and saints, adults and infants, of all time; black and white, rich and poor, the sane and the idiot, are all to be *changed, resurrected*. God’s grace will be honored and glorified in its sovereign power, and impartial goodness in saving and resurrecting a mighty host which no man can number, out of every nation, kindred, tongue and people under heaven, to stand with him on Mount Zion. “And so shall they ever be with the Lord.”

The use to be made of this subject, as we learn from the words of Paul, is to “comfort one another with these words.’ You will often be in trouble. These truths will comfort you. Comfort the bereaved and desolate. Let them be used on all occasions, these words are soothing and consoling. Another use is to prompt us to active obedience to God.

In I Corinthians 15, last verse, it is said, “Therefore, my brethren, dearly beloved, be ye steadfast, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as ye know that your labor is not in vain in the Lord.” This encouraging doctrine should be used to enforce a steadfast obedience at all times. Good works are not lost if resurrection is truth.

RESURRECTION: T.S. Dalton The Bible is very plain in setting forth the idea that the same body that was slain, was put in Joseph's new tomb; the same body arose from the tomb; and the same body appeared to the disciples, and it was a flesh and bone body, for Jesus said to them, "handle me, for a Spirit hath not flesh and bones as you see me have" Oh! says one, "flesh and blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God." That's so, but he doesn't say that flesh and bones cannot enter Heaven, neither did he mean any such thing, but is simply showing the inability of man as corrupt, fallen creatures, to conform themselves to the image of Christ; for he says, "neither doth corruption inherit incorruption," which shows that change from corruption to incorruption, from the image of the earthly Adam to the image of the heavenly Adam, was alone the work of God. But to deny that flesh and bones enter Heaven is to make Jesus Christ a deceiver and an imposter, for the Gallileans did gaze upon that body which Jesus said had flesh and bones, as it ascended up and was received out of their sight." (*T.S. Dalton Zion's Advocate July 1893*)

RESURRECTION Proof Texts: Job 19:23-27, "Oh that my words were now written; Oh that they were printed in a book. That they were graven with an iron pen and lead in the rock forever. For I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth; and though after my skin worms destroy this body yet in my flesh shall I see God; whom I shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold and not another; though my reins be consumed within me."

Psalms 17:15, "As for me I will behold thy face in righteousness: I shall be satisfied when I awake with thy likeness."

Isaiah 26:19, "Thy dead men shall live, together with my dead body shall they arise. Awake and sing, ye that dwell in dust: for thy dew is as the dew of herbs, and the earth shall cast out the dead."

Daniel 12:1-2, "And 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 everlasting contempt."

Hosea 13:14, "I will ransom them from the power of the grave; I will redeem them from death: O death, I will be thy plagues; O grave, I will be destruction; repentance shall be hid from my eyes."

John 5:28-29, "Marvel not at this; for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation."

John 6:54, “Who eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day.”

Acts 24:13,15, “Neither can they prove the things whereof they now accuse me. But this I confess unto you, that after the way which they call heresy, so worship I the God of my fathers, believing all things which are written in the law and in the prophets; and have hope toward God, which they themselves also allow, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead both of the just and the unjust.”

Romans 8:10-11, “And if Christ be in you, the body is dead because of sin; but the spirit is life because of righteousness. But if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his spirit that dwelleth in you.”

I Corinthians 15:51-55, “Behold, I shew you a mystery; We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump: for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed. So when this corruptible shall have put on corruption, 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. O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory.”

RESURRECTION: Harold Hunt: Philippians 3:20-21, “For our conversation is in heaven; from whence also 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, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself.”

God is coming back for these bodies, and he is going to rejoin them to our departed spirit. I don't know how he is going to do it, but then, he is not depending on me to help, so it is not important for me to know how he will do it.

Job 14:11-12, “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.”

How long is man going to be in the grave? Job says it will be “till the heavens be no more.” As long as the sun shines in the heavens, as long as the moon rules over the night, as long as the stars twinkle in the sky, these old bodies will stay in the grave. But there is a day coming, when the Lord will step out on the clouds of glory, and declare that time will be no more. The elements will melt with fervent heat, the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burned up (II Peter 3:10), and God is going to speak to these bodies, and raise them out of the ground.

Men will forget, but God remembers, and on the resurrection morning he will find you. I get the idea that day may not be very far off, but people have believed that for a long time. I am consoled in the fact that God knows when that time will be, and he will be on time.

I believe that one reason a lot of people want to believe the time is near is because they are afraid that if it is a long time the Lord might forget who they were, and where they are buried. But God knows who you are, and he will know where to find you.

I knew a good brother who had diabetes, and had to have his leg amputated. I went to the hospital to stay with the family on the day of his surgery. There was a man from the funeral home there; he had come to pick up the leg. He took the leg back to the funeral home and preserved it in formaldehyde.

I did not ask the old brother why he wanted his leg preserved in formaldehyde; I knew what he was up to. When he died, he wanted the leg buried with him. He was trying to make it easy on the Lord. On the resurrection morning he did not want the Lord looking all over Union County trying to find that leg.

Job 14:13, “O that thou wouldest hide me in the grave, that thou wouldest keep me in secret until thy wrath be past, that thou woudest appoint me a set time and remember me.”

We do not always think of the grave as a hiding place. But what more secure place is there for the Lord to hide his chosen ones from all the trouble raging around them. In the grave God hides their sleeping dust, preserves it, and watches over it, until that grand day when he will call for them. He will raise those sleeping bodies from the grave, reunite them with their departed spirit; and spirit, soul, and body, he will carry them home to be with him in all eternity.

Job 14:14-15, “If a man die, shall he live again? All the days of my appointed time will I wait until MY CHANGE come. Thou shalt call and I will answer thee; thou wilt have a desire to the work of thine hands.”

There is a change that is going to take place in the resurrection; these old bodies are going to be changed. I remember when I was a boy, we used to sing a song that said, “We will have a new body.” We will have a new body in that this body is going to be made new—THIS SAME BODY.

I Corinthians 15:42, “So also is the resurrection of the dead; it is sown in corruption; it is raised in incorruption; it is sown in dishonor; it is raised in glory; it is sown in weakness; it is raised in power; it is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body.”

There are some changes that are going to take place on that day. There are some things we are going to leave in the grave. All that is vile, all that is corrupt, all that is sinful, we will leave in the grave.

The longer I live the more real that day becomes to me. I am not in a hurry to leave this old world. I wouldn't mind to live to be about 90 years old, and preach at least once every day until then. I am enjoying living. I am having the time of my life. I have never enjoyed life more. I have never enjoyed the church more. I have never enjoyed preaching more than I have the last several years. I have never enjoyed my Bible more than I have the last few years. I enjoy visiting among the churches, and experiencing your fellowship, and preaching to you.

It is a delight to any God-called minister to have an opportunity to preach the gospel, and he appreciates any invitation to visit and preach to the Lord's people. Jeremiah said this desire to preach is a *fire shut up in the bones*. The only way the preacher can get any relief from that burning desire is to preach.

But in spite of all that, I get more than a little anxious to see that eternal city. I like to close my eyes sometimes, and envision what it must be like. In spite of all the sin and wickedness there is in the world, this old world is still a beautiful place to live. Sometimes I like to just look around and admire the beauty of God's creation. Especially in the spring, when the azaleas are in bloom, and the mountain laurel, and the rhododendron, and the dogwoods, and all the others, and the grass is its greenest green, and everything around us has that fresh smell of new life, we cannot help but be amazed at the beauty of God's creation.

And then I like to think that as beautiful as this world is, how beautiful Eden must have been before sin ever entered the picture. But, not even Eden in that day could compare with what that eternal city must be like. I don't know if there will be azaleas, and pretty little pink bushes, and pretty little white bushes in heaven, but I kind of think there will be. After all, heaven is a real place, and we will be walking around in real bodies. I don't know any reason to think there will not be all those scenes over there that dazzle our minds down here.

But any way you look at it, I believe that heaven with all its splendor will outshine anything we have seen down here.

Sylvester Hassell: Enoch and Noah, and perhaps other prophets, preached righteousness, and predicted the coming terrible judgment of God upon the ungodly race, but in vain. Enoch walked with God, and, about a thousand years after the creation of Adam, was translated to heaven without dying; just as, about two thousand years afterwards, during the rampant idolatry of the kingdom of Israel, the prophet Elijah was similarly favored—these two witnesses, before the coming of Christ, thus being divinely

enabled to demonstrate to an unbelieving world, the doctrine of the resurrection of the body and its existence with the soul in glory. In the same manner, the bodies of the saints who are living on earth at the second or last personal coming of Christ, shall be changed, in a moment, without dying, from a mortal to an immortal state, and be caught up with their spirits to dwell forever with the Lord (I Thessalonians 4:15-17)." (*Hassell*)

Revelation, The Beasts Of The

The Beasts of the REVELATION: *Sylvester Hassell:* The first Apocalyptic Beast rises out of the sea (Revelation 13:1) or out of the bottomless pit (Revelation 17:8), and has seven heads and ten horns, each horn having a crown upon it, and upon his heads the name of blasphemy; he has the power and authority of the Dragon, and makes war upon the saints and overcomes them; and all the world wonders after the beast, and worships him, except those whose names are written in the Book of Life and the lamb slain from the foundation of the world (Revelation 13:1-10).

The First Beast shows himself to be the direct representative of the Dragon, who also has seven heads and ten horns (Revelation 12:3), and who, first in human history, assumed the lowest beastly nature, that of the serpent (Genesis 3). The First Beast represents the World-Power opposed to God—the *seven* heads implying the assumption of Godhead, and caricaturing the seven spirits of God (Revelation 1:4); and the ten horns implying the whole cycle of worldly opposition to the Divine perfections.

The seven heads seem to be the seven world monarchies— Egypt, Assyria, Babylon, Persia, Greece, Rome, and the Germanic Empire (the German hordes that conquered Rome); though many scholars think the last or seventh is not yet developed; it is certain, from the interpretation of the angel to John, that at least six of these heads have already appeared (Revelation 17:10), and that sixth was Rome, which reigned over the earth while John was living. Pagan Rome deified her emperors, and worshiped, it is said, 30,000 idols, and dominated the civilized world, and massacred the saints of God in ten persecutions.

Christianity seemed, for a brief period, to give its idolatry a deadly wound, in the fourth century; but that wound was healed, that is, the idolatry was restored by the apostasy of Papal Rome to picture-worship, Mariolatry (the worship of Mary), and the adoration of the Pope and the Eucharist. The ten horns of the First Beast seem to be ten kings who are to be subordinate to this world-power in its last development (Revelation 17:12).

The Second Apocalyptic Beast is the same as the False Prophet (Revelation 13:11-18; 19:20; 20:10); and also seems, in most respects, identified with the great, richly-dressed, blasphemous murderous whore, Mystery Babylon, who rides upon the First Apocalyptic Beast, and is drunken with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus (Revelation 17); the same as the “little horn” on the fourth beast in Daniel 7, and the “man of sin,” or “son of perdition,” predicted by Paul in II Thessalonians 2; and, in its full development, is the chief and last of the “false Christs or false prophets” foretold by John in his first epistle (Revelation 2:18).

He rises out of the earth, that is, out of civilized and consolidated and peaceful society, and is of the earth, earthy, worshiping earthly idols and not the God of Heaven—it is a *beast*, all the time, notwithstanding that it has two horns like a lamb, mocking Christ, and appearing mild and innocent, yet really having the spirit of the Dragon, and, out of the abundance of its heart, speaking and acting like the Dragon.

While the First Beast was a political power, this adds to the features of the First Beast hypocrisy and deceivableness, and is a pseudo-spiritual power, prophesying and working deceptive miracles for the First Beast, and making an image to the First Beast, and commanding all to worship the image, and killing those that refuse, and setting a mark in the right hands or foreheads of the idolatrous worshipers, and letting none buy or sell except such as have the mark or name of the beast, or the number of his name.

The Second Beast (or False Prophet), although assuming the garb of religion (see Matthew 7:15), is more oppressive than the first. The Dragon, Beast and False Prophet, “the mystery of iniquity,” form a hellish Anti-Trinity, counterfeit of “the mystery of godliness,” God manifest in Christ, witnessed to by the Spirit. “The Dragon personates the Father, assigning his authority to his representative, the Beast, as the Father assigns his to the Son; while the False Prophet, like the Holy Ghost, speaks not of himself, but tells all men to worship the Beast, and confirms his testimony by miracles, as the Holy Ghost attested Christ’s Divine mission.” (*Hassell’s History* ppg 254, 255)

The Mark of the Beast: *Sylvester Hassell:* The mark in the right hand and forehead implies prostration of the body and intellect to the Beast; or the mark in the forehead shows profession, and in the hand shows work and service for the Beast. The mark may be, as in the sealing of the saints, not visible, but symbolical of allegiance.

The number of the Beast is said to be the number of a man, and is **666**. Countless attempts have been made to solve this enigma. Before the invention of the Arabic digits, numbers were generally represented by letters; so that every name, by the addition of the values of its letters, had a certain numerical value. From the language of the angel to John (Revelation 17:18), it seems certain that Rome was at least primarily meant; and the most scholarly solutions point to Rome.

The language in which John wrote the book of Revelation, like that of the remainder of the New Testament is Greek; and the numerical value, in Greek, of each of the following words, or phrases, is 666:---*Lateinos* (Latinus, said to have been the first king of the Roman aborigines, from whom they derived their name of latin); *E Latine Basileia* (the Latin kingdom); *Italike Filii Dei* (Italian Church); *Paradosis* (tradition); *Euporia* (wealth). *Vicarius Filii Dei* (a Latin phrase, meaning Vicar of the Son of God, blasphemously assumed by the Pope); *Vicarius Generalis Dei in Terris* (Vicar General of God on earth), have the numerical value, in Latin, of 666. Also the word Romiith (Roman), in Hebrew, has for its numerical value 666. Latin is Rome's language in all official acts.

Let it be especially remembered that “the only two Greek nouns in all the New Testament, whose numerical value is exactly 666, are *Paradosis* and *Europia*, precisely the two expressing the grand corrupters of the church, *Tradition, the corrupter of doctrine*, and *wealth, the corrupter of practice*. The only unquestionable 666 in the Old Testament is the 666 talents of gold that came in yearly to Solomon, and were among his chief corrupting influences (I Kings 10:14; II Chronicles 9:13).” (*Hassell's History* ppg 255, 256)

The Two Horns of the Earth-Beast: *Sylvester Hassell:*

The two horns of the earth-beast represent the two phases of idolatry which ever corrupt the church, literal and spiritual image-worship and covetousness. In Pelletan's “Profession of Faith in the Nineteenth Century,” Wealth is addressed “Divine Son-Messiah-Redeemer-dumb confidant of God— begotten by mysterious conception, who hast saved men from misery, redeemed the world,” etc.

As the woman divinely clothed with the sun, and having the moon under her feet, and upon her head a crown of twelve stars, and persecuted by the Dragon (Revelation 12), represents the true church, so the woman humanly arrayed in purple and scarlet, and decked with gold and precious stones and pearls, and sitting upon the scarlet-colored beast, and having upon her forehead the name *Mystery, Babylon the Great, the Mother of Harlots and Abominations of the Earth*, and drunken with the blood of the saints, represents the false or apostate church with her daughters, whether Roman, Greek, or Protestant, not loving Christ, the heavenly Bridegroom, but giving its affections to worldly idols— corrupted by tradition and wealth.

The name Babylon given to the head of the image of the world-powers in the second chapter of Daniel is given in Revelation to the harlot. This connects her with the fourth kingdom, Rome, the last part of the image. Her sitting upon seven mountains or hills (Revelation 17:9), and her being the city which in John's time reigned over the kings of the earth (Revelation 17:18), also prove her to be Rome. Babylon means confusion, and well describes the rival claims of apostate Rome and her apostate daughters, and the “confused noises and blood-rolled garments” of their many wars upon each other and upon the followers of the Lamb, the Prince of Peace

(Isaiah 9:5-6); but all these persecutors shall stumble, and their “confusion” shall be “everlasting” (Jeremiah 20:11). (*Hassell’s History* pg 256)

The Time of His Coming: Sylvester Hassell: In regard to the *time* when all these events shall take place, it is *altogether uncertain*. Christ told his Apostles that it was “not even for them to know the times or the seasons, which the Father hath put in his own power” (Acts 1:7); and that the day and hour of the coming of the Son of man were unknown to any man and to the angels, and even to himself in his humanity, and known only to the Father (Mark 13:32).

Therefore all his people are to watch (Matthew 24:42). What is called the Year-Day theory is popular with many writers, though rejected by several recent and able scholars. This theory is sought to be based upon such passages as Leviticus 7:5; Deuteronomy 16:9-10,16; Numbers 14:33-34; (Ezekiel 4:5-6; Daniel 9:24; and maintains that a day in prophecy means a year in history. It is replied that prophetic numbers are symbolical, and can hardly be thought to be also literal; that the above passages are irrelevant, especially the main passage in Daniel 9:24, where the word translated *weeks* simply means *sevens*; that the theory is contrary to the words of Christ about our not knowing the times or the seasons; and that if it is applied to any prophetic numbers, it should be applied to all, and that would make the Millennium (Revelation 10:1-7) last 360,000 years.

Scarcely any Year-Day theorist applies his theory to the Millennium. Still, he insists that, in the latter days, many were to run to and fro, and knowledge was to be increased, and the book of prophecy was to be sealed only to the time of the end (Daniel 12:4); and that, as the beginnings of the periods are uncertain, although we know the periods themselves, their ends are also uncertain, so that Christ’s words would still be true.

The three years and a half, or time, and dividing of time, or 42 months, or 1,260 days, so often mentioned in prophecy, are the same period; and, if the Year-Day theory be true, they denote 1,260 years. As for the fall of Mystical Babylon, we cannot tell the exact date, even if she were to continue 1,260 years. Pope Boniface III., in A.D. 606, received from the Emperor Phocas the title of “Universal Bishop;” Pope Theodore I., in A.D. 648, assumed the title of “Sovereign Pontiff,” and was the last pope whom a bishop dared to call brother; Pope Stephen III., in A.D. 754, by acknowledging the usurper Pepin as the lawful king of France, received from him the three territories of Rome, Ravenna, and Lombardy, the beginning of the *temporal power* of the popes.

Reckoning the 1,260 years from these dates, we should reach A.D. 1866, 1908, and 2014; or, if only 360 days are reckoned to a year, A.D. 1849, 1891, and 1997. If the latter date were correct, and there was then to be a persecution of God’s people, unprecedented in horror, and lasting a literal period of three years and a half, as

many suppose, it would make the fall of Romish Babylon about A.D. 2000. (All future dates are, of course, except to God, uncertain.)

As shown by Revelation 19:17-21, “the world, at its highest development of material and pseudo-spiritual power, is but a decorated carcass round which the eagles gather,” as literal Jerusalem was at its destruction by the Romans (Matthew 24:15-28). The one was a lively type of the other.

Mr. Charles Hodge (in his *Systematic Theology*), however, makes the wise remark: “Experience teaches that the interpretation of unfulfilled prophecy is exceedingly precarious. There is every reason to believe that the predictions concerning the second advent of Christ, and the events which are to attend and follow it, will disappoint the expectations of the commentators, as the expectations of the Jews were disappointed in the manner in which the prophecies concerning the first advent were accomplished.”

In reference to the highly important discourse of Christ in Matthew 24 and Matthew 25, it is to be observed that Christ is answering *three* distinct questions of his Apostles: 1st, When the temple and city of Jerusalem were to be destroyed; 2nd, What were to be the signs of his coming; and 3rd, What was to be the time or the sign of the end of the world (Matthew 24:3). The questions, perhaps, amounted to but one in the minds of the disciples at that time, because they probably supposed that these three events were to be simultaneous. It is in accordance with the entire analogy of Scripture prophecy to understand that these predictions had a primary and lower fulfillment in the destruction of Jerusalem, but will have a final and higher fulfillment in the destruction of this sin-polluted world.

So the prophecies of Isaiah and Jeremiah were intended to foretell, not only the deliverance of national Israel from Babylonian captivity, but also the far more important redemption of spiritual Israel from the bondage of sin and Satan.

For the declarative glory of God, the righteousness and mercy of his dealings are to be displayed before the assembled universe on the most solemn and final day of judgment (Matthew 11:22,24; 25:26-31; Luke 10:14; Acts 17:31; Hebrews 6:2; II Peter 2:9; 3:7-13; I John 4:17; Revelation 20:11-15). The time and place and duration of that momentous scene have not been revealed to mortals. Christ, the Mediator between God and man, the Savior of sinners, he who loved and gave himself for his chosen people, embracing every truly humble soul, is to be the judge (Matthew 25:31-32; 28:18; John 5:27; Acts 10:42; 17:31; Romans 14:10; Philippians 2:10; II Timothy 4:1); otherwise his little ones “would sink in despair before the terrible bar.”

The persons to be judged are men and angels (Ecclesiastes 12:14; Psalms 1:4; II Corinthians 5:10; Romans 14:10; Matthew 12:36-37; 25:32; Revelation 20:12; Matthew 8:29; I Corinthians 6:3; II Peter 2:4). “The saints will be present, not to

have their portion *assigned* (for that was fixed long before, Matthew 25:34; Ephesians 1:3-4; II Thessalonians 2:13; I Peter 1:1-5; John 5:24), but to have it *confirmed* forever, and that God's righteousness may be vindicated in both the saved and the lost (Romans 14:10; II Corinthians 5:10), before the universe."

The books that are to be opened are the book of the law (Galatians 3:10), the book of conscience (Romans 2:15-16, and the book of God's omniscience (Hebrews 4:13); and, besides these, another most precious book, the book of God's fatherly remembrance, mentioned at the close of the Old Testament (Malachi 3:16-18; 4:1-3), which is the same as the Lamb's book of life, mentioned at the close of the New Testament (Revelation 13:8; 20:12-15; 21:27)—a book containing the names of all the redeemed to God by the blood of the Lamb out of every kindred, and tongue, and people and nation (Revelation 5:9-10; 1:5-6; 17:14; Isaiah 35:10; 53:5-11; Jeremiah 23:6; Matthew 1:21; John 10:15,27-30; 17:2-3,9-10,20-24; Acts 13:48; Romans 5:19-21; 8:28-39; I Corinthians 1:26-31), their names being written therein, not for their works, but for *Christ's work for* and *in* them—the *Lamb's* book of life (Romans 3:10-20; 6:23; 11:6).

The saints are justified freely by God's grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus (Romans 3:24), or justified by faith, the gift of God (Romans 5:1; 4:16; Galatians 5:22; Ephesians 1:19; Philippians 1:29; Hebrews 12:2). Faith being appreciable by God and the believer alone (Revelation 2:17), and works being appreciable by all, the saints "works of faith and labors of love" are published as the external and *evidential* test to indicate their preparedness for glory, and to vindicate the righteousness of God (I Thessalonians 1:3-4; Matthew 25:34-40; 7:16-20; Galatians 5:22-23; Ephesians 2:1-10).

Acquitted by the free mercy of God, while humbly feeling their own utter unworthiness, the saints are shown to be the children of God by their divinely inspired deeds of mercy to his people (Matthew 25:34-40; James 2:13-26; Ephesians 5:1-2). True faith worketh by love, which is the fulfilling of the law, and the proof that we have passed from death unto life, and are the justified children of God (Galatians 5:6; 6:15; Romans 13:10; I Corinthians 13:13; I John 3:14-18; 4:7-8,11,13,20; 5:1; Romans 3:24-26; 5:1-5). As for their sins, while they themselves can never forget them, and never cease to be deeply grateful to him who loved them and washed them from their sins in his own blood, (Revelation 1:5), their covenant God has long since promised, not only to forgive, but to *remember their sins no more* (Jeremiah 31:31-37).

Being thus accepted in the Beloved, and freely justified by his grace (Ephesians 1:6-7; Romans 3:24), the saints will become assessors with the Judge, and heartily indorse his righteous judgments (Psalms 149:5-9; I Corinthians 6:2-3; Revelation 20:4; 19:1-5). In the light of the "Great White Throne" (Revelation

20:11) all deception will be banished, the secrets of all hearts will be revealed, every individual will appear in his true character (Ecclesiastes 12:14; I Corinthians 4:5; Malachi 3:18); the wicked, though seeking to justify themselves, will be justly condemned by the holy law of God, and by their own consciences (Romans 3:19; 2:12-16; Galatians 3:10), and will be sentenced to everlasting misery, while the righteous are welcomed to everlasting blessedness (Matthew 25:46).” (*Hassell’s History* ppg 257-262)

Revelation, The Book Of

The Book of REVELATION: Sylvester Hassell:

Three Methods of Interpretation: There are three methods of interpreting the book of Revelation—the Preterist, the Futurist, and the Historical (or continuous). The Preterist maintains that the prophecies in Revelation have already been fulfilled—that they refer chiefly to the triumph of Christianity over Judaism and paganism, signalized in the downfall of Jerusalem and of Rome. Against this view it is urged that if all these prophecies were fulfilled some 1,400 years ago (the Western Roman Empire fell A.D. 476), their accomplishment should be so perspicuous as to be universally manifest, which is very far from being the case.

The Futurist interpreters refer all the book, except the first three chapters, to events which are yet to come. Against this view it is alleged that it is inconsistent with the repeated declarations of a speedy fulfillment at the beginning and end of the book itself (Revelation 1:3; 22:6-7,12,20). Against both these views it is argued that, if either of them is correct, the Christian church is left without any prophetic guidance in the Scriptures, during the greater part of its existence; while the Jewish church was favored with prophets during the most of its existence.

The Historical or Continuous expositors believe the Revelation a progressive history of the church from the first century to the end of time. The advocates of this method of interpretation are the most numerous, and among them are such famous writers as Luther, Sir Isaac Newton, Bengel, Faber, Elliott, Wordsworth, Hengstenbeg, Alford, Fausset and Lee. The ablest living expositors of this class consider the seven seals, seven trumpets, seven thunders and seven vials as all synchronous, or contemporaneous, or parallel, a series of cyclical collective pictures, each representing the entire course of the world (as connected with the church) down to the end of time; just as the seven churches in the first three chapters represent the universal church, the message to each pointing to the second coming of Christ.

So the introduction in the first chapter, and the conclusion in the last chapter, refer to the beginning and the end of time, and to the second coming of Christ. Three

times in the last chapter is his quick coming predicted. For these reasons the book of Revelation has been called the “Book of the Prophecy of Christ’s Coming.”

It is the most difficult and sublime book of the Bible. While foretelling the righteous and terrific judgments of God upon the sins of man, it shows that all things are absolutely subject to the Divine foreknowledge and control (Acts 15:18; Psalms 76:10; 46:6; Matthew 24:22); and it abounds in the strongest consolation to the tried people of God, revealing the certainty of their final triumph over all their enemies, and their sure entrance into eternal bliss. Hence, it has been impressively remarked that “the book spreads itself out before us like the mantle of dusky night, brodered over with brilliant stars like jewels—enlivening the hope, patience, perseverance and love of the church of God, and affording her way in situations of the greatest obscurity, while presenting an impenetrable veil to the profane gaze of the worldly mind.”

Scarcely are any two leading interpreters agreed as to the exact events alluded to by each prophecy; no doubt many of the prophecies are still future, and cannot be understood until their fulfillment. While the prophecies may have one, or more than one, typical, imperfect, historical fulfillment, there can be no question that they also imply a higher spiritual fulfillment.” (*Hassell’s History* ppg 252, 253)

Reverend

REVEREND The term “Reverend,” has, in modern times, taken the place of the New Testament term “Elder.” Primitive or Old School Baptists are about the only people who hold to the term Elder for distinguishing the pastor. They do not want any high-sounding titles applied to them. To apply reverend to men appears to them bigotry, pride, and a species of robbery. This word is used but one time in the Bible (Psalms 111:9), and then in connection with the Lord’s name only. And when inspiration says “Holy and reverend is his (God’s) name;” to change it to say, “Holy and Reverend” is the preacher, is robbing God of his name, to satisfy man’s vanity. As well say, “Holy Mr. Smith,” as say “Reverend Mr. Smith.”

Protestants have borrowed this and many other unscriptural customs from the Catholics. May God enable us to reverence him, and like Elihu (Job 32:21-22), not give flattering titles to men.” (*R.H. Pittman*)

Richard Coeur-De-Lion King of England

RICHARD COEUR-DE-LION King of England (*See under The CRUSADES*)

Robinson, John

ROBINSON, John (*See under The INDEPENDENTS*)

Romans, The Book Of

The Book of ROMANS: *Sylvester Hassell:* As Matthew is the fit beginning of the Gospels, linking the New with the Old Testament, so the epistle to the Romans is the fit beginning to the epistles, giving the genealogy of the doctrine of Christ through the Old Testament. The Apostle Paul, in this epistle, firmly holds his ground in the prophetic and historic line of the Old Covenant, and from that standing point opens the dispensation of the Spirit.

The Acts left him in Rome; the succeeding epistle is addressed to the Romans. It stands justly at the head of the Pauline epistles. It is the most comprehensive and systematic statement of Paul's theology, both theoretical and practical, for which he lived and died. It gives the clearest and fullest exposition of a vital and fundamental subject, salvation by free grace, the need, nature and effects of gospel justification for individual souls, vindicated by the witness of the Law and the prophets. Luther calls Romans "the chief book of the New Testament, and the purest gospel;" Coleridge styles it "the profoundest book in existence;" Meyer, "the greatest and richest of all the apostolic works;" and Godet denominates it "the cathedral of the Christian faith." (*Hassell's History pg 207*)

Sabbath, The

The SABBATH: *Sylvester Hassell:* On the seventh day, as Moses informs us (Genesis 2:1-3), God ended and rested from his work of creation, and, therefore, blessed and sanctified that day. Science confirms this statement, and declares that no new species of vegetable or animal has appeared on earth since the introduction of man. In saying that God "rested," the historian does not mean that "the everlasting Creator" was "weary" (Isaiah 40:23), but that he simply ceased from the work of the material creation on earth.

That cessation, or divine Sabbath, yet continues; God still, however, carries on his Sabbath-day's work of providence and redemption (John 5:17; Hebrews 1:3). "His resources are infinite; not baffled by the fall of man, he proceeds, according to his eternal purpose, to work out the grand plan of redemption. After a dark evening and night of 4000 years, the Sun of Righteousness at length arose, and began to dispel

the gloom; but, after the lapse of nearly nineteen centuries, we still see but the grey dawn of God's Sabbath morning, which we yet firmly believe will brighten into a glorious day that shall know no succeeding night" (Revelation 11:15; 21:25).

As man was made in the image of his Creator, he, too, was, according to the divine arrangement, to work six days, and then rest from his ordinary bodily and mental labors on the seventh day, (Genesis 1:28; 2:15), Exodus 16:22-26; 20:8-11), and to "sanctify" or set apart that day from a common to a sacred use by devoting it especially to the worship of his Maker (Leviticus 10:11; Lev 19:30; Lev 23:3; Deuteronomy 33:10; Luke 4:16; Acts 13:14-15,27; Acts 15:21).

"The Sabbath was made for man," says the Lord of the Sabbath (Mark 2:27); if properly observed, it would be a blessing to the whole human race. Man needs, not only the night for rest, but one-seventh of his days also for rest. As proved by both physiology and history, this rest exercises a most beneficial influence on man's physical, mental and moral nature. A change of employment is a rest; as God devotes his Sabbath to the work of providence and redemption, so it is a great blessing to man to have a frequently and regularly occurring day for solemn reflections upon his relations and obligations to his Creator and fellow-creatures, and upon his eternal interests.

Still, "man was not made for the Sabbath" (Mark 2:17); he is not to idolize the Sabbath, or observe it in the oldness of the letter, with pharisaical rigidity, and hypocrisy (Isaiah 1:13; Matthew 12:1-14; Mark 2:23-28; Luke 13:11-17; John 7:22-24; Romans 15:5-6; Colossians 2:16; Galatians 4:9-11). The Christian is especially to remember that the Sabbath is but a shadow or type, of which Christ is the substance (Colossians 2:17; Hebrews 3 and Hebrews 4), who ended the work of his eternal redemption by rising from the dead on the Lord's Day (Matthew 28:1-6; Hebrews 9:12; Revelation 1:10); and as a "holy priest" should he evermore offer up to his adorable Redeemer the spiritual sacrifices of heartfelt thanksgiving and praise (I Peter 2:5; Psalms 103:1-5; 108; I Thessalonians 5:16-18) Christ particularly honored the first day of the week, not only by rising from the dead on that day, but also by repeatedly visiting his disciples, after his resurrection, on that day (John 20:19,26). The apostles, too, it would seem habitually assembled on that day (Acts 20:7; I Corinthians 16:1-2; Acts 2:1). The day of Pentecost was the first day of the week, because it was the fiftieth day after the resurrection of Christ, the Christian church, delighting to honor their Lord has observed the Lord's Day, the first day of the week, as the Sabbath, or Holy Convocation, Day of the New Dispensation; but Christian forbearance on this subject is inculcated in Romans 14:5-6, and Colossians 2:16-17." (*Hassell's History* ppg 44-46)

Sylvester Hassell: Servants and domestic animals were also to be allowed to rest (Exodus 20:10; Deuteronomy 5:14). Only the covetous and carnal were impatient of the Sabbath restraints (Amos 8:4-12). Works of necessity and mercy and

religious service were in full accordance with the spirit and design of the Sabbath day (Matthew 12:1-13; Luke 4:5).

The formalistic, self-righteous Pharisees, substituting an ostentatious ritualism for spiritual piety, held to a multitude of so-called “traditions of the elders,” which they pretended to have derived, by oral transmission, from Moses himself, and to which they attributed a higher authority than even to the written law. They resolved all religion into manifold and burdensome law. “Upon the single topic of the observance of the Sabbath, their Mishna (or second law) contains thirty-nine general rules, under each of which are numerous subordinate precepts, each with specified exceptions. Their labyrinth of casuistry, like that of the Roman Catholic Jesuits, was an instrument for evading moral obligations, and for committing iniquity under the apparent sanction of law.”—G.P. Fisher.

“After the exile and in the hands of the Pharisees the Sabbath became a legal bondage rather than a privilege and benediction. Christ, as the Lord of the Sabbath, opposed this mechanical ceremonialism, and restored the true spirit and benevolent aim of the institution. When the slavish, superstitious, and self-righteous sabbatarianism of the Pharisees crept into the Galatian churches and was made a condition of justification, Paul rebuked it as a relapse into Judaism.

In the gospel dispensation the Sabbath is not a legal ceremonial bondage, but rather a precious gift of grace, a privilege, a holy rest in God in the midst of the unrest of the world, a day of spiritual refreshing in communion with God and in the fellowship of the saints, a foretaste and pledge of the never-ending Sabbath in heaven. The due observance of it in England, Scotland and America is, under God, a safeguard of the public morality and religion, a bulwark against infidelity, and a source of immeasurable blessing to the church, the state, and the family.”— P. Schaff.

It must be stated, however, that in no passage of the New Testament is the first day of the week called “the Sabbath.” Neither the New Testament nor the literature of the early centuries mention any explicit appointment of the first day of the week as a day of Christian worship, or of the Lord’s Day, or Sunday, as a substitute for Saturday, the Old Testament Sabbath enjoined in the decalogue.

But the New Testament shows that the special religious commemoration of the Lord’s Day was a spontaneous exhibition of Christian feeling that sprang up under the eye of the apostles, and with their approval. Any formal decree abolishing the old, and substituting a new, Sabbath, would only have offended the weak Jewish Christians. The Sabbath and marriage were instituted by God himself in Paradise, not for the Jews only, but for the whole human race.

The penalty of death for the violation of the Sabbath was not threatened at its institution in Eden, nor even written in the decalogue, or moral law, on the tables of

stone; but it was a peculiar feature of the Hebrew judicial or civil law (Exodus 31:14; Numbers 15:31-36), typifying the spiritual death of those who, while professing to have entered into the true Sabbath or rest by believing in the finished redemption of Christ, yet really depend upon their own works for salvation (Hebrews 3:4).

The Sabbath was instituted by God to commemorate both his first or natural and his second or spiritual creation (Genesis 2:3; Exodus 20:11; Deuteronomy 5:15); to remind men of him, their Creator and Redeemer; to turn their thoughts from the seen and temporal to the unseen and spiritual; to afford time for religious instruction and for the public and special worship of God; to give recuperative rest to sinful, toiling humanity; to be a type of that rest which remains for the people of God; and to be a sign of the covenant between God and his people (Exodus 31:13,16-17; Ezekiel 20:12). It is thought that nine-tenths of the people derive the greater part of their religious knowledge from the services of the sanctuary.

The Roman Emperor Constantine, 321 A.D., made Sunday a legal holiday, allowing only necessary agriculture labors on that day. Leo VI, about 900 A.D. repealed the agricultural exemption, thus thoroughly establishing Sunday as a day of rest. Alfred the Great, about the same time, forbade work, trade and legal proceedings on Sunday in England. "Calvin's view of the fourth commandment was stricter than Luther's, Knox's view stricter than Calvin's, and the Puritan view stricter than Knox's. The Puritan practice in Scotland and New England often runs into Judaizing excesses.

About the year 1600 a strong Sabbath movement traveled from England to Scotland, and from both these countries to North America, the chief impulse being given in 1595 by a book entitled *The Sabbath of the Old and New Testament*, written by Nicolas Bound, a learned Puritan clergyman of Suffolk. Archbishop Whitgift and Chief Justice Popham attempted to suppress the book, but in vain—considering the Puritan Sabbath theory a cunningly concealed attack on the Church of England, by substituting the Jewish Sabbath for the Christian Sunday and all the Church festivals.

At last King James I brought his royal authority to bear against the Puritan Sabbatarianism, and issued his famous *Book of Sports* in 1618, afterwards republished by his son, Charles I, with the advice of Archbishop Laud, in 1633.

This curious production formally authorizes and commends the desecration of the evening of the Lord's Day by dancing, leaping, fencing and other "lawful recreations," on condition of observing the earlier part of the day by strict outward conformity to the worship of the Church of England. The court set the example of desecration by balls, masquerades and plays on Sunday evening; the rustics repaired from the houses of worship to the ale-house or the village-green to dance around the May-pole and to shoot at the mark. To complete the folly, King James ordered the

book to be read in every parish church, and threatened clergymen who refused to do so with severe punishment. King Charles repeated the order. The people not conforming with the King's decree were to leave the country.

The popular conscience revolted against such an odious and despotic law, and Charles and Laud, for this among other causes, were overwhelmed in common ruin. The Puritan Sabbath theory triumphed throughout the British Isles and the American colonies, the citizens of which countries have never been willing to exchange it for the laxity of Sunday observance on the Continent of Europe, with its disastrous effects upon the attendance at public worship and the morals of the people.

The Sabbatic view of Sunday is incorporated in the Presbyterian, the Congregational and the Baptist Articles of Faith. In 1678 under Charles II, all labor or business, except works of necessity or charity were forbidden by a statute which may be regarded as the foundation of all the present law on the subject in England and the United States.

“The Old School Baptists,” says Elder S.H. Durand, of Pennsylvania, in the *Signs of the Times*, “do not observe the first day of the week of the Jewish Sabbath, for Christ and his apostles gave no such command; but they refrain, on that day, from all works except those of necessity, for these three reasons: 1st, the law of our country forbids unnecessary work on that day, and we are commanded to obey the higher powers (Romans 13:1-5); 2nd, it is universally appointed for religious meetings, and it is a good thing that we can have one day in the week for the public worship of God without distraction from business; and 3rd, the apostles and early disciples appear to have met regularly on the first day of the week, though they also met on other days and from day to day. When the child of God believes on the Lord Jesus Christ, he ceases from his own works, as God did from his, and enters into rest, and all the remainder of his life is really God's holy Sabbath with him, and all the days and nights of the week he should not do his own works or speak his own words (Isaiah 58:13-14)”

The phrase, *Lord's Day* occurs only once in the Bible—in Revelation 1:10; but the same Greek adjective for Lord's, *Kuriakos*, occurs in I Corinthians 11:10, applied to “the Lord's Supper,” a literal as well as a spiritual feast; and the phrase, *the Lord's Day*, is used to designate the first day of the week by the following writers of the second century: Barnabas, Irenaeus, Justin Martyr, Melito, Dionysius of Corinth, Clement of Alexandria, and Tertullian.

At first both days were kept; the apostles, like Christ, worshiped with the Jews in their synagogues on the seventh day, until the Jews persecuted and prevented them (Matthew 12:9; 13:54; Luke 4:16,44; Acts 13:5,14-52; 14:1-7; 17:1-9,17; 18:4)

Christ particularly honored the first day of the week, Sunday, not only by rising from the dead on that day, but also by repeatedly visiting his disciples, after his

resurrection, on that day (John 20:19,26). The apostles too, it would seem, habitually assembled on that day (Acts 20:7; I Corinthians 16:1-2; Acts 2:1). The day of Pentecost was the first day of the week, because it was the fiftieth day after the resurrection of Christ, which took place on the first day of the week. Without any formal commandment in the New Testament, but no doubt by divine arrangement (Ephesians 1:10-13) ever since the resurrection of Christ, the Christian Church, delighting to honor their Lord, has observed the Lord's Day, the first day of the week, as the Sabbath, or Holy Convocation of the New Dispensation; but Christian forbearance on this subject is included in Romans 14:5-6, and in Colossians 2:16-17. (*Hassell's History ppg 44- 46*)

R.H. Pittman: In remembrance of Christ's resurrection the ancient church, like the apostolic church, observed the first day of the week (or Sunday) as a day of public joy and thanksgiving, of public worship of God, and of collections for the poor; but neither the ancient nor the apostolic church ever called that day the Sabbath. In the year 321 Constantine appointed the first day of the week, which he called "the venerable day of the Sun," in reference both to the Roman sun-god, Apollo, and to Christ, the Sun of Righteousness, as, in some respects, a day of rest. He forbade the sitting of courts and military exercises, and all secular labor in towns on that day; but allowed agricultural labor in the country.

Under Moses—the law dispensation, labor is first. Under Christ—the gospel dispensation—grace is first. Christ deserves the first of all things, even the first day of the week for special public worship of his matchless name." (*R.H. Pittman*)

Sabbaths, Multiple

Multiple SABBATHS: Harold Hunt: There could be more than one Sabbath in the same week. The Leviticus account of the day of atonement (Leviticus 23:23-44) shows that there could be as many as four successive Sabbaths on four successive days. In addition to the regular weekly *seventh day* Sabbath (Exodus 20:8-11), we are told, "On the first day shall be a Sabbath, and on the *eighth day* shall be a Sabbath" (Exodus 20:26). Exodus 20:26 says, "In the *ninth day* of the month at even, shall ye celebrate your Sabbath." And we are told, "Also on the *tenth day* of this seventh month there shall be a day of atonement: it shall be an holy convocation unto you.....and ye shall do no work in that same day: for it is a day of atonement....It shall be unto you a Sabbath of rest" (Exodus 20:26,26,26).

John 19:31, "The Jews therefore, because it was the preparation, that the bodies should not remain upon the cross on the Sabbath day, (for THAT SABBATH DAY was an high day,) besought Pilate that their legs might be broken, and that they might be taken away."

Christ was not crucified on Friday. The Sabbath that followed the crucifixion was not the weekly Sabbath. It was rather one of the *high day* Sabbaths.

Matthew 12:40, “For as Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale’s belly; so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth.”

Christ was in the grave three full days and three full nights. The Jews did not divide their days at midnight; that was a Roman practice which came later. The Jewish day began at sundown of the night before. “And [first] the evening [then] the morning were the first day” (Genesis 1:5). The Sabbath that followed the crucifixion began at sundown of the previous day.

Christ was taken down from the cross and buried on Wednesday before the *high day* Sabbath began at sundown. He was in the grave Wednesday night and Thursday, Thursday night and Friday, Friday night and Saturday.

Mary Magdalene and the other Mary came to see the sepulchre (Matthew 28:1) before sunrise, “very early in the morning” (Mark 16:2; Luke 24:1) “when it was yet dark” (John 20:1), “as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week” (Matthew 28:1). Notice that Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John are all very careful to demonstrate that Christ did not come out of the grave at sunrise on Sunday morning. When the women arrived at the tomb, the sun had not yet risen, and they discover that the Lord had already come out of the grave.

Neither the angel, nor the earth-quake, (Matthew 28:2) had anything to do with the resurrection. The angel did not roll the stone away to let the Lord out of the tomb. Stones and doors are no hindrance to him (John 20:19). The angel rolled away the stone to let the women see that the tomb was empty. The Lord had been in the garden alone all night.

Sacraments, The

The SACRAMENTS: Sylvester Hassell: Roman Catholicism has substituted the unscriptural term *sacrament* for the ordinances of the Christian religion; and, in utter defiance of the New Testament and of the true nature of vital godliness, has defined a *sacrament* to be an indispensable and efficacious means in the hands, however of popish priests or Bishops who may be the vilest sinners, of conveying Divine Grace and salvation. In the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard, about the middle of the twelfth century, Rome fixed the number of *sacraments* at seven, as follows: Baptism, confirmation, the Lord’s Supper, penance, extreme unction, ordination and marriage. Thus to the two beautiful emblematic ordinances of Baptism and the

Lord's Supper, instituted by Christ, Rome has added three institutions of her own invention— confirmation, penance and extreme unction, and two other institutions—marriage and ordination—which, though of Divine appointment, are nowhere in the Scriptures called church ordinances.” (Hassell)

Sacrifices of The Mosaic Law, The Different

The Different SACRIFICES of the Mosaic Law: Sylvester Hassell: As it has been well said, the key note of the whole system is the same—self-abdication and a sense of dependence on God. Every sacrifice was assumed to have a vital connection with the spirit of the worshiper. The offering, unless accompanied with the heart of the offerer, was rejected by God (Psalms 40:6; 50:8-15; Proverbs 21:3; Isaiah 1:11-15; Jeremiah 7:21-23; Hosea 6:6; Micah 6:7-8; I Samuel 15:22; Matthew 5:23-24).

There were three kinds of offerings for the altar, in the following historical order: 1st, The burnt-offering, which, throughout Genesis, seems the only offering made by the people of God; 2nd, the meat-offering (un-bloody), or the peace-offering (bloody); and 3rd, the sin or trespass-offering (Leviticus 1; 2; 3; 4). The legal or ritual order was: 1st, The sin-offering; 2nd, the burnt-offering; and 3rd, the peace-offering (Leviticus 8).

The idea of sacrifice was complex, involving three elements, the expiatory, the self-dedicatory, and the eucharistic. All these three ideas entered into every sacrifice; but expiation or propitiation was the predominating element in the sin or trespass-offering; and thanksgiving in the meat or peace-offering. The spiritual order corresponds to the ritual; the sin of the worshiper must first be taken away by an atonement; then he must be consecrated to God; and then he can offer up acceptable sacrifices of praise and love.

The sin-offering was in part burnt upon the altar, in part given to the priests, or burnt outside the camp; the burnt offering was wholly burnt upon the altar; the peace-offering was shared between the altar, the priests, and the sacrificer. The incense offered, after sacrifice, in the Holy Place, and (on the day of atonement) in the Holy of Holies, was a symbol of the intercession of the priest (as a type of the great High Priest), accompanying and making efficacious the prayer of the people.

The same five animals that God commanded Abraham to offer in the sacrifice of the covenant (Genesis 15:9) are the five alone named in the law for sacrifice; The ox, sheep, goat, dove and pigeon (the ancient Jews kept no home-bred fowls or chickens). These animals fulfilled the three legal conditions; they were legally clean, were commonly used for food, and formed a part of the home wealth of the sacrificers, who thus offered up the support of their life for that life itself.

Every sacrificial animal was to be perfect, without spot or blemish, neither diseased nor deformed; except that a victim with a disproportioned limb was allowed in a free-will peace-offering. A male animal was generally required; and the age was from a week to three years old. "Such animals only were allowed in sacrifice as are most useful and valuable to man, and such as are most domestic (or nearest to man), harmless, patient and cleanly.

Neither filthy swine, nor devouring lions, nor the warlike horse, nor the subtle fox, nor the voracious dog, nor any creature that subsists on animal food, was appointed for sacrifice; but, in general, those alone which represent most aptly what Christ would be, and what his people ought to be; as the laborious ox, the gentle, harmless and cleanly sheep; and the tender, loving, mourning dove; for even the useful goat was sacrificed far less frequently than sheep and oxen.---T. Scott. (From Hassell)

"The unbloody offerings are generally acknowledged to have been expressions of dependence, thankfulness, and homage to God; but it is impossible to explain satisfactorily the bloody offerings except as originating by Divine appointment, and pointing forward to the one great spotless antitypical Victim who was to come in the fulness of time, and suffer for the sins of the spiritual Israel. Life was the divinely appointed forfeit of sin (Genesis 2:17; Ezekiel 23:20; Romans 6:23); the blood contains the life, according to both Scripture (Leviticus 17:11) and science; and, therefore, for the remission of sins, the life-blood must be taken (Leviticus 17:11; Hebrews 9:22)."

"But the victim must be more closely related to us than are the inferior animals; he must be, according to the first proclamation of the gospel, in Eden (Genesis 3:15), a "seed of the woman;" and yet he must be without any blemish or sin of his own, as typified by the legal sacrifices; and he must be able to bruise the head of the serpent, or conquer Satan; in other words, he must be a holy, omnipotent man, one partaking of the nature both of God and of man, the Son of God and the Son of man; in order that, in his human capacity, he may render all the active and passive obedience that the law required, even unto death; and that, in his Divine capacity, he may rise again, re-enter Heaven, and ever live to make efficacious inter-cession for the purchase of his blood."

"In the mind of every spiritual Israelite, even under the old dispensation, 'the lessons conveyed in the symbols of the altar must have all converged, with more or less distinctness, towards the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world (Revelation 13:8), who was to come at the appointed time, that he might fulfill all righteousness (Matthew 3:15), and realize in the eyes of men the true sin-offering, burnt-offering and peace-offering; who has now been made sin for us, though he knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him (II Corinthians 5:21); who has given himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet-smelling savor (Ephesians 2:13-14); our true paschal lamb which has been slain for

us (I Corinthians 5:7), to the end that by eating his flesh and drinking his blood we might have eternal life (John 6:54)”—S. Clark.

The nature and effect of Christ’s atoning sacrifice was forcibly illustrated by the ritual of the Day of Atonement (Leviticus 23:26-32; Numbers 29:7-11; Hebrews 9). This was the tenth day of the seventh day of the seventh month (third of October), five days before the Feast of Tabernacles. It was the only day of fasting and humiliation enjoined in the law. It was a Sabbath, a day of holy convocation or assembly, on which the children of Israel were to afflict their souls, and do no manner of work, under penalty of being cut off from the Lord’s congregation. “The one absorbing thought of all was to be the great atonement by the High Priest on that day. No other priest was allowed to be in or about the sanctuary on that solemn day, teaching that his antitype, the Messiah, has a priesthood exclusively his own, and no work of another is to be added to his complete work of atonement.

The High Priest bathed and dressed himself in white linen garments, symbolizing the holiness required for the admission into God’s presence—the holiness of Christ. This was the only day in the year on which the High Priest, even entered the Holy of Holies. Taking a censer with burning coals from the brazen altar, and applying a handful of incense, he entered the Most Holy Place, where the mercy-seat became enveloped in the cloud of smoke from the incense, typifying Christ’s merits incensing our prayers, so as to make them a sweet-smelling savor to God (Revelation 8:3-4).

Then, being a sinner himself, the Jewish High Priest atoned for himself and family; the true High Priest, being sinless, has to make no atonement for himself. Afterwards the High Priest offered an atonement for Israel. This consisted of two goats, on one being written “For Jehovah,” on the other “For Azazel” (or “For Complete Removal”). The lots were cast, and one goat (that for Jehovah) was slain, and its blood was sprinkled upon and before the mercy-seat, typifying Jesus’ vicarious bearing of our sins penalty, death; and the other, or scape-goat, after the High Priest had laid his hands upon its head and confessed over it all the sins of Israel, was sent away by a fit man into the wilderness, a land not inhabited, and there let loose typifying the complete removal of our sins out of sight to where no witness will rise in judgment against us, ‘as far as the east is from the west’ (Psalms 103:12), ‘Christ’s rising again for our justification’ (Romans 4:25), so that, being to sin and the law, we live by union with his resurrection life, sin being utterly put away in proportion as that life works in us John 14:19; Romans 6; Colossians 3).

Death and life are marvelously united alike in Christ and his people. The same fact was symbolized by the slain bird and the bird let loose after having been dipped in the blood of the killed bird (Leviticus 19:4-7). The Jewish High Priest entered the Most Holy Place once every year to repeat his typical atonement; but the true High Priest infinitely transcends the type, for he entered Heaven, the Most Holy Place, not made with hands, once for all, having “by one offering forever perfected them that

are sanctified,” and “obtained eternal redemption for us,” so that “there is no more offering for sin” (which condemns the Roman Catholic notion of the Lord’s Supper being a sacrifice).

After the typical High Priest’s atonement, the veil between the Holy and the Most Holy Place continued as before to preclude access to priests and people alike; but the veil was rent at Christ’s death, throwing open the holiest Heaven continually to all believers through faith in his sacrifice.

The Jewish Gemara states that the High Priest tied a tongue-shaped piece of scarlet cloth on the scape-goat, and that as the goat was led away, the red cloth turned white as a token of God’s acceptance of the atonement, illustrating Isaiah 1:18, “Though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow;” but that no such change took place for forty years before the destruction of Jerusalem—a singular testimony from Jewish authority to Christ, as he was crucified, or made the true atonement, just forty years before the destruction of the holy city; the type ceased when the antitype was realized.

The day of atonement was the indispensable preparation for the joy that followed in the Feast of Tabernacles; and so we can only truly “joy in God” when “through our Lord Jesus Christ we have received the atonement” (Romans 5:11).---A.R. Faussett. (Hassell)

Saint Peter's Cathedral

SAINT PETER’S CATHEDRAL: Sylvester Hassell: The sixteenth century was the period of the fixed and executed purpose of the popes to build at Rome a religious structure to be known as “St. Peter’s,” designed to eclipse in costly and colossal magnificence all the other temples of earth; and, though intended by the popes to be a grand perpetual monument of Roman Catholic glory, yet designed by Providence to be a grand perpetual monument of Roman catholic shame, proclaiming forever to the world the bottomless abyss of corruption into which an organization calling itself the “Holy Catholic Church” had descended to offer in the public marts of Europe the *unblushing sale for gold of unlimited indulgences for past, present, and future sins---the declared object of the popes being to devote the gold to the erection of the cathedral of “St. Peter’s;”* against which tremendous and unparalleled abomination Martin Luther was raised up by the Holy Spirit to utter a mighty trumpet blast of God’s absolute and eternal predestination of his people to everlasting life, of justification by faith alone, and salvation by grace alone, which reverberated all over Roman Catholic Europe, aroused sleeping millions from their nocturnal slumbers, and shook to its center the kingdom of Mystical Babylon.” (Hassell)

Pope Julian II. (1503-1513) was a bold unscrupulous politician and warrior, who devoted his administration to intriguing and fighting for his own aggrandizement. In 1506, changing the plans of Nicholas V., he laid the foundation-stone of the present cathedral of "St. Peter's," which was finished in 1644 at a cost of sixty millions dollars. The "elegant heathen Pope" Leo X. (1513-1521), having exhausted his treasury in lavish expenditures, and yet desiring to immortalize his administration by the completion of "St. Peter's," commissioned and sent out a number of Dominican monks to sell indulgences or pardons for sins in order to raise money for this purpose.

John Tetzel, one of these monks, went to Juterboch, four miles from Wittenberg, in Saxony, and, with unequaled exaggerations and shamelessness, "sold grace for gold as dear or cheap as he could." He had a price for every sin, and so deluded the people that money poured into his coffers from men, women and children, rich and poor, even from beggars; and he boasted that he had saved more souls by his indulgences than the Apostle Peter had saved by his sermons, and that the red cross he carried had as much efficacy as the cross of Christ. He declared that Christ since his ascension had nothing more to do with the church till the last day, but had entrusted all to the pope, his vicar and viceregent. Tetzel had, years before, squandered large amounts of their iniquitous gains in the most abominable dissipations.

The cup of Rome's iniquity seemed, indeed to be full. God no longer suffered this diabolical mockery of his holy religion to proceed unrestrained. Foreknowing all things, he had for thirty-three years been preparing, in the heart of Germany and in the bosom even of the Roman communion, a man qualified by his experience and by the Divine Spirit to meet this very emergency." (*Hassell*) (*See also under Martin LUTHER*)

Samaria And The Samaritans

SAMARIA and the Samaritans: Sylvester Hassell: The land of Israel was not left desolate when the king of Assyria depopulated the country. He brought in others to fill their places, men, women, and children, from different provinces of his empire, to secure the country which he had conquered; and in this way Samaria was settled. Here originated a most remarkable people, both in regard to their religion and their perpetuity.

The zealous king of Judah, Josiah, undertook to destroy the idols in the lands once occupied by the ten tribes, ninety-three years after their captivity. He met with resistance elsewhere, but not in Samaria. There he killed the idolatrous priests, which they were willing to, and had no objection to the worship set up by Josiah. Ninety-two years afterwards, viz., in the year B.C. 536, when Ezra under the decree

of Cyrus was laying the foundation of the second temple, these people desired to assist him in the work on the ground of a common religion. Said they, "Let us build with you: for we seek your God, as ye do; and we do sacrifice unto him since the days of Esar-haddon, king of Asshur, who brought us hither." But the Jews replied, "Ye have nothing to do with us to build an house unto our God; but we ourselves together will build unto the Lord God of Israel as Cyrus, the king of Persia, hath commanded us" (Ezra 4).

Upon this refusal of their assistance they became much displeased, and did what they could ever afterwards to hinder the work, and actually prevailed with the king of Persia to put a stop to it for awhile. The bitterness engendered on that occasion has never passed away. It continued between the two people all the time during the existence of the second temple. In the days of our Savior "the Jews had no dealings with the Samaritans," and we presume the prejudice remains to this day, whenever they come in contact.

The Jewish nation has been broken up for eighteen hundred years [as of 1885 Ed.], and their descendants are now dispersed abroad among the nations of the earth without the least sign of nationality; while the Samaritans occupy their old ground still, hold fast to their old religion, and are full of their old prejudices. They worship on Mount Gerizim, and hold to the five books of Moses, with the books of Joshua and Judges in a corrupted form. The Pentateuch, however, is their Bible, and they still look for a Savior to come. Their copy of the Pentateuch is very ancient, and written in the ancient Hebrew or Phoenician character. When they received it or what is the date of it is unknown—perhaps a little before the Babylonian captivity." (*Hassell's History* ppg 123, 124)

Satisfaction

SATISFACTION: Abridged from John Gill: Though the doctrine of satisfaction is not only closely connected with, but even included in, the doctrine of redemption, made by paying a satisfactory price into the hands of justice, and is a part of it; yet it is of such importance, that it requires it should be distinctly and separately treated of. It is the glory of the Christian religion, which distinguishes it from others; what gives it the preference to all others, and without which it would be of no value itself. And though the word *satisfaction* is not syllabically expressed in scripture, as used in the doctrine under consideration, the thing is abundantly declared in it.

Socinus denies [this]; though he himself owns, that a thing is not to be rejected, because not expressly found in scripture; for he says, it is enough with all lovers of

truth, that the thing in question is confirmed by reason and testimony; though the words which are used in explaining the question are not found expressly written.

What Christ has done and suffered, in the room and stead of sinners, with content, well pleasedness, and acceptance in the sight of God, is what may, with propriety, be called *satisfaction*. This is plentifully spoken of in the word of God; as when God is said to be “well pleased for Christ’s righteousness sake,” and with it, it being answerable to the demands of law and justice; and is an honoring and magnifying of it.

The sacrifice of Christ, and such his sufferings are, is said to be of a “sweet smelling savor to God;” because it has expiated sin, atoned for it; that is, made satisfaction for it, and taken it away. [This] the sacrifices under the law could not do; hence here was a remembrance of it every year.

Isaiah 42:21 The LORD is *well pleased* for his righteousness’ sake; he will magnify the law, and make it honorable.

Ephesians 5:2 And walk in love, as Christ also hath loved us, and hath given himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweetsmelling savor.

And there are terms and phrases which are used of Christ, and of his work; as “propitiation, reconciliation, atonement,” etc. which are equivalent and synonymous to satisfaction for sin, and expressive of it; concerning which may be observed the following things:

I. The necessity of satisfaction to be made for sin, in order to the salvation of sinners; for without satisfaction for sin, there can be no salvation from it; “for it became him for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the Captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings.” That is, it became the all wise and all powerful Former and Maker of all things for himself.

It was agreeable to his nature and perfections. It was fitting, and so necessary, that it should be done; that whereas it was his pleasure to bring many of the sons of men, even as many as are made the sons of God, to eternal glory and happiness by Christ; that the author of their salvation should perfectly and completely suffer, in their room and stead, all that the law and justice of God could require; without which not a sinner could be saved, nor a son brought to glory.

If two things are granted, which surely must be easily granted, satisfaction for sin will appear necessary:

1. That men are sinners; and this must be owned, unless any can work themselves up into such a fancy, that they are an innocent sort of beings, whose natures are not

depraved, nor their actions wrong; neither offensive to God, nor injurious to their fellow creatures. And if so, indeed then a satisfaction for sin would be unnecessary; and one would think the opposers of Christ's satisfaction must have entertained such a conceit of themselves. But if they have, scripture, all experience, the consciences of men, and facts, are against them; all which declare men are sinners, are transgressors of the law, and pronounced guilty by it before God; and are subject to its curse, condemnation, and death, the sanction of it. And "every transgression" of it, and disobedience to it, has received, does receive, or will receive, "a just recompense of reward." That is, righteous judgment and punishment, either in the sinner himself, or in a surety for him.

Hebrews 2:2 For if the word spoken by angels was steadfast, and every transgression and disobedience received *a just recompense of reward*;

God never relaxes the sanction of the law; that is, the punishment for sin it threatens; though he favorably admits one to suffer it for the delinquent. By sin men are alienated from God, set at a distance from him, with respect to communion. Without reconciliation or satisfaction for sin, they never can be admitted to it. A sinner, not reconciled to God, can never enjoy nearness to him, and fellowship with him; and this, when ever had, is the fruit of Christ's sufferings and death. He suffered, in the room and stead of the unjust, to bring them to God. And it is by his blood, making peace for them, that they that were afar off, with respect to communion, are made nigh, and favored with it.

Ephesians 2:13-14 But now in Christ Jesus ye who sometimes were far off are made nigh by the blood of Christ. For he is our peace, who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us;

I Peter 3:18 For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit:

The satisfaction of Christ does not procure the love of God, being [rather] the effect of it. Yet it opens the way to the embraces of his arms, stopped by sin. Moreover, men by sin, are declared rebels against God, and enemies to him. Hence reconciliation, atonement, or satisfaction, became necessary; as they are enemies in their minds, by wicked works. Yea, their carnal mind is enmity itself against God. And, on the other hand, on the part of God, there is a law enmity, which must be slain, and was slain, through the sufferings of Christ on the cross.

Ephesians 2:16 And that he might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross, *having slain the enmity thereby*:

And so made peace and reconciliation; for this designs not any internal disposition in the mind of God's people, before conversion, which is overcome in it,

by the love of God implanted in them; but the declared enmity of the moral law against them, broken by them; of which the ceremonial law was a symbol, in the slain sacrifices of it, and stood as an handwriting against them; all which were necessary to be removed.

2. The other thing to be taken for granted is, that it is the will of God to save sinners, at least some of them; for if it was not his will to save any from sin, there would be no need of a satisfaction for, it. Now it is certain, that it is the will and resolution of God to save some; whom he appointed not to the wrath they deserve, but to salvation by Christ; whom he has ordained to eternal life, and are vessels of mercy, afore prepared for glory; and for whose salvation a provision is made in the council and covenant of grace, in which it was consulted, contrived, and settled, and Christ appointed to be the author of it; and who, in the fulness of time, was sent and came about it, and has obtained it; and which is ascribed to his blood, his sufferings, and death, which were necessary for the accomplishment of it.

Some have affirmed that God could forgive sin, and save sinners, without a satisfaction; and this is said, not only by Socinians, but by some, as Twisse, Dr. Goodwin, Rutherford, etc. who own that a satisfaction is made, and the fitness and expedience of it. But then this is giving up the point; for if it is fitting and expedient to be done, it is necessary; for whatever is fitting to be done in the affair of salvation, God cannot but do it, or will it to be done.

Besides, such a way of talking, as it tends to undermine and weaken the doctrine of satisfaction; so to encourage and strengthen the hands of the Socinians, the opposers of it; much the same arguments being used by the one as by the other. It is not indeed proper to limit the Holy One of Israel, or lay a restraint on his power, which is unlimited, boundless, and infinite; with whom nothing is impossible, and who is able to do more than we can conceive of. Yet it is no ways derogatory to the glory of his power.

Nor is it any impeachment of it, nor argues any imperfection or weakness in him, to say there are some things he cannot do; for not to be able to do them is his glory; as that he cannot commit iniquity, which is contrary to the purity and holiness of his nature. He cannot do an act of injustice to any of his creatures, that is contrary to his justice and righteousness. He cannot lie; that is contrary to his veracity and truth. He cannot deny himself, for that is against his nature and perfections.

And for the same reason he cannot forgive sin without a satisfaction, because so to do, does not agree with the perfections of his nature. It is a vain thing to dispute about the power of God; what he can do, or what he cannot do, in any case where it is plain, what it is his will to do, as it is in the case before us. At the same time he declared himself a God gracious and merciful, forgiving iniquity, transgression, and sin. He has, in the strongest terms, affirmed, that he “will by no means clear the guilty,” or let him go unpunished; that is, without a satisfaction.

Exodus 34:6-7 And the LORD passed by before him, and proclaimed, The LORD, The LORD God, merciful and gracious, longsuffering, and abundant in goodness and truth, Keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin, and *that will by no means clear the guilty*; visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, and upon the children's children, unto the third and to the fourth generation.

Jeremiah 30:11 For I am with thee, saith the LORD, to save thee: though I make a full end of all nations whither I have scattered thee, yet will I not make a full end of thee: but I will correct thee in measure, and will not leave thee altogether unpunished.

Nahum 1:3 The LORD is slow to anger, and great in power, *and will not at all acquit the wicked*.

Numbers 14:18 The LORD is longsuffering, and of great mercy, forgiving iniquity and transgression, *and by no means clearing the guilty*, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation.

Besides, if any other method could have been taken, consistent with the will of God, the prayer of Christ would have brought it out. “Father, if it be possible, let this cup of suffering death pass from me.” [He] adds, “not my will, but thine be done!” what that will was, is obvious.

Hebrews 10:5-10 Wherefore when he cometh into the world, he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a body hast thou prepared me: In burnt offerings and sacrifices for sin thou hast had no pleasure. Then said I, Lo, I come (in the volume of the book it is written of me,) *to do thy will*, O God. Above when he said, Sacrifice and offering and burnt offerings and offering for sin thou wouldest not, neither hadst pleasure therein; which are offered by the law; Then said he, *Lo, I come to do thy will*, O God. He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second. *By the which will* we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all.

It may be said, this is to make God weaker than man, and to represent him as not able to do what man can do. One man can forgive another the debts that are owing to him; and in some cases he should, and is to be commended for it. And one may forgive another an offence committed against himself, and ought to do it; especially when the offender expresses repentance. But it should be observed, that sins are not pecuniary debts, and to be remitted as they are. They are not properly debts, only so called allusively. If they were proper debts, they might be paid in their kind, one sin by committing another, which is absurd. But they are called debts, because as debts oblige to payment, these oblige to punishment. [This] debt of punishment must be

paid, either by the debtor, the sinner, or by a surety for him. Sins are criminal debts, and can be remitted no other way.

God, therefore, in this affair, is to be considered not merely as a creditor, but as the Judge of all the earth, who will do right; and as the Rector and Governor of the world; that great Lawgiver, who is able to save and to destroy; who will secure his own authority as such, do justice to himself, and honor to his law, and show a proper concern for the good of the community, or universe, of which he is the moral Governor.

So though one man may forgive another a private offence, committed against himself, as it is an injury to him, yet he cannot forgive one, as it is an injury to the commonwealth, of which he is a part.

A private person, as he cannot execute vengeance and wrath, or inflict punishment on an offender; so neither can he, of right, let go unpunished one that has offended against the peace and good of the commonwealth.

These are things that belong to the civil magistrate, to one in power and authority. And a judge that acts under another, and according to a law which he is obliged to regard, can neither inflict punishment, nor remit it, especially the latter, without the order of his superior. God indeed is not under another; he is of himself, and can do what he pleases; he is the Maker and Judge of the law. **But then he is a law to himself. His nature is his law, and he cannot act contrary to that.**

Wherefore, as Joshua says, “He is an holy God; he is a jealous God; he will not forgive your transgressions, nor your sins,” that is, without a satisfaction; and which comports with his own honor and glory; of which he is a jealous God.

Sin is “*crimen laesae Majestatis*,” a crime committed against the majesty of God. It disturbs the universe, of which he is Governor, and tends to shake and overthrow his moral government of the world, to introduce atheism into it, and bring it into disorder and confusion, and to withdraw creatures from their dependence on God, and obedience to him, as the moral Governor of it. [It] therefore requires satisfaction, and an infinite one, as the object of it is; and cannot be made, but by an infinite Person, as Christ is. Such a satisfaction the honor of the divine Being, and of his righteous law, transgressed by sin, requires. Which leads to observe,

That to forgive sin, without a satisfaction, does not accord with the perfections of God.

1. Not with his justice and holiness. God is naturally and essentially just and holy. All his ways and works proclaim him to be so; and his creatures own it, angels and men, good and bad. As he is righteous, he naturally loves righteousness;

and naturally hates evil, and cannot but show his hatred of it; and which is shown by punishing it.

God is a consuming fire; and as fire naturally burns combustible matter, so it is natural to God to punish sin. Wherefore, punitive justice, though denied by Socinians, in order to subvert the satisfaction of Christ, is natural and essential to him. He cannot but punish sin. It is a righteous thing with him to do it; the justice of God requires it; and there is no salvation without bearing it. He is praised and applauded for it, by saints and holy angels. To do otherwise, or not to punish sin, would be acting against himself and his own glory.

2. To forgive sin, without satisfaction for it, does not agree with his veracity, truth, and faithfulness. With respect to his holy and righteous law: it became him, as the Governor of the universe, to give a law to his creatures; for where there is no law, there is no transgression. Men may sin with impunity, no charge can be brought against them; sin is not imputed, where there is no law. But God has given a law, which is holy, just, and good; and which shows what is his good and perfect will.

And this law has a sanction annexed to it, as every law should have, or it will be of no force to oblige to an observance of it, and deter from disobedience to it. **And the sanction of the law of God is nothing less than death, than death eternal;** which is the just wages, and proper demerit of sin, and which God has declared he will inflict upon the transgressor; “In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.”

Now the veracity, truth, and faithfulness of God, are engaged to see this sanction established, and threatening executed; either upon the transgressor himself, or upon a surety for him; for the judgment of God is, that such a person is worthy of death; and his judgment is according to truth; and will and does most certainly take place.

3. The wisdom of God makes it necessary that sin should not be forgiven, without a satisfaction; for it is not the wisdom of any legislature, to suffer the law not to take place in a delinquent. It is always through weakness that it is admitted, either through fear, or through favor and affection. This may be called tenderness, lenity, and clemency; but it is not justice. And it tends to weaken the authority of the legislator, to bring government under contempt, and to embolden transgressors of the law, in hope of impunity.

The all wise Lawgiver can never be thought to act such a part. Besides, the scheme of men’s peace and reconciliation by Christ, is represented as the highest act of wisdom, known to be wrought by God; for “herein he has abounded towards us in all wisdom and prudence.”

But where is the consummate wisdom of it, if it could have been in an easier way, at less expense, without the sufferings and death of his Son? Had there been another and a better way, infinite wisdom would have found it out, and divine grace and mercy would have pursued it.

4. Nor does it seem so well to agree with the great love and affection of God, to his Son Jesus Christ, said to be his beloved Son, the dear Son of his love; to send him into this world in the likeness of sinful flesh—to be vilified and abused by the worst of men—to be buffeted, lashed, and tortured, by a set of miscreants and to put him to the most cruel and shameful death, to make reconciliation for sin, if sin could have been forgiven, and the sinner saved, without all this, by a hint, a nod, a word speaking; “Thy sins are forgiven thee,” and thou shall be saved!

Nor does it so fully express the love of God to his saved ones; but tends to lessen and lower that love. God giving his Son to suffer and die, in the room and stead of sinners, and to be the propitiation for their sins, is always ascribed to the love of God, and represented as the strongest expression of it!

But where is the greatness of this love, if salvation could have been done at an easier rate? and, indeed, if it could have been done in another way. The greatness of it appears, in that either the sinner must die, or Christ die for him; such was the love of God, that he chose the latter!

To all this may be added, as evincing the necessity of a satisfaction for sin, that there is something of it appears by the very light of nature, in the heathens, who have nothing else to direct them. They are sensible by it, when sin is committed, deity is offended. Else what mean those accusations of conscience upon sinning, and dreadful horrors and terrors of mind?

Witness also, the various, though foolish and fruitless methods they have taken, to appease the anger of God; as even to give their firstborn for their transgression, and the fruit of their body for the sin of their souls; which shows their sense of a necessity of making some sort of satisfaction for offences committed; and of appeasing justice, or vengeance, as they call their deity.

Acts 28:4 And when the barbarians saw the *venomous* beast hang on his hand, they said among themselves, No doubt this man is a murderer, whom, though he hath escaped the sea, *yet vengeance suffereth not to live.*

The various sacrifices of the Jews, they were directed to under the former dispensation, plainly show the necessity of a satisfaction for sin; and plainly point out forgiveness of sin, as proceeding upon it; though they themselves could not really, only typically, expiate sin, make atonement and satisfaction for it. But if God could forgive sin without any satisfaction at all, why not forgive it upon the

foot of those sacrifices? The reason is plain, Because he could not, consistent with himself, do it without the sacrifice of his Son, typified by them.

Therefore it may be strongly concluded, that a plenary satisfaction for sin, by what Christ has done and suffered, was absolutely necessary to the forgiveness of sin. “Without shedding of blood is no remission,” neither typical nor real; without it there never was, never will be, nor never could be, any forgiveness of sin.

Hebrews 9:22 And almost all things are by the law purged with blood; and without shedding of blood is no remission.

II. The ground and foundation of satisfaction for sin by Christ, and the cause and spring of it.

First, The ground and foundation on which it is laid, and upon which it proceeds, are the council and covenant of grace, and the suretyship engagements of Christ therein.

1. The scheme of making peace with God, or of appeasing divine justice, and of making reconciliation for sin, that is, satisfaction for it, was planned in the everlasting council; which, from thence is called, “the council of peace.”

Zechariah 6:13 Even he shall build the temple of the LORD; and he shall bear the glory, and shall sit and rule upon his throne; and he shall be a priest upon his throne: and *the counsel of peace* shall be between them both.

“God was” then “in Christ,” or with Christ, “reconciling the world,” the whole number of the elect, “to himself.” That is, they were consulting together to form the plan of their reconciliation and salvation. And the method they pitched upon was, “not imputing their trespasses to them;” not to reckon and place to their account, their sins and iniquities, and insist upon a satisfaction for them from themselves. God knew, that if he made a demand of satisfaction for them on them, they could not answer him, one man of a thousand, no, not one at all; nor for one sin of a thousand, no, not for a single one. If he brought a charge of sin against them, they must be condemned; for they would not be able to give one reason, or say anything on their own behalf, why judgment should not proceed against them.

Wherefore, “Who shall lay anything to the charge of God’s elect?” Since God will not, whoever does, it will be of no avail against them; for “it is God that justifies” them. And happy are the persons interested in this glorious scheme, to whom the Lord “imputeth not iniquity.” And it was also further devised in this council, to impute the transgressions of the said persons to Christ, the Son of God; which, though not expressed in the text referred to, yet it is implied and understood, and in clear and full terms signified, in the verse following but one, in which the account of

the scheme of reconciliation is continued; “For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin.”

II Corinthians 5:19 To wit, that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them; and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation.

That is, the sinless Jesus, who was made sin, not inherently, by a transfusion of sin into him, which his holy nature would not admit of; **but imputatively, by a transfer of the guilt of sin unto him, by placing it to his account, and making him answerable for it.** [This] was done, not merely at the time of his sufferings and death, though then God openly and manifestly “laid upon him,” or made to meet on him, “the iniquity of us all,” of all the Lord's people, when “the chastisement of their peace was on him,” or the punishment of their sin was inflicted on him, to make peace for them.

But [it was done] as early as the council of peace was held, and the above method was concerted and agreed to, or Christ became a Surety for his people. So early were their sins imputed to him, and he became responsible for them. And this laid the foundation of his making satisfaction for sin. For,

2. The scheme drawn in council, was settled in covenant, which, on that account, is called “the covenant of peace,” in which covenant **Christ was called to be a Priest;** for Christ glorified not himself to be called one; but his father bestowed this honor on him, and consecrated, constituted, and ordained him a Priest with an oath,

Isaiah 54:10 For the mountains shall depart, and the hills be removed; but my kindness shall not depart from thee, neither shall *the covenant of my peace* be removed, saith the LORD that hath mercy on thee.

Malachi 2:5 *My covenant was with him* of life and peace; and I gave them to him *for the fear wherewith he feared me, and was afraid before my name.*

Psalms 110:4 The LORD hath sworn, and will not repent, *Thou art a priest for ever* after the order of Melchizedek.

Now the principal business of a priest, was to make reconciliation and atonement for sin. For the sake of this Christ was called to this office; and it was signified to him in covenant, that he should not offer such sacrifices and offerings as were offered up under the law, which could not take away sin, or atone for it.

And though God would have these offered, as typical of Christ's atoning sacrifice, from the beginning, throughout the former dispensation, to the coming of Christ; yet it was not his will that any of this sort should be offered by him. “Sacrifice and

offering thou wouldst not.” **And therefore, though Christ was a Priest, he never offered any legal sacrifice.**

But when anything of this kind was necessary to be done for persons he was concerned with, he always sent them to carry their offerings to a priest; as in the case of cleansing lepers.

Matthew 8:4 And Jesus saith unto him, See thou tell no man; but go thy way, *shew thyself to the priest*, and offer the gift that Moses commanded, for a testimony unto them.

Luke 17:14 And when he saw them, he said unto them, *Go shew yourselves unto the priests*. And it came to pass, that, as they went, they were cleansed.

A sacrifice of another kind, and to answer a greater purpose, was to be offered by him, and which in covenant was provided; “A body hast thou prepared me.” [This] is put for the whole human nature; for not the body of Christ only, but his soul also, were made an offering for sin.

Hebrews 10:5 Wherefore when he cometh into the world, he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldst not, but a body hast thou prepared me.

Hebrews 10:10 By the which will we are sanctified through the offering of *the body* of Jesus Christ once for all.

Isaiah 53:10 Yet it pleased the LORD to bruise him; he hath put him to grief: when thou shalt make *his soul* an offering for sin, he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of the LORD shall prosper in his hand.

And this offering for sin was made by Christ’s suffering and dying in the room and stead of sinners, when he was wounded for their transgressions, and bruised for their sins, and stricken for their iniquities; that is, to make satisfaction for them. This was what was enjoined in covenant. This commandment he received from his Father, and he was obedient to it, even to die the death of the cross. And this work was proposed and appointed to him in covenant, and declared in prophecy, in order to finish transgression, make an end of sin, and make reconciliation for iniquity. And this he did by the sacrifice of himself.

Now as this whole scheme was drawn in council, and settled in covenant, it was proposed to Christ, and he readily agreed to it. [He] became the surety of the covenant, the better testament; and engaged to assume human nature, to do and suffer in it, all that the law and justice of God could require, and should demand of him, in the room and stead of sinners, in order to make full satisfaction for their sins, of which the above things are the ground and foundation.

3. There is nothing in this whole transaction that is injurious to any person or thing, or that is chargeable with any unrighteousness; but all is agreeable to the rules of justice and judgment.

(1.) No injury is done to Christ by his voluntary substitution in the room and stead of sinners, to make satisfaction for their sins; for as he was able, so he was willing to make it. He [assumed] human nature, was qualified to obey and suffer, he had somewhat to offer as a sacrifice. As man, he had blood to shed for the remission of sin, and a life to lay down for the ransom of sinners. And as God, he could support the human nature in union with him under the weight of sin laid on it; and bear the whole of the punishment due unto it with cheerfulness, courage, and strength.

And as he was able, so he was willing. He said in covenant, when it was proposed to him, “Lo, I come to do thy will,” and at the fulness of time he readily came to do it. [He] went about it as soon as possible, counted it his meat and drink to perform it, and was constant at it. And what was most distressing and disagreeable to flesh and blood, he most earnestly wished for, even his bloody baptism, sufferings, and death; and “volenti non fit injuria.”

Besides, he had a right to dispose of his own life; and therefore in laying it down did no injustice to any. The civil law will not admit that one man should die for another. The reason is, because no man has a right to dispose of his own life. But Christ had; “I have power,” says he, “to lay it down;” that is, his life. Hence he is called, “The prince of life,” both with respect to his own life, and the life of others,

John 10:18 No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This commandment have I received of my Father.

Acts 3:15 And killed the Prince of life, whom God hath raised from the dead; whereof we are witnesses.

And accordingly it was in his power to give it as a redemption price for his people; wherefore he says, he came “to give his life a ransom for many.”

Matthew 20:28 Even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many.

And which he did give; and he also had a power to take it up again. Was a good man admitted by the civil law to die for a bad man, it would be a loss to the commonwealth, and is another reason why it is not allowed of. But Christ, as he laid down his life for sinners, so he could and did take it up again, and that quickly. He was delivered to death for the offences of men, to satisfy justice for them; and then he rose again for the justification of them.

He died once, and continued a little while under the power of death, but it was not possible for him to be held long by it. When through it he had made satisfaction for sin, he rose from the dead, and will die no more, but will live for ever for the good of his people.

Nor is the human nature of Christ a loser but a gainer by his sufferings and death; for having finished his work, he is glorified with the glory promised him in covenant before the world was; is crowned with glory and honor, highly exalted above every creature, has a place at the right hand of God, where angels have not; angels, authorities, and powers, being subject to him. Nor has the human nature any reason to complain, nor did it ever complain of any loss sustained by suffering in the room and stead of sinners, and by working out their salvation.

(2.) Nor is there any unjust thing done by God throughout this whole transaction. There is no unrighteousness in him, in his nature, nor in any of his ways and works; nor in this affair, which was done “to declare his righteousness, that he might be just,” appear to be just, “and be the justifier of him that believes in Jesus,” upon the foot of a perfect righteousness, and full satisfaction made for sin.

The person sent to do this work, and who was given up into the hands of justice, and not spared, was one God had a property in. He was his own Son, his only begotten Son; and it was with his own consent he delivered him up for all his people; and who being their surety, and having engaged to pay their debts, and to answer for any hurt, damage, or wrong done by them; and having voluntarily taken their sins upon him, and these being found on him by the justice of God; it could be no unrighteous thing to make a demand of satisfaction for them.

Isaiah 53:7 He was oppressed, and he was afflicted, yet he opened not his mouth: he is brought as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before her shearers is dumb, so he openeth not his mouth.

That is, satisfaction was required of him, and he answered to the demand made upon him; and where is the unrighteousness of this? Christ’s name was in the obligation, and that only. Therefore he was the only person that justice could lay hold upon, and get satisfaction from.

Besides, there was a conjunction, an union, a relation between Christ and his people, previous to his making satisfaction for them; which lay at the bottom of it, and showed a reason for it; as in all such cases where the sins of one have been punished on another. As when God has visited the iniquities of fathers upon the children, there is the relation of fathers and children; and the fathers are punished in the children, as being parts of them.

Thus Ham, the son of Noah, was the transgressor, but the curse was denounced and fell on Canaan his son, and Ham was punished in him. When David numbered the people, and so many thousands suffered for it, here was a relation of king and subjects, who were one in a civil sense, and the one were punished for the other. Thus Christ and his people are one, both in a natural sense, being of the same nature, and partakers of the same flesh and blood.

And so satisfaction for sin was made in the same nature that sinned, as it was fit it should; and in a law sense, as a surety and debtor are one, so that if one pay the debt it is the same as if the other did it; and in a mystical sense, as head and members are one, as Christ and his people be head and members of the same body, so that if one suffer, the rest suffer with it.

Nor is it any unjust thing, if one part of the body sins another suffers for it; as, if the head commits the offence, and the back is punished. Christ and his people are one, as husband and wife are, who are one flesh; and therefore there can be no impropriety, much less injustice, in Christ's giving himself a ransom price for his church, to redeem her from slavery; or an offering and sacrifice for her, to make atonement for her transgressions.

And as there appears to be no unrighteousness in God through this whole affair, so far as he was concerned in it, so there is no injury done him through a satisfaction being made by another; for hereby all the divine perfections are glorified.

Psalms 85:10 Mercy and truth are met together; righteousness and peace have kissed each other.

(3.) Nor is there any injury done to the law of God. It has the whole of its demands, no part remaining unsatisfied; for it is neither abrogated nor relaxed. There is a change of the person making satisfaction to it, which is favorably allowed by the lawgiver. But there is no change of the sanction of the law, of the punishment it requires; that is not abated. The law is so far from being a loser by the change of persons in giving it satisfaction, that it is a great gainer. The law is magnified and made honorable; more honorable by Christ's obedience to it, than by the obedience of the saints and angels in heaven; and is made more honorable by the sufferings of Christ, in bearing the penal sanction of it, than by all the sufferings of the damned in hell to all eternity.

Isaiah 42:21 The LORD is well pleased for his righteousness' sake; he will magnify the law, and make it honorable.

Secondly, The causes, spring, and source of satisfaction.

1. So far as God the Father was concerned in it, he may be said to be an efficient cause of it, and his love the moving cause.

He was at the first of it, he began it, made the first motion, set it in motion.

II Corinthians 5:18 And all things are of God, who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation;

He called a council upon it; he contrived the scheme of it. He set forth Christ in his eternal purposes and decrees to be the propitiation for sin, to make satisfaction for it. And he sent him in the fulness of time for that purpose. He laid on him the iniquities of his people, and made him sin for them by imputation. He bruised him, and put him to grief, and made his soul an offering for sin. He spared him not, but delivered him into the hands of justice and death. And what moved him to this, was his great love to his people.

John 3:16 For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.

I John 4:10 Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son *to be* the propitiation for our sins.

2. In like manner Christ may be considered as an efficient cause, and his love as a moving cause in this affair. He came into the world to die for sinners, and redeem them to God by his blood. He laid down his life for them. He gave himself for them an offering and a sacrifice unto God, a propitiatory, expiatory one. And what moved him to it, was his great love to them, and kindness for them. “Hereby perceive we the love of God,” that is, of God the Son, “because he laid down his life for us,” and the love of Christ is frequently premised to his giving himself to die in the room of his people.

I John 3:16 Hereby perceive we the love of God, because he laid down his life for us: and we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren.

Galatians 2:20 I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me: and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me.

Ephesians 5:2 And walk in love, as Christ also hath loved us, and hath given himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweetsmelling savour.

Ephesians 5:25 Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it.

III. The matter of satisfaction, or what that is which gives satisfaction to the justice of God; so that a sinner upon it, or in consideration of it, is acquitted and discharged. This is no other than Christ’s fulfilling the whole law, in the room

and stead of sinners. This was what he undertook in covenant. Hence he said, “Thy law is within my heart.” He was willing and ready to fulfil it. When he came into the world, by his incarnation he was made under it voluntarily, and became subject to it, for he came not to destroy it, but to fulfil it. He is become “the end of the law,” the fulfilling end of it, to everyone that believes: he has fulfilled it.

1. By obeying the precepts of it, and answering all that it requires. Does it require an holy nature? It has it in him, who is “holy, harmless, and undefiled.” Does it require perfect and sinless obedience? It is found in him, who did no sin, never transgressed the law in one instance, but always did the things which pleased his Father; and who has declared himself “well pleased for his righteousness sake,” and with it. And that [is] as wrought out for his people by his active obedience to the law, which is so approved of by God, that he imputes it without works for the justification of them,.

Romans 4:6 Even as David also describeth the blessedness of the man, unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works.

Romans 5:19 For as by one man’s disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous.

Nor is it any objection to this doctrine that Christ, as man, was obliged to yield obedience to the law for himself, which is true. But then it should be observed, that as he assumed human nature, or became man, for the sake of his people, “to us,” or for us, “a child is born.” So it was for their sake he yielded obedience to the law.

Besides, though he was obliged to it as man, yet he was not obliged to yield it in such a state and condition as he did; in a state of humiliation, in a course of sorrow and affliction, in a suffering state throughout the whole of his life, even unto death. The human nature of Christ, from the moment of its union to the Son of God, was entitled to glory and happiness; so that its obedience to the law in such a low estate was quite voluntary, and what he was not obliged unto.

Nor is it to be argued from Christ’s yielding obedience for his people, that then they are exempted from it. They are not; they are under the law to Christ, and under greater obligation to obey it. They are not obliged to obey it in like manner, or for such purposes that Christ obeyed it, even to justify them before God, and entitle them to eternal life.

2. Christ has fulfilled the law and satisfied it, by bearing the penalty of it in the room and stead of his people, which is death of every kind.

Genesis 3:19 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.

Romans 6:23 For the wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.

[This includes] corporal death, which includes all afflictions, griefs, sorrows, poverty, and disgrace, which Christ endured throughout his state of humiliation. He took our infirmities, and bare our sicknesses; and was a man of sorrows, and acquainted with griefs all his days. All that he suffered in his body, when he gave his back to the smiters, and his cheeks to them that plucked off the hair; when he was buffeted and smitten with the palms of the hand in the palace of the high priest; and was whipped and scourged by the order of Pilate; his head crowned with thorns, and his hands and feet pierced with nails on the cross, where he hung for the space of three hours in great agonies and distress.

Some have confined his satisfactory sufferings to what he underwent during that time, which though very great indeed, and none can tell what he endured in soul and body, in that space of time. Yet these, exclusive of what he endured before and after, must not be considered as the only punishment he endured by way of satisfaction for the sins of men. The finishing and closing part of which was death, and what the law required. Hence making peace and reconciliation are ascribed to the bloodshed and death of Christ on the cross.

Colossians 1:20 And, having made peace through the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself; by him, I say, whether they be things in earth, or things in heaven.

Romans 5:10 For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life.

Which death was a bloody, cruel, and painful one, as the thing itself speaks, and the description of it shows, and was also a very shameful and ignominious one, the death of slaves, and of the worst of malefactors; and was likewise an accursed one, and showed, that as Christ was made sin for his people, and had their sins charged upon him, so he was made a curse for them, and bore the whole curse of the law that was due unto them.

Psalms 22:15-16 My strength is dried up like a potsherd; and my tongue cleaveth to my jaws; and thou hast brought me into the dust of death. For dogs have compassed me: the assembly of the wicked have inclosed me: they pierced my hands and my feet.

Galatians 3:13 Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us: for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree:

Moreover, Christ not only endured a corporal death, and all that was contained in it, and connected with it, or suffered in his body; but in his soul also, through the violent temptations of Satan, “he suffered, being tempted.” And through the reproaches that were cast upon him, which entered into his soul, and broke his heart; and through his agonies in the garden, when his soul was exceeding sorrowful, even unto death. And especially through his sufferings on the cross, when his soul, as well as his body, was made an offering for sin. And when he sustained what was tantamount to an eternal death, which lies in a separation from God, and a sense of divine wrath. Both which Christ then endured, when God deserted him, and hid his face from him; which made him say, “My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me!” And he had a dreadful sense of divine wrath, on the account of the sins of his people laid upon him, the punishment of which he bore; when he said, “Thou hast cast off and abhorred, thou hast been wroth with thine anointed,” thy Messiah.

Psalms 89:38 But thou hast cast off and abhorred, thou hast been wroth with thine anointed.

And thus by doing and suffering all that the law and justice of God could require, he made full and complete satisfaction thereunto for his people. It was not barely some thing, some little matter, which Christ gave, and with which God was content, and what is called *acceptilation*, but a proper, full, and adequate satisfaction, which he gave, so that nothing more in point of justice could be required of him.

IV. The form or manner in which satisfaction was made by Christ; which was by bearing the sins of his people, under an imputation of them to him, and by dying for their sins, and for sinners; that is, in their room and stead, as their substitute. These are the phrases by which it is expressed in scripture.

First, By bearing the sins of his people, which we first read of in Isaiah 53:11-12, where two words are made use of, both alike translated: “And he bare the sin of many,” avn he took, he lifted them up, he took them off of his people, and took them upon himself; and again, “He shall bear their iniquities,” lboy, as a man bears and carries a burden upon his shoulders; and from hence is the use of the phrase in the New Testament.

Isaiah 53:11-12 He shall see of the travail of his soul, and shall be satisfied: by his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many; for he shall *bear their iniquities*. Therefore will I divide him a portion with the great, and he shall divide the spoil with the strong; because he hath poured out his soul unto death: and he was numbered with the transgressors; and he bare the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors.

Hebrews 9:28 So Christ was once offered to *bear the sins* of many; and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation.

The author of Hebrews observes, that “Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many,” pointing at the time when he bore the sins of many. It was when he was offered up a sacrifice to make atonement for them. The apostle Peter observes where he bore them.

I Peter 2:24 Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree, that we, being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness: by whose stripes ye were healed.

“He bore them in his own body,” in the body of his flesh; when that was offered once for all; and “on the tree,” upon the cross, when he was crucified on it. Now his bearing sin, supposes it was upon him: there was no sin *in* him, inherently, in his nature and life. Had there been any, he would not have been a fit person to take away sin, to expiate it, and make satisfaction for it. He was manifested to take away our sins; that is, by the sacrifice of himself; and in him is no sin.

I John 3:5 And ye know that he was manifested to take away our sins; and in him is no sin.

And so [he was] a fit sacrifice for it. But sin was upon him, it was *put* upon him, as the sins of Israel were *put upon* the scapegoat, by Aaron. Sin was put upon Christ by his divine Father; no creature could have done it, neither angel nor men; but “the Lord hath laid on him,” or “made to meet on him,” “the iniquity of us all.”

Isaiah 53:6 All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the LORD hath *laid on him* the iniquity of us all.

[This was] not a single iniquity, but a whole mass and lump of sins collected together, and laid, as a common burden, upon him; even of us all, of all the elect of God, both Jews and Gentiles; for Christ became the propitiation, or made satisfaction, for the sins of both.

I John 2:2 And he is the propitiation for our sins: and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world.

This phrase, of laying sin on Christ, is expressive of the imputation of it to him; for as it was the will of God, not to impute the trespasses of his elect to themselves. It was his pleasure they should be imputed to Christ, which was done by an act of his own. “For he hath made him to be sin for us,” that is, by imputation, in which way we are “made the righteousness of God in him,” that being imputed to us by him, as our sins were to Christ.

The sense is, a charge of sin was brought against him, as the surety of his people. “He was numbered with the transgressors.” Bearing the sins of many, he was reckoned as if he had been one, sin being imputed to him; and was dealt with, by the justice of God, as such. Sin being found on him, through imputation, a demand of

satisfaction for sin was made; and he answered it to the full. All this was with his own consent. He agreed to have sin laid on him, and imputed to him, and a charge of it brought against him, to which he engaged to be responsible. Yea, he himself took the sins of his people on him. So the evangelist Matthew has it.

Matthew 8:17 That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias the prophet, saying, Himself took our infirmities, and bare our sicknesses.

As he took their nature, so he took their sins, which made his flesh to have “the likeness of sinful flesh,” though it really was not sinful.

What Christ bore, being laid on him, and imputed to him, were sins, all sorts of sin, original and actual; sins of every kind, open and secret, of heart, lip, and life; all acts of sin committed by his people. He has redeemed them from all their iniquities; and God, for Christ’s sake, forgives all trespasses. His blood cleanses from all sin, and his righteousness justifies from all. All being imputed to him, as that is to them: all that is in sin, and belongs to sin, were borne by him; the turpitude and filth of sin, without being defiled by it, which cannot be separated from it; and the guilt of sin, which was transferred to him, and obliged to punishment; and particularly the punishment itself.

Genesis 4:13 And Cain said unto the LORD, My punishment is greater than I can bear.

Lamentations 5:7 Our fathers have sinned, and are not; and we have borne their iniquities.

Sin is often put for the punishment of sin, and is greatly meant, and always included, when Christ is said to bear it; even all the punishment due to the sins of his people: and which is called, “the chastisement of our peace,” said to be “upon him.”

Isaiah 53:5 But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed.

That is, the punishment [was] inflicted on him, in order to make peace, reconciliation, and atonement for sin. Bearing sin, supposes it to be a burden. And, indeed, it is a burden too heavy to bear by a sensible sinner. When sin is charged home upon the conscience, and a saint groans, being burdened with it, what must that burden be, and how heavy the load Christ bore, consisting of all the sins of all the elect; from the beginning of the world to the end of it?

Yet he sunk not, but stood up under it, failed not, nor was he discouraged, being the mighty God, and the Man of God’s right hand, made strong for himself. He himself bore it; not any with him, to take any part with him, to help and assist him. His

shoulders alone bore it, on which it was laid. His own arm alone brought salvation to him.

He bore it, and bore it away. He removed the iniquity of his people in one day; and that as far as the East is from the West. In this he was typified by the scapegoat, on whom were put all the iniquities, transgressions, and sins, of all the children of Israel, on the day of atonement, and which were all borne by the scapegoat to a land not inhabited.

Leviticus 16:21-22 And Aaron shall lay both his hands upon the head of the live goat, and confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions in all their sins, putting them upon the head of the goat, and shall send *him* away by the hand of a fit man into the wilderness: And the goat shall bear upon him all their iniquities unto a land not inhabited: and he shall let go the goat in the wilderness. Aaron was also a type of Christ, in bearing the sins of the holy things of the people of Israel, when he went into the holy place.

Exodus 28:38 And it shall be upon Aaron's forehead, that Aaron may bear the iniquity of the holy things, which the children of Israel shall hallow in all their holy gifts; and it shall be always upon his forehead, that they may be accepted before the LORD.

And the sin offering was typical of the sacrifice of Christ, which is said to bear the iniquities of the congregation, and to make atonement for them.

Leviticus 10:17 Wherefore have ye not eaten the sin offering in the holy place, seeing it is most holy, and God hath given it you to bear the iniquity of the congregation, to make atonement for them before the LORD?

Secondly, The form and manner in which Christ made satisfaction for sin, is expressed by "dying for sin," that is, to make atonement for it; and "for sinners," that is, in their room and stead, as their substitute.

1. By dying for the sins of his people. This the apostle represents as the first and principal article of the Christian faith, "that Christ died for our sins, according to the scriptures."

I Corinthians 15:3 For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures.

According to the scriptures of the Old Testament, which speak of Christ being "cut off," in a judicial way, by death, but not for himself, for any sin of his own; and of his being wounded, bruised, and stricken, but not for his own transgressions and iniquities; but as "wounded for our transgressions, bruised for our iniquities, and stricken for the transgressions of his people."

Daniel 9:26 And after threescore and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off, *but not for himself*: and the people of the prince that shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary; and the end thereof shall be with a flood, and unto the end of the war desolations are determined.

Isaiah 53:5 But he was wounded *for our transgressions*, he was bruised *for our iniquities*: the chastisement of our peace *was* upon him; and with his stripes we are healed.

Isaiah 53:8 He was taken from prison and from judgment: and who shall declare his generation? for he was cut off out of the land of the living: *for the transgression of my people* was he stricken.

That is, [he was] wounded and bruised unto death, and stricken with death; which death was inflicted on him as a punishment for the sins of his people, to expiate them, and make atonement for them, being laid on him, and bore by him. The meaning of the phrases is, that the sins of his people were the procuring and meritorious causes of his death; just as when the apostle says, “for which things sake,” that is, for sins before mentioned; “the wrath of God cometh on the children of disobedience.”

Colossians 3:6 For which things’ sake the wrath of God cometh on the children of disobedience.

The sense is, that sins are the procuring, meritorious causes of the wrath of God, being stirred up, and poured down upon disobedient sinners. So, in like manner, when Christ is said to be delivered into the hands of justice and death, “for our offences.” the sense is, that our offences were the meritorious cause why he was put to death, he bearing them, and standing in our room and stead; as his resurrection from the dead, having made satisfaction for sins, was the meritorious and procuring cause of our justification from them; as follows, “and was raised again for our justification.”

Romans 4:25 Who was delivered *for our offences*, and was raised again for our justification.

The Socinians urge, and insist upon it, that the particle *for*, used in the above phrases, signifies not the procuring, meritorious cause, but the final cause of Christ’s death; which they say was this, to confirm the doctrines and practices he taught, that men, by obedience to them, might have the forgiveness of their sins: which is a doctrine very false; for though Christ did, both by the example of his life, and by his sufferings and death, confirm the truths he taught, which is but what a martyr does; and that though through the grace of God, his people do obey from the heart the doctrines and ordinances delivered to them. Yet it is not by their obedience of faith

and duty, that they obtain the forgiveness of their sins; but through the blood of Christ, shed for many, for the remission of sins.

2. By dying for sinners, as their substitute, in their room; so the several Greek particles, anti, uper, peri, used in this phrase, and others equivalent to it, signify a surrogation, a substitute of one for another; as in various passages in the New Testament, and in various writers, as has been observed by many, with full proof and evidence, and most dearly in the scriptures, where Christ's sufferings and death are spoken of as for others; thus Christ gave his life “a ransom for many,” in the room and stead of many.

Matthew 20:28 Even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many. So he himself is said to be antilutron, “a ransom for all,” in the room and stead of *all* his people, Jews and Gentiles. The prophecy of Caiaphas was, “That one Man should die for the people,” in the room and stead of them.

John 11:50 Nor consider that it is expedient for us, that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not.

“Christ died for the ungodly,” in the room and stead of the ungodly. “While we were yet sinners Christ died for us,” in our room and stead.

Romans 5:6-8 For when we were yet without strength, in due time Christ died for the ungodly. For scarcely for a righteous man will one die: yet peradventure for a good man some would even dare to die. But God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us.

Again, “Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust,” in the room and stead of the unjust.

I Peter 3:18 For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, *the just for the unjust*, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit:

The Socinians say, that these phrases only mean, Christ died for the good of men. That Christ became a Surety for good to his people, and has obtained good for them, by performing his suretyship engagements, is certain. Yet this good he has obtained by obeying, suffering, and dying, in their room and stead. Thus, that the blessing of Abraham, even all the spiritual blessings of the everlasting covenant, might come upon the Gentiles, through Christ, he was “made a curse for them.”

In their room, he bore the whole curse of the law for them, as their substitute, and so opened a way for their enjoyment of the blessings, or good things, in the covenant of grace; and that sinners might be made the righteousness of God in him, or have his

righteousness imputed to them for their justification. He was “made sin for them,” had their sins laid on him, and imputed to him, as their substitute; and was made a sacrifice for sin in their room and stead, to make atonement for it.

Galatians 3:13-14 Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us: for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree: That the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ; that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith.

II Corinthians 5:21 For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him. This is the greatest instance of love among men, “that a man lay down his life” uper, “for,” in the room and stead of, “his friend.”

John 15:13 Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends.

And such was the love of Christ to his church, “that he gave,” delivered “himself” to death uper authv, for her, in her room and stead.

Ephesians 5:25 Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it.

5. The effects of satisfaction made by Christ, or the ends that were to be, and have been answered by it.

1. The finishing and making an entire end of sin. This was Christ's work assigned him in covenant, and asserted in prophecy; and which was done when he made reconciliation or atonement for sin.

Daniel 9:24 Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression, and *to make an end of sins*, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the most Holy.

Not that the being of sin was removed thereby; for that remains in all the justified and sanctified ones, in this life, but the damning power of it. Such for whom Christ has made satisfaction, shall never come into condemnation, nor be hurt by the second death, that shall have no power over them. Sin is so done, and put away, and abolished, by the sacrifice of Christ for it, that no charge can ever be brought against his people for it. The curse of the law cannot reach them, nor light upon them. Nor can any sentence of condemnation and death be executed on them; nor any punishment inflicted on them. They are secure from wrath to come. Sin is so finished and made an end of, by Christ's satisfaction for it, that it will be seen no more by the eye of avenging Justice. It is so put away, and out of sight, that when it

is sought for, it shall not be found. God, for Christ's sake, has cast it behind his back, and into the depths of the sea.

2. In virtue of Christ's satisfaction for sin, his people are brought into an open state of reconciliation with God. Atonement being made for their sins, their persons are reconciled to God, and they are admitted into open favor with him. He declares himself "pacified towards them, for all that they have done."

(Ezekiel 16:63) That thou mayest remember, and be confounded, and never open thy mouth any more because of thy shame, *when I am pacified toward thee* for all that thou hast done, saith the Lord GOD.

3. Sin being atoned for, and made an end of, an everlasting righteousness is brought in, with which God is well pleased. Because by it his law is magnified and made honorable; all its demands being fully answered, by Christ's obeying its precepts, and bearing its penalty. Which righteousness God so approves of, that he imputes it to his people, without works. So it is unto all, and upon all, them that believe, as their justifying righteousness; which acquits them from sin, and entitles them to eternal life.

4. Immunity from all evil; that is, from all penal evil, both in this life, and in that to come, is an effect of Christ's satisfaction for sin. Since sin being removed by it, no evil can come nigh them; no curse attends their blessings; no wrath is in their afflictions. All things work together for their good. It is always well with them in life, in all the circumstances of it. At death, they die in the Lord, in union to him, in faith, and hope of being for ever with him. And at judgment, the Judge will be their Friend and Savior, and it will be well with them to all eternity; they will be eternally delivered from wrath to come.

5. With respect to God, the effect of Christ's satisfaction is the glorifying of his justice. For that end was Christ "set forth to be the propitiation," or to make atonement for sin; to declare the righteousness of God, to show it in all its strictness, "that he might be just, and the justifier of him that believes in Jesus," appear to be just in so doing. Yea, all the divine perfections are glorified hereby.

Romans 3:25-26 Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; To declare, I say, at this time his righteousness: that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus.

Psalms 21:5 His glory is great in thy salvation: honor and majesty hast thou laid upon him.

There are many objections made by the Socinians, to this important doctrine, and article of faith. Some of the principal of which are as follow:

1. It is suggested, as if the doctrine of satisfaction for sin to the justice of God, is inconsistent with the mercy of God, and leaves no room for that. But the attributes of mercy and justice, are not contrary to each other. They subsist and accord together, in the same divine nature. “Gracious is the Lord, and righteous; yea, our God is merciful.” [He is] merciful, though righteous; and righteous, though gracious and merciful.

Psalms 16:5 The LORD is the portion of mine inheritance and of my cup: thou maintainest my lot.

Exodus 34:6-7 And the LORD passed by before him, and proclaimed, The LORD, The LORD God, merciful and gracious, longsuffering, and abundant in goodness and truth, Keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin, and that will by no means clear *the guilty*; visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, and upon the children's children, unto the third and to the fourth generation.

And as they agree as perfections in the divine Being; so in the exercise of them. They do not clash with one another, no, not in this affair of satisfaction. Justice being satisfied, a way is opened for mercy to display her stores.

Psalms 85:10 Mercy and truth are met together; righteousness and peace have kissed each other.

2. It is objected, that pardon of sin, upon the foot of a full satisfaction for it, cannot be said to be free; but eclipses the glory of God’s free grace in it. It is certain, that remission of sin is through the tender mercy of God, and is owing to the multitude of it; it is according to the riches of free grace, and yet through the blood of Christ: and both are expressed in one verse, as entirely agreeing together.

Ephesians 1:7 In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace;

The free grace of God is so far from being eclipsed, in the forgiveness of sin, through the satisfaction of Christ, that it shines the brighter for it. Consider that it was the free grace of God which provided Christ to be a sacrifice for sin, to atone for it; as Abraham said to Isaac, when he asked, “Where is the lamb for a burnt offering? My son,” says he, “God will provide himself a lamb for a burnt offering.”

Genesis 22:7-8 And Isaac spake unto Abraham his father, and said, My father: and he said, Here am I, my son. And he said, Behold the fire and the wood: but where is the lamb for a burnt offering? And Abraham said, My son, God will provide himself a lamb for a burnt offering: so they went both of them together.

So God, of his rich grace and mercy, has provided Christ to be an offering for sin; and his grace appears more, in that it is his own Son, his only begotten Son, he provided to be the atoning sacrifice. It was grace that set forth Christ in purpose, proposed him in council and covenant, and sent him forth in time to be the propitiation for sin. It was grace to us that he spared him not, but delivered him up for us all.

And it was grace in God to accept of the satisfaction made by Christ; for though it was so full and complete, as nothing could be more so; yet it would have been a refusable one, had he not allowed Christ's name to be put in the obligation. Had it not been for the compact and covenant agreed to between them, God might have marked, in strict justice, our iniquities, and insisted on a satisfaction at our own hands. He might have declared, and stood by it, that the soul that sinned, that should die. It was therefore owing to the free grace and favor of God, to admit of a Surety in our room, to make satisfaction for us, and to accept of that satisfaction, as if made by ourselves.

Moreover, though it cost Christ much, his blood, his life, and the sufferings of death, to make the satisfaction for sin, and to procure forgiveness by it; it cost us nothing; it is all of free grace to us. Besides, grace in scripture is only opposed to the works of men, and satisfaction by them, and not to the works of Christ, and to his satisfaction.

3. It is pretended, that this scheme of pardon, upon the foot of satisfaction, makes the love of Christ to men, to be greater than the love of the Father. It represents the one as tenderly affectionate, compassionate, and kind to sinners; and the other as inexorable, not to be appeased, nor his wrath turned away without satisfaction to his justice; and so men are more beholden to the one than to the other.

But the love of both is most strongly expressed in this business of Christ's satisfaction; and he must be a daring man that will take upon him to say, who of them showed the greatest love, the Father in giving his Son, or the Son in giving himself, to be the propitiatory sacrifice for sin; for as it is said of Christ, that he loved the people, and gave himself for them, an offering and a sacrifice of a sweet smelling savor to God, so it is said of the Father, that he "so loved the world," that he gave his only begotten Son to suffer and die for men; and that herein his love was manifested; and that he commended it towards us, in sending Christ to be the propitiation for sin.

Ephesians 5:2 And walk in love, as Christ also hath loved us, and hath given himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweetsmelling savour.

Ephesians 5:25 Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it.

Galatians 2:20 I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me: and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me.

John 3:16 For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.

I John 4:9-10 In this was manifested the love of God toward us, because that God sent his only begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him. Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins.

Romans 5:8 But God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us. Can there be greater love than this expressed by both? and which is greatest is not for us to say.

4. It is said, that if Christ is a divine Person, he must be a party offended by sin; and if he has made satisfaction for it, he must have made satisfaction to himself; which is represented as an absurdity. All this will be allowed, that Christ is God, and, as such, equally offended as his Father; and that he made satisfaction to the offended, and that, in some sense, to himself too; and yet no absurdity in it.

Indeed, in case of private satisfaction, for a private loss, it would be quite absurd for one to make satisfaction to himself. But in case of public satisfaction, for a public offence to a community, of which he is a part, he may be said, by making satisfaction to the whole body, to make satisfaction to himself, without any absurdity. A member of parliament, having violated the rules and laws of the house, when he makes satisfaction for the same to it, may be said to make satisfaction to himself, being a member of it. It is possible for a lawgiver to make satisfaction to his own law broken, and so to himself, as the lawgiver.

Thus Zaleucus, a famous legislator, made a law which punished adultery with the loss of both eyes. His own son first broke this law, and in order that the law might have full satisfaction, and yet mercy shown to his son, he ordered one of his son's eyes, and one of his own, to be put out; and so he might be said to satisfy his own law, and to make satisfaction to himself, the lawgiver.

But in the case before us, the satisfaction made by Christ, is made to the justice of God, subsisting in the divine nature, common to all the three Persons. This perfection subsisting in the divine nature, as possessed by the first Person, is offended with sin, resents it, requires satisfaction for it; and it is given it by the second Person, in human nature, as God man. The same divine perfection subsisting in the divine nature, as possessed by the second Person, shows itself in like manner, loving righteousness, and hating iniquity; affronted by sin, and demanding

satisfaction for it, it is given to it by him, as the God man and Mediator; who, though a Person offended, can mediate for the offender, and make satisfaction for him.

And the same may be observed concerning the justice of God, as a perfection of the divine nature, possessed by the third Person, the Spirit of God. The satisfaction is made to the justice of God, as subsisting in the divine nature, common to the three Persons. [It] is not made to one Person only, singly and separately, and personally; but to God, essentially considered, in all his Persons; and to his justice, as equally possessed by them; and that as the Lord, Judge, and Governor of the whole world; who ought to maintain, and must and does maintain, the honor of his Majesty, and of his law.

5. Once more, it is said that this doctrine of Christ's satisfaction for sin, weakens mens obligation to duty, and opens a door to licentiousness. But this is so far from being true, that, on the contrary, it strengthens the obligation, and excites a greater regard to duty, in those who have reason to believe that Christ has made satisfaction for their sins; for the love of Christ in dying for them—in being made sin and a curse for them, to satisfy for their sins, constrains them, in the most pressing manner, to live to him, according to his will, and to his glory; being bought with the price of Christ's blood, and redeemed from a vain conversation by it. They are moved the more strongly to glorify God with their bodies and spirits, which are his, and to pass the time of their sojourning here in fear.

The grace of God, which has appeared in God's gift of his Son, and in Christ's gift of himself to be their Redeemer and Savior, to be their atoning sacrifice; teaches them most effectually to deny ungodliness and worldly lusts, and to live soberly, righteously, and godly in this evil world,

II Corinthians 5:14 For the love of Christ constraineth us; because we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead:

I Corinthians 6:20 For ye are bought with a price: therefore glorify God in your body, and in your spirit, which are God's.

I Peter 1:17-18 And if ye call on the Father, who without respect of persons judgeth according to every man's work, pass the time of your sojourning here in fear: 18 Forasmuch as ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from your vain conversation received by tradition from your fathers.

Titus 2:11-12 For the grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men, Teaching us that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly, in this present world.

SATISFACTION: C.H. Cayce: My second argument is, All for whom Christ died will be saved, because he bore their sins in his own body on the tree. I Peter 2:24, “Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree, that we, being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness; by whose stripes ye were healed.”

If he bore their sins in his own body on the tree, it follows that their sins must necessarily have been taken off them and laid on him. Now, there are two points I want to argue from this text. We see, by the language of the text, the Son of God, the second person in the Trinity, the spotless Lamb of God, bare the sins of these people for whom he died. We see him bearing them on the rugged tree of the Roman cross, suffering the penalty due for their sins, **to render satisfaction for their sins.**

Now then, I maintain that in his bearing their sins on the cross **he rendered satisfaction for their sins.** He paid the debt that they owed to the demands of divine justice. So, if one of these characters, whose sins he bore on the tree, sinks down to hell, then God the Father is demanding payment of the same debt twice. That debt has been paid by the Son of God when he bore their sins in his own body upon the rugged tree of the Roman cross—there bearing their sins, suffering for their sins, paying the debt that they owed to the demands of divine justice. If that is for all of Adam’s posterity, and one of the race of Adam sinks down into eternal night, and is plowing the fiery regions of an endless hell, it follows that he is **suffering for the very same, identical sins that Jesus has suffered for;** the very same sins that Jesus Christ bore in his own body on the rugged tree of the Roman cross.

And I am going to state this right here, that Brother Penick or any other man can never make it appear that the justice of God remains untarnished and yet one sinner sink down to eternal night for whom Jesus has died.

In order that he make it appear that one of these characters for whom Christ died, whose sins he bore on the rugged tree of the Roman cross, sinks down to a yawning hell, he must show that God is unjust.

He must admit that God is just; and **as God is just he does not demand the payment of the same debt twice.** As Jesus bore their sins in his own body on the rugged tree of the cross, and paid the debt they owed to divine justice, it follows that every one of those characters whose sins Jesus bore in his body on the tree will finally be saved in heaven without the loss of one. Hence my proposition is sustained, that all for whom Christ died will be saved in heaven.

Remember the first argument: “The Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all.” All their iniquities were taken off them and laid on the Lord Jesus Christ.....If any of these characters goes to hell,

they go there without iniquity; they go there without sin; their iniquities having been taken off them and laid on the Lord Jesus Christ. (C.H. Cayce; Cayce: Penick Debate 1907)

Saul of Tarsus

SAUL of Tarsus, (See under PAUL the Apostle)

Saul, King

King SAUL: Sylvester Hassell: Toward the close of Samuel's life the kingly power was set up in Saul. Samuel's sons, like those of Eli, were too unworthy to become his successors. The people demanded a king in order to be like other nations; and although forewarned of the evil consequences of a monarchy by Samuel, they disregarded all, and urged him to select a king for them. This displeased Samuel; yet God said unto him, "They have not rejected thee, but they have rejected me, that I should not reign over them. Hearken unto their voice: howbeit yet protest solemnly unto them, and shew them the manner of the king that shall reign over them."

Samuel did so, but they disregarded his warnings and demanded a king; which God gave them in his anger, and yet did not forsake them. He directed Samuel to anoint Saul, the son of Kish, a Benjamite, to be a king over them, and to go forth as their captain to deliver them out of the hand of the Philistines, because their cry under oppression had come unto him (I Samuel 9:15-16). In making up the army of Israel cavalry was forbidden, lest the kings and people should trust in horses and chariots, and exhaust their resources too rapidly by keeping up such an expensive show of formidable array, and be tempted to engage in demoralizing foreign wars. They were rather to trust in the living God, while they went forth in person to combat.

The kingly power, thus set up, did not overturn the previously existing theocracy, for the king was only the servant still, or viceregent, of God, to enforce his commands, and to be established in his authority or dethroned, as seemed good in his sight. The king's authority extended to all temporal and spiritual affairs, and in this respect church and state were united, God, however, being admitted to be the righteous Ruler and Governor over all.

Saul, for unfaithfulness and presumptuous sins in office, was rejected from the throne, as was all his house. David, the youngest son of Jesse, was anointed and appointed to succeed Saul, and in his family it pleased God to make the kingly power hereditary. Saul came to the throne B.C. 1095, and reigned over all Israel forty years. In the Battle of Gilboa he was defeated by the Philistines, and took his own life. Saul was aware of David's having been anointed by God's prophet to be

king over Israel, yet sought often to kill David so as to defeat God's purpose in this respect.

Quite similar was the conduct of Herod about one thousand years afterwards, when, after having been specially informed that the king of the Jews was born in Bethlehem, who was to reign over the house of Jacob forever, he sent forth executioners, who slew all the male children in that vicinity from two years old and under, in order to frustrate the declared purpose of God!" (Hassell)

Scapegoat, The

The SCAPEGOAT: C. H. Cayce: In the offering in which there was a scapegoat, two goats were used. See Leviticus 16. Both these goats represented the work of Christ in His atonement and sacrifice for sin. One of the goats was slain. So was Christ slain. The priest laid his hands on the head of the scapegoat and confessed the sins of Israel on the head of that goat, then the goat was carried away by a fit man into the land of forgetfulness. Our sins were laid on Christ; see Isaiah 53:6. He bore our sins in His own body on the tree; see I Peter 2:24. He put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself; see Hebrews 9:26. The scapegoat, therefore, represented the work of Christ in carrying our sins away into the land of forgetfulness, where they will be remembered against us no more. Our sins are, therefore, atoned for, satisfaction is made for them; and they are also all borne away, in the work of Christ."
(CAYCE'S EDITORIALS vol. 1, ppg 271)

Scholastic Theology

SCHOLASTIC THEOLOGY: Sylvester Hassell: The Scholastic Theology is generally reckoned to have begun with **Anselm**, "Archbishop of Canterbury" (1033-1109), and terminated with **Eckhart** of Germany (1250-1329), thus extending from the middle of the eleventh to about the middle of the fourteen century. It was an application of Aristotelian logic to the support of Catholic doctrines, and a sublimation of theology of theology into metaphysics. Beginning with Realism (the doctrine that universal ideas are real things), it ended in Nominalism (the doctrine that such ideas are only the names of things); and after weary, hair-splitting debates of three centuries, the system resulted in rationalism, skepticism, and pantheism.

"The **Schoolmen**," says Taine, "seem to be marching, but are merely marking time." They served, perhaps, to keep thought alive, and prepare the way for modern

thought. The initial point of the debate was the denial (about 1050) by Berengar of Tours that the bread and wine in communion are changed into the real body and blood of Christ; **Lanfranc** and Anselm, of Canterbury, endeavored, in reply, to establish the doctrine of Transubstantiation (that, while the sensible properties of the elements are not changed, their underlying “substance” is changed into the “substance” of Christ’s body). Twice was Berengar forced by the Catholic authorities to sign a recantation, which twice he revoked, “leaving a memory curiously mingled of veneration and abhorrence.”

Under the influence of the Nominalism of **William Occam**, Martin Luther substituted for transubstantiation the doctrine of “**consubstantiation**” (that the body of Christ is actually, substantially present *with* the bread and wine); but, “as the logic of Protestantism became clear and self-consistent, this weak compromise faded quite away.”

The schoolman **Albertus Magnus** (1193-1280) is said to have been familiar with all the learning of his time; and his disciple, **Thomas Aquinas** (1224-1274), in 2,000 folio pages, 600 topics, 3,000 articles and 15,00 arguments, made the most complete and authentic exposition of Catholic theology (*Summa Theologie*)” (Hassell)

Schoolmen, The

The SCHOOLMEN (*See under SCHOLASTIC THEOLOGY*)

Scottish Covenanters, The

The SCOTTISH COVENANTERS (*See under The COVENANTERS*)

Second Century, The

The SECOND CENTURY: Sylvester Hassell: The last one of the Apostles has passed away from the shores of time, and the Apostolic Age proper has therefore ended.

We now descend from the Primitive Apostolic Church, with all its inspiration, signs and wonders, to what may be called the church uninspired, guided by fallible teachers, who in expounding the Scriptures referred back to Christ and the Apostles for their authority, and who expected conquest by the silent and invisible working of God’s Spirit within men more than by miracles apparent to the natural eye.

“The hand of God has drawn a line of demarcation between the century of miracles and the succeeding ages, to impress us more deeply with the supernatural origin of Christianity, and the incomparable value of the New Testament. Notwithstanding the striking difference, the church of the second century is a legitimate continuation of that of the primitive age. While far inferior in originality, energy, and freshness, it is distinguished for conscientious fidelity in preserving and propagating the sacred writings and traditions of the Apostles, and for untiring zeal in imitating their holy lives amidst the greatest difficulties and dangers.”—*Schaff.*”

As admitted by all standard historians, there is an impenetrable gulf between the close of the New Testament and the beginning of uninspired church history. The Joseph Henry Allen, recent lecturer on church history at Harvard University, remarks: “Any bridge across this wide gulf must be built, so to speak ‘in the air.’ We can erect our two towers, but the cables will not meet.” Such is the uniform and destructive testimony of learning and candor against all claims to a material succession from the Apostles made by the Catholic and similar communions. Thus does the God of history direct the minds of candid inquirers beyond all mere human authority to the apostolic writings of the New Testament.

“Church history *severed from the New Testament and from the Christ whom that Testament presents.*” says the learned, eloquent and forcible writer, Mr. Wm. R. Williams, of New York, “is a very dismal swamp, a mere morass and pestilent jungle, where trees obstruct on every side the vision and show no pathway, where the foot sinks and the miasma ascends and the snake lurks, where a man learns to plunge forward into passive credulity or to start back into sheer skepticism and despair. But, with the Bible in hand and the eye fixed on Christ, the Lawgiver and Sovereign of the kingdom and the Leader of the sacramental host, order springs out of the tangled mass of seeming confusion.”

The persecutions of the second century were unabated, and formed a continuous commentary on the Savior’s words; “Behold, I send you forth as sheep in the midst of wolves;” “I came not to send peace on earth, but a sword.” No merely human religion could have stood such a fire as did the religion of Christ during the first three centuries. It not only suffered, but expanded and became more diffused among the nations, and went directly on towards victory over Judaism and heathenism, without physical force, but by the moral power, patience and perseverance of its votaries, and the omnipotent work of the Holy Spirit, thereby proving to the world the divinity and indestructibility of its nature. (*Hassell*) (*See also article on PLINY*)

Secret Societies

SECRET SOCIETIES: John R. Daily: [Secret Societies are not like the Lord's church. They rise and fall; they come and go. The Lord's church will stand forever. With a few exceptions, such as Freemasonry, most of the organizations mentioned by Elder Daily have gone out of existence during the 90 years since he wrote his book. But, the principles involved in such organizations are today as they were then. New organizations, with new names, have simply been erected on the old foundations. hlh]

Chapter 1: Secret Societies Religious: For thousands of years there have been secret societies in the world with their *mysteries*. The modern secret organizations have been constructed in part from the models furnished by these ancient ones. They are now quite numerous. They may be grouped as religious, political, patriotic, temperate and industrial. We shall give attention to the religious group in this work. **The oldest among this group, except the Jesuits, is the Masonic Order.**

The Jesuit, or Society of Jesus, was founded by Ignatius Loyola in 1532, and was sanctioned by the Pope Paul III in 1540. We shall give no attention to this, as it does not affect us, being purely a Roman Catholic fraternity.

As Camber's Encyclopedia says, "The history of Freemasonry has been overlaid with fiction and absurdity." **The first Grand Lodge was formed in London in 1717, by J. T. Desaguliers.** This first Lodge was given power to grant charters to others. This is the origin of Modern Freemasonry.

Freemasonry being the oldest of the secret societies that directly concern us, now nearly two hundred years old, and being the pattern after which the others are mainly formed, and being the one in which the principles of lodgism are the most fully developed, we shall give prominence to that order in our treatise, though others also shall receive a share of attention.

Freemasonry, The Independent Order of Odd-Fellows, and others of like nature, are religious organizations. Take, for example, the prayer offered at the initiation of a candidate to the degree of *Entered Apprentice* in a Freemason Lodge, as given on pages 26 and 27 of the *Craftsman and Freemason's Guide*. "O thou supreme Author of our being and lover of our souls; thou art everywhere present, and knowest the thoughts and intentions of our hearts; bless us, we pray thee, in our endeavors to do good, and spread peace and concord and unity among our fellow men. May this, our friend, who is now to become our brother, devote his life to thy service and his talents to thy glory. May he be endowed with wisdom to direct him all his ways, strength to support him in all his difficulties, and the beauty of morality and virtue to adorn his life. May he set thee constantly before his eyes, and seek thy approbations as his greatest treasure. May he become enlightened in the knowledge

of divine things, and be induced to love thee from thy manifest love to him. And may he and we regulate our actions by the light of revealed truth, and so construct our spiritual edifice, that when done laboring as apprentices in this lower temple, we may be raised to the sublime enjoyments of the upper sanctuary—in that temple not made with hands, eternal in the heavens, whose maker and builder is God. Amen.”

This shows Freemasonry to be religious and to hold to the unscriptural theory that they can construct their own “spiritual edifice” so as to “be raised to the enjoyment of the upper sanctuary.”

Is it possible that any Christian, especially a Primitive Baptist, can have fraternal affiliations with such a religious sect as that? It seems unreasonable.

Take, as another specimen, the prayer at the close of a lodge-meeting of Odd-Fellows, as found on pages 99 and 100 of *Odd-Fellow’s Text-book*: “We bless thee, O Lord, that we have been permitted to enjoy this, another Lodge-meeting. Pardon what thou hast seen amiss in us; and now, as we are about to depart, let thy blessing be with us, and with our brethren throughout the globe. May brotherly love prevail, and every moral and social virtue adorn our lives, while members of the Lodge below, and at last be admitted to the joys of a better world : and thine be the glory, forever and ever, Amen.”

“The Lodge below” is suggestive of the idea of a Lodge above. The idea is held forth in many prayers they offer that there is to be a transition from the “Lodge below” to the “Lodge above.” How can any Primitive Baptist endure such blasphemy, comparing the Lodge, the secret oath-bound Lodge, in which wicked people mingle with them and call them *Brother*, comparing that Lodge to heaven and immortal glory? Echo answers — “how?” **It is a religious order, but what kind of religion does it promulgate?**

The following petition suggested for the funeral service of Freemasons, is given on page 199 of the *Freemason’s Guide*; “And at last, Great Parent of the universe, when our journey shall be near its end; when the silver cord shall be loosed, and the Golden bowl broken; oh, in that moment of mortal extremity, may the ‘lamp of thy love’ dispel the gloom of the dark valley; and may we be enabled to ‘work an entrance’ into the Celestial Lodge above, and in thy glorious presence, amidst the ineffable mysteries, enjoy a union with the souls of our departed friends, perfect as the happiness of heaven, and durable as the eternity of God. Amen. So mote it be.” **Is the institution not a religious one?** Are the members not taught that they can “work an entrance into the Celestial Lodge above?” Such Deistical, Arminian teaching! How can a Primitive Baptist ever endure it?

In the *Ancient Constitutions* of Freemasonry, which are said to be “obligatory, as fundamental regulations, in all parts of the world,” and are declared to be “absolutely requisite in all who aspire to partake of the sublime honors of those who

are duly initiated into the mysteries and instructed in the art of ancient Masonry,” there is found the following significant statement in Chap. I. Sec. First: “Whoever, from love of knowledge, interest or curiosity, desires to be a mason, is to know that, as his foundation and great corner stone, **he is firmly to believe in the eternal God, and to pay that worship to him which is due to him as the great Architect and Governor of the Universe.**”

As it requires all who desire to become Mason, not only to believe in the eternal God, but to pay that worship to him which is due, it is undeniable that Freemasonry is a religious order. **Its religion is purely Deism.** We are so glad that we have never aspired “to partake of the sublime honors” of those who are duly initiated into the mysteries of ancient Masonry!

In the Odd-Fellows nine *Chapters of Council*, Chap, IV. Sec. Fourth, the following declaration is made: “Our infinite Creator, who is the Soul of all true friendship, and the Source of all Good; who is abundantly worthy of our love; and who may rightfully command our obedience, is the only proper object of our worship.”

Here is the doctrine of Deism again. The order would not dare to associate the name, the sweet name of Jesus with the Father. That would be contrary to its doctrine. So Odd-fellowship is a worshiping or religious institution, but save us from its doctrine.

In the *Freemason’s Monitor*, by Daniel Sickels, page 114, is found the following declaration: “That so, in *age* as Master Masons, we may enjoy the happy reflection consequent on a well-spent life, and die in hope of a glorious immortality.” On page 120, same work, we read: “That we may welcome the grim tyrant, Death, and receive him as a kind messenger sent from our Supreme Grand Master, to translate us from this imperfect, to that all perfect, glorious and celestial Lodge above, where the Supreme Architect of the universe presides.” See, also, *The Craftsman and Freemason’s Guide*, page 75.

What blasphemy it is to apply to the God of heaven the terms used by the Masons as titles of the officers of this human, oath-bound, secret organization, such as Supreme Grand Master and Supreme Architect, and to speak of heaven as “The Lodge above!” While it is a religious order, what kind of religion does it inculcate? We shall see in subsequent chapters.

The members of Freemasonry are not harmonious in their claims of the design and nature of the order. Some say it is a religious order, and that its religion is good enough for them. Some go so far as to say its tenets of religion and morals are in perfect accord with those of the Christian church. Some of these, when pressed by arguments showing the absurdity of such a position, retract by saying it is not really a religious order at all, but merely benevolent and charitable. Others claim for it that it is simply a kind of insurance arrangement and social in its nature.

To this Babel of voices we need not listen. From its prayers and ceremonies and literature we can learn that it is religious, and from these sources we ascertain the nature of its religion. **The Lodges have their altars, and these are religious instruments. The order has its creed which is religious. It has its religious ritual.** A mere social organization, insurance company or business firm has no need of an altar, a religious creed or ritual.

While the majority of Masons, perhaps, do not profess to be Christians, and many of them we know are very wicked, yet all, the good and the bad, are tied up in a religious order in a bond of brotherhood and under an oath of the most severe penalties that the human mind is capable of framing. **Men of all religions, and of no other religion save that of Freemasonry, are thus bound together as brethren in a religious, secret, oath-bound fraternity.** Who can read the following stanza, found in *The Craftsman and Freemason's Guide*, without seeing the high claims of this order as to its religious expectations? It was appointed to be sung as the concluding stanza of a *Most Excellent Master's Song*, addressing God.

Thy *wisdom* inspired the great Institution,
Thy *strength* shall support it till nature expire;
And when the creation shall fall into ruin,
Its *beauty* shall rise through the midst of the fire.

What real Christian is there of this order, who, reading the stanza, and seeing in it the high-sounding claims of this union of *brotherhood*, is not so disgusted with the whole thing as to give it up entirely and have no further affiliation with it? Let all who have read thus far read on to the end of this book.

In the Odd-Fellow's Text-Book, page 54, in "A word to the Neophite" (one newly admitted to the order), he is told to be attentive to the instructions he is about to receive, for "they teach him his duty to his God, his country, his family, and himself; they demonstrate to him that 'vice is a monster of such frightful mein,' that it should be shunned and hated; they persuade him that there is in Fraternal Union and Love the truest, sublimest pleasure; they lead him to obedience to his Divine Maker, in which he cannot fail to be blessed in life, death, and eternity."

Just think of it! This Secret order, which says, "Jew or Gentile, Catholic or Protestant, is, as such, welcome to our doors," (page 233, Odd-Fellow's Text-Book), which in all its sacred rituals will not allow Christ's name to be mentioned, pretends to teach an applicant for membership all his duty of God, to "lead him in obedience to his Divine Maker, in which he cannot fail to be blessed in life, in death, and in eternity."

According to this he need not be a member of any other body religious, he need not attend to his Bible, he need not apply to any other source for religious instruction but a lodge of “Independent Order of Odd-Fellows.”

Following that instruction he will be sure to be blessed in life, death, and eternity! He will have all he needs here and hereafter, finding in that *Fraternal Union* the truest, sublimest pleasure, and a blissful home in eternity! Can you, Christian church member, subscribe to this? If not, get out of this oath-bound order of Pagan religion, with its Christless ceremonies, prayers, and lectures.

We now give two stanzas of a parting hymn for Odd-Fellows, given on page 272, Odd-Fellow’s Text-Book.

Brothers, bind the mystic chain;
Its links keep ever bright;
Not a blemish – not a stain –
To dim its golden light.

Wondrous chain, to mortals given,
Binding in the bonds of love,
Heaven to earth, and earth to heaven,
And man to God above.

Brothers! raise to heaven your hands,
The links that bind the heart!
Consecrate anew the bands
Of faith before we part;

Then, in heavenly peace and trust,
Part in Friendship, Truth, and Love,
Till, released from earth and dust,
We meet again above.

This *Hymn* of the Odd-Fellows makes the claim that the golden, mystic chain, wondrous chain given to mortals, the chain that unites them in an oath-bound brotherhood as Odd-Fellows, binds heaven to earth, earth to heaven, and man to God. Christian Odd-Fellows, I mean Odd-Fellows who are Christian, what do you think of this claim? **Do you believe your joining the Odd-Fellows has bound you to heaven and God by a mystic, golden chain?** If you do not, get out of that *mystic* affair, break that *golden* chain. That is a religion you cannot afford to encourage by your sanction.

No wonder they leave the name of Christ out of their religious system. What need have they of Christ, when their chain of brotherhood binds them to God, so

they can part with the expectation of meeting in heaven when “released from earth and dust?”

Chapter 2: Secret Societies Religious (Cont.) We have mentioned only the two leading secret societies thus far, because they are the leaders in the dark channel of mystic secrets. It will not be possible in the limits of this work for us to notice all the minor fraternal orders, nor is it necessary for us to do so. Such attention shall be given to them as their importance in this investigation seems to require. The Knights of Pythias is prominent among these minor orders. Take this tribute of respect for a departed *Knight* as an example of the religion of the religion of that secret order.

“Once again the Supreme Ruler of the Universe hath summoned, through death, a Brother Knight, from the labors of the castle here to the joys of the beautiful castle in the New Jerusalem. As a recompense of his service under tri-colored banner, he has received the plaudit ‘well done’ from the Great Father.”

As the Masons and Odd-Fellows claim a transit at death from their Lodges below to the “Lodge above,” so these wonderful *Knights* these oath-bound *Knights*—claim a passage from their “castle here to the joys of the beautiful castle in the New Jerusalem,” as a recompense for service rendered under tri-colored banner. They thus take the Holy Bible, purposely leaving out the name of God to keep from offending those of their number who do not believe in the God of the Bible, and then say that membership and service in their K. of P. Lodge is a passport into the presence of the One in whom many of them do not really believe! What consistency!

This secret order was organized in Washington, D. C., in 1864, by J. H. Rathbone. It now [1914 ed.] claims a membership of 500,000. In the opening ceremonies of this Lodge the *Prelate* offers the following prayer: “Supreme Ruler of the Universe, we humbly beseech thy blessing upon the offers and members of this Lodge. Aid us to avoid anger and dissension; help us to work together in the spirit of fraternity; and inspire us to exemplify the friendship of Damon and Pythias. Hear and answer us, we beseech thee. Amen.” All “Amen.”

Let all observe that this prayer is not offered for Christ’s sake, nor is the pleading made to imitate the humble, loving example of Christ. No, Christ is not in it at all. This order is like all other secret orders in the respect. Whom does the petitioner pray God to enable all to imitate? Damon and Pythias!

Damon and Pythias – who are they? They are two Pythagorean philosophers, heathen philosophers, whose friendship for each other was so great that by the tyrant Dionysius of Syracuse, Pythias asked that Damon be allowed to go home to see his family before he died, pledging himself to die in his stead if he did not return at the appointed time. Damon did return just in time to save the life of his friend

Pythias, which so touched the heart of Dionysius that he pardoned Damon and saved them both.

It is upon this circumstance and the friendship of these heathen philosophers that this oath-bound, secret order has been constructed. It is a Christless, heathenish religion that is practiced by the order. How can a Christian say "Amen" to such a prayer? Echo answers *How?*

The Ancient Order of United Workmen is a secret order, founded by John Jordan Upchurch, October 27th, 1868. The watchwords, adopted to express the fraternal principles of this order, are Charity, hope and protection. This is also a religious order. The closing of an ode adopted to be sung at the opening of a lodge meeting is,

Let us pledge unto each other,
Charity and truth and love,
And we ne'er shall lack a brother,
And at last shall meet above.

The closing prayer, offered by the Past Master Workman, is very short but very expressive: "Almighty God, we ask thy blessing as we are about to separate. Go with us, guide us, and receive us at last. Amen." All present respond "Amen." This is a religious prayer, but notice it is Christless like all other secret order prayers. Notice also that this prayer asks Almighty God to receive them at last as a lodge of Ancient Order of Workmen!

There is a silly order known as the *Improved Order of Redmen*. If this is *improved*, what must the unimproved thing be? We say *silly*, and we mean what we say. We have printed the Constitution and By-laws for some of their lodges, being in the printing business, and we have their Complete Revised Ritual, adopted by the Great Council of the United States. We also have Robinson's *One Hundred Reasons why I am a Red Man*. From all these sources of information we are made to wonder that sensible men allow themselves to be duped into as silly a thing as that. It may be because they pledged in writing their "most sacred honor to keep secret everything they might see and hear in the council chamber," before they could be admitted to know what those secrets were.

This is a religious order. Read the closing prayer at the *quenching* of their *Council Fires*, and see. It is offered by the *Sachem*. "O thou great Spirit! We acknowledge Thy wisdom and goodness toward the Red Men of our Tribe. We ask thee to watch over us during the slumbers of the night, and while following the hunt. Guard us from all harm, succor the distressed, feed the hungry, clothe the poor. Do Thou, Great Spirit, impress upon each Red Man's heart to bear patiently the lot assigned him on earth, so that, when he is called from the hunting grounds of his fathers, he may meet the shaft of death with unwavering courage, and feel assured that Thou

wilt sustain him through the ‘dark valley of the shadow of death.’ Hear us, oh Great Spirit!” *Response by the Brothers* – “Hear us, oh, Great Spirit!”

Comment seems altogether unnecessary. How can a Christian member unite this, another Christless prayer, to the *Great Spirit*, with the wicked, saying, “Hear us, oh Great Spirit?” What mockery this is! It is not only a mockery of religion, but the whole thing is a shock to common sense!

We come next to the Modern Woodmen of America. It is very modern indeed, and scarcely less silly than the Order of Redmen! It is the product of the brains of Joseph Cullen Root, of Lyons, Iowa, who wrote its first ritual in 1882. The name came to him as he was listening to a sermon of “Rev. S. Crawford, in which he spoke of the woodmen felling the trees of the forest. This Ritual was revised and changed by W. A. Northcutt, who claimed to undertake the *Herculean task* in obedience to the commands of the *Head Camp*.

With much pomp and silly ceremonies and threatenings of murder, the candidates for admission to the degrees of the *Beneficiary* and *Fraternal* pass as members of these degrees. The candidate for admission to the Fraternal degree must ride the *Camp Goat*, while the *Neighbors* all sing, to the tune of *Marching through Georgia*: “Keep the logs a-rolling, boys and pile them high and dry,” &c.

He is then put to the task of sawing a tough stick of wood in two minutes. Later on his hoodwink is removed and he is tied to a moving rack that draws him slowly to a revolving saw, by a band of supposed enemies of the order, when, just as he is nearing the saw and ready to give it all up for this life, he is rescued by supposed friends and is congratulated for his fidelity to his oath, showing himself willing to die rather than give the secrets of the order away.

The odes and hymns and funeral rites of this oath-bound order show it to be a kind of religious institution, as well as a mystic play-house for the sporting class. But some say it is “Only a Mutual Insurance Society!” But why should a Mutual Insurance Society have all this connected with it? For our part, we are not insured save by him who has promised never to leave us nor forsake us, but if we wanted any earthly body of men to do His security, we would not patronize an institution like the “Modern Woodmen of America.” Never would be!

We are informed by the *Cyclopaedia of Fraternities* that there are some three hundred different brotherhoods and sisterhoods in the United States. In speaking of their origin it says, “**Few, who are well informed on the subject, will deny that the Masonic Fraternity is directly or indirectly the parent organization of all secret societies, good, bad, and indifferent.**”

There are sisterhoods, then, as well as brotherhoods. Yes, even women are encouraged and induced to join in bands of secrecy under a solemn oath. The

Eastern Star is an order of the Masonic Fraternity. It has its degrees of Jephtha's Daughter (Daughter's Degree), Ruth (Widow's Degree), Esther (Wife's Degree), Martha (Sister's Degree), and Electa (Benevolent Degree). Its teachings claim to be "founded on the Holy Bible," and so it is a religious order. Only members of the Masonic Order and women relatives of such members may join it. The heroines of the different degrees are exalted by a perversion of Scripture that would be amusing if it were not serious. *Electa*, the title of the heroine of fifth and last degree, it is claimed, is alluded to in the second epistle of John. A wild claim, this!

The Rebekah Lodge, the members of which generally style themselves "Sister's of Rebekah," a Female Odd-Fellow lodge, was instituted by Schuyler Colfax, in 1851. The object seems to be to reconcile women to the lifelong pledge of secrecy made by their husbands by inducing them to take a similar obligation. Though men may belong to the Rebekah Lodge, no woman may become a member of an Odd-Fellow Lodge. The men may know the secrets of the women, but no woman has the right to know the secrets of the men. A fact this is which seems very significant.

This, like the secret orders of men, and like the Eastern Star, is of a Christless religion. We give here the opening of a lodge meeting, after which the *Worthy Chaplain* invokes the blessings of the *Supreme Ruler of the Universe* upon the meeting.

Brothers of our mystic union –
Sisters of our social band –
Here is peaceful, pure communion,
We at Friendship's altar stand.

Love unfurls her banner o'er us –
Truth will guide us on our way –
Faith illumine the path before us –
Hope a future bright display.

Charity that faileth never,
Calls to worship at her shrine;
Here we bow and pledge forever,
Labor in her cause divine.

When the clouds of sin and sadness,
Shroud in gloom the weary head,
Then in peace, and joy, and gladness,
Shall the love of light be shed.

This ode and the various rites and ceremonies of the order show it to be a worshiping order. But who is worshiped? Not the God of Christ, God manifested in the flesh, the God of the Bible, but a deistic god of its own. Sisters of the church, do

not become entangled in the oath-bound fetters of the Eastern Star or the Rebekah Lodge. If you are already entangled, release yourself from the entanglement. You are married to Christ. How can you be content to be married, at the same time, to an earthly, Religious society that is Christless? Think you that your better, nobler Husband will approve of it?

The Modern Woodmen of America has its female auxiliary, known as *The Royal Neighbors of America*. Prayers are offered, hymns are sung, and there is considerable Scripture reading, in the lodge meetings. The lodge has also a funeral rite that is quite elaborate, giving every one dying as a member the hope of a happy immortality in heaven.

Chapter 3: Lodge Religion Deism: We have some very warm friends who are members of secret societies, and seem much devoted to them. They appear to really think them not only perfectly harmless, but a great advantage and blessing in many ways. These will be hard to convince that we are right in our convictions, and some may be so displeased as to think hard of us and feel cold toward us for publishing this work on secret societies. To all such we beg to say that all we ask is for them to read and carefully consider what we have written herein.

Come, let us reason together. This task has been undertaken and accomplished from a felt sense of duty, and we know we have in view the good of our fellow mortals, and especially our dear brethren in the holy cause of Christianity. We humbly hope that God may so bless our efforts that even the votaries of lodge secretism may be drawn closer to us in Christian affection.

We have shown that secret societies are religious. What has been shown of the orders mentioned, is true generally of secret societies. Even the temperance orders, so called, such as the Sons of Temperance, The Good Templars, The Knights of Honor and Temperance, gotten up with the avowed object of saving men from the drink curse, have interspersed in their program prayers, songs, Scripture reading and lectures. The secrecy, regalia, and the ceremonies are copied from the older lodges. The impression is made on the simple-minded that the religion of such societies is all right. **Evidently there is nothing in the secrecy, oaths, regalia, or ceremonies of the temperance lodges that can save men from the snare of drunkenness.** If they have done any good in that way at all it is not because of such secretism that they have done it.

Having shown that secret societies are religious orders, we now propose to show that the principles of their religion is absolutely false, and that it is not only out of harmony with the Christian religion, but that it is antagonistic to it.

Lodge religion is Deism. By Deism we mean belief in a God as opposed to Atheism, but not recognizing Divine revelation as recognized and received by Christians. Any religion that leaves Christ out of its system is Deism. While the

Bible is on the altars of lodges, the whole Bible, is ignored by the orders and left out of their religious prayers and ceremonies. Readings are chosen in the Masonic ritual that do not contain the name of Jesus. One passage, II Thessalonians 3:6,16, contains that sweet name twice, and is appointed to be read at the opening of the Royal Arch Degree. But, lo! The name of Jesus is stricken out of the passage entirely. See *Craftsman and Freemason's Guide*, page 137.

Why is this done? Why is that name, the sweetest of all names to the Christian, taken out of this passage? The reason is that a great many members of this religious order do not believe in Jesus Christ in any sense whatever, and it would offend such to hear his name pronounced. The prayers they offer to their god, never contain this name. They never say for Christ's sake.

"If Masonry were simply a Christian institution, the Jew and the Moslem, the Brahman and the Buddhist, could not conscientiously partake of its illumination. But its universality is its boast. In its language citizens of every nation may converse; at its altar men of all religions may kneel; to its creed disciples of every faith may subscribe." Mackey's *Encyclopedia of Freemasonry*, page 162. What Christian can kneel at such an altar and subscribe to such a creed?

"Whoever, from love of knowledge, interest, or curiosity, desires to be a Mason, is to know that, as his foundation and great corner stone, he is firmly to believe in the eternal God, and to pay that worship which is due him as the great Architect and Governor of the Universe." *Craftsman and Freemason's Guide*, page 212. **He is not required to believe in Jesus Christ. He who enters a Masonic lodge must leave the Saviour at the door, as well as his wife and children.**

The Book on the altar is denominated the *Book of the Law*. This term is given it so that it may be replaced by any other religious book the members of the order might prefer. This *Book of the Law* may be the *Koran* of Mohammedans, the *Book of Mormon*, the Book recognized by the Buddhist, the Parsee, or any worshiper of Deity under any form. Robert Morris says, in *Webb's Freemason's Monitor*, "So broad is the religion of Masonry and so carefully are all sectarian tenets excluded, that the Christian, the Jew and the Mohammedan may and do harmoniously united in its moral and intellectual work with the Buddhist, the Parsee, and the worshiper of Deity under any form." "It is a Landmark, that a *Book of the Law* shall constitute an indispensable part of the furniture of every Lodge. **I say advisedly, a Book of the Law, because it is not absolutely required that everywhere the Old and New Testaments shall be used.** The *Book of the Law* is that volume which, by the religion of the country, is believed to contain the revealed will of the Grand Architect of the Universe. Hence, in all Lodges in Christian countries, the *Book of the Law* is composed of the Old and New Testaments; in a country where Judaism was the prevailing faith, the Old Testament alone would be sufficient; and in Mohammedan countries, and among Mohammedan Masons, the *Koran* might be substituted.

Masonry does not attempt to interfere with the peculiar religious faith of its disciples, except so far as relates to the belief in the existence of God, and what necessarily relates from that belief. The *Book of the Law* is to the speculative Mason his spiritual Trestle-board: without this he cannot labor; whatever he believes to be the revealed will of the Grand Architect constitutes for him this spiritual Trestle-board, and must ever be before him in his hours of speculative labor, to be the rule and guide of his conduct. The Landmark, therefore, requires that a Book of Law, a religious code of some kind, purporting to be an exemplar of the revealed will of God, shall form an essential part of the furniture of every Lodge.” Mackey’s Text Book of Masonic Jurisprudence, pages 33 and 34.

Christian brother, how can you endure the religion of an order, a secret order, an oath-bound order, which ties you up with such company as that, which fellowships the Jew, the Mohammedan, the heathen Chinaman and Hindu, and *blackballs* you dear Saviour? **This institution ignores Jesus Christ in order to have the fellowship of his enemies.**

What is proved to be the religion of Freemasonry can be proved to be the religion of Odd-Fellowship. An inquiry, and an answer to that inquiry is found, in *Donaldson’s Odd-Fellow’s Text Book*, page 155: “Shall a man, a unit in the universal kingdom of God, stand aloof from his fellow-unit because he may not be of the same faith or nation as himself? Nay! The question must not be, ‘Is he a Christian, or is he a Jew, or a Mohammedan; is he a European, or an American, and Asiatic, or an African?’ But, ‘Is he *a man and a brother?*’”

Man is considered a “unit in the universal kingdom of God,” and Odd-Fellowship aims at the union of every religious faith in its own religious faith, which is a faith with no Christ in it. *The Holy Trinity, Triune God*, any recognition of Christ as the Saviour of Sinners, or as the second person of the Godhead, are intentionally omitted in the Odd-Fellow prayers, in order that Christian, Jews, Mohammedans, and all other religions, may unite in those prayers. This question was submitted to the *Sovereign Grand Lodge* at a session in 1888: “Is it lawful for a chaplain to commence and finish his prayer in the name of Christ?” The Grand Sire, after defining the word sect, said in answer, “In this sense Christianity is a sect, hence it is inexpedient, unwise and I think, unlawful to make prominent mention of it (the name of Christ) in Lodge work.” Official Report, No. 58 page 11.

“Judaism, Christianity and Mohammedanism recognize the one only and true God.” *New Odd-Fellow’s Manual*, by A. B. Grosh. Thus it is stated as a doctrinal principle of Odd-Fellowship that Judaism and Mohammedanism recognize the only true God, while they are the avowed enemies of Christ.

“Who is a liar but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ? He is anti-Christ, that denieth the Father and the Son. Whosoever denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father.” I John 2:22-23.

As the Odd Fellow Lodge denies Christ, it is anti-Christ, and as a religious teacher, it is a liar. “Let God be true, but every man a liar.” Romans 3:4. My Christian brother, in the unholy alliance of Odd-Fellowship, you are bound up by an oath with those who are the avowed enemies of your blessed Saviour, in a religion that denies him. Oh, can you, will you stay there? It is folly for you to say you can stay in the Free Mason or the Odd- Fellow Lodge, and affiliate with them, and not subscribe to their religion and to their god. You know that what we here give is the truth concerning those orders. You cannot accept the doctrine of the Church of Christ and accept the doctrine of these secret orders at the same time and be consistent. They are antagonistic and so are utterly unreconcilable.

The Ancient Order of United Workmen requires a candidate for admission to the Junior Workman Degree to declare that he is over 21 and under 45 years of age, that he is sound in bodily health to the best of his knowledge and belief, and that he believes in a Supreme Being, the Creator and Preserver of the Universe. The Foreman, in addressing him says, “The Ancient Order of United Workmen imposes no religious test other than a belief in the Deity.”

So we see the doctrine of this order is like that of the Masons and Odd-Fellows. The Society of the *Improved Order of Red Men* believe in the *Great Spirit* of the American Indians, but Christ is not known or needed in their ritual. In lodges of the Knights of Pythias the Bible lies on the altar with the two swords crossed, and is called the *Book of the Law*. But, like the other secret orders, the Christ of the Bible is wholly ignored. The *Book of the Law* is not followed. We have the last revised ritual of this order, and know whereof we speak. **The Bible lies there open as a deception.** The society of the Modern Woodmen of America, with its *working tools* of Beetle, Axe and Wedge, has its Christless ceremonies and prayers. The candidate as he is conducted along the route to the *Arcana* (singular-Arcanum, any thing hidden) never hears the name of Jesus pronounced.

In the closing ceremonies of a Rebekah Degree in the Lodge of the “Sisters of Rebekah,” after the singing of an ode in which the name of Christ must not be mentioned, the Noble Grand calls upon the Chaplain to invoke the Divine blessing, but in doing so he must not do it in the name of Christ. Further statement or examination of this fact, that secret societies are religious without any Christ in their religion, is wholly unnecessary.

It may be claimed, and we believe it is by some, that Theism, and not Deism, is the doctrine of secret societies. The difference is so immaterial that this distinction is a hair-splitting matter. Both mean belief in a God, as distinguished from Atheism, which is a belief that there is no God. In the early part of the

seventeenth century the word Deism fell into some discredit, and after a time the term Theism was used in its stead. In 1871 a church was founded in London known as the Theistic Church. The leading principles are,

1. That it is the right and duty of every man to think for himself in matters of religion.
2. That there is no finality in religious beliefs; that higher views of God are always possible.
3. That it is our duty to obtain the highest truth, and to proclaim it and to detect and controvert errors.
4. That religion is based on morality.
5. That Theism is not aggressive against persons, only against erroneous opinions.

So it matters not whether we denominate the religious doctrine of secret societies Deism or Theism, for in neither beliefs is the Bible as essential rule of faith and practice, and the use of the Bible in their religious exercises is solemn mockery.

Chapter 4: Universal Fatherhood of God: Secret societies are founded upon the false religious dogma of Universalism—the dogma of the Universal Fatherhood of God, the Universal Brotherhood of man. Universalists stand upon this as the main plank in the platform of their faith. If they could prove this, they could establish their doctrine of Universal salvation beyond any successful contradiction.

In the Twenty-second Landmark of Freemasonry, given on page 35 of *Mackey's Text-Book of Masonic Jurisprudence*, is this statement: “But the doctrine of Masonic equality implies that, as children of one great Father, we meet in the Lodge upon the level – that on that level we are all traveling to the one predestined goal.” Thus they say they are all traveling to the one *predestined goal*, being all children of the one great Father. That predestined goal we suppose is heaven, or final happiness somewhere. As this goal is *predestined*, they cannot fail to reach it, though many of them are known to be outbrokenly wicked!

It is said in *Craftsman and Freemason's Guide*, page 35: “By the exercise of brotherly love we are taught to regard the human species as one family, the high and the low, the rich and the poor, who, as created by one Almighty Parent, and inhabitants of the same planet, are to aid, support and protect each other.” **So they believe that not only members of the order are children of God, but the whole human species.**

In the *Odd-Fellow's Text-Book*, on page 127, we read, “Man is a constituent of one Universal Brotherhood, having come from the hand of a common parent. * * * *”

By it, all nations, tongues, and creeds, may be brought to comprehend the motive for Fraternity. *Fraternity!* This is our cornerstone. Upon its solid basis rests our superstructure. It teaches us to regard the great family of mankind as our brethren; children of one heavenly Father, the great Author of our existence.”

The great cornerstone of Odd-Fellowship, the basis upon which the whole superstructure rests, is the greatest falsehood, the greatest error that was ever promulgated. This is not only the doctrine of Odd-Fellowship, but of the whole Lodge system. Even the little insurance orders, like the Modern Woodmen of American, declared at their National Congress in 1897: “Fraternity is the culmination of the ‘Sermon on the Mount,’ and the glorification of the sublime doctrine of Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of man. This is the bedrock upon which every true order must be founded.”

Again, *Odd-Fellow's Text-Book*, page 146: “Wherever man is found, in whatever situation in life, he bears his Maker's image; he is immortal; and however poor, or even degraded he may be, in his soul are the signs of human equality. If thou canst do aught to promote his happiness, then, or canst relieve his wants, DO IT: it is thy duty. If there be a scheme of good, designed to meliorate his condition, engage in it with all thy heart, remembering that he for whom thou art laboring is thine own *Father's son*. Pause not to inquire his creed or his faith, his title or his condition; but consider that, with all his errors or imperfections, he is thy brother.”

On the supposition that this is true, all men are Divine. What, then, is there in the Divinity of Christ? He stands not one whit above the lowest of the race in this respect. There is no need for any to be born again, in fact none can be, if all are already children of God by creation.

None are children of God except those who are born again, born of him. Man as born only of the flesh belongs to the creation of God, but there is a newer and higher sense in which he becomes a child of God and an heir of glory. We are creatures in Adam whom God has created, but we must be created anew in Christ Jesus unto good works to belong to the family of God. Ephesians 2:10. “That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit.” John 3:6.

This claim of Universal Brotherhood stands face to face with an inconsistency that makes it hard to understand how men can use the term in connection with secret societies. One must be a member of the Lodge to be a *brother*. It is said to be rather difficult to get into a Mason or Odd-Fellow Order. They boast of that. A man may get one or more *black balls*, which shuts him out. Is he then a *brother*? Most persons cannot enter at all. Women, children, the maimed, all are barred out, not from any fault of theirs, but from their unfortunate state, as viewed from the standpoint of the claims of those orders.

Those who enter must pay to enter and keep on paying to remain in them, to be *brothers*. Yet all the human family, women, children, old men, the maimed, all are members in the one family of God! Nevertheless one who seeks a admittance into a lodge of K. of P. or of Modern Woodmen is a *Stranger* till he gets in, and one who applies to a Red Men Lodge for initiation is a *Pale Face* till he is duly initiated among the wild men of the forest.

Secret Societies claim to give no preference to the Christian over the Pagan, and pretend to be exceedingly hostile to divisions based on religious convictions, yet a large majority of the human family are forever prohibited from entering their dark and mysterious chambers. For our part we cannot tell how a Christian man must feel to be bound up in oath-pledge brotherhood with the avowed enemies of his Saviour, while his own Christian wife must remain separated from so near relationship with him. **In the face of all these glaring facts, it is claim of secret lodgism that the Universal Brotherhood of man is the “bedrock upon which every order must be founded!”** Surely in all their religious principles and ceremonies, secret societies display nothing better than a systematic and perpetual hypocrisy.

Chapter 5: Conditional Salvation: The doctrine of salvation as taught by the religious writings, prayers, and ceremonies of secret societies is conditional, as **they hold forth the idea that man by his own efforts prepares himself for the “Lodge above,” as they style heaven.** Though this conflicts somewhat with the Universal platform upon which these heretical orders claim to be founded, yet it is their doctrine. It could not be expected that a religious doctrine framed by the world would be consistent, even with itself.

Taking the secret societies in proper order, we shall first examine Freemasonry. “The Lamb has, in all ages, been deemed the emblem of innocency; he, therefore, who wears the lamb-skin as a badge of Masonry, is thereby continually reminded of that purity of life and conduct, which is essential necessary to his admittance into the Celestial Lodge above, where the Supreme Architect of the Universe resides.” *Craftsman and Freemason’s Guide*, page 29. A member of the Primitive Baptist church surely feels strange in wearing the lamb-skin to be reminded by it that his entering heaven, which Freemasonry requires him to regard as the “Celestial Lodge above,” is essentially and necessarily conditioned on his living a life of pure conduct, Christ and the new birth playing no part in the matter of his salvation. **In this he is professing to believe two conflicting doctrines, the doctrine of Freemasonry and the doctrine of the Bible.**

“The candidate receives those first instructions whereon to erect his future moral and Masonic edifice in a particular part of the Lodge, because as on the night of his initiation he commences the great task, which is never in his future life to be discontinued, of erecting in his heart a spiritual temple for the indwelling of God, of which the material Temple at Jerusalem was but the symbol.” *Mackey’s Manual of*

the Lodge, page 41. Well! Well ! The great task of the Mason, according to the doctrine of his order, is to erect a spiritual temple in his heart for the indwelling of God, which task he begins on receiving his first instructions in the wonderful mysteries of Masonry, and he is never to discontinue this task during his subsequent life! Great task this!

“Faith is the substance of things hoped for—the evidence of things not seen. If we—with suitable, true devotion—maintain our Masonic profession, our faith will become a beam of light, and bring us to those blessed mansions where we shall be eternally happy with God, the Grand Architect of the Universe.” *Mackey’s Masonic Ritualist*, page 13. Now, think of it! Their reaching those blessed mansions where they shall be eternally happy with God, depends upon their maintaining their Masonic profession! What more? We shall see.

“And thus guided by the movable jewels of Masonry, he may descend the vale of life with joy, in the hope of being accepted by the Most High, as a successful candidate for admission into the Grand Lodge above.” *Macoy’s General History, Cyclopedia and Dictionary of Masonry*. Page 578. If a member expects to be admitted into the “Grand Lodge above,” then, he must wear the jewels of Freemasonry! We suppose these *jewels* are the three, so called, which are given to an Entered Apprentice; a *listening ear*, a *silent tongue*, and a *faithful heart*. How does that suit you, Christian Freemason? Is there any more? Abundance of it.

“The definitions of Freemasonry have been numerous, and they all unite in declaring it to be a system of morality, by the practice of which its members may advance their spiritual interests, and mount by the theological ladder, from the Lodge on earth to the Lodge in heaven.” *Macoy’s General History, Cyclopedia and Dictionary of Freemasonry*, page 147.

By practicing the Masonic system, according to the definition in which all Masons unite, the Mohammedan, the Confucianist, the Buddhist or the Parsee, can mount the theological ladder and reach the Lodge in heaven, as well as the Christian Mason. They all climb the same ladder, using their own *Trestle-Board*, or *Book of Law*. **The Koran is as helpful to the Mohammedan as the Bible is to the Christian in making the ascent! Primitive Baptist Mason, get off that “Theological Ladder.”**

In Captain William Morgan’s *Exposition of Freemasonry*, in the first section of Lecture on the degree of Entered Apprentice, the following instruction is given: “Union is that kind of friendship that ought to appear conspicuous in the conduct of every Mason. It is so closely allied to the divine attribute, truth, that he who enjoys the one is seldom destitute of the other. Should interest, honor, prejudice, or human depravity ever influence you to violate any part of the sacred trust we now repose in you, let these two important words (union and truth), at the earliest insinuation, teach you to put on the checkline of truth, which shall infallibly direct you to pursue

that straight and narrow path, which ends in the full enjoyment of the Grand Lodge above, where we shall all meet as Masons and members of one family; where all discord on account of religion, politics or private opinion shall be unknown and banished from within our walls.”

This needs no comment, as it speaks for itself a plain language. This is our first quotation from this book. Freemasons have charges that this book is untruthful. But why should a Mason who had been in the order for thirty years, who knew his life was very greatly endangered by the exposure he was making, speak falsely in regard to the secrets of the order? His book exposing the secrets of Masonry was written and published in August, 1826, and **in September of the same year he was kidnaped and carried away from the village of Batavia, N.Y., where he lived, and was never heard of by his friends any more.** His exposition has been attested by such men as Chas. G. Finney, David Bernard, and John G. Stearns, men of honor, who, like Morgan, came out from this oath-bound society and declared against it. Hosts of others have followed this commendable example, commendable because the work of God requires it. *“Come out from among them.”*

Our denunciation of secret societies may seem rather violent and severe to the friends of such societies. Many of them have worked in their lodges so long that it will be very hard to convince them that there is anything wrong in them. Some of them, likely, just will not be convinced. In the face of all that may be said and proved against secret orders, they will still contend they are beneficial and accomplish much good. We ask all such conscientious persons, who profess the religion of Jesus, Has your Master in His book commanded you to bind yourselves by a solemn oath in a secret bond of brotherhood with men of the world, some of whom are the vilest of earth?

Chapter 6: Conditional Salvation: (Cont.) Odd-Fellowship pretends to teach men “Friendship, love and truth.” But the friendship it teaches is the friendship of the world. “The friendship of the world is enmity with God. Whosoever therefore will be a friend of the world is the enemy to God.” James 4:4. This alludes to friendship in a religious sense we think. True spiritual love is inseparably connected with faith in Jesus Christ. “And this is his commandment that we should believe on the name of his Son Jesus Christ, and love one another, as he gave us commandment.” I John 3:23. Odd-Fellowship discards Jesus Christ. The love it teaches, therefore, is merely love of the world. Christ is the Truth, and no system that ignores him can teach the truth concerning man’s well being spiritually. All this being true, Odd-Fellowship does not teach real Friendship, Love, and Truth.

It is pretended that initiation into the Odd-Fellow Society begins in spiritual darkness. The candidate is blindfolded and encircled with chains. The imitation of a coffined corpse is placed before him, and his blindfold is temporarily removed while he receives moral lecture. The Past Grand Master, in giving him instruction about doing, doing, doing, says in his closing words to him, “May your initiation

and consequent practice aid in releasing you from all blindness of moral vision, and set you free from the fetters of ignorance and error.” This setting free is to be done by initiation into the Lodge and the consequent practice of the initiated. Such is the teaching of Odd-Fellowship.

We invite attention to the following given on page 126, *Odd-Fellow's Text-Book*: “Man, by his own evil passions, brings himself into a state of slavery more bitter than any human bondage, if he suffers himself to be led captive by them, he must at last be dragged to the lowest depths of wretchedness—misery—despair. He should, therefore, if under their control, seek to liberate himself from their grasp, ere their hold upon him become so firm that it cannot be shaken. Man gropes his way through life in darkness and doubt; his reason and his moral nature are dark; until he acquires, by virtuous perseverance, a knowledge of himself, his duty, his destiny. Then the light breaks in upon him, and he sees clearly the path he is required to tread.” See how much of man's own self there is in the system of salvation taught by Odd-Fellowship. Observe that the Spirit of God and the Saviour of sinners have no place in this scheme.

“But we must struggle on, though beset with danger, toil, and strife, through the wilderness of this world, to our destiny. Let us therefore be stout of heart, and determine, through faith and energy, to overcome the obstacles that lie in our path. Let not fear or discouragement cause us to turn back, after we shall have once entered upon our journey. Let us take honesty for our guide; however rough or uncouth he may seem, or whatever abuse may be heaped upon him by those who love him not, if we cling to him, he will assuredly bring us at last to a peaceful and pleasant abode.” *Odd-Fellow's Text-Book*, pages 159, 160.

What is the faith and energy through which the Odd-Fellow is to overcome at last? Not faith in Christ or the energy of the Holy Spirit, but faith in himself and the energy of his own manufacture.

On page 17 of this book is given a quotation from this same Text-Book, in which the instructions to the “Neophite” claim to lead him “to obedience to his Divine Maker, in which he cannot fail to be blessed in life, death, and eternity.” By following the instructions of his lodge, and clinging to that *honesty* which its teaching imparts to him, he can escape the depths of wretchedness—misery—despair, and reach at last a peaceful and pleasant abode, being forever set free from the fetters of ignorance and error. We who are never thus initiated and instructed are in a bad row, and our destiny is forever sealed if Odd-Fellow doctrine should be true.

In the third section of chapter nine of the *Odd-Fellows Counsel* we find this: “It may be, that in following it (the road to heaven), poverty and want will beset thee: but keep up thy spirit; look not at present ease, which is but for a moment, but rather at future rest, which shall be everlasting.” In the fifth section we find this strong

language: “Brother! cheer thee! Thou hast done well; thou art far on the toilsome way. The impediments and incitements thou hast overcome are in the distance; thank heaven! Thou hast pressed nobly through them. But, alas! how many, ere they come thus far, sink under the difficulties, or embrace sirens that crowd about them. Thou mayst ‘thank God and take courage.’ Thou hast learned and attained much through perseverance and firmness. Thy progress now shall be more calm; thy foes shall abandon thine as a hopeless case. Thou hast passed the critical point, and shalt henceforth proceed more safely. So is it with all who commence this journey betimes; who set out early for the goal of Virtue and of true Happiness: the longer they delay, the greater the danger they shall perish ere they shall attain to the point to which thou hast arrived. Thou mayst not know all that is yet before thee. Thou shalt feel nevertheless, in the midst of thy darkness, that thy Father will not forsake thee. And though a storm more fearful than any thou hast yet encountered—that of physical death—shall soon burst upon thee, the hand of God Almighty, which has sustained thee thus far, will protect thee amid that storm, and thou shalt come up through it with joy and gladness to the land eternal delight. In that glorious Rest, thou shalt behold the innumerable hosts who have traveled this path before thee. Thou shalt join the Patriarchs of the infant world, and mingle thy voice with theirs in the music of angels. Thou shalt dwell in the presence of the Most High, whose smile is heaven. Through-out the eternal ages of Jehovah thou shalt be the associate of angels and just men made perfect, in a land where, far more than this, Faith and Truth are lovely and divine.”

The religious eloquence of this passage is indeed charming. In reading it one’s mind cannot fail to be impressed with the faultless diction and flowing style of rhetoric. But when we pause to think that the *brother* addressed as being on his way to heaven to mingle his in the music of angels, is a secret lodge *brother*, who may be as vile as Judas, the betrayer of Jesus, and that the course he is pursuing in following his lodge instructions is the way that leads to “the land of eternal delight,” the religious eloquence, the faultless diction and the flowing rhetoric of this passage become as empty and unstable as a bubble.

God Almighty is declared to be the sustainer and protector of this lodge traveler through the storms that are to come, even through the storm of physical death, because he has “passed the critical point,” has overcome the impediments and incitements and left them in the distance, and has learned and attained so much through his perseverance and firmness.

The author of the *Text-Book* from which we get the foregoing eloquent effusion, says on page 167, referring the *Nine Chapters of Counsel*, “We have endeavored, in the preceding pages, to lay before our brethren of the Order a synopsis of the grand principles of our institution, and the duties we are, as Odd-Fellows, pledged to practice.” So we who are not in the Lodge are to understand we are not on the way to heaven at all, and that those who are in it will not reach that land of eternal delights unless they overcome the “impediments and incitements” and pass nobly

through them, so as to “pass the critical point.” Well, we would rather risk our hope in Jesus than risk the “mystic secrets” of the Odd-Fellow Lodge or any other oath-bound, human Lodge on earth. We happen to know the signs and grips of the order as well as the doctrinal principles, and we are not at all willing to risk the eternal salvation of our souls with the whole affair for one moment.

The first rank in the order of Knights of Pythias is the Rank of Page. Its motto is Friendship and its grip is called the Grip of Link of Friendship. The conclusion of the speech of the Chancellor Commander in conferring this Rank is, “Keep sacred the lessons of tonight; and so live that when you come to the river that marks the unknown shore, your hands may be filled with deeds of charity, ‘the golden keys that open the palace of eternity.’ I now confer upon you the Rank of Page in the Order of the Knights of Pythias.”

The teaching of this order is that by keeping sacred the lesson learned and filling his hands with deeds of charity the Page will have the key to unlock the “palace of eternity” when he comes to the “river that marks the unknown shore.” It appears that those who never enter that lodge can never unlock the “palace of eternity!”

Chapter 7: Conditional Salvation (Cont.) In the instructions given to a candidate for the Workman Degree, in a lodge of Ancient Order of United Workmen, who has just taken the oath, the Master Workman says to him, “Upon the altar before you are the emblems of our order—the Bible, the Anchor, and the Shield. The Bible contains within its pages man’s duty to God the Creator and Preserver, and his duty to his fellow men. The performance of these duties brings satisfaction here and eternal happiness hereafter. The Anchor symbolizes hope, which paints the promised joy of life, weaves a wreath for every woe, and bids you look beyond the grave for its fruition. The Shield is the emblem of protection. It guards those we love from poverty, and defends them from danger and trial of this life. By its aid we uphold truth, preserve virtue and defend the principles of our order.”

We see it is the doctrine of this order that we are saved by what we do. That our hope, which bids us look beyond the grave for its fruition, is not predicated on anything Jesus does for us, but on the performance of our duty to God and our fellow-men. **Jesus plays no part whatever in securing for us eternal happiness hereafter. In this its religion is like all other secret societies.**

In the burial service of The Modern Woodmen of America, a part of I Corinthians 15 is used, but this is omitted: “the second man is the Lord from heaven.” Christ has no part in the system. On the ground of his being in this secret Lodge, and not on the ground of anything done for him by the Saviour of sinners, the departed Lodge member is declared to “live in the eternal glories of his Maker.”

Hostility is thus declared to the gospel of Jesus Christ. Worldly men have organized Lodges with their oath-bound secrets, making the claim that faithful membership in them will result in final salvation in heaven.

At the installation of officers in a Rebekah Lodge, the following prayer is ordered in the ritual to be offered: "Almighty and ever living God, we humbly beseech Thee to bless the work in which we have been engaged. Preserve, O Heavenly Father, the Order of which we are members. Aid us in the good work of benevolence and charity to which we are pledged, and give direction and success to our efforts. Bless, we pray Thee, the members who have been selected as officers of the Lodge. Endow them with Thy Spirit and Thy wisdom. Let thy protecting care be over them. Guide them, by Thy power, in the way everlasting. Direct us, O Lord, in all our doings, with Thy most gracious favor, **and that in all our works, begun, continued, and ended in Thee, we may glorify Thy holy name, and finally by Thy mercy, obtain life everlasting. Amen.**"

This prayer is not offered for Christ's sake, and there is no reference made to Christ's service in it. The idea is plainly prominent that the Lodge work and fidelity to the Lodge is the course that leads to everlasting. **These secret organization set aside the divine plan of salvation, and substitute in its place mere moral teachings and Lodge fidelity, which are exemplified and enforced by material symbols.** The Atonement of Christ, the regenerating work of the Holy Spirit, and the experience of the child of God, are all wholly unknown to this human religion. The tendency of lodge teaching and ceremonies is to lead man to trust in his own miserable, paltry self-righteousness, for his final acceptance with God.

Jesus said, "If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, take up the cross, and follow me." Matthew 16:24. No one is following Christ by taking on himself the oath-bound obligations of secrecy in a human Lodge, in the professed brotherhood of all classes of men, where the name of Christ is not named and his work in the salvation of his people is wholly unknown, and where false religious teaching abounds in the ceremonies and prayers and doctrinal principles that have been framed by people of the world.

When we were young we attended a burial service conducted by the Freemasons. A neighbor, who participated, asked us what we thought of it. We were not slow in telling him. Wicked men led and united in that religious service with a few who were good. "So mote it be" was drawled out repeatedly with hypocritical solemnity by the non-professing, even by some of the most wicked men in the community. How any who have any sense of reverence for the Lord's holy name can endure such mockery, we are unable to understand.

We here insert the second night's experience in a Masonic lodge room, of a Methodist minister, M. L. Haney, as told by him in his work, *The Story of my Life*. "Next lodge night came round, and I, as a new convert, was on hand. I got my little apron, and sat down to take in the excellencies of my new brotherhood. I had not been seated long when the Holy Spirit suggested that I look around, and see my brethren. I slowly and thoughtfully scanned the whole circle; and to my surprise,

there were the most profane in the city—drunk-ards, and vile characters—mixed up with a few good men. Having made the survey, and considered the heart relations into which I was brought with these characters, the Holy Spirit, as by a pen of fire, wrote these works upon my heart: “Come out from among them, and *be ye separate*, saith the Lord.’ I tarried not to confer with flesh and blood, but obeyed the heavenly vision, and at the earliest opening let those dear souls know that I could not stay with them and go with God; took off my little apron, and have never seen it since.”

There is a high claim made by the standard authors of the Masonic Fraternity, that initiation into that order is death to the world and resurrection to a new life.

We insist upon particular attention being given to the following from pages 20 and 21, *Manual of the Lodge*, by Mackey: “The Lodge is, then at the time of the reception of the Entered Apprentice, a symbol of the world, and the initiation is a type of the new life upon which the candidate is about to enter. There he stands, without our portals, on the threshold of this new Masonic life, in darkness, helplessness and ignorance. Having been wandering amid the errors and covered over with the pollutions of the outer and profane world, he comes inquiringly to our doors, seeking the new birth, and asking a withdrawal of the veil which conceals divine truth from his uninitiated sight. And there, as with Moses at the burning bush, the solemn admonition is given, ‘Put off thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground;’ and ceremonial preparations surround him, all of a significant character, to indicate to him that some great change is about to take place in his moral and intellectual condition. He is already beginning to discover that the design of Masonry is to introduce him to new views of life and its duties. He is, indeed, to commence new lessons in a new school. There is to be, not simply a change for the future, but also an extinction of the past; **for initiation is, as it were, a death to the world and a resurrection to a new life.**”

Read this again, Christian professor, and answer this question, *Can you afford to belong to such an order?* You may say you do not have to subscribe to all its teachings and everything its authors may have written. **But your affiliation with it and participation in its deistic, Christless religion is a subscription to its heretical literature.** If you say you do not subscribe to the teaching of this human society and still hold membership in it and patronize its lodge meetings, your actions contradict your statement. We will give two more extracts.

“In the Ancient Mysteries the aspirant was always kept for a certain period in a condition of darkness. Applied to Masonic symbolism, it is intended to remind the candidate of his ignorance, which Masonry is to enlighten; of his evil nature, which Masonry is to purify; of the world, in whose obscurity he has been wandering, and from which Masonry is to rescue him.” *Mackey’s Manual of the Lodge*, pages 38, 39.

It is the religious doctrine of this human, oath-bound society, as stated by its recognized standard author, that a man, before he becomes a Mason, is wandering in the darkest obscurity of ignorance and in the evil of his nature, and that Masonry will rescue him from his ignorance and wash away the evil of his nature. **This explains why Christ is left out of the entire religious system of Masonry.** From this some astonishing inferences might be drawn as to the irretrievable state of women, children, old men, cripples, and others who cannot get into this *mystical*, pagan order. Let the reader draw them.

“The members of our society at this day, in the third stage of Masonry, confess themselves to be christians, ‘The veil of the temple is rent,’ the builder is smitten, and we are raised from the tomb of transgression.” *Robert Macoy’s General History, Cyclopedia and Dictionary of Freemasonry.*

These statements are not utterances of opposition; they are published declarations of the standard Freemason authors, and are sent forth as instruction to its members in the doctrinal principles of the order. Will our friends among the Masons who may read this book appreciate our efforts to lay these facts before them, and if possible to induce them to break away from this unholy alliance? Surely none of them will think less of us for it.

It may be held by some, in fact we have heard it assumed, that Albert G. Mackey, and Robert Macoy, and Cornelius Moore, and other recognized Masonic authors, are themselves conditionalists, and so may have written from their own viewpoint. But what they have written has never been disputed by any Masonic work. So their books on Freemasonry stand as the true exponent of the doctrine of Masonry. Besides this is exemplified in the ceremonies and prayers of the order. It is the most degrading of heresies.

Chapter 8: Oath-Bound Secretism: Oath-bound secretism is not right, whether it be for bad or for good. If it be for bad purposes, it is not right. All will agree to this. If it be for good purposes it is not right, for good purposes ought not to be secreted. Men in secret lodges do not let the good they are pretending to do there shine out. They cannot, for they are sworn under severe penalties not to do so. They occupy second or third stories, blind the windows and curtain the doors, allowing no one to come in unless he obligates himself in advance not to reveal a thing that is done inside. Assuming that every secret lodge is doing good, how is any one to know of the good done in the them? By paying the initiation fee and taking a solemn oath not to reveal what he is afterwards to find out about the secrets of the lodge! In swearing he does not know what he is swearing to. He is paying for a privilege and swearing to what he does not know in order to enjoy the privilege. **It is like paying a fee to sign a contract and then giving affidavit to the contract before one knows what the contract is!**

This is an utter disregard for the example of Christ. When asked in his trial by the high priest concerning his disciples and his doctrine the lowly Jesus replied, "I spake openly to the world; I ever taught in the synagogue and in the temple; and in secret have I said nothing." John 18:20. **Thus the founder of the Christian religion and the religion he founded are continually open to the closest and fairest inspection and investigation.**

Sworn secretism as practiced by the lodges is not only an utter disregard the example of Jesus, it is open violation of his express command. The children of God are called children of the day, and not of the night. For that reason they are commanded not to put their light under a bushel, but to let it shine out. **In violation of this the member admitted into a secret lodge dares not tell his own wife and children what he has seen and heard and learned in the lodge.** Suppose, after being initiated, he returns home to his family at a late hour of the night, and is asked by his devoted wife, "Was there anything bad or ridiculous in the proceedings?" "No," he answers, "it was all good and solemn." Well, if there was nothing bad or ridiculous in what was done, and all that transpired was good and solemn, tell me all about it." "No," he replies, "I cannot tell you anything." "Why can you not tell me, that I may also know the good there is in it?" "Oh, I was sworn not to tell anything, under a severe penalty. So I cannot tell even you."

Has God ever authorized such a bar to be raised between a husband and his wife? Has he not declared, "What God hath joined together, let not man put asunder?" He has never authorized or sanctioned the locking up of that which is good from our fellowmen in profound secrecy. **The whole principle of secretism as practiced by the Lodges is anti-christian, and the whole principle of the Christian religion is anti-secret.** The one belongs to the kingdom of light, the other to the kingdom of darkness. The one is from heaven, the other from this sinful world. **Both are religious, but their religions are wholly incompatible.**

In the lodges of secret societies two things are strictly insisted upon; vis. *secrecy* and *obedience*. When once initiated under the oath-bound fetters of a secret Lodge a man throws away his liberty and becomes the tied servant of a heretical, human order, heretical in all of its religious principles and purely human in its origin, organism and design. We remember Jesus says, "A corrupt tree cannot bring forth good fruit," and we candidly believe he is right.

We raise a question here for all to think about. Why should organizations for the pretended purpose of benefitting mankind be secret orders and bind all their members to perpetual secrecy? Counterfeiters work in secret, and everybody knows why. Thieves form their plans and carry out their operations in secret, and the reason is plain. Men who plot treason against governments do their work in the dark, and all understand. But why should societies claiming to be benevolent, so carefully guard their *secrets*? Let no one misunderstand us here. We are not classing Freemasons, Odd-Fellows, Knights of Pythias, etc., with

counterfeiters, thieves and anarchists. Not at all are we. We are simply asking why they should try so hard to keep their operations secret.

The false religious principles of secret societies, which we have proved to be the very platform on which they are based, and which no honest informed person will deny, furnish sufficient reason why any Christian professor should not belong to them, and *especially any Primitive Baptist*. Secretism, such secretism as they attempt, stands as an additional reason why *no one* should belong to them.

“Have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove them.”

Chapter 9: Charity: Charity is that disposition of the heart which inclines men to think favorably toward their fellowmen, and do them good. It means especially liberality and benevolence toward the poor. Charity, in its highest sense, is a divine principle. There is a distinction between human and divine charity. Human charity is but natural, while Divine charity is spiritual in its nature. This word, as used a number of times in I Corinthians 13, is from the Greek word *agape*, which means love. In this lesson it means the love of God in the heart of a Christian. This is Divine charity, which none possess but those who are born again, or born of God.

In this chapter we want to be understood as referring to human charity, that which is natural to man. A disposition to be charitable in this sense is very commendable. This principle of liberality and benevolence was once much more universally prevalent than now. Our fathers have told us of the good feeling that prevailed in the days of their youth, and we who are now fathers remember how it was when we were young. We have lived to see this noble principle dwindle down till it is almost undiscoverable now. The blaze has become so small that it is nearly down to a spark.

It seems to be an effort to remove the taint of secrecy that secret societies offer the plea of charitableness. They claim to be charitable institutions. Most lodges throw out this bait to those men whose oaths, and money, and influence they wish to secure. Provision for sick and death benefits form part of the bait. This is very tempting bait, and many are caught by it. We are all liable to sickness, and it is good when one gets sick to have proper attention and help. But is it an act of charity when lodge members who are obligated by oath to do so, wait upon a sick man who has paid his fee to get into the lodge and has kept his dues paid up to secure for himself such benefits? Far from it. Those who call this charity do not know the meaning of the word. We heard a member of the Odd-Fellow society say once that he had joined that order because he wanted to be cared for if he got sick. He said that in a spell of sickness before he became a member no one gave him any attention. It is too bad to have to buy *friends*. But are they real friends if they have to be bought? Is their attention in times of need a matter of charity? We leave this question to the sound thinking.

Nearly all secret societies are for men. Men only are allowed to join them. Men who are old, and men who have serious physical defects are not admitted. Also men who happen to be too poor to pay their fees of initiation and keep up their regular dues after their initiation are not taken in. Is that charitable? Does charity confine itself to those who are in a condition to need little or no help? Those who get in and then fail to keep up their dues are dropped out and lose all the benefit for which they paid when they entered. Is that charity? It might be termed a matter of business, but it is not charity.

Some orders pay out sums annually to their members in pursuance to an agreement, but no order pays out more that it collects from its members. So that is not charity. If a widow receives one, two or three thousand dollars after her husband's death, because her husband was a lodge member and kept up his dues, that is not a donation of charity at all. More may be paid to the widow than her husband paid in, but more is not paid to widows than is paid in by all the members. In addition to what is paid out as sick benefits and death dues and other helpful purposes, grand and costly temples are erected, and vast sums of money is expended for vain display, all coming from the pockets of the members. And these societies are called charitable!

The dying out of the principle of charity in the human race today is mainly due to secret societies and insurance companies. If one gets sick now it is supposed by his neighbors that he is a member of some lodge that will take care of him, or that he has an accident insurance or an insurance to cover loss from sickness, and so no interest is taken in his case. If he does not belong to an order, or if his life is not insured, it is thought he has been willfully negligent, and so he gets no sympathy. The poor must share with the rich in this deplorable state of affairs. Our churches are affected by this so that they fail to do their duty toward their needy members and the poor that surround them. Money is paid into oath-bound secret societies, the religion of which is deistic and Christless as we have seen, that ought to be put into the church for purposes of pure charity. These societies pay no attention as a rule to the poor and the needy, while the church invites to sweet fellowship the poor, the blind, the deaf, the lame, without money and without price. Would it not be far better for all church members who pay in their dues to secret societies to withdraw from those orders and pay what they have to spare into the church of Jesus Christ that its influence for charity may be known to all men? Would it not be better to help the cause of Christ than to help the societies of the world?

Help due from lodges, so far from being a matter of charity, often comes grudgingly and is sometimes refused. The following is from a Lebanon, Ind., paper: "William C. Burk, of Thorntown, has brought suit against Thorntown Lodge, No. 124, Knights of Pythias, to enforce the payment of \$126, which he claims is due him from the lodge's nurse fund as a result of eighty-four days' illness, during which

time he required the services of a nurse. Mr. Burk alleges the lodge has refused to take action on his claim. Artman & Smith are his attorneys.”

Chapter 10: High Sounding Titles, and Oaths: We entertain no feeling of hostility toward members of secret societies. Some of them, as we have said, are among our best and most valued friends. We do not aim to be harsh and unkind in this work. Plainness, but gentleness and firmness are aimed at, and any seeming departure from these is of the head and not of the heart. In our opinion the titles, claims, rites and ceremonies and oaths of secret orders, are incompatible with the genius of the sweet, open, frank gospel of Jesus and his spiritual kingdom. We hold it to be our inalienable right to show our opinion, and we are trying to do so in the spirit of love.

Secret societies display the very opposite of the humble spirit of Christianity. The spirit of these societies stands out in bold contrast to the meek spirit of that holy religion. Jesus made himself of no reputation, and his true followers seek not exaltation. The tendency of the work of grace in the heart is to humble the subjects of it, while the tendency of the world’s religion is the very opposite. Of himself the Master said, “I am meek and lowly in heart.” He said his kingdom came not with observation; that is, it was of such a meek and quiet character, so different from what the men of the world did not recognize it or observe it when it came. How different it is with these worldly, men-made, secret orders!

The title of the chief presiding officer in a Masonic Lodge is “Worshipful Master.” **Worshipful, worthy of worship, we suppose. It is sinful to pay such reverence to man.** An organization which confers upon its officials the right to claim such reverence is anti-Christian. *Master, one to be obeyed.* Obedience to man, in this sense, is forbidden by the Savior. It was for this reason that he censured the Scribes and Pharisees. “They love the uppermost seats in the synagogues, and greetings in the markets, and to be called Rabbi, Rabbi. But be ye not called Rabbi; for one is your Master, even Christ. * * * Neither be ye called Masters; for one is your Master, even Christ.” Matthew 23:6-10. What he said concerning these Scribes and Pharisees would have applied to *worshipful Grand Masters*, if speculative Masonry had then existed as now.

In the Freemason Lodge are Deacons, Senior and Junior; Wardens, Senior and Junior; besides Tyler, Secretary and Treasurer. These are pledged to observe the *will* and *pleasure* of the “Worshipful Grand Master,” and they have their seats arranged in a certain order, the whole being intended to represent a worshiping court rendering obeisance to the secret, oath-bound institution, that is purely human in its origin and in all that pertains to it. In the midst of all stands the altar, with the open Bible placed upon it, over which lie the square and compass.

The Worshipful Master is seated in the east, the reason being, “as the sun rises in the east to open and adorn the day, so presides the Worshipful Master in the east to open

and adorn the Lodge, set his crafts to work with good and wholesome laws, or cause this to be done.”

The Junior Warden’s place is in the south, for the explained reason that, “as the sun in the south at high meridian is the beauty and glory of the day, so stands the Junior Warden in the south, the better to observe the time, call the crafts from labor to refreshment, superintend them during hours thereof, see that none convert the hours of refreshment into that of intemperance or excess; and call them out again in due season, that the Worshipful Master may have honor, and profit and pleasure thereby.”

The Senior Warden’s position is in the west, for the following reason: “As the sun sets in the west to close the day, so stands the Senior Warden in the west to assist the Worshipful Master in opening the Lodge, take care of the jewels and implements, see that none be lost, pay the craft their wages, if any be due, and see that none go away dissatisfied.”

The Junior Deacon’s place is at the right hand of the Senior Warden in the west; the Senior Deacon’s place is at the right hand of the Worshipful Master in the east; the Secretary’s place is at the left hand of the Worshipful Master, and the Treasurer’s place at his right hand.

The Worshipful Master’s will and pleasure is to be observed by all, and strict observance to what is termed the *Ancient Constitutions* of the order is expected to be adhered to. **This all shows the religion of the order to be of a Pagan type. Superstitions and idolatry pervade the whole service.** Christians ought not to engage with wicked men in such a religious sham. All the advantages claimed for such a society may be obtained in ways that are far less objectionable. Connection with them is a grief to many of the humble followers of Christ, and all can readily see that connection and affiliation with such an order is, to say the least, of a very questionable character. We are sure that for these and many more reasons the better and safer way is to avoid connection with them altogether.

The highest official in a lodge of Independent Order of Odd-Fellows is *The Noble Grand*. It is considered a distinction of which a member may be reasonably proud. “By the laws of the Order he is required to support and maintain the rules and regulations of those bodies of which his Lodge is subordinate, and to enforce strict adherence to the laws of his own Lodge.” Next to the *Noble Grand* is the *Vice Grand*. Then there are Conductors, Wardens, Guardians, and Supporters, with Secretaries and Treasures. In the Degree Lodges are the High Priest and Deputy High Priest. In the Subordinate Encampments are the Chief-Patriarch, Senior and Junior Warden, Scribe and Treasurer. The Grand Encampments have their Grand-Patriarchs, Grand High Priests, and many other *Grand* officers. The high-sounding titles are often employed, “Most Worthy Grand-Master,” “Right Worthy Grand-Secretary,” “Right Worthy Grand-Scribe,” etc.

The religion and religious service of the I. O. O. F. Lodge, like the Masonic Lodge, are of a pagan, deistic nature. To be bound up by oath in such an organization is not to be separate from the world as the Bible enjoins Christians to be. Such an entanglement with the world is therefore, in positive and direct disobedience to what the Bible requires. "Come out from among them, and be ye separate," is written in the word of God, and addresses the children of the Most High who are under the oath-bound fetters of such false religious orders of the world. There can be no mistake about it.

The officers of a subordinate Lodge of Knights of Pythias are, Chancellor Commander, Vice Chancellor, Prelate, Master of the Work, Master of Exchequer, Master at Arms, Inner Guard, and Outer Guard. In the Lodge Room the open Bible is placed on a triangular shaped altar, which is denominated the *Book of Law*, and on the Bible lies two crossed swords. The ritualist prayers and ceremonies of the secret order is Christless as we have seen. Like the Masonic order and the order of Odd-Fellows, it is a deistic organization, partaking of the nature of Paganism.

In the middle of the room of a Lodge of Modern Woodmen stands an urn instead of an altar. Into this urn the *Neighbors*, as the members of the order are termed, are required to drop a pebble, either white or black. A white pebble expresses happiness, and a black pebble expresses sorrow. This is said to be taken from an ancient custom of the Thracians, who, every evening before they slept, were accustomed to drop a white pebble in an urn if the day had been to them a pleasant one, but if it had not, they dropped a black pebble. At death it could be told by counting these pebbles whether or not their lives had been delightfully or ill spent. See what foolish customs are seized upon for the practice of modern lodges!

The officers M. W. Of A. Are Consul, Escort, Adviser, Banker, Clerk, Watchman, Chief Forester, Forest Patriarch, etc. Then there are Foresters who play their part in the silly performances. The officers are honored by the term *Venerable*; as, *Venerable Consul*.

The following funeral anthem shows how the members of this order are taught to look upon the state of their members after death, all because they have been true to the secret order.

Among the dead our Neighbor sleeps,
His life was rounded true and well;
And love in bitter sorrow weeps,
About his dark and silent cell.

No pain, no anxious, sleepless fear,
Invades his house; no mortal woes
His mortal resting place draws near,

To trouble his serene repose.

His name engraven on the stone,
That friendship's tears will often wet,
But each true Neighbor's heart upon
That name is stamped more deeply yet.

So let him sleep that dreamless sleep,
Our sorrows clustering 'round his head;
Be comforted, ye loved, who weep!
He lives with God; he is not dead.

It is understood by this that his standing as a *Neighbor* in this secret Lodge has insured his happy state with God. He may have been wicked, as many of them are, yet this, or something like it, is sung over his remains by some who, like him, make no profession of religion at all. No thanks to Christ for his "secret repose," for his "dreamless sleep," for his not being dead. It resembles the others in this respect. The vilest of earth may have a standing in it. The wicked do have a standing there. Is it right for Christians to fellowship or patronize such an institution? It is the worst of folly to say it is.

In a Lodge of Ancient Order of United Workman, the presiding officer, Guide, Overseer, Foreman, Recorder, Financier, Past Master Workman, Inside and Outside Watchman. Then there are the Grand and Supreme Lodge officers; as, Grand Master Workman. An altar stands in the midst at which the *Grand Honors* are received, the Bible playing a hypocritical part in the proceedings.

The world may call these things *Grand*, and of this the wicked world may freely partake, but a Christian who thinks anything of his profession should certainly stand aloof from such mockery. It is natural for the world to love its own and hate what is pleasing to the Lord. But how can one love the Lord and, at the same time, love that which the world loves so much?

We need not take the space to speak of the high claims and titles of the other orders. There is a similarity pervading them all. We have not mentioned the *Druids*, the *Elks*, the *Eagles*, and scores of others. We hope any of them who may read this book will not feel slighted. The United Ancient Order of Druids sprang from a club organized in London, England, about 1718. Its branches or lodges are called *Groves*. A *Grove* was instituted in New York in 1833, which became the parent of the society in America. The name came from an ancient order of Priests of Celts of Gaul and Britain and Germany, a heathen order, one of whose religious characters was the sacrifice of human life. A Supreme body was finally organized under the name *Grand Grove of the United States of the United Ancient Order of Druids*. What a high-sounding title! The *Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks*, a secret society after the pattern of the others somewhat, was founded by members of the

theatrical profession in New York city in 1868, but now men in all professions and occupations are admitted. We shall make no more mention of the *Eagles*, and perhaps ought to ask to be excused for even speaking of that order at all.

Some of the oaths taken by candidates for initiation into the lodges of secret orders are most dreadful, especially the ones required to be taken for admission into the different degrees of Freemasons. The candidate for admission to the degree of Entered Apprentice is prepared by being stripped to his shirt and drawers, blindfolded, his left foot bare, a slipper on his right foot, his left breast and arm naked, and a rope called a Cable-tow around his left arm and neck. After certain ceremonies, he is required to kneel on his left knee, put his left hand under the Bible and square and compass, and his right hand on them. In this position he takes a long oath of secrecy, binding himself under no less penalty than that of having his throat cut across, his tongue torn out by the roots, and his body buried in the rough sands of the sea at low watermark, where the tide ebbs and flows twice in twenty-four hours. "So help me God," he adds, "and keep me steadfast in the due performance of the same."

This oath begins thus: "I _____, of my own free will and accord, in the presence of Almighty God and the Worshipful Lodge, erected to him and dedicated to the Holy Saints John, do hereby and hereon, most sincerely promise and swear," etc. Now we claim that such a use of the name of Almighty God, in connection with the *Worshipful Lodge*, and calling upon that holy one to help keep such an oath as that, is nothing short of base profanity. Surely it is taking his holy name in vain, and "the Lord will not hold him guiltless that taketh his name in vain." Exodus 20:7. Are we right in our opinion? Let considerate men judge.

The Candidate for admission to the Fellow Craft Degree, a higher degree of Masonry, begins his oath with the same language, and concludes with these words: "Binding myself under no less penalty than that of having my left breast torn open, my heart plucked out and given as a prey to the beasts of the field and fowls of the air, should I ever knowingly violate this my solemn obligation of a Fellow Craft Mason. So help me God, and keep me steadfast in the due performance of the same."

The oath taken by a candidate for admission to the higher degree, that of Master Mason, is more lengthy and more ridiculous than the two mentioned. It begins the same way, and concludes by naming the following penalty: "Binding myself under no less penalty than that of having my body severed in twain, my bowels taken from thence and burned to ashes, and the ashes scattered to the four winds of heaven, that no more trace or remembrance may be had of so vile a wretch as I, should I knowingly violate this my solemn obligation as a Master Mason. So help me God, and keep me steadfast in the due performance of the same."

In taking the oath of Fellow Craft, the candidate kneels on the right knee, and the oath of Master Mason is taken with the candidate standing on both knees. In each case the candidate is hoodwinked or blindfolded. In the initiation of a Master Mason the awful play of the murder of *Hiram Abiff* is enacted. Frightful scenes are gone through with in these ceremonies.

The Past Master invokes the penalty of having his “tongue split from tip to roots.” The Most Excellent Master swears to have his “heart taken out and exposed to rot on a dunghill.” The Royal Arch Mason takes an oath to have his “skull smote off and his brain exposed to the meridian sun.” These are a few of the penalties which we give as samples.

We have not space in this small work to go into the secret ceremonies of the other orders, nor is it necessary. They are not generally so objectionable as those taken by candidates for admission to the different degrees of Masonry, but in all of them a solemn promise is made, pledging obedience to unknown superiors, and pledging never to reveal the secrets of the order.

Chapter 11: Come Out From Among Them: We now come to a final appeal. We are sure it is an appeal of love for God’s people who may be bound up under the fetters of oath-bound orders. This appeal will not be heeded by all who may read this, who should come out and stay out. But may we not hope it will be heeded by some? God grant that it may. “Come out from among them, and be ye separate.” II Corinthians 6:17. This is an appeal from the word of God, addressed to all who are entangled in an unholy alliance with the world. Will this not be heeded by such as love the Lord and want to obey him?

Separation from the world, such as real Christianity requires, is utterly impossible so long as fellowship is held in the brotherhood of Secret Societies. It will hardly be disputed by any that these societies belong to the world. It will not be pretended that they are of Divine origin. This will not be claimed even by their most ardent votaries. In this world only, they have their origin, from which come the principles that underlie their organizations. Their morality and benevolence, their aims and ends, are worldly. Their religion, as we have seen, is of the world, and is basely false. Their membership is predominantly made up of people that are worldly, people who make no pretensions to religion other than the false religion of the orders. Jews, pagans, infidels, Mohammedans, ungodly and wicked—these stand equally with Christians, in equally good standing in this religious, hypocritical brotherhood. Is this not being “unequally yoked together with unbelievers?” Surely it is. National Israel was most positively forbidden to enter into any alliance with the surrounding nations, and disregard of this express command became the most fruitful source of corruption and consequent calamity to that nation. This principle applies to the church of Christ today. The beloved, loving John says, “We know that we are of God, and the whole world lieth in wickedness.” I John 5:19.

“The whole world lieth in the wicked one,” is the literal translation from the Greek. Now we know that the true church is of God. Since the whole world lies in the wicked one, and since all Secret Orders are of the world, do we not know that they all lie in the wicked one? “What fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness, and what communion hath light with darkness? And what concord hath Christ with Belial? Or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel? and what agreement hath the temple of God with idols: for ye are the temple of the living God,” II Corinthians 6:14-16. This sets forth in strong language the attitude the church should maintain toward the Secret Societies of the world.

It is the duty of members of the church of Christ to stand in an attitude of uncompromising hostility to worldly societies. They should do this in order to preserve their freedom from their corrupting influences and to maintain a perpetual testimony against their evils. The word of God is the voice of duty and the voice of wisdom. It says, “Have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove them.” Ephesians 5:11. It is only by obeying that voice that we can keep ourselves unspotted from the world.

Let us suppose (what will never be) that the unworthy writer were a member of a Secret Order, tied up in such an unholy alliance with the world. On Sunday he preaches salvation by grace through Jesus Christ, wholly independent of conditions to be performed by man. A *brother* in the Lodge dies. He attends the funeral as an official in the *brotherhood*, and reads from his little book a prayer containing this remarkable statement: “And at last, Great parent of the Universe, * * * * may we be enabled to ‘work an entrance’ into the Celestial Lodge above, and in thy glorious presence, amidst the ineffable mysteries, enjoy a union with the souls of our departed friends, perfect as the happiness of heaven, and durable as the eternity of God. Amen.”

“So mote it be,” escapes the lips of a number of men of the world, some of whom are basely wicked. Christ’s name is not mentioned. He plays no part in the system whatever. Who is so blind as to be unable to see the inconsistency of such? Would the members of his church, even Lodge members, be pleased with such inconsistency? Suppose, then, that an *entered apprentice* is to be initiated, and he reads a prayer as an official in the Lodge on that occasion, containing the following false petition: “And may he and we regulate our actions by the light of revealed truth, and so construct our spiritual edifice, that when done laboring as apprentices in this lower temple, we may be raised to the sublime enjoyments of the upper sanctuary in that temple not made with hands, eternal in the heavens, whose maker and builder is God. Amen.”

What confidence could any sound thinking one have in him after hearing him preach in the pulpit, and then offer such a false, ridiculous petition? Suppose he were to be lecturing the members of his lodge, teaching them the principles of the order, and should quote from the writings of a prominent author of the Society,

Macoy, “The definitions of Freemasonry have been numerous, and they all unite in declaring it to be a system of morality, by the practice of which its members may advance their spiritual interests, and mount the theological ladder from the Lodge on earth to the Lodge in heaven.” Who would ever want to hear him preach after that?

Can any one blame us for saying that will never be? Are we not setting a good example, in this respect at least, to all who love and hold to the truth? No one can deny that we are. Then let all follow that example. Oh, come out from the world, you who have been deceived and enticed into such societies. They are wholly inconsistent with the genius and spirit of Christianity. “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,” James 4:4. This is very strong language, but it is not ours; it is the word of God. To hold membership in an oath-bound secret order is to show friendship to the world in a way that is positively forbidden in the Word of God. Such societies are no real benefit to the world even, but if the world will have them, let them have them.

“Wherefore, come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing; and I will receive you, and ye shall be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty.”

Selah

SELAH The word *Selah*, which occurs so often in some of the Psalms, and in the prayer of the prophet Habakkuk, which may itself be called a Psalm, has been variously interpreted by the learned, and it is probable that in our ignorance of ancient forms of music, we have no means of coming to a certainty as to its meaning. But what cannot be explained in words may be understood by the heart. There are “songs without words,” which reveal themselves to the sympathetic mind without need of comment, and thus the *Selah*, —the holy pause of the Psalmist, coming after some great truth, or some fresh discovery, requires nothing more.

The voice rests; perhaps the harp or the psaltery goes on to repeat in a solemn symphony the latest measure sung to its accompaniment, and our hearts, responding with an inward assent to the truth of God, feel that *Selah* is our “Amen. So let it be.”

There are three *Selah* pauses in Psalms 3. Let us examine them as the examples of the times when such notes occur. In the second verse:—“Many there be which say of my soul. There is no help for him in God. *Selah*.” This is the *Selah* of wonder.

The child of God starts in amazement at the bare thought of such blasphemy against his God and his father. No help for him in God! His tongue is hushed, his harp is silent with astonishment. He pauses awhile in horror. Then, gathering up his strength, he breaks forth into a burst of holy confidence. "But thou, O Lord, art a shield for me; my glory, and the lifter up of mine head;"—a truth to which his own experience bears witness. "I cried unto the Lord with my voice, and he heard me out of his holy hill. Selah." This is the *Selah* of praise.

Again the voice of the Psalmist in his song pauses, and we seem to see the eye of the singer raised in mute adoration. From his own experience he is led to a grand general truth, and in the last verse he cries, "salvation belongeth unto the Lord; thy blessing is upon they people. Selah." This is the *Selah* of triumph. He began with complaint, but ends with victory."
(From the Gospel Standard, reprinted in Zion's Advocate Sept. 1898)

Semi-Pelagianism

SEMI-PELAGIANISM *(See under PELAGIANISM)*

Servetus, Michael

Michael SERVETUS *(See under John CALVIN)*

Shiloh

SHILOH *(See under JUDAH)*

Simmons, Menno

Menno SIMMONS *(See under MENNO SIMMONS)*

Sin Unto Death, The

The SIN Unto Death: Harold Hunt: I John 5:16-17, "If any man see his brother sin a sin, which is not unto death, he shall ask, and he shall give him life for them that sin not unto death; *there is a sin unto death*; I do not say that he shall pray for it. All unrighteousness is sin, and there is a sin not unto death."

There is a balance of truth, and sometimes we can emphasize one aspect of truth to the neglect of another, equally important, aspect of truth, and we give people an entirely wrong impression. The Bible teaches very clearly—as clearly as language can make it—that the child of God is eternally secure in Him, and that there is nothing in this world that can separate him from the love of God that is in Christ Jesus.

In Romans 8:35-39, Paul lists all sorts of things—everything the mind can imagine—and shows that none of those things can separate the child of God from the love of God. There is no possibility that any child of God will lose what God has prepared for him in heaven. There is no possibility that anything will ever separate one of his from his love.

But it is possible, and it very often does happen, that a child of God loses everything that is worth having *this side of the grave*. He will not lose anything on the other side; but it is possible for the child of God to lose everything that is worth having in this life.

Sometimes a person can tell the truth, and yet tell it in such manner as to give people an entirely false impression. Sometimes, in talking about the security of the child of God, we state that doctrine in such a way that people get a wrong idea as to what we are saying. Sometimes we say it this way. I have said it this way; I try not to say it this way any more, but I have said it in the past. Sometimes we say that if the child of God does not walk in the pathway of obedience, if he does not believe the truth, and abide in the truth, he will not lose his home in eternal heaven; *all he loses* is the joys and benefits of this life. Well, that statement is true. If a child of God does not walk in the pathway of obedience, he does not lose anything in eternal heaven; all he loses is the joys and benefits that would have been his in this life.

But when we phrase it in that way, I am afraid that we leave the impression that that is not very much to lose. I think it is better if we say that what the disobedient child of God loses is *everything that is worth having this side of the grave*. We do not stand to lose our home in that eternal city; but we do stand to lose ever so much, and in this booklet, I would like for us to look at some things the Bible says about that.

In this passage John says, “any man see his brother sin a sin which is not unto death, he shall ask, and he shall give him life for them that sin not unto death.” He goes on to say, “There is a sin unto death; I do not say that he shall pray for it.” Very nearly all of my life, I have heard people wrestle with the question, “What is the sin unto death?” I believe the Bible makes it clear enough, and if

the Lord will assist me, I would like for us to notice what the Bible says about that subject.

Generally, when you mention the sin unto death, somebody wants to identify a particular offense, and say, “This sin is the sin unto death.” Somebody says the sin of adultery is the sin unto death. Somebody else says the sin of fornication, or the sin of murder, or some other heinous offense is the sin unto death. Now those are wicked sins, and we could spend the entire time talking about what terrible sins those are, and the great consequences that they bring upon the child of God. But when the apostle says, “There is a sin unto death,” He is not talking about any particular, nameable offense, such as adultery, fornication, drunkenness, murder, and so on. He says that “there is A sin unto death,” but in the next verse he goes on to say, “There is A sin not unto death.” Do you see, if you try to narrow that sin unto death down to *just one nameable offense*, you are, by your own argument, left with *just one offense* that is not unto death, and I don’t know anybody who believes that.

Well, before we go any farther, what is that sin unto death that John was talking about? It is simply this: The sin unto death is any offense that you commit—that you persist in—until God totally, and finally, and irreversibly cuts you off from the joys and benefits that might have been yours in this life in such manner that there is no reversal, no reinstatement, and you will never again, from that day forward, enjoy what you might have enjoyed had you walked in the pathway of obedience.

And we will notice in just a few pages, if the Lord will bless us that that offense, very often, is something that you might not have expected it to be. Let me say it again. What is the sin unto death? It is any offense in which you persist in—which you continue in—until God totally, finally, and irreversibly cuts you off, and sets you adrift—as far as this world is concerned—so that there is no prospect, no hope, no possibility, that you will ever again be restored to the joy that you might have had here in this life.

You are still a child of God. Heaven is still your home. God chose you; Christ died for you; he has quickened you by his Spirit from a state of death in sin to a state of life in Christ Jesus—and yet you have made shipwreck of your life—and there is no possibility that you will ever have what you might otherwise have had.

The Lord gives us several illustrations of that. Matthew 21:18-20, “Now in the morning as he returned into the city, he hungered, and when he saw a fig tree in the way, he came to it, and found nothing thereon, but leaves only, and said unto

it, Let no fruit grow on thee from henceforth forever, and presently the fig tree withered away. And when the disciples saw it, they marveled, saying, How soon is the fig tree withered away.” Now bear in mind that this was a good plant, a good tree.

A good tree brings forth good fruit. A corrupt tree cannot bring forth good fruit. So this tree was capable of bringing forth good fruit. This tree is symbolic of a child of God, who is not bearing the fruit that he ought to bear. The Lord hungered, he looked for food on this tree, he came to it, and found no fruit thereon, but leaves only, and he said unto it, “Let no fruit grow on thee henceforth, *forever*.” Now bear in mind that it was a good tree. It was capable of bearing good fruit. It did not; the judgment of God fell upon it, and let me ask you: How long do you believe that it is going to be until this tree bears good fruit?

“Let no fruit grow on thee henceforward *forever*.” That is long enough, is it not? *Never again will this tree bear the fruit it might have borne.* This tree might at one time have borne that fruit, but now the judgment of God rests upon it, because it did not bear fruit, and now, there is no possibility that this tree will ever again be the fruitful tree that it might have been.

Let’s look at another illustration. In the twenty-fifth chapter, of Matthew , beginning at the fourteenth verse (Matthew 25:14), “The kingdom of heaven is as a man traveling into a far country, who called his own servants, and delivered unto them his goods.” You remember the story. There were three servants. To one servant he delivered five talents, to another servant, two talents, and to another servant one talent. The man with five talents went out and worked with them, and doubled what he had. He gained five talents. The man with two talents went out, and with what he had to work with, he did the same thing. He doubled what he had. He gained two talents. Not all of us have the same capacity. God does not require me to use your talent. All God requires me to do is to do the best I can with what I have to work with. And that man with two talents did just as well as the man with five talents. He just did not have as much to work with. But the man with one talent “went and hid his talent in the earth,” and when his Lord came back he challenged him. You remember the Lord commended those other two servants, and gave the same commendation to the man with two talents as he did to the man with five talents. But then in verse twenty-four he which had received the one talent came and said, “Lord, I knew thee that thou art a hard man, reaping where thou hast not sowed, and gathering where thou hast not strawed, and I was afraid, and went and hid thy talent in the earth, lo, there thou hast what is thine. His Lord answered and said unto him, Thou wicked and slothful servant, thou knewest that I reap where I sowed not, and gather where I have not strawed; thou oughtest, therefore, to have put my

money to the exchangers, and then, at my coming, I should have received mine own with usury. Take, therefore, the talent from him, and give it unto him which hath ten talents, for unto every one that hath shall be given, and he shall have abundance, but from him that hath not shall be taken away even that which he hath. And he cast the unprofitable servant into outer darkness; there shall be weeping, and gnashing of teeth.”

Notice that these were *all servants of the same Lord*. They all had talents given them from the same Lord. They all had the ability, according to their own capacity, to serve their Lord. The man with one talent could not do as much as the man with five talents, but he could have done just like the man with two talents. He could have used what he had. But he did not use it, and he lost it. Let me ask you again, what do you believe was the prospect that his Lord would ever give him another talent. What do you think is the prospect that his Lord will say, “kay, you have had one probation; you missed out that time, but I am going to give you another chance.” It is not going to happen, is it? He was cast out into outer darkness, where there is weeping and gnashing of teeth. These were all three servants of the same Lord. They all had talents with which they could have served their Lord.

Now once more, in John 15, “I am the true vine, and my Father is the husbandman. Every branch in me that beareth not fruit he taketh away, and every branch that beareth fruit, he purgeth it that it may bring forth more fruit. Now ye are clean through the word which I have spoken unto you. Abide in me, and I in you, as the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine, no more can ye, except ye abide in me. 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.”

Now let me ask you: is this talking to children of God, or is it talking to dead alien sinners? It is talking to children of God, is it not? He says, “I am the vine, and ye are the branches.” The dead alien sinner is not a branch in Christ Jesus. This is talking to the Lord’s children. Now notice verse six, “If a man abide not in me, he is cast forth as a branch, and is withered, and *men* cast them into the fire, and they are burned.”

Is that talking about eternal damnation? It is not men that cast anyone away into that terrible place. But notice that it is men that cast these people into the fire. Sometimes that happens by a vote in conference in church. “Men gather them, and cast them into the fire, and they are burned.”

Now it does not always happen that the person is turned out of the church. I have known some people who were in the condition that is described in these

verses, who stayed in the church the rest of their lives. They never did anything so outward, so obvious, that they would ever be dealt with by the church, and yet, their joy was gone. Everything they had ever experienced was gone. It had been gone for years. There was no spiritual joy about them, and yet, they stayed right there in the church, and, sometimes, were the most insistent on making all the decisions. That becomes a problem in the church, when that happens. But that is another story, and I do not want to get sidetracked on that. I have another theme I want to follow at this moment.

“If a man abide not in me (that is one of the branches in him) he is cast forth as a branch and is withered, and men gather them, and cast them into the fire, and they are burned.” Again, the same question we asked awhile ago: after this branch is cast into the fire and burned, what do you believe are the prospects that branch will ever be put back in the vine, and bear fruit in the vine. That is a ridiculous question, isn't it. *None whatsoever.*

If a person is born of the Spirit of God there is nothing in all of this world that is going to separate him from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord. David said it in Psalms 89, “If his children forsake my law, and walk not in my judgments; if they break my statutes, and keep not my commandments; then will I visit their transgressions with the rod and their iniquities with stripes, nevertheless, my lovingkindness will I not utterly take from them, nor suffer my faithfulness to fail. My covenant will I not break, nor alter the word that goeth forth out of my mouth.”

He deals very clearly with the eternal security of the child of God. There is nothing in this world that can separate the child of God from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus, but the child of God can so persist in sin, and go on, and on, until he loses everything that is worth having here in this life.

We talk about a person losing the joy of his salvation. He can do that. He loses the joy of the church, the joy of the gospel. He wonders why the preacher cannot preach the way he used to preach. He allows, “That preacher used to go to the pulpit every Sunday morning and he would just set this place on fire, but he just can't preach like that any more.” Perhaps the preacher preaches as well as ever. *Maybe the man cannot listen* the way he used to. *He cannot hear* the way he used to hear. A person stands to lose the joy of the church, his home in the church, his job, his family, his children, his home, his health, and, perhaps, even his sanity.

There is no end to the things that a person stands to lose—this side of the grave. You will never lose what God has waiting on you on the other side. But I am sure that some of you can think of someone you have known very well. There is

no doubt in your mind that he is a child of God. You have been with him in church. You have seen him rejoice under the preaching of the gospel, and you cannot doubt that he is born of the Spirit of God. And yet, today, he has made shipwreck of his life. You can supply the name. Everybody knows somebody who fits that pattern. He has lost the joy of his salvation; he has lost the joy of the church; he has lost his home in the church; he lost his wife; his children will not talk to him; he lost his job; he lost his business; he lost his home; he lost his health; and perhaps, lost his sanity. He lost everything worth having— this side of the grave. The text says, “Men gather them and cast them into the fire, and they are burned.”

There is no possibility those branches will ever again be put back together and put back in the vine to bear fruit here in this life.

Hebrews 6:1-6, “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, Of the doctrine of baptisms, and of laying on of hands, and of resurrection of the dead, and of eternal judgment. And this will we do, if God permit. For it is impossible for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, And have tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come, If they shall fall away, to renew them again unto repentance; seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame.”

I believe it is clear enough that he is talking about a child of God. He says that if that person shall fall away, it is impossible to renew him again to repentance, seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame. That is still talking about that branch that was cut off and cast into the fire. It is talking about that fig tree to which the Lord said, “Let no fruit grow on thee from henceforth forever.” It is talking about that one talent servant whose talent was taken away and who was cast out into outer darkness, where there is weeping and gnashing of teeth. And Paul says it is impossible to renew such a person to repentance.

Somebody may want to know, “But what if he decides to repent?” *He cannot do it.* It is not possible for him to repent. A person cannot repent just any time he decides to. If God does not give repentance you cannot repent. II Timothy 2:25, “In meekness instructing those that oppose themselves; if God peradventure will give *them repentance* to the acknowledging of the truth.” Acts 11:18, “When they heard these things, they held their peace, and glorified God, saying, Then hath God also to the Gentiles *granted repentance* unto life.” Romans 2:4, “Or despisest thou the riches of his goodness and forbearance and longsuffering; not knowing that the goodness of God *leadeth thee to repentance?*”

The one text says that God gives repentance, the next text says that he grants repentance, and the last text says that he leads to repentance. If God does not give repentance, if he does not grant it, if he does not lead you to it—you cannot repent.

You cannot just wake up one morning, after you have lived for a long time in a bad way, and say, “Hey, I just believe I will repent today. I believe I will change my way. I am going to turn over a new leaf. I am going to start doing better.” It does not work that way. Now the religious world thinks you can do that. They think that is all there is to it. But they are wrong. You cannot just wake up one morning and decide, “I am going to do better.” If God does not give repentance, you will never repent. If he does not grant repentance, if he does not lead you to repentance, you cannot repent. The text says that it is impossible to renew them again unto repentance. You can talk to him all you want to, but you will never get him to repent. He cannot repent. It is not within his capacity.

Hebrews 10:26, “For if we sin wilfully, after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins, but a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries.” *This person is left without a consciousness of a hope in Christ Jesus.* “There remaineth no more sacrifice for sins.” What state is he in? Here it is. “But a fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries.”

He is a child of God, and he will live in heaven some day, but he feels none of the power of that hope in his heart. All that is there is fear, that fear of indignation, which shall devour the adversaries. “He that despised Moses’ law died without mercy under two or three witnesses. Of how much sorer punishment suppose ye shall he be thought worthy who hath trodden the Son of God under foot, and counted the blood of the covenant wherewith he was sanctified an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the spirit of grace.”

Now Paul is telling us about something that is worse (a “sorer punishment”) than death. What is worse than death? It is for a child of God to be cut off and be in the condition we have been talking about.

Sometimes we talk about what a harsh thing the law of Moses was. And the Law of Moses was a harsh system. But for a person to be stoned to death was really a less punishment than to be left here in this life, cut off—com-pletely cut off—from the joys and the benefits that he might otherwise have had. “Of how much sorer punishment suppose ye shall he be counted worthy, who hath trodden

under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified an unholy thing.”

“The blood of the covenant wherewith he was sanctified....” Is that talking about a dead alien sinner? It does not sound like it. Those who will one day suffer eternally are not sanctified by the blood of the covenant. He “counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace, for we know him that hath said, Vengeance belongeth unto me, I will recompence, saith the Lord, and again, The Lord shall judge *his people*.” This is talking about his people. If there was ever any doubt, that should remove all doubt. Hebrews 10:31, “t is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God.”

II Peter 1:5, “And beside this, giving all diligence, add to your faith, virtue, and to virtue, knowledge, and to knowledge, temperance, and to temperance, patience, and to patience, godliness, and to godliness, brotherly kindness, and to brotherly kindness, charity, for if these things be in you and abound, they make you that ye shall neither be barren, nor unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ, but he that lacketh these things is blind, and cannot see afar off, and *hath forgotten that he was purged from his old sins*.”

It does not mean that those sins are still charged against him. The Lord put those sins away at Calvary, and he “hath perfected forever them that are sanctified” (Hebrews 10:14). But the man in this condition is *blind*; he “cannot see afar off,” and he has “*forgotten that was purged from his old sins*.” He does not have that witness within his heart.

I was talking with a man a few years ago. I stopped at the place where he was working, and visited with him for just a moment, and in the course of the conversation he said, “Brother Hunt, I just don’t get a thing in the world out of the church any more.” Now he was there every Sunday, and, for that matter, he makes all the decisions, ninety per cent of them, anyway. But he said, “Brother Hunt, I just don’t get a thing out of the church any more.” He said, “I think, perhaps, I have gotten too old to enjoy the church.” He is just a little older than I am, and at that time he was about the same age I am today. But, anyway, he thought he was too old to enjoy the church. That is sad, isn’t it? But, oh, how many children of God are in exactly that same condition. They are blind; they cannot see afar off, and they have forgotten that they were purged from their old sins.

I would like for us to notice two characters the Bible talks about, who were in that condition. II Peter 2:15-16, “Which have forsaken the right way, and are gone astray, following the way of Balaam, the son of Bosor, who loved the

wages of unrighteousness, but was rebuked for his iniquity, the dumb ass speaking with man's voice, forbad the madness of the prophet.” That is talking about Balaam, a prophet in the Old Testament.

Balaam is one of the most mysterious characters in the Bible. And one of the reasons that he is so mysterious is because he behaved himself in such a manner that, sometimes, it is difficult to tell whether he was a child of God or not. But I believe that when we look at him closely, that the Bible makes it clear enough that he was a born again character. Listen to the way Balaam talks in the book of Numbers. In Numbers, chapter 23, beginning with verse 8 (Numbers 23:8). Balak had called for him to come and to curse Israel, and he wanted to do that. Balak had promised him all kinds of wealth if he would curse Israel. Balak was afraid of Israel.

Balak said, in verse seven, “Come and curse me Jacob, and come defy Israel.” And then in verse eight, Balaam replied, “How shall I curse whom God hath not cursed, or shall I defy, whom the Lord hath not defied, for from the top of the rocks I see him, and from the hills I behold him, lo the people shall dwell alone and shall not be reckoned among the nations. Who can count the dust of Jacob, and number the fourth part of Israel, Let me die the death of the righteous, and let my last end be like his.”

Do you remember how Jacob died? Jacob died in his own bed, in his right mind, with his family all around him, with his mind on the Lord, and he was talking about the Lord and his goodness. Balaam said that when he came to die, that was how he wanted to die—in his own bed, in his right mind, with his family all around him, and with his mind on the Lord. Does that sound like a dead alien sinner to you? It does not sound like a dead alien sinner to me. One that wants to die with his mind on the Lord bears evidence of an experience of grace.

And in verse nineteen of that same chapter (Numbers 23:19), he says, “God is not a man that he should lie, neither the Son of man that he should repent, hath he said, and shall he not do it, or hath he spoken, and shall he not make it good?” Balaam had more light on Bible doctrine, and he manifested more light in that one verse of scripture than ninety-nine per cent of the religious people, and the religious leaders in America today. He does not sound like a dead alien sinner to me. “God is not a man that he should lie, neither the Son of man that he should repent; hath he said, and shall he not do it, or hath he spoken, and shall he not make it good?”

And in Numbers 24:17, “I shall see him but not now, I shall behold him, but not nigh, there shall come a star out of Jacob, and a sceptre shall rise out of Israel, and shall smite the corners of Moab, and destroy all the children of Sheth.”

Some two thousand years later there were wise men from the East, who saw the star that signalled the arrival of the King of Israel—the arrival of the Lord Jesus Christ. They saw that star and they went to Bethlehem searching for the Christ child.

I have heard it said that they saw that star and then followed it to Bethlehem. They did not do that, they followed it to Nazareth. They did not have to follow that star to Bethlehem; they had the prophecy of Micah, “And thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel” (Micah 5:2). They saw that star and they went directly to Bethlehem. Why did they know that star signaled the arrival of the King of Israel? Why did they know that star signaled the arrival of the Savior? It was because they had read this prophecy of Balaam. They had read this text from Numbers, chapter twenty four, when Balaam said, “There shall come a *star* out of Jacob and a sceptre shall rise out of Israel.” Two thousand years later, after Balaam had prophesied that star would appear, it did appear; the wise men saw it, they knew that the time of the Messiah was at hand; and they went to Bethlehem, seeking for the Lord.

I believe the Bible gives proof enough to show that Balaam was a child of God. The wicked do not talk the way Balaam talked; they do not pray the way Balaam prayed. Balaam prayed, wanting to “die the death of the righteous.” He said, “Let me die the death of the righteous, and let my last end be like his.” But let us go to Numbers 31:8, “Balaam also, the son of Beor, they slew with the sword.” When the Bible gets around to recording the death of Balaam, it records it almost as a footnote, as if to say, “Oh, by the way, Balaam was killed in the battle too.”

What happened to Balaam? What happened was that Balak offered him money if he would curse Israel, and he tried to curse Israel, and he could not do it. Balak made the offer again, and Balaam tried again to curse Israel, and he still could not do it. And Balak made the offer the third time, and Balaam tried to curse Israel the third time, and he still wound up promising blessing upon Israel.

But let us go to the Revelation. “But I have a few things against thee, because thou hast there them that hold the doctrine of Balaam, who taught Balak to cast a stumbling block before the children of Israel, to eat things sacrificed to idols, and to commit fornication,” Revelation 2:14. Balaam tried to curse Israel, and he could not. He said, “I cannot curse those whom the Lord has blessed.” But, do you see, he had seen Balak’s money, and if there was any way he could earn that money, he wanted to do it. But he had discovered that God would not allow him to curse his people.

Balaam was also a crafty man in a natural way. And he finally went to Balak and said, "Balak, I have got it all figured out; God has blessed Israel, and I cannot curse them, but here is what you can do: if you will send bad women down there, you can get Israel in trouble with their God." He taught Israel to commit fornication, and to eat things sacrificed unto idols. He says, "I cannot curse them; God has blessed them, and I cannot undo it, but if you will send enough bad women down there, and get Israel to misbehave, and to offer sacrifice to strange gods, you can get them in trouble with their God, and bring the wrath of God on them." He earned his pay, but he lost everything.

I hear a text over in Matthew, where the Lord says, "What is a man profited if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?" Matthew 16:28. He did not lose his eternal destiny, but he lost everything that was worth here having in this life. The scriptures tell us. "In patience possess ye your souls." Balaam did not do it. Balaam sold out. I am convinced that Balaam was a child of God, and I expect to see him someday. A man that talked the way he talked sounds like a child of God to me, and I expect that some day I shall see him there in the glory world. But he lost everything that was worth having here in this life.

Have you ever seen it? Have you ever seen a child of God, who sold out, and died, fighting against the very cause that he had, at one time, supported? Sure you have. It happened to Balaam.

In I Samuel 10:6, Samuel was talking to Saul, who was about to become king over Israel. And he says to Saul, "And the Spirit of the Lord will come upon thee, and thou shalt prophesy unto them, and *shalt be turned into another man*. And it was so, that when he turned his back to go from Samuel, *God gave him another heart*." It does not sound to me like it is talking about a dead alien sinner. He said, "Thou shalt be turned into another man," and he said, "God gave him another heart."

What is it that happens in regeneration? God takes out that hard and stony heart, and gives a heart of flesh. Even though he was a big man physically, he was small in his own sight. He was a very humble man, a very self-effacing person. But he became king, and, as we say, it went to his head, and he was not able to handle it, and he became lifted up in pride. One time he endeavored to perform the office of the priest, because the priest did not get there on time. He tried to do the priest's job for him. That got him in trouble. He did not have any business trying to take the priest's job. And from there on it was downhill.

But, anyway, Samuel sent him to destroy the nation of Amalek. Do you remember? Amalek had stood against Israel, when Israel came into land of Canaan? Now God would send Israel to destroy the nation of Amalek. And he

was commanded to destroy the entire nation—just wipe them off the face of the earth. There were reasons for that, which we don't have time to get into, but suffice it to say that, because of their immoral life style, as people would say nowadays, because of the way they lived, they were just absolutely riddled with disease, and God was intending to use Israel, like a surgeon's scalpel to remove that diseased flesh from the human race. That is as far as we need to go with that. But, anyway, God intended for that entire nation to be destroyed, to be wiped off the face of the earth. You remember the story. Saul did not do that. He saved the king, Agag, and the best of the cattle alive.

And then, when Samuel arrived, Samuel asked Saul, "Have you done what you were supposed to do?" "Yes, I have done just exactly what I was told to do." And Samuel wants to know, "Well, if you have, what meaneth, this lowing of the cattle in mine ears?" "Be sure your sin will find you out." Samuel says, "I hear cattle lowing over on the other side of the hill. What is that commotion, if you have destroyed all of Amalek, and all their livestock?" And you remember that Saul tries to blame it on the people. But, we don't have time to get into all of that.

But in I Samuel 15:22, "And Samuel said, Hath the Lord as great delight in burnt offerings and sacrifices as in obeying the voice of the Lord? Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams. For rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft." The Amalekites were involved in witchcraft, and Saul was telling Samuel, "You are not a bit better than they are. Your rebellion is just like their rebellion." Witchcraft was a part of their national religion. He says, "For rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft and stubbornness is as iniquity and idolatry, because thou hast rejected the word of the Lord, he hath also rejected thee from being king." I Samuel 15:26, "And Samuel said unto Saul, I will not return with thee, *for the Lord hath rejected thee from being king over Israel.* And as Samuel turned to go away, he laid of hold the skirt of his mantle, and it rent, and Samuel said unto him, The Lord hath rent the kingdom of Israel from thee this day, and hath given it to a neighbor of thine, that is better than thou. And also the strength of Israel will not lie, nor repent, for he is not a man that he should repent. Hath he said, and shall he not do it, or hath he spoken, and shall he not make it good."

I doubt that it is really a coincidence that Samuel winds up saying almost identically the same words that Balaam had said hundreds of years before. "The Strength of Israel will not lie nor repent, for he is not a man that he should repent."

I Samuel 15:35, "And Samuel came no more to see Saul until the day of his death. Nevertheless Samuel mourned for Saul, and the Lord repented that he had made Saul king over Israel." Now notice one thing in the first verse of the next

chapter (I Samuel 16:1). “And the Lord said unto Samuel, How long wilt thou mourn for Saul, seeing I have rejected him from reigning over Israel?”

Two things I want to notice. What do you believe was the likelihood that Saul would ever again be the king of Israel? None whatsoever. He had lost it. It was gone. His rejection was total, and complete, and irreversible.

One other thing I want to notice. He says, “How long wilt thou mourn for Saul, seeing I have rejected him from reigning over Israel?” Do you remember another expression very similar to that? The verse we started out with said, “There is a sin unto death; I do not say that ye shall pray for it.” God said to Samuel, “How long wilt thou mourn for Saul; it won't do you you any good.” “There is a sin unto death; I do not say that ye shall pray for it.” Now that fits too well for it to be wrong. That is exactly what he is talking about. He says, “There is a sin unto death; I do not say that ye shall pray for it.” And here he says, “How long wilt thou mourn for Saul, seeing I have rejected him from being king over Israel.”

In I Corinthians 9:27, Paul the apostle says, “But I keep under my body, and bring it into subjection, lest, by any means, after I have preached to others, I myself should be a castaway.” What was Paul afraid of? Was he afraid he was going to lose his home in heaven? No. Paul made that plain enough. I don't know any way language could make it any plainer than Paul made it.

Paul made that as plain as it could be, that if one is chosen of God, redeemed by him, and born of his Spirit, that he is heaven-bought, and heaven-born, and heaven-bound. and nothing in this world, past, present, or future, above us, or below us, or angels, or principalities, or powers, life, death, or anything else can separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus (Romans 8:38-39). What was he afraid of? He was afraid that he would wind up like Balaam. He was afraid that he would wind up like King Saul. He said, because that could happen to him, he kept his body in subjection, “and bring it into subjection, lest that by any means, after I have preached to others, I myself might be a castaway.”

I have known people to make shipwreck of their life. We have all seen that, at one time or another. And, sometimes, after a person has just made total shipwreck of his life, somebody else will square his shoulders, and say, “Well, I will tell you, right now, I will never be guilty of anything of any such thing as that.” I don't know that; and you don't know that. It behooves every last one of us to be constantly on our knees, begging God that God would give us grace to survive. and to persist, and to press on in his service. If Paul the apostle, as

eminent a servant as he was, was concerned lest he himself should be castaway, certainly, it behooves Harold Hunt that I be constantly on my guard.

I would like for us to notice, just for a moment, two offenses that, I believe, are the most common offenses, that ever put a child of God in that particular condition. We know that a person can destroy his life by gross immoral conduct. We know that adultery, fornication, drunkenness, murder, debauchery, and the like will destroy a person's life. But, while we know that we are all at risk with regard to those things, generally, most of us are not very likely to commit any of those heinous offenses. Most children of God are not likely to fall into those sins. We stay on guard against those things.

That is not to say that we are totally immune against those terrible sins; I don't want to leave that impression. But the thing I am pointing out is that the pitfall that you and I are most likely to get into is not nearly so much any of those things as it is some other things. There is much less likelihood that I will ever be guilty of robbing a bank than there is that I might fall into these offenses that we hear about in these next three texts. I believe that there are more children of God, who make shipwreck of their lives on these three rocks than on any other thing that ever besets any child of God.

Let's go back, for a moment, to those three examples we used a moment ago: the one talent servant, the barren fig tree, and the branch that did not bear fruit. Let me ask you: what was the offense of those three? They were all guilty of exactly the same offense. What was their offense? *Their offense was in doing absolutely nothing.* Was that not their offense? Their offense was in doing nothing.

There are more children of God, who make shipwreck of their life in things that would never get you turned out of the church, than there are who make shipwreck of their lives in the great and heinous offenses. I want to notice three of them. We have noticed one already. There is, first of all, the great offense of doing absolutely nothing. And here are two others.

In Matthew 6, the Lord is giving what we refer to as "the Lord's prayer." In verses fourteen and fifteen (Matthew 6:14-15), after he has taught them how to pray, he says, "For if ye forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will also forgive you. But if ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses." Notice that it is "your heavenly Father" if you forgive, and it is still "your Father," if you don't forgive. This is not talking about a person's eternal destiny. That person who is chosen, and redeemed, and born of the Spirit of God, is a child of God, and he will be in heaven some day. It is "your Father," if you forgive, and it is "your Father," if you do not forgive. But notice what we get into, when we transgress.

He says, "If ye forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will also forgive you, but if ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses." A few times in my life I have seen somebody so upset at another person that he would look the other person in the eye, trying to let him know how angry he was, and tell him, "I will never forgive you until the day you die." Did you ever hear anybody say that? It sends a cold chill over you, does it not? Just to think that anybody would say that. "I will never forgive you until the day you die." Let me ask you: if it sends a cold chill over you to hear somebody say that to somebody else, *think of God saying that to you.*

Imagine God saying to Harold Hunt, "Harold Hunt, you are my child, and I will have you with me in heaven one day, but as far as this life is concerned, I will never forgive you until the day you die." That is what the text says. "For if ye forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will also forgive you, but if ye forgive not men their trespasses, *neither will your Father forgive your trespasses.*"

There was no forgiveness for that barren fig tree. There was no possibility that the barren fig tree would ever bear another fig. There could be no forgiveness for that branch that was cast into the fire and burned. It could never be put together again. There was no forgiveness for that one talent servant, who lost his talent. It was gone, and he would never have it back again. Many a child of God has made shipwreck of his life. He persisted, and persisted, until finally, God said, "Enough."

There is a sin unto death. What is the sin unto death? It is any sin that you continue in, until God finally says, "Enough," and he cuts you off. And as far as this life is concerned, it is all over. I believe there have been more children of God who got into that condition because of malice, because of an unforgiving spirit, than, probably, for any other reason.

Somebody gets offended, and he says, "That is alright, I will bide my time, I will have my day, I will just sit here and pat my foot until my day comes. Just you watch, my day will come; I will have the last laugh." And he persists, and persists with that malicious spirit. Perhaps, he would not do anything to the other person. He has too much judgment to strike out at the other person. Somebody would see him do that. He might chuckle if he passes by and sees him changing a flat tire in the rain and mud. But he would not overtly do anything to him. But he says, "I will watch; I will wait; I will have my day. Just you wait, I will have my day."

And finally, his day does come, and like Saul, or like Balaam, or like the barren fig tree, God says to him, “Enough,” and as far as this life is concerned, it is all over. And that judgment is irreversible. There will never again be for him that joy that he could have had. It is all over. He will never repent, because he cannot repent.

Now he may come to church every meeting time for the rest of his life. He may be very active in the church. And once in awhile he may get some sort of satisfaction from the church. He does get some benefit from the good company. He knows the people at the church; he grew up with them; he has known them all his life, and he likes their company. So he goes to church. He is ashamed not to. He cannot feel anything, but he enjoys being with them. Perhaps, before he got in that shape the church may have let him make most of the decisions, so he still gets to make most of the decisions. Perhaps, they do not realize what has happened to him. But he still cannot feel anything. It is all gone. It is over with.

I have the idea that, probably, most of the trouble in our churches has come from people in that condition, who stay right in the church. They have no spiritual joy at all. It is all gone. They have no spiritual discernment whatsoever, but they are still bound and determined to keep everybody else in line.

I believe that there have probably been more people, who got in trouble, because of a spiteful, malicious spirit than any other thing.

And there is another text that goes with that thought. Matthew 18:6, “But whoso shall offend one of these little ones, which believe in me, it were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and that he were drowned in the depth of the sea.” How very careful we ought to be with regard to the Lord’s little ones. And that is not always one that is young in age. It may be one that is advanced in years. “But whoso shall offend one of these little ones, that believe in me, it were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and that he were drowned in the depth of the sea.”

We noticed a text a few moments ago that talked about that same thing. Hebrews 10:28-29, “He that despised Moses’ law died without mercy under two or three witnesses: *of how much sorer punishment*, suppose ye shall he be counted worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace?” Paul says that there is something worse than death—a sorer punishment than to be stoned to death under Moses’ law, and this text says the same thing. This text says that he would be better off dead—he would be better off if he was drowned in the depth of the sea.

A few times I have heard somebody say that some person would be better off dead. I am sure that you have probably heard somebody say that. It is a terrifying statement, is it not? But this is God talking, and if God says it, it is right. I have heard people make that statement, when I did not think they were right; but when God says it, you can be sure that is the way it is. And he says that this person would be better off dead. I would hate for God to say that Harold Hunt would be better off dead. But that is what he says about this character.

But what got him into this condition? Was he guilty of some heinous offense that would get him turned out of the church? No, he was guilty of offending one of the Lord's little ones. "But whoso shall offend one of these little ones, which believe in me, It were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and that he were drowned in the depth of the sea." The Lord says he would be better off dead.

And the Lord says that it will not do any good to pray for him. His condition is irreversible. God has already pronounced judgment. The barren branch is burned up.

"There is a sin unto death; I do not say that ye shall pray for it."

Six Hundred and Sixty-six

SIX HUNDRED AND SIXTY-SIX See the topic on The Mark of the Beast in the article on The Book of REVELATION

Sodom and Gomorrah

SODOM AND GOMORRAH: Sylvester Hassell: It is believed that the wicked cities occupied a part of the site now covered by the Dead Sea. There are vast quantities of sulphur and bitumen and salt, and numerous evidence of other than volcanic combustion, in and around that most mysterious body of water. The surface of the Dead Sea is 1,300 feet below the level of the Mediterranean, and its water, in the northern part, is 1,300 feet deep. It is the deepest depression on the surface of the earth; and the air above and around has a hot, steaming, stagnant, sulphurous character; neither animals nor vegetables live in the water; dead driftwood fringe the shores—apt emblems of the low morals of the corrupt inhabitants of the plain, and God's terrible judgment upon them,—spiritual and eternal death. (*Hassell*)

Solomon

SOLOMON: Sylvester Hassell: Solomon, the son of David, succeeded his father, and was crowned king B.C. 1014, in a time of profound peace, and equaled him in the length of his reign—forty years. He was much devoted to God in the first part of his reign. He built the temple, placed the ark within it, and dedicated it. He was seven years and a half in building it, and completed it B.C. 1004. Immense sacrifices were offered to God upon its dedication; the glory of God filled the house after the ark was carried into it, so that the priests could not minister because of the cloud; Solomon, kneeling, spread forth his hands towards heaven, and offered the prayer of dedication; after which he dismissed the people, who returned to their homes joyful and with glad hearts (I Kings 8).

This, no doubt, was the greatest and happiest day that the Hebrew nation ever witnessed. The hundreds of thousands who could not be present at the dedication considered themselves equally interested and alike participating in the joyful festivities of the occasion. Wisdom was specially given to Solomon. God asked him, before this time, what he would have, and he asked for wisdom to govern Israel well. They were God's people—they were then a great people—and he desired wisdom to govern them well for their good and God's glory.

He did not ask for long life, or for riches or honor, but for wisdom. The Lord granted his request, and, in addition to wisdom, conferred on him riches and honor exceeding that of all other men. The temple was a small structure in comparison to many others, both ancient and modern; but it was the most costly of all, chiefly on account of the quantity of gold and silver used in its construction.

In this respect it was a forcible type of the true church in all ages of the world, which, though so much smaller than the false church, is yet the most costly of all—having cost the precious blood of Christ as of a lamb slain from the foundation of the world, and being clothed with his imputed righteousness, which outshines by far all the righteousness of man.

After the dedication the Lord appeared unto Solomon again, assuring him that he had heard his prayer and had blessed the temple, and would establish his (Solomon's) throne over Israel forever if he proved faithful; but, should he turn from the Lord and serve other gods, he would cut off Israel out of the land, and cast the house which he had hallowed out of his sight! (I Kings 9:2-7).

Now was the zenith of Hebrew greatness. The sun of national Israel had pierced the horizon when Abram was first called from "Ur of the Chaldees," and had

been gradually rising higher and higher—higher and higher still—for nearly a thousand years, until, at this auspicious period, he stood forth in his meridian splendor, shedding his benign rays over the beautiful land of Palestine, the garden-spot of the world, with all the tributary nations around it.

Added to this was the religious character of the people; who were loud in their praises of, and faithful in adoring, the only true God. Israel in spirit was but little annoyed by Israel after the flesh: the sons of Belial shrunk back from persecuting the sons of God, and all seemed united in love, peace and prosperity—from Dan to Beersheba, and from the great river to the sea. Spiritual Israel here had rest, indicative of that which remains for the people of God in heaven, and indicative of that rest which all experience when changed from the legal to the Christian dispensation, or translated from the kingdom of Satan into the kingdom of God's dear Son.

But these halcyon days under the reign of Solomon were of short duration—God's people must not expect a long continuance either of temporal or spiritual happiness in this poor, sinful world—both are fleeting in their character and soon pass away; but, while spiritual enjoyments are renewed from time to time until they are perfected by the transcendent glories of eternity, temporal enjoyments terminate at the grave.

Solomon transgressed the law of his God. He did not prove faithful to the end. He gave himself up to carnal pleasures. He made an affinity with Pharaoh, king of Egypt, by marrying his daughter, and took many wives from the heathen nations around him, all of which was expressly forbidden. His strange wives were idolaters, and he indulged them in idolatry. He built them high places for the worship of their deities, and joined some of them in their infamous worship.

With the decline of his zeal for God and the honor of his name came a decline of his earthly greatness. God made known to him his displeasure, and notified him of the downfall of his kingdom and the rending off the ten tribes in the days of his successors. He appeared not then to repent of his sins, but no doubt did before his death, which took place B.C. 975, when he was succeeded by his son Rehoboam (I Kings 12).

During the reigns of both David and Solomon, as at all other past times since the fall of Adam, while there were a few spiritual worshipers of God, the mass of the people either worshiped idols, or only outwardly worshiped God in accordance with the will, the example or the command of their rulers. "But the constant tendency was to idolatry; and the intercourse with foreign nations which Solomon maintained, as well as his own example, greatly increased the tendency. Under Solomon, indeed, idolatry struck its roots so deep that all the

zeal of the reforming kings that followed him failed to eradicate it. It was not till the seventy years' captivity of Babylon that the soil of Palestine was thoroughly purged of the roots of that noxious weed."—W.G. Blaikie.

The question is sometimes asked, was Solomon a spiritual Israelite, a child of grace, an heir of God, and has he gone to heaven? We answer, Yes. All the writers of the books both in the Old and in the New Testaments were heaven-born and heaven-bound. God would not permit an unregenerate man, a heathen, a barbarian to write a book for him, and then place it in the sacred canon of Scripture. This would be a most preposterous thing. Besides, it is said that he "loved the Lord, walking in the statutes of David his father" (I Kings 3:3). And again, the Lord said of him, "He shall build an house for my name, and I will stablish the throne of his kingdom forever. I will be his Father, and he shall be my son. If he commit iniquity, I will chasten him with the rod of men, and with the stripes of the children of men; but my mercy shall not depart away from him, as I took it from Saul, whom I put away from before thee" (II Samuel 7:13-15).

The Lord made two special revelations to him, and gave him more wisdom than any other man; and this wisdom was spiritual as well as natural. And, in addition to all this, Solomon wrote three books that are preserved and handed down to us in the Old Testament, viz., the Song of Songs, Ecclesiastes, and Proverbs; in all of which there are evidences of a spiritual mind, and the unction of the Holy Spirit is clearly manifest.

We have said that during the reign of Solomon the sun of Israel's greatness was at his height; and from his reign that sun began to decline, sinking lower and lower, until it finally set amidst the darkness and desolation that followed the destruction of Jerusalem by the Roman army under Titus (A.D. 70). The nationality was then overthrown, and the remnant of Israel scattered among the nations." (*Hassell*)

Solomon's Temple spiritualized

SOLOMON'S Temple spiritualized: Sylvester Hassell:
SOLOMON'S TEMPLE SPIRITUALIZED, or Gospel Light Brought Out of the Temple at Jerusalem, by John Bunyan, is probably the most wonderful piece of spiritual interpretation of Scripture in the world. A few of Bunyan's seventy points we must give.

Mount Moriah, on which Solomon's temple was built, was a type of Christ, the mountain of the Lord's house, the rock against which the gates of hell cannot prevail.

The foundation stones of the temple were types of the prophets and apostles. Christ is the foundation of his church personally and meritoriously; but the prophets and apostles, doctrinally and ministerially.

Solomon, the wise and wealthy and peaceable king, as the builder of the temple, was a type of Christ. The trees and stones of which the temple was built were first selected out of the forest and quarry where there were others equally good by nature, and were thoroughly hewed and squared and fitted for their proper place, and then brought to the temple and properly adjusted without noise or confusion; so with God's people, who are chosen by him in the wild field of nature, then hewed and squared by his word and doctrine applied by his Spirit, and afterwards brought in and added quietly by him to his Zion.

The temple, with its chambers, was narrowest downwards, and largest upwards different from all other buildings; so the hearts of God's people should be narrow in their desires for earthly things, but wide in their desires for spiritual and eternal things; those in the church who are nearest or most concerned with earth are the most narrow-spirited as to the things of God.

The pinnacles of the temple were types of those lofty, airy, heady notions with which some men delight themselves while they hover like birds above the solid godly truths of Christ; these are dangerous places—Satan tried to destroy Christ on one of them. Christians, to be safe, should be low and little in their own eyes.

The porters had charge of the treasure-chambers, and had to keep diligent watch lest any not duly qualified should enter the house of the Lord; these were types of God's ministers.

The door of the temple represented Christ. The wall of the temple was his divinely sustained humanity, and the fine gold on the wall a type of his righteousness.

The windows were narrow without, but wide within; types of the written word, through which as through a glass we now darkly see something of the glory of the Sun of Righteousness. By the light of the written word, the church can see the dismal state of the world and how to avoid it, but by that light the world sees but little of the beauty of the church.

The chambers represented rest, safety, treasure, solace, and continuance.

The two winding stairs from the first to the second story, and the second to the third, were types of the two-fold repentance of the child of God, that by which he turns from nature to grace, and that by which he turns from the imperfections which attend a state of grace and glory.

The molten sea was a figure of the pure word of the gospel, without men's inventions, mingled with the fire of the Holy Ghost. The twelve oxen upon whose backs the sea stood were types of the apostles and ministers of Christ, who should keep their uncomely parts covered with gospel grace, and should proclaim the gospel in all the world.

A golden censer is a gracious heart, heavenly fire is the Holy Ghost, and sweet incense the effectual, fervent prayer of faith.

The Holy Place was a type of the church militant; and the Most Holy Place a type of the church triumph.

Things in the Most Holy Place could not be seen by even the highest light of the world, but only by the light of the fire of the altar, a type of the shinings of the Holy Ghost.

The floor of the temple was overlaid with gold, like the pure golden streets of the New Jerusalem. The walk of God's people should be beautiful and clean; and, when we happily reach the Celestial City, we shall no more step into the mire or stumble upon blocks and stones, or fall into holes and snares, but all our steps will be in pure gold.

Oh, what speaking things, says Bunyan, are types, shadows, and parables, had we but eyes to see, had we but ears to hear!
(*Hassell*)

Sons of God, The

The SONS of God Genesis 6:2, "That the sons of God saw the daughters of men that they were fair; and they took them wives of all which they chose." **Q.** Who were those sons of God? **A.** "As the arts and sciences advanced, and population and civilization increased, wickedness also increased. The "sons of God" the Sethite professors of religion, intermarried with the "daughters of men," the irreligious Cainites; the selfish, worldly, licentious and warlike offspring of these wicked marriages filled the earth with profligacy and bloodshed. (*Hassell*)

Sons of the Prophets

The SONS of the Prophets: Sylvester Hassell: There were “companies” of “sons” of the prophets (I Samuel 19:19-20; II Kings 2:3,5; 4:38-41; 6:1-7), but the object and end of their associations is little known to us. They are mentioned only in the days of Samuel, David, Elijah, and Elisha. They appear to have been young men who admired the prophets—sought their society—waited on them and received instruction from them in sacred music (I Samuel 10:5; II Kings 3:15; 1Ch 25:1-7), but could not be made prophets by their teachers. God chose whom he would and raised them to the prophetic office, without any regard to their former human training (Amos 7:14-15; I Kings 19:15-21). The collections of these young men were located at different places, such as Ramah, Bethel, Jericho, and Gilgal (I Samuel 19:18-24; II Kings 2:1-5; 4:38; 22:14). Nothing of the kind appears in the New Testament.” (*Hassell*)

Soul

See Soul of Man, The

Soul of Man, The

The SOUL of man: Sylvester Hassell: “**Dichotomy** maintains that human nature has only two distinct sub-stances or elements—body and soul or spirit. **Trichotomy** maintains that there are in man three elements, body, soul, and spirit. In the account of man’s creation (Genesis 2:7) and of man’s death (Ecclesiastes 12:7) only two principles are mentioned—that which is called soul in Genesis being called spirit in Ecclesiastes. See also II Corinthians 5:1-8; Philippians 1:23-24; Acts 7:59. The Hebrew and Greek terms, in the Scriptures, translated soul, spirit, mind, heart, and life, are often used interchangeably, and denote the immaterial principle that man derived from God, each of these terms, however, being frequently employed to denote a particular aspect or function of attribute of that principle. The Greek and Roman philosophers taught that man had three constituent elements; and, in conformity with the usage of his contemporaries, Paul says “spirit, soul, and body,” to express the whole of man’s nature (I Thessalonians 5:23). In Hebrews 4:12, the term “*herai*” includes the two terms “soul and spirit,” the lower and higher faculties of the mind. In Luke 1:46-47, soul and spirit are the same principle.” (*Hassell*)

As to the origin of the souls of Adam's posterity, it should forever abase the pride of human philosophy that it is unable to solve this first and nearest mystery of man's existence—it cannot tell whether each soul is derived by direct creation from God, or by traduction from parents according to divine arrangement.
(*Hassell*)

Spanish Inquisition, The

The SPANISH Inquisition (*See under the Spanish INQUISITION*)

Staupitz, John

John STAUPITZ (*See under Martin LUTHER*)

Strict Baptists

STRICT BAPTISTS (*See under Strict BAPTISTS*)

Sublapsarianism (Infralapsarianism)

SUBLAPSARIANISM (Infralapsarianism) (*See under John CALVIN*)

Sunday Schools

SUNDAY SCHOOLS: Sylvester Hassell: Robert Raikes, of Gloucester, England, is generally admitted to have been the founder of modern Sunday Schools. In 1781 he hired teachers to instruct some poor children in Gloucester in reading and in the catechism on Sunday. His example was extensively imitated in the British Isles and the United States; and, by the end of the eighteenth century, the instruction had almost universally become *gratuitous*, and was said to be far superior in quality to what it was before, because now springing from pure benevolence. It is claimed by the Methodists that John Wesley, first in 1784, suggested that the instruction should be gratuitous, and also expressed the hope that Sunday Schools would become "nurseries for Christians" (See the Article on Sunday Schools in

McClintock and Strong's Cyclopaedia of Biblical, Theological and Ecclesiastical Literature, vol. x., p.21). The writer of the Article just mentioned declares that, "within the last fifty years Sunday Schools have come to be regarded as an essential branch of church action, not merely in England and America, but throughout the Protestant world, whether in home or mission fields;" and he intimates, at the conclusion of his Article, that, in the Sunday School, he sees "the problem of the conversion of the world in process of solution." It thus appears that for nearly 1,800 years of the Christian era, the church was destitute of an "essential" requisite in its work, and the problem of the conversion of the world had not begun to be solved. (*Hassell*)

Supererogation, Works of

Works of SUPEREROGATION: Sylvester Hassell: The Lateran Council of 1215, under Pope Innocent III., adopted seventy canons, exalting the papal supremacy to the highest point, and containing a summary of papal doctrine and polity, justifying, among other things, **transubstantiation, indulgences**, works of supererogation, and the extirpation of *heretics*. The doctrine of works of supererogation was founded upon the alleged distinction between the precepts of the law and the exhortations of the gospel, the former being considered obligatory, and the latter non-obligatory; so that, when a person performed the latter, he laid up a stock of merits; and all the merits of the saints, with the merits of Christ, formed a vast treasury, from which indulgences might on certain conditions, be granted to persons of deficient merit or of positive sinfulness. This doctrine was defended by the famous Schoolmen, Alexander Hales, Thomas Aquinas, Albertus Magnus, and Bonaventura; and it was implicitly decreed in the Council of Trent in the sixteenth century.—The Council of Toulouse, in 1229, under Pope Gregory IX., prohibited *laymen* from possessing or reading the Bible in the mother tongue; and the same pope in 1231 prohibited *laymen* from disputing on the faith under penalty of excommunication." (*Hassell*)

Supralapsarianism

SUPRALAPSARIANISM (*See under John CALVIN*)

Synergism

SYNERGISM: Sylvester Hassell: In the second and third centuries this Hellenistic spirit, in the Alexandrian and Antiochian schools, attempting to combine Pagan philosophy with Christianity, developed what is known as the *Greek Anthropology* based upon the *trichotomy* of Pythagoras, Plato, and, and after them, of the mass of Greek and Roman philosophers. They taught that man is composed of three distinct elements: 1st, *some, corpus*, or body, the material part; 2^d, *psyche, anima*, or soul, the animal part (including animal life and propensities); and 3rd, *pneuma, mens*, or spirit, the rational part (including the will and the moral affections), and that, of these three elements, only the first two, the body and the soul, were affected by the fall of Adam, the third element, the spirit or *will*, being as free and pure in all men, when born, as it was in Adam before his fall; and this universal free-will of the human race can and must take the first step in regeneration, and then the grace of God will meet and help it, and, if the will continues to co-operate with Divine grace, the soul will be finally saved. This **synergistic**, or co-operative, or Semi-Pelagian theory of regeneration and salvation, basing the decision of man's eternal destiny upon his natural free-will, had, for its ablest advocate **Origen** (born A.D. 185, died 254), who also taught that men are fallen angels, and that all men, and all the wicked angels, even Satan himself, will be finally saved. Though in point-blank contradiction not only to the general tenor, but to the plain letter of the Scriptures (John 1:13; 3:3-8; Romans 9:16; 1:6; Philippians 1:6; 2:13; Psalms 110:3; James 1:18), synergism has prevailed throughout the Greek Catholic Church for 1,700 years, and still thus prevails; and the result, or rather the concomitance, is that the Eastern or Greek Churches are declared by the latest and ablest historians to be "dead," "decayed," "petrified." Cyril Lucar, Patriarch of Constantinople, who believed the truth and attempted to teach it in the Greek communion, was five times deposed and finally strangled to death through the intrigues of the Jesuits, and his body thrown into the Bosphorus (A.D. 1638)." (*Hassell*)

Tabernacle, The: Symbolism

The TABERNACLE: Symbolism: Sylvester Hassell: The tabernacle represents Christ's mystical body, the church, in which God dwells, and Israel draws nigh to God through atonement and regeneration, and with offerings, prayers, and praises. The court represents the Jewish dispensation; the Holy Place, the Christian dispensation; the Most Holy Place, the glorified church. In the world's great wilderness, the church is a little garden inclosed by divine grace. Its aspect is toward the rising Sun of Righteousness. Every one who enters the true church must have the saving application of the Holy Spirit, represented by the holy anointing oil, and must pass by the altar of burnt-offering, and with the eye of faith behold the Lamb of God atoning thereon for his sins; and he must be washed in the laver of his precious blood—cleansed by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost. The blood comes first, and then the water; so faith in Christ's blood should come first, and then the water of baptism, and then admission into the church.

In the midst of the spiritual darkness of his world, the child of God should let his light shine—that light proceeding entirely, not from the candlestick, but from the oil of the grace and Spirit of Christ in his heart. In order for that light to burn well, the snuffs of carnal thoughts, words and deeds will frequently have to be trimmed off with the snuffers of trial, are proof and admonition, and, so as not to defile the sanctuary, be carried off with the snuff-dishes of either repentance or church censure. Having the old leaven of malice and wickedness thus purged out, he is prepared to approach the table of the Lord, and celebrate that sacred and solemn feast with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth, and thus from Sabbath to Sabbath have his spiritual grace renewed.

Though a poor sinner, and feeling himself to be such, he is yet a priest unto God, and therefore every morning and evening, and indeed evermore, should he desire to approach the golden altar, and draw as near as he may to the blessed mercy-seat, and, through the medium of Christ's prevailing atonement and intercession, pour out his fervent supplications and thanksgivings to the God of his salvation. His great High Priest and Mediator, after having made a real, an agonizing, and an efficacious atonement for him, passed beyond the veil of the white, scarlet, and purple clouds, and the blue heavens, and entered the true Holy of Holies, and there now successfully pleads the merit of his blood for every member of his mystical body.

The seven branches of the candlestick represent all the different churches of Christ at different times and places, each independent of the other in its local government, but all united in one stem, Christ, and pervaded by the oil or grace of one Spirit, having one Lord, one faith, and one baptism.

The twelve loaves of bread represent the twelve tribes of Israel, continually shown or presented before the Lord, dedicated to him, and accepted, with all their offerings by him, through the sweet frankincense of Christ's mediation, and ever partaking of his blessings. The profusion of gold represents the preciousness, beauty, solidity and purity of the church of Christ.

The perfect cube of the Holy of Holies, 10 by 10 by 10, with squares in every direction, containing the Shekinah in the midst of darkness, symbolizes the perfection, order and stability of the Divine Trinity, dwelling in inaccessible light, enveloped with impenetrable darkness. It is the parable of God's presence and nature in creation, in providence and in grace. The cherubim represent the highest creaturely life, at once manifesting and concealing God, and glorying in loving submission to him, and interested in his wonderful plan of redemption.

The ark of the covenant is Christ Jesus, who above all others has ever kept the holy law of God, and who has kept that law for his people, so that the mercy of God covers all the violations of the law, and God always looks down upon them in mercy; and Christ also has in his hand the rod of universal and eternal power, and an everlasting sufficiency of heavenly provision for all the needs of his covenant people.

The perpetual preservation of the law in this innermost shrine of the Divine worship represents the infinite and unchangeable holiness of God, also requiring perfect holiness in all those who abide in his presence. None can so abide except the living, as indicated by the blood brought annually into the Most Holy Place by the High Priest; for the blood is the life; and yet, separated from the animal, it also represents death, signifying that in order to worship God aright, the flesh must be slain, the heart must be dead to all creature-worship, and alive unto God.

The duplication of the tabernacle in Solomon's Temple represented the double emphasizing of all these momentous truths." (*Hassell's History* ppg 87, 88)

No windows in the TABERNACLE: The fact that there were no windows in the tabernacle indicates that the candlestick provided all the light the priest needed to perform his work. The light of God's word, and the light of his Spirit are sufficient for our every need; we do not need the light of this world.

Psalms 119:105, "Thy word is a LAMP unto my feet, and a LIGHT unto my path."

I Corinthians 1:21, "For after that in the wisdom of God the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe." Hlh

Tables Of Stone, The: Symbolism

The TABLES OF STONE: Symbolism: Moses and Joshua, coming down the mountain, saw what the people were doing, and Moses was so filled with anger that he threw down and broke the two tables of stone on which God had written the Ten Commandments.....typifying that the first use which man makes of God's law is to break it.....God gave to Moses other tables of stone, like unto the first, and required him to deposit them in the ark for safe keeping. The first represented our safety in Adam, which failed; the second represented our safety in Christ, which cannot fail. (*Hassell*)

Tempt

TEMPT Q. Does God ever tempt anybody? Compare Genesis 22:1, and James 1:13. **A.:** Genesis 22:1, "And it came to pass after these things, that God did tempt Abraham, and said unto him, Abraham, and he said, Behold, here I am."

James 1:13, "Let no man say when he is tempted, I am tempted of God: for God cannot be tempted with evil, neither tempteth he any man." The word *tempt* has more than one meaning. It does not always mean to entice to do evil. In the Genesis text, the Hebrew word is *nacah*; it is a primary root word meaning to prove, to assay, to test, or to tempt. God was proving Abraham, testing him. Hlh

Ten Virgins, The

The TEN VIRGINS: C.H. Cayce: The word *then*, the first word in the chapter, is used here in the sense of *therefore*. It denotes a reason; for this reason "shall the kingdom of heaven be likened unto ten virgins." The kingdom of heaven is likened unto ten virgins, not likened unto five virgins. Five of the virgins were wise and five of them were foolish; and the kingdom of heaven was

likened unto all of the ten. They all slumbered and slept—both the wise and the foolish.

At midnight the cry was made, “Behold, the bridegroom cometh.” Midnight denotes a time of darkness, and all were slumbering. So, at the closing out of the law dispensation, at the time of the coming of Christ into the world, it was a time of darkness—gross darkness—and all were slumbering.

The foolish said, “Give us of your oil; for our lamps are gone out”—or, “our lamps are going out.” Their lamps had been burning once; but they are going out now. There was a light in law worship and law service in the law dispensation; but as the law dispensation is going out, the light of that worship and service is also going out. The light was only a borrowed light, it is true; but it was needed then. In the night time, we need the light of the moon, which is a borrowed light; but when the day has come, and the sun has risen, the light of the moon is not needed, and goes out. The day of gospel worship has now come; the sun of gospel light is shining; the light of law worship is no longer needed, and it has gone out.

“But the wise said, Not so; lest there be not enough for us and you; but go ye rather to them that sell, and buy for yourselves.” We do not presume that the wise virgins would tell the foolish ones to go and buy that which was necessary for them to have in order that they have a home in heaven. The grace of God in the eternal salvation of poor sinners is not for sale.

But there is something for sale without money and without price. See Isaiah 55:1-2: “Ho, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters, and he that hath no money; come ye, buy and eat; yea, come, buy wine and milk without money and without price. Wherefore do ye spend money for that which is not bread? and your labor for that which satisfieth not? hearken diligently unto me, and eat ye that which is good, and let your soul delight itself in fatness.” This language was addressed to Israel, the Lord’s children. There was something they could buy; but they could not buy redemption or regeneration.

Again, Revelation 3:18: “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.” This language was for the church at Laodicea. They were the people of God. There was something for them to buy; and they could buy it in no other way than in rendering the service to the Lord which He required of them, and in being diligent in the same. The Lord does not require law worship or service; but He requires gospel worship and service. The light of law worship and law service has gone out.

“And while they went to buy, the bridegroom came; and they that were ready went in with him to the marriage: and the door was shut.” The readiness here, we think, is the engaging in the gospel worship and service. The door is shut on law worship and law service. That is closed out. It is not admitted in the gospel kingdom or church of Christ. The Lord has closed the door against that, and no man has the power or authority to open the door and admit law worship and law service into the church.

“Afterward came also the other virgins, saying, Lord, Lord, open to us. But he answered and said, Verily I say unto you, I know you not.” He does not recognize law service. The light of that service has gone out. He now requires gospel service. Law worship and law service is not acceptable to Him. Those who engage in that kind of service are not recognized by Him. He will not receive them or their service. If the church engages in it, the candlestick will be removed.

“Watch therefore.” For the reason that all this is true, we should watch. How necessary it is that we watch, and not engage in law worship and law service. If we do engage in such, we may be assured of the fact that the Lord will not recognize it, and that He will not receive us into the manifestation of His presence here. “For ye know neither the day nor the hour wherein the Son of man cometh.”

He comes in the manifestation of His Spirit often; we know not when He will thus come. We should be diligent in rendering the service He requires, so we may be ready for Him when He does thus come. “And, behold, I come quickly; and my reward is with me, to give every man according as his work shall be.”—Revelation 22:12. He comes quickly, or often.

The final and great lesson taught in the parable is that we should watch. It teaches the necessity of doing this. The reason for doing this is that the law dispensation is at an end, and the light of the law worship and law service was going out. Hence, the great lesson taught is the closing out of the law dispensation, law worship and service, and the ushering in of the gospel dispensation, gospel worship and service. (*Cayce's Editorials vol. 2, ppg 283-286*)

Tertullian

TERTULLIAN (*See also under NOVATION*)

Tetzel, John

John TETZEL (See under *SAINT PETER'S CATHEDRAL* and *Martin LUTHER*)

Theodore

THEODORE: Sylvester Hassell: Theodore, a Greek monk of Tarsus, in Cilicia, was “consecrated” by Pope Vitalian, in 668, to be “Archbishop of Canterbury,” and retained the *primacy* of England till his death in 690. He diffused Greek learning over England, and has been called “the father of Anglo-Saxon literature;” and he energetically organized the Anglican episcopate, so that *the latest and most approved English Episcopalian writers* frankly admit that he is “*the father of their diocesan organization*”---that “*the church of England, as we know it today, is the work, so far as its outer form is concerned, of Theodore;*” and that “*the church of England, perhaps more directly than any other church in Europe, is the daughter of the Church of Rome.*” (*Hassell's History* ppg 412, 413; italics in the original)

Thessalonians, The Books of 1st and 2nd

The Books of 1st AND 2nd THESSALONIANS: Sylvester Hassell: The Thessalonian epistles complete Paul's addresses to seven churches, and though first in composition, are properly the last in the canon as they are distinguished by the eschatological element, and sustain the conflict of faith by the preaching of that blessed hope and the glorious appearing and coming of the day of God. Paul wrote these two letters from Corinth, during his first sojourn in that city; and it seems to have been a chief object of the Apostle to correct a misapprehension into which the Thessalonians had fallen in regard to the speedy coming of Christ. He taught them that the Lord would not come so soon as they had expected, but that first there must be a falling away, and the man of sin, the son of perdition, must be revealed; that they could not make a mathematical calculation of the time when Christ would come; and that in no case should the expectation check industry and zeal, but rather stimulate them. (*Hassell's History* pg 209)

Thomas A Beckett

THOMAS A BECKETT: Sylvester Hassell: In the eleventh century William the Conqueror, King of England, refused to swear fealty to the pope; but in the twelfth century England was, even more than France and Germany, subject to the

pope. Thomas a Beckett, the haughty and impracticable “Archbishop of Canterbury,” censured and quarreled with Henry II. Of England, not for the vices of the king, which were great, but for his futile attempt to make himself independent of the pope; and some hasty and angry words of Henry led four knights to murder Beckett in 1170—Beckett indulging to the last in bitter invectives against his foes, and falling, says Milman, “as a martyr, not of Christianity, but of sacerdotalism.” Two years afterward the pope *canonized* him, and Beckett became for several centuries the most popular *saint* in England, his worship superseding that of God and even of Mary, and as many as a hundred thousand pilgrims at one time visiting his tomb. Henry himself, in 1174, underwent a public and humiliating penance there, walking three miles with bare and bleeding feet on the flinty road, prostrating himself at the tomb, scourged, at his own request, by the willing monks, and spending a night and day in prayers and tears, imploring the intercession of the *saint* in Heaven.” (*Hassell’s History* pg 436)

Thomas Aquinas

THOMAS AQUINAS (*See under Thomas AQUINAS*)

Three Hours Darkness

THREE HOURS Darkness (*See Three Hours DARKNESS at the Crucifixion of Christ*)

Time Salvation

TIME SALVATION : C.H. Cayce: If there is only one salvation, or one kind of saving, spoken of in the Bible, then no man under heaven can harmonize the Bible. In Ephesians 2:5 the apostle says, “By grace ye are saved.” They are saved by the unmerited favor of Christ. This being true, they are not saved by reason of any good thing done by them. The same apostle says, in another place, “Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to His mercy He saved us.”—Titus 3:5. They are saved according to God’s mercy, and not by any righteous works performed by them.

The same writer says, “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.”—I Timothy 4:16. Here is a saving which follows as a result of doing something, and that doing is a righteous doing. But this saving is not an eternal saving, or the receiving of eternal life. The receiving of eternal life is “not by works of righteousness which we have done,” but according to God’s mercy. Timothy

was a child of God, already in possession of eternal life, when Paul wrote the language to him just quoted.

Hence, it was too late for him to save himself in that respect; but it was not too late for him to save himself from false doctrines and wrong practices by taking heed unto himself and to doctrine and continuing therein. He would save others—"them that hear thee"—in the same way that he would save himself by doing what the apostle here admonished; hence he would save others from false doctrines and wrong practices. (*Cayce's Editorials vol. 2, ppg 378*)

J. H. Oliphant Conditionality is a necessary element of moral government. I do not regard the resurrection of the dead, or regeneration, as acts of obedience, as a vice or virtue on our part, because they are not our acts at all. They are the simple acts of God. They do not properly belong to moral government, but to another system of things.

Some of our brethren object to the word *conditional*, but I think it represents the truth on the subject as well as any word we could use. "If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love." The word *IF* in this text denotes conditionality. Webster in defining the word says, "It introduces a conditional sentence." This is not the only use of the word *if*, but Webster mentions it first.

There are hundreds of places in the Bible where the word is used as in the above text. I have conferred with some of the educators of this city relative to the meaning of the word, and I doubt whether there is a single college or institution of learning among English speaking people that would deny Webster's definition. "If ye do these things, ye shall never fall." If we tell people this is not conditional, they would not know the meaning of any text.

I regard Cruden as a good author. Our *Signs of the Times* brethren advertise his book and sell it, and I think it an excellent help to the study of the Bible. He gives the meaning; 1st, "A condition, 2nd, A supposition," 3rd, "A reason of a matter." Cruden cites some places in Deuteronomy 28, as an example of where *if* is used in a "conditional" sense, also Luke 9:23. The word *if* occurs six or eight times in Deuteronomy 28. Carefully read the whole chapter. Deuteronomy 28:2, "If thou shalt hearken unto the voice of the Lord thy God, blessed shalt thou be in the city," etc. Now, if we deny conditionality in these places, we must deny the generally accepted meaning of the word *if*.

Jesus says, "Take my yoke upon you and learn of me, and ye shall find rest." Jesus addresses his disciples as intelligent beings, and lays before them an inducement to follow him; he does not deal with them as the boy deals with his marbles, but presents motives, as if he would say, You need rest; you are

laboring and heavy laden, and need rest. He plainly encourages them to obedience by promising them rest in case they obey. Parents do the same thing with their children. “If you obey me in this matter, I will give you a toy, or give you my approval.”

Some of my brethren think it would be an unworthy motive for us to serve the Lord in the hope of receiving a blessing, but why are these motives put before us as an encourage-ment to obedience? Take the words, “If ye keep my commandment, ye shall abide in my love.” Would it be a sin for us to desire to abide in his love? Or would it show an unworthy temper if we ask, “How can I enjoy the love of God?” And when told that we shall abide in his love IF we keep his commandments, would it be a sin for us to allow this fact to weigh something with us? Certainly not. To say, “We shall be blest IN obedience” would not change the case.

If we are told that precious fruit grows on a certain road, we understand that we cannot have the fruit unless we go along that road. So, if we put it this way, there is as much reason to be influenced to obedience by the hope of reward as there is to admit that our **time salvation** is conditional. We gain nothing to say we are blest IN obedience, for in this way of putting it we clearly hold that our receiving the blessing depends on our obeying. If the blessing is IN obedience, it is plain that we must obey in order to enjoy it, and also that we cannot enjoy it in disobedience, but if men obey they will receive the blessing.

Take the text in Peter, “He that will love life, and see good days,” etc. Is it a sin to love life, and see good days? Peter here urges this as an inducement to lead brethren to obey. It is a good motive and worthy for men to desire to enjoy life. Peter tells them how to do this, “let him refrain his tongue from evil, and his lips that they speak no guile; let him seek peace, and ensue it.” As a motive and encouragement to obedience he says, “he that will love life, and see good days.” These are not the only motives, but they are some of the motives. It is not sinful to serve God and do right in order that we may see good days. Our ministers have urged this upon the people as one reason why they should obey. I have hundreds of times urged that there is sweet peace found in obedience, that we cannot have peace and rest of mind in sinful paths, hence we should eschew evil, seek peace, and ensue it. **We should distinguish between that salvation in which we are quickened, and that which “we work out.”**

God’s word does not call on us to be quickened, or to be born again; but it does, hundreds and thousands of times, show us it is OUR DUTY to obey. Now, if obedience is of grace in the same sense that being born again is of grace, how is it that we are called on to do the one and not called on to do the other? We can scarcely read a page of God’s word, but we see a command, exhortation, or

encourage-ment to obey the Lord and do right. **And we may read every line in the Old and New Testaments, and not once find it our duty to be born again.**

Now, if both are of grace in the same sense, why are we, times without limit, exhorted to do the one, and scores of motives laid before us to induce us thereto, and not once exhorted to do the other? The fact is, we should make a distinction here. We should either exhort everybody to be born again, or [exhort] nobody to obedience, or [else] we should make a **plain, clear distinction between time salvation and eternal salvation.** (*J.H. Oliphant Justification 1899 Emphasis added*)

T.S. Dalton: James says again, “Brethren, if any of you do err from the truth, and one convert him, Let him know, that he which converteth the sinner from the error of his way shall save a soul from death and hide a multitude of sins.”

Notice he is not talking about ungodly sinners, but *brethren*; hence if one of our brethren should be drawn off into error, and therefore fails of the enjoyment of the blessings of the *time salvation*, it is our duty to labor with him, and do all we can to convert him from the error of his way, and we thereby *save* a soul from death, and hide a multitude of sins.

Not that we *save* him from an eternal death, for Jesus alone can do that, but we *save* him from that error in which he has been ensnared, and thereby enable him to enjoy again the blessings of the *time salvation*. (*Zions Advocate Oct. 1897*)

Sylvester Hassell: All Primitive Baptists are agreed upon the unconditionality of our eternal salvation, and the inability of those who are dead in sin to render spiritual obedience to the law of God. Instead of repentance and faith being conditions prerequisite to salvation, we understand that they are the work of the Holy Spirit in the renewed heart, and are the essential parts of salvation; and, until this spiritual renewal, the fallen child of Adam will love sin and hate holiness and continue in rebellion against God.

But there is an apparent disagreement in two or three of our associations, among worthy and lovely brethren, who would be heartily fellowshipped and gladly welcomed by other Primitive Baptists everywhere, as to whether our time salvation, that is, our deliverance from spiritual darkness, coldness, distress, and chastisement during the present life is conditioned or dependent upon our obedience to God, and as to whether the child of God is able to obey or not.

Now, even the authors of dictionaries have no right to manufacture or change the meanings of words; their business is simply to ascertain and state the meanings

which words actually and already have in the language of which they treat. It would be deceptive to use words in a different sense from that which they generally have, unless we explain the sense which we mean. The most of controversies are strifes of words; and when words are properly defined, and their correct meaning is accepted by both parties, the controversy ends.

A “condition” is defined by the best of English dictionaries to be “an event, object, fact, or being that is necessary to the occurrence or existence of some other, though not its cause; a prerequisite; that which must exist as the occasion or concomitance of something else; that which is requisite in order that something else should take effect; an essential qualification.” And these dictionaries say that the word “if” is “the typical conditional particle, and is nearly always used to introduce the subordinate clause of a conditional sentence,” and means “on the supposition that; provided, or on condition that; in case that, granting, allowing, or supposing that.”

There are 1,422 “ifs” in the Bible—830 in the Old Testament, and 592 in the New Testament; and these conditional sentences make up about one-fiftieth part of the Bible. Thus forty-nine fiftieths of the Scriptures are unconditional, and one fiftieth is conditional. All reverent minds must admit that this conditional part of the Scriptures, though comparatively small, has a real and true meaning.

It cannot be denied by any informed and honest man that such Scriptures as the following are conditional: “If his children forsake my law, I will visit their transgression with the rod, nevertheless, my loving-kindness will I not utterly take from him,” Psalms 89:30-33. “If ye be willing and obedient, ye shall eat the good of the land; but if ye refuse and rebel, ye shall be devoured with the sword, for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it,” Isaiah 1:19-20. “If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them,” John 13:17. “If ye live after the flesh, he shall die; but if ye, through the Spirit do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live,” Romans 8:13. “How shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation?” Hebrews 2:3. “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,” I John 2:7. See also such scriptures as Leviticus 26; Deuteronomy 4:29-31; 7:12-26; 11:13-32; 28; Ezekiel 18; 33.

Not only is it certain that these scriptures are conditional, but it is equally certain that the condition, introduced by “if,” necessarily precedes the conclusion, which would not take place unless the condition took place first. If the conclusion in these sentences means eternal punishment, then Arminianism is true; but either the text itself, or the context and other scriptures, prove that the punishment or chastisement threatened in case of disobedience, is temporal and corrective, and not eternal and destructive, for God gives his children eternal life, and they shall

never perish, and though their voluntary sins separate them from his face, nothing present or future can ever separate them from his love. (John 10:28-30; Hebrews 12; Isaiah 59:2; Romans 8:28-39).

Thus the conditionality of time salvation is just as certain as the truth of the eternal word of God.

Baptists have always heretofore understood it so; nearly all Baptists understand it so now; and this truth is in perfect accordance with Christian experience. And if the living child of God, having the indwelling of the Spirit of life and grace, which makes him alive, is not able to obey heartily and sincerely, though imperfectly, the commandments of his heavenly Father, his real state does not differ from that of those who are dead in sin. Of course he can do nothing spiritual or acceptable to God except by that Spirit of grace; but that Spirit dwells in him. John 14:16-17); Romans 8:9-17; II Corinthians 6:16; Ephesians 2:22); and he can do all things through Christ who strengthens him. (Philippians 4:13); and he well knows and loves to confess that he has nothing good which he did not receive from God, and that without Christ he can do nothing, and that, by the grace of God, he is what he is—a poor, hell-deserving sinner, **SAVED BY GRACE**—a brand plucked from the eternal burning (I Corinthians 4:7; James 1:17; John 15:5; I Corinthians 15:10; I Timothy 1:15; Zechariah 3:2).

And he knows just as well, both from the Scriptures and his own experience, that in wilful disobedience to God, he does not enjoy that spiritual comfort which he has in obedience.

All the children of God are assured of these truths as they are of their own existence; and bitter contention over them is wholly unnecessary, unprofitable, unwholesome, and subverting. The ENTIRE scriptural truth about any matter unites, comforts, and edifies the children of God; while a contention for a PART of the truth for the WHOLE truth divides, distresses, and overthrows them. Truth is spherical; we must look at it on all sides to understand it at all aright. Extremes are dangerous; let us avoid them as we would the verge of a fatal precipice. “Let our moderation be known unto all men—the Lord is at land,” Philippians 4:5. (*Sylvester Hassell Advocate and Messenger 1939*)

S.F. Cayce: I know that when I first identified with the Baptists in this country (in 1866) they ALL believed that our eternal salvation is wholly unconditional, altogether the work of God, but that the time salvation, or Christian enjoyment, of the children of God (those already born of God) in this life depends greatly upon their obedience, and that it (their timely salvation) is in that sense conditional.” (*Cayce’s Editorials vol. 1, pg. 8*)

TIME SALVATION: J. H. Oliphant vs. Silas Durand Silas Durand began preaching not long after the Civil War and continued to preach well into the Twentieth Century. He was one of the most articulate and influential of all preachers. Some of us have spent many happy hours in reading his writings. Like Gilbert Beebe and other Absoluters, he could be very edifying and instructive—so long as he stayed away from some of his fatalistic ideas.

In his earlier ministry, like any sound Primitive Baptist in any age, he defended what he called “*conditional* salvation inside the church.” In his later ministry he reversed himself, and began to deny what he had once preached, and accused those who advocated what we call *time salvation* of advocating a *new and strange thing*. That seems to be always the pattern, when someone abandons the truth, he accuses those who oppose his departure of coming up with a new doctrine.

I have before me a copy of his correspondence with Elder J. H. Oliphant. In this little book Elder Oliphant points out that what Silas Durand calls *a new and strange thing* is nothing more than the very doctrine Durand had himself once preached.

Elder Oliphant says, “In the *Monitor* of October you say, ‘In the beginning of my ministry I sometimes spoke of a ‘conditional’ salvation inside the church, referring to the fact that only when we are walking in obedience to the commands of Jesus can we enjoy the power and comfort of that salvation.’ In my letter to you I do not think I contended for more or less than is contained in this quotation. Had you not shifted your position you would have the hearty endorsement of our brethren now.” Elder Durand had abandoned the doctrine of *conditional* (time) salvation he once preached, and many Primitive Baptists abandoned him. Elder Oliphant pointed out that the Primitive Baptists had abandoned him, because he had abandoned his former doctrine.

It is safe to say that, no matter how sound in the faith, nor how edifying a minister might once have been, nor how sound he may still be with regard to other doctrines, the Bible instruction is clear. “If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him godspeed, for he that biddeth him godspeed is partaker of his evil deeds,” I John 1:10,10. If he is known to preach falsehood, we must not invite him into our pulpit.

Elder Durand was a prolific and effective writer. He was known and respected wherever there were Primitive Baptists. Till this very day his writings are still being republished and distributed. But we must not let that move us. Paul tells

us, “But though we, or an angel from heaven preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed,” Galatians 1:8. And then, not being satisfied with having barely stated it, he will not let it rest; he says it again, “As we said before, so say I now again, If any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed,” Galatians 1:9.

It is hard to imagine how Paul could have found any stronger language than he did. We are living in an age when people do not believe doctrine is important. Paul emphasized the importance of doctrine by calling down a woe on anybody who preached any other gospel. As forceful and articulate as Silas Durand was, his ministry underscored the danger of departing from the Bible standard.

If there is no such thing as *time salvation*, there is no basis for exhorting the congregation to exert themselves in the service of the Lord. To say it another way, if everything that will ever happen was fixed and determined before the world began, we are all reduced to mere spectators in the grand scheme of things.

You will notice in the quotes to follow that Durand is more consistent than most halfhearted Absoluters. Since he is so sure that God has already predestinated everything—both good and evil—that will ever happen, **he insists there is nothing to be gained in obedience, nothing to be lost in disobedience.**

He is sure there is no reason to fear that God will punish us for our disobedience, no reason to exhort or encourage the saints. If ever there was a doctrine calculated to destroy lives—and churches—that doctrine is it.

Granted, most of those who deny the reality of *time salvation*, continue to exhort the faithful, but exhorting people to good works at the same time you insist that every result is already determined is like mounting a flywheel off-center and trying to make it run smooth. If you mount it off-center, there is a good chance it is going to vibrate.

And if you tell people there is nothing to be lost in disobedience—no reason to fear God will punish them—there is a good chance they will transgress.

But listen to these two men as they debate the question. The emphasis is added. hlh

Objection to the term conditional time salvation

Durand: Before the expression, “conditional time salvation,” had been used in any Old Baptist publication, so far as I know, I had sometimes spoken of a

“conditional salvation inside of the church.” but do not remember of writing it. **I soon saw, as I thought, that I was not warranted in the use of that word**, that it did not express the truth of doctrine and experience. Concerning that doctrine and experience my mind did not change, but only as to **the propriety of using that word** to express the salvation that is experienced in time, while walking in the paths of righteousness.

Oliphant: You would refuse the terms “free will” and “free moral agency” because they have been so long used with an unscriptural meaning, and say, “The Bible terms will do for us;” but you do not apply this rule to the expression, “The absolute predestination of all things,” and which seem to the most of our brethren to teach a very objectionable sentiment. I still complain of your position, because it strips man of all WILL or CHOICE, in his conduct as truly as if he were a tree or a stone. In your reply you say, “That is true,” admitting that men are as destitute of will in their actions as a tree, because the prophet uses the figure “Trees of righteousness” and you accept the comparison of a Christian to a stone without any will, because Peter speaks of them as “lively stones.”

Removes distinction between right and wrong

Durand: If the Lord works in them that which is well pleasing in his sight, and if they declare by inspiration that he has wrought *all* their works in them, what more outside works can there be? I do not suppose such thoughts would occur to one except upon the supposed necessity in order to defend a conditional salvation.

Oliphant: You quote the text, “for thou also hast wrought all our works in us.” What do you understand by the words “all our works?” Did God work David’s works in his behavior with Uriah and his wife, in him? Did he work Peter’s conduct in denying his Lord, in him? You complain of a heart deceitful and desperately wicked. Did God work all this deceitfulness in you? You quote this text several times as if it were your main reliance.

If all our sins and wickedness are wrought in us by the Lord, then wherein does right differ from wrong? You also quote Hebrews 13:20-21, “Working in them that which is well pleasing in his sight.” Is there anything in or about God’s people that is not well pleasing in his sight? Paul mentions some, I Corinthians 10:5, “With many of them God was not well pleased.” If every work was wrought in them, how does it occur that God was not well pleased with them? In Hebrews 13:16, “With such sacrifices God is well pleased.” But if God is pleased with all our conduct and all our ways, why mention that with such sacrifices God is well pleased.” There is as much difference between right and

wrong as there is between heaven and hell, and yet you do not make a distinction, that I can see.

Oliphant: I have all my life heard Baptists affirm that regeneration is unconditional and independent of our choice. We become sons and heirs unconditionally, but as His sons we are under a parental or disciplinary government, which is conditional. We may be tried and even burned, but a good conscience can only be maintained by paying the price of its maintenance, and a good conscience is of great value. **My own experience is that doing wrong is widely different from doing right.**

Denies the reality of obedience

Durand: What has our will to do with our love, or with our belief? We cannot of ourselves will to do either, neither is it of our will that we keep the commandments.

Oliphant: You say, “Neither is it of our will (or choice) that we keep the commandments.” **If you are right in this, there is no such thing as obedience,** if we pay any attention to the meaning of the word *obedience*, you make a sad blunder when you say, “Neither is it of our will” etc. On your plan God’s government of his people is like the boy’s government of his marbles. You may say, “Neither is it of the will of the marble that it is in the right place.” Your theory requires a new dictionary, made expressly to suit your doctrine.

Oliphant: Obedience is a virtue, and disobedience a sin, but it was no virtue in Lazarus to come to life, and no sin to remain dead. Obedience is not the act of an inert, lifeless body, but the intelligent, willing act of a conscious being. It is a MORAL ACT with respect to MORAL LAW, while quickening into life is the independent act of God, and is not a moral act.

Durand: Again, you remind me that my “theory” strips man of will [or] choice as fully as a tree in its bearing or not bearing fruit. That is true; that figure is also used more than once in describing the Lord’s people in their gospel state. They are “trees of righteousness,” and he will be glorified in the fruit they shall bear; Isaiah 61:3. They are branches of Christ, the true Vine, and he says, “From me is thy fruit found.” His will is effectually wrought in them. He will “make them perfect to do his will, working in them that which is well pleasing in his sight,” and he shall be glorified in them; Hebrews 13:21.

He insists salvation in time is never optional

Durand: He never invites. **The word “invite” is never used by him, nor concerning him, in the Scriptures. He calls, and his call is always obeyed.** He speaks, not to the ear, but to the heart, and his word never returns to him void, but accomplishes his will; Isaiah 55:11. He describes those he calls as they are, “laboring and heavy laden,” unable to do any part of the work of satisfying the law, which presses them down under its condemning power, while they struggle under it, unable to rise. They can not go from sin to holiness, from the powers of darkness to him. But his call brings them.

Oliphant: You say the word “invite” is never used by him nor concerning him in the Scriptures. He calls, and his call is always obeyed.” Now read, “As though God did beseech you by us, we pray you in Christ’s stead, be ye reconciled to God.” He appeals to them in Christ’s stead. Is this always obeyed? **And if our wills are in no sense connected with obedience, why does he use the words “beseech” and “pray?”** If our obedience is of God, just as regeneration is of God, or just as the raising of Lazarus was of God, how is it that Paul uses the words “beseech” and “pray” in urging to obedience, if it is of God as regeneration is of God? While the word “invite” is not used here, yet the words “beseech” and “pray” suggest as much dependence on the will as the word “invite” would suggest.

He denies anything is gained in obedience or lost in disobedience

Durand: There seems to prevail in the mind of some brethren, the worldly view of reward or a fear of punishment is necessary to compel obedience. * * * * Will any offered reward cause one to seek righteousness as he does who hungers for it? Will any fear of punishment turn one away from evil as effectually as a hatred of evil felt in the heart?

Durand: The principle now so much advocated of doing works of obedience for the reward which shall be given them, I decidedly distrust and oppose in myself or another.

Durand: In commenting on this you say the Savior addresses his people as parents say to their children, “If you will obey me in this matter I will give you a toy, or give you my approval.” Again you say, “He presents motives, as if he would say, You need rest, you are laboring and heavy laden, and need rest. He plainly encourages them to obedience by promising rest in case they obey.” I do not understand it so at all.

Oliphant: In your effort to set aside the moral government of God you find it essential to leave nothing in any way dependent on our wills in the matter of obedience, and hence you must hold that his commands are always obeyed. You

say, "I have wondered why spiritually instructed men should try to apply them to gospel things which are all made new. That was the form of the conditional covenant, and the conditional expressions are correctly quoted by you." In this you admit that God's people were under a conditional state of things then, but not now, because things were not as certain then as now. How one can hold things uncertain under the old covenant, but certain now, and yet believe in the absolute predestination of all things, I cannot see.

Makes God the cause of all good and all evil

Durand: I do not find two kinds of predestination spoken of in the Bible or elsewhere. I do not understand that the difference you refer to between physical and moral government and necessity applies to this subject * * * * If he works in them that which is well pleasing in his sight, can there be any uncertainty as to whether they will all please him in his own time?

Oliphant: You say, "I do not find two kinds of predestination spoken of in the Bible. You certainly admit that predestination is efficacious, causative, respecting our regeneration, creation, etc. So, if you know of but one kind of predestination, you would also hold that sin is also efficaciously predestinated. In your article in the *Church Advocate*, October, 1896, you say, "Can we think that he predestinated salvation, and all the times and ways of its experience * * * * and did not predestinate that which made it necessary * * * * Did the Lord predestinate the rainbow and not the dark cloud in which he set it to display its glorious beauty?" From these and many of your expressions we would understand you to hold that God is as much the cause of evil as he is of good; and what is this but to destroy the distinction between right and wrong?

He puts dragging in the place of leading

Durand: They feel a longing for this, but their own will and work will not lead them into that holy walk. It can only be as they "are led by the Spirit," Galatians 5:18, and as Jesus walks in them, as he said, "I will dwell in them, and walk in them."

Oliphant: You quote, "If ye be led by the Spirit," etc. Galatians 4:18. The word *led* implies that those led are willing to be led. If the party led is not willing and active, then it would be *drag*. So this word *lead* is fatal to your position that the will is not concerned in our obedience.

If any man will do his will," John 7:17. So here again the will is concerned in doing God's will. Numberless places could be found showing the will to be

concerned in obedience. Duty would mean nothing, obedience would mean nothing, if we exclude the will from them. Vice, virtue, right, or wrong, might be excluded from every language under heaven, and man is reduced in his conduct to the level of a watch or a clock.

The fact is when you deny the will of man being concerned in his obedience, you deny that man is a moral being. The planets obey the laws they are under, but not willingly; they are not moral beings. And so I understand you to deny man to be a moral being. The words obey, disobey, vice, virtue, leads, led, duty, reward—all these words denote a dependence on the will, and I understand you to change the meaning of all these words to suit your notion of things.

He denies the will is involved in

obedience

Durand: I do not understand, as you assert, that the word *if*, as used in the New Testament, implies a condition. It is never used as expressing a dependence upon the will of the creature, as it is in the Old testament.

Oliphant: But does the New testament teach, as you insist, that the obedience of God's people is independent of the will? You admit that in the Old Testament obedience is dependent on the will. "If ye forsake the Lord and serve strange gods, then he will turn and do you hurt." You seem to admit that in this command the will is concerned. The Savior says, "If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love." Can you see any difference in the form of these two commands? And if the will is concerned in the one, how can you say the will is not concerned in the other? Let anyone hunt out the commands of God to Israel of old, and lay them down side by side with the commands of God to his people now, and show how or why the will is excluded from our conduct now, and was not excluded from their conduct. I am sure the form of expression is the same. It is the same God, and the people of God are now just what they were then, and so now why should God's words to his people mean one thing in the Old Testament, and another in the New? The blessings from obedience in the Old testament were all confined to time, and the curses for disobedience were all confined to time, and so it is now in the church. I think you are hard pressed if you espouse a theory that requires you to hold that the commands of God in the Old Testament were not all obeyed, but in the New they are all obeyed.

Oliphant: See also Hebrews 10:28, "He that despised Moses' law died under two or three witnesses. Of how much sorer punishment suppose ye shall he be thought worthy?" etc. Here Paul again shows that the conditional covenant that Israel was under illustrates God's discipline over his people here, now, and shows that the antitype corresponds with the type.

He denies the word if indicates a condition

Durand: The word *if* does not in my view imply anywhere in the new covenant a condition which may or may not be performed, and upon the performance of which, by us, according to our will, depends our experience of favors and blessings of God.

Oliphant: The word “if” denotes conditionality, and it is frequently used in the New Testament. You say, “The Savior and his apostles do not say, ‘if you will, but ‘if you do.’ It is never used to show a dependence upon the will of the creature,” etc. But the Savior and his apostles do say, “If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine,” etc. If some dependence is not here expressed, what sentence would express dependence on the will? Also, “If ye will hear his voice, harden not your hearts,” etc.

Oliphant: Paul does not say that God will make his children perfect, as you quote, but he earnestly invokes God TO DO SO! I must kindly protest against your dropping the words, “In every good work” from Paul’s words. It would be unimportant had you not dared anyone to say that the sins of David and Jonah and Peter were contrary to God’s will! Paul petitioned, or desired that God would “Make you perfect *in every good work* to do his will, working in you that which is well pleasing in his sight.” But you would have us understand that God’s will is as effectually wrought in their disobedience as in their obedience, and that “From him is their fruit found.”

We are moral beings subject to moral law

Oliphant; Paul not only prays God to perfect his brethren, but also exhorts and beseeches them, sometimes with tears and anguish of heart, to a righteous course; to take earnest heed to themselves; to quench not the Spirit; to grieve not the Holy Spirit of God, whereby they are sealed unto the day of redemption. He speaks of doing despite to the Spirit of grace, and of sinning willfully after we have received a knowledge of the truth. If we are as destitute of choice, or will, or incapable of any intelligent activity as a stone or a tree, how can we do any of these things or be benefitted by exhortation? Inanimate objects, like a stone or a tree, can make no response, for they are not moral beings; but men are, and choice is one of the essentials of that state. If men are not moral beings, there would be no moral government; and as such terms as “right” and “wrong” belong to moral government, I see no reason, your theory being true, why these works might not have been left out of all language.

Oliphant: In regeneration we are passive, but in obedience we are active. Resurrection is a physical act of God, but obedience is a willing, moral act of Jesus or his people. So there is a distinction between God's decrees touching our obedience and our regeneration.

Oliphant: You must see there are many instances where conditions are expressed in the New Testament in the strongest possible manner; that some please God by keeping his commandments, while against the disobedient his wrath is revealed. You know that the apostles would beseech and pray and exhort and warn in order to affect the conduct of men; and yet you insist that our happiness is in nowise conditional or dependent upon our walk, but that God's will is effectually wrought whether we obey or disobey, and that our will is no more concerned in our obedience than the tree is in the bearing of fruit.

TIME SALVATION: Deuteronomy 11:26-28: C. H. Cayce: "Behold, I set before you this day a blessing and a curse; a blessing, if ye obey the commandments of the Lord your God, which I command you this day: and a curse, if ye will not obey the commandments of the Lord your God, but turn aside out of the way which I command you this day, to go after other gods, which ye have not known."

It seems to us that this language is as plain as language could make it that the Lord here promised the children of Israel a blessing if they would render that obedience unto Him which He required of them. The blessing which He promised depended upon their doing what He commanded. Here were blessings they were to enjoy upon the ground of rendering obedience, and upon that ground only. He did not promise these blessings whether they rendered obedience or not, or unconditionally. On the other hand, He promised a curse if they did not render that obedience unto Him, but if they should turn aside and serve other gods. Here is punishment promised upon their disobedience.

Deuteronomy 30:15-20 reads: "See, I have set before thee this day life and good, and death and evil; in that I command thee this day to love the Lord thy God, to walk in His ways, and to keep His commandments and His statutes and His judgments, that thou mayest live and multiply: and the Lord thy God shall bless thee in the land whither thou goest to possess it. But if thine heart turn away, so that thou wilt not hear, but shalt be drawn away, and worship other gods, and serve them; I denounce unto you this day, that ye shall surely perish, and that ye shall not prolong your days upon the land, whither thou passest over Jordan to go to possess it. I call heaven and earth to record this day against you, that I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing: therefore choose life, that both thou and thy seed may live: that thou mayest love the Lord thy God, and that thou mayest obey His voice, and that thou mayest cleave unto Him: for He is the

life, and the length of thy days: that thou mayest dwell in the land which the Lord swore unto thy fathers to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob to give them.”

It seems to us that this language, too, is as plain as it can be made. He did not set life and death before the Gentiles, or the world of the ungodly; but He set them before Israel, His people, and required obedience of them, and promised the blessing if they rendered the obedience required. On the other hand, rebellion and disobedience would bring death and destruction upon them. The life nor the death were neither of them eternal, but the life was to be enjoyed in the land of Canaan, which the Lord promised to give to Abraham and to his seed after him. The land, therefore, belonged to the Israelites. It was theirs by gift and by birth.

They were not required to render obedience to the Lord in order that the land be theirs; but they were required to render obedience unto Him in order that they continue in the land and enjoy the blessings in the land.

National Israel were a typical people; they were a type of spiritual Israel. As national Israel were required to render obedience unto the Lord in order that they enter the land of Canaan and enjoy the blessings of the land, even so the Lord's Israel today—spiritual Israel—must obey the Lord, or render service unto Him, in order that they enter the church—the antitype of the land of Canaan, the gospel Canaan—and enjoy the blessings in the church. The blessings here promised were to be enjoyed only when they rendered the service unto the Lord which He required, and could not be had or enjoyed any other way. The Lord made the enjoyment of these blessings to depend upon the obedience rendered by them unto Him. As the Lord put it that way, no man could or can change it and make it some other way.

Here the Lord commanded them to choose life. It would be folly to command one to choose life who had no life. Choice is something that pertains to and belongs to life. One must have life in order to choose. Hence those people were not alien sinners, or destitute of life. They were to prolong their life in Canaan by doing what the Lord commanded. They would escape punishment, sorrow, distress, captivity, and destruction by the sword by doing what the Lord required. This belongs today to the Lord's people.

If all would only awake to duty and each one of us be found at our post doing what the Lord requires of us, how much better it would be. May the Lord help us so to do. (*Cayce's Editorials vol. 4, ppg 403-406*)

TIME SALVATION: Deuteronomy 28-30: Harold Hunt: Quite often, somebody wants to know, “If the Bible does not teach what you call *Arminianism*, where do those preachers come up with all their proof texts. The

fact is that *Arminian* preachers come up with their proof texts by taking texts that deal with what we Primitive Baptists call *time salvation*—salvation in this time world from the snares and pitfalls of this life—and giving them an eternal application. They take God’s *promises* to his born again children and make them into *propositions* to the dead alien sinner. They change those promises of blessings into conditions to gaining eternal life.

The Calvinist does much the same thing. He first throws in a hefty dose of fatalism. Then he takes God’s timely promises to his born again children, and applies them to eternal salvation. What the Arminian makes into a *condition*, the Calvinist makes into an *inevitable consequence*. He is sure that if one does not hear and believe the preached gospel, it is irrefutable evidence he is not one of the elect. If he is beyond the reach of the preached gospel, the Calvinist is sure he will burn forever. The one doctrine is as chilling as the other.

In order to change the subject, those who oppose the doctrine of time salvation often pretend the controversy is over the sovereignty of God. But divine sovereignty has never been the question. God is sovereign in all he does. He is sovereign in saving his people from eternal damnation, and he is sovereign in his dealings with them on a day to day basis.

When we say there are conditions involved in our salvation, we mean just that. There is a difference between saying there are conditions involved, and saying that time salvation is absolutely conditional. It is true that God showers us with his timely blessings when we obey, and he chastises us when we disobey. But it is also true that he often blesses us *in spite of the fact* that we do not obey. He is sovereign; he can do that. Considering that even “all our righteousnesses are as filthy rags” (Isaiah 64:6), and that we never deserve even “the least of his mercies” (Genesis 32:10), we must acknowledge that even our temporal blessings are the product of his sovereignty.

But the fact remains that God does promise blessings *if* we obey, and he does warn us of the consequences *if* we disobey. We never receive all the blessings we might have, had we been more diligent in the Lord’s service. And it is a fact that much of the trouble that comes our way is the product of our carelessness.

National Israel was, in many ways, a type of spiritual Israel, and in Deuteronomy 28-30, God set before Israel life and death, blessing and cursing—blessing if they obeyed, and cursing if they disobeyed. God has been faithful to that promise; he did bless them when they obeyed. But they forgot his promises and his warnings, and they are—even to this very day—experiencing the consequences of their disobedience. Listen to God’s instructions.

“See, I have set before thee this day, life and good, and death and evil, in that I command thee this day to love the Lord thy God, to walk in his ways, and to keep his commandments, and his statutes, and his judgments, that thou mayest live and multiply, and the Lord thy God shall bless thee in the land whither thou goest to possess it. But if thine heart turn away, so that thou wilt not hear, but shalt be drawn away and worship other gods, and serve them, I denounce unto you this day, that ye shall surely perish, and that ye shall not prolong your days upon the land whither thou passest over Jordan to possess it. I call heaven and earth to record this day against you that **I have set before you life and death**, blessing and cursing; therefore choose life, that both thou and thy seed may live,” Deuteronomy 30:15-19.

The Majority Opinion

The majority opinion in religious circles is that every person comes into this world with a responsibility, either to choose eternal life, and live in heaven, or to reject God, to reject eternal life and to suffer in all eternity. And those who advocate that notion are convinced they have Bible proof for their doctrine.

I have heard people say that every denomination can prove its doctrine, if you will just allow them to select their own proof texts. That is not true. The only thing you can prove by the Bible is the truth. The Bible is one harmonious fabric throughout. If there is one verse in the Bible that teaches eternal heaven is conditioned on our choice, you will not find one verse that denies it. On the other hand, if you find one verse in the Bible that teaches our home in eternal heaven is based on the sovereign grace of God, you will not find one verse in the Bible to deny that.

The Bible is in agreement with itself. We cannot go through the Bible and pick out what we want, and reject all the other. I want it all. Solomon said, “Buy the truth and sell it not,” Proverbs 23:23. I am not willing to surrender so much as one verse to those who advocate error.

I Have Set Before Thee Life and Death

But the objector says, “Now, wait a minute, Harold Hunt; you have contradicted yourself. You started out with a text that teaches our doctrine; listen to what it says. ‘See, I have set before thee this day life and good, and death and evil.’” He says, “If that is not plain enough, verse nineteen says ‘I call heaven and earth to record against you this day that **I have set before you life and death**, blessing and cursing; therefore choose life, that both thou and thy seed may live.’”

At first glance, those verses do seem to teach the doctrine of salvation by man's free will. Our carnal minds are much more conditioned to accept error than they are to accept truth. And if we are not careful, we will read into a passage something it does not say.

The best way to understand the Bible is, first off, don't argue with the Book. Let it say what it says.

Does Not Require Much Interpreting

The Bible does not require nearly as much interpreting as most people imagine it does. Every now and then I hear somebody make a statement that sounds very good. Error can sometimes sound very much like the truth. Somebody says, "I always interpret the Bible literally." That sounds good, doesn't it? "I always interpret the Bible literally."

The fact is that you cannot *interpret* any document *literally*. Somebody says, "Now, wait a minute, Harold Hunt. What kind of statement is that?" But do you see? You either *interpret* something, or else you take it *literally*; you cannot do both. If you interpret anything, you are not taking it literally.

There are some passages that must be interpreted. The types, shadows, figures, symbols, parables, and some of the prophecies, must be interpreted in order to understand what is being said.

For instance, the metaphors of the Bible must be interpreted. The Bible refers to Christ as *that Rock*. "For they drank of that spiritual *Rock* that followed them: and that *Rock* was Christ," I Corinthians 10:4. The word *rock* is a metaphor; it needs to be interpreted. The Lord is not a stone; he is represented by a stone. He is like a stone; he is solid and enduring. There is some of the Bible that must be interpreted; but there is not much. With most of it, you should just let it say what it says. And in this text that is all you have to do. It does not take a lot of interpreting to see what he is saying. Just keep reading. It will explain itself.

Blessing In the Land

Deuteronomy 30:16, "And the Lord, thy God, shall bless thee **in the land** whither thou goest to possess it." He is not talking about gaining a home in heaven; he is talking about life or death **in the land---the land of Canaan**. But lest we might have missed it, in Deuteronomy 30:18 he says, "I denounce unto you this day, that ye shall surely perish, and that ye shall not prolong your days **upon the land**." He wants to make sure we get the point. He is talking about life in the land of Canaan. He is not talking about life in eternal heaven.

“I call heaven and earth to record this day against you that I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing. Therefore, choose life that both thou and thy seed may live. That thou mayest love the Lord thy God, and that thou mayest obey his voice, and that thou mayest cleave unto him for he is thy life and the length of thy days: that thou mayest dwell **in the land** which the Lord swore unto thy fathers, to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob, to give them.” Deuteronomy 30:19-20.

He says the same thing three times in rapid succession, and if somebody does get it by the third time, there is not much need to say it the fourth time. Very often, we preachers repeat ourselves. If I repeat myself, it is an indication that I probably forgot my place. I repeat myself trying to remember where I was, and where I was headed. But God never loses his place. If he repeats himself, he repeats himself for our benefit.

He repeats himself, because we might have missed it the first time. He repeats himself, generally, in slightly different words, because he knows the tendency of the sinful heart of man to gainsay and twist the Scriptures. He knows there are those who will look at a verse and say, “Well, that does not mean exactly what it says; here is what it really means,” and they twist it to fit their own point of view.

But there is often another verse that says the same thing in slightly different words. I call that *the gotcha text*. A person figures out a way to dodge one text, but when he has dodged it, all of a sudden, here comes another verse, from another direction, and it catches him. By twisting the first text, he places himself squarely in the cross-hairs of *the gotcha text*.

This text has absolutely nothing to do with eternal heaven. It has everything to do with the land of Canaan. It has to do with the inheritance of Israel, in the land of promise.

What the Text Does Teach

I think I have said enough to demonstrate that this text does not belong to those people who teach that eternal heaven is conditioned on your works. They can twist it all they want to, but it will never fit their system.

But, on the other hand, very often we deal with this text, and others like it. We prove that it does not belong to those who teach error. And when we are satisfied we have proved our point, we leave it alone. This text does not teach what the majority of religious people think it does, but it does teach something. And I would like for us to spend the rest of this little booklet looking at what it does teach.

What it does teach is very unsettling. Isaiah said, “Comfort ye, comfort ye my people, saith your God, speak ye comfortably to Jerusalem, and cry unto her that her warfare is accomplished, that her iniquity is pardoned, for she hath received of the Lord’s hand double for all he sins,” Isaiah 40:1. The gospel message is a comforting message, but there are some parts of Bible truth that scare the living daylights out of me. I fear that sometimes we preachers only preach about the comforting parts, because when we preach on the warnings of the Bible, people get upset at us. But the Lord’s preaching often upset people. God did not call us to rock people to sleep.

In Israel of old the people told the prophets, “Speak unto us smooth things; prophesy deceits,” Isaiah 30:10. They would much rather hear the promises than the warnings. Even today, we preachers spend too much time speaking smooth things. What this text does teach can be very unsettling. I believe God’s people need to be stirred up—stirred up about those things we do wrong. We need to caution God’s children about how we suffer, when we experience the chastening rod of God.

Blessing and Cursing

Paul said, “**It is a fearful thing** to fall into the hands of the living God,” Hebrews 10:31. “The fear of God is the beginning of wisdom,” Psalms 111:10, and if the warnings of God do not scare you, they ought to.

To get the background of our text we need to go back to chapter twenty-seven. “And Moses with the elders of the children of Israel commanded the people, saying, Keep all the commandments which I command you this day,” Deuteronomy 27:1. God was going to lead them into the land of Canaan. They would receive the land as a free gift, but if they expected to continue to enjoy the benefits of the land, there were some commandments they would have to obey.

“Therefore it shall be that when ye be gone over Jordan, that ye shall set these stones which I command you this day in Mount Ebal, and thou shalt plaster them with plaster....And thou shalt write upon the stones all the words of this law very plainly,” Deuteronomy 27:4,8. “And Moses charged the people the same day saying, “These shall stand upon Mount Gerizim **to bless the people** when ye come over Jordan; Simeon, and Levi, and Judah, and Issachar, and Joseph, and Benjamin. And these shall stand upon Mount Ebal **to curse**, Reuben, and Gad, and Asher, and Zabulun, and Dan, and Naphtali,” Deuteronomy 27:11-13. If Israel obeyed God, while they were in the land of Canaan, they would enjoy great *blessing*, blessing such as no nation had ever enjoyed. But if they refused

and rebelled, there was a *curse* waiting for them. They would suffer as no nation ever suffered.

In **Deuteronomy 28**, we read the blessings that were promised. When Israel obeyed the commandments of God, they were the most blessed of all people. But when they transgressed, they were some of the most miserable of all people. Listen to the list of blessings. These are the ways God said Israel would be blessed, if they did what he commanded them to do.

Blessed Shalt Thou Be

“Blessed shalt thou be in the city, and blessed shalt thou be in the field,” **Deuteronomy 28:3**. That pretty well covers the territory, doesn't it? In the city, in the field, wherever they happened to be, God would shower blessings on them. “Blessed shall be the fruit of thy body, and the fruit of thy ground, and the fruit of thy cattle, and the increase of thy kine, and the flocks of thy sheep; blessed shall be thy basket and thy store; blessed shalt thou be when thou comest in, and blessed shalt thou be when thou goest out; the Lord shall cause thine enemies that rise up against thee to be smitten before thy face; they shall come out against thee one way, and flee before thee seven ways.” Deuteronomy 28:4-7.

That fairly well covers the ground. You are going to be blessed in the city; and you are going to be blessed in the field. Your crops are going to prosper. Your herds and your flocks will increase. Your enemies will flee from you.

Every way you go, and every where to turn, you are going to experience the blessing of the Lord.

They were a blessed people. Do you remember when they first sent the spies to spy out the land? When the spies returned, among other things, they brought back a cluster of grapes carried by two men on a pole (Numbers 13:23). Canaan was a fruitful land. Oh, the blessing God showers on his people, when we do those things he has commanded us to do.

All These Curses

“And it shall come to pass that if thou wilt not hearken unto the voice of the Lord thy God to do all his commandments, and his statutes, which I command thee this day, that **all these curses shall come upon thee**, and overtake thee. Cursed shalt thou be in the city, and cursed shalt thou be in the field. Cursed shall be thy basket and thy store. Cursed shall be the fruit of thy body, and the fruit of thy land. And the increase of thy kine, and the flocks of thy sheep. Cursed shalt

thou be when thou comest in and cursed shalt thou be when thou goest out, Deuteronomy 28:15-19.

The word *cursed* is a strong word, isn't it? It is an even stronger word when God uses it. Men curse each other all the time, and all it does is reveal the mood somebody is in, and it reveals his manner of expressing himself. But when God pronounces a curse, that is something else again. In this text God pronounces a curse on those who despise and neglect his law.

Some Passages Are Mighty Scary

There are some things in the Bible that scare the life out of me. One of the scariest passages in the Bible is Matthew 18:6. The Lord says, "But whoso shall offend one of these little ones which believe in me, it were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, he were drowned in the depth of the sea."

Let me ask you; did you ever hear anybody say, "That man would be better off dead." Sure you have. Imagine that God might say that about you. That is what he said. "But whoso shall offend one of these little ones which believe in me, it were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and he were drowned (stone cold dead) in the depth of the sea."

I have never lost so much sleep over anything, as I have lost over that verse. I have lain awake, staring at the ceiling, fearful that I might have said something, or done something, that injured one of the Lord's little ones. The penalty is frightening. Any time you have an inclination to strike out at somebody, it would be a good idea to quote that verse before you say anything. The Lord said you would be better off with a millstone around your neck, lying on the bottom of the sea, than to injure one of his little ones.

"Cursed shalt thou be when thou comest in, and cursed shalt thou be when thou goest out," Deuteronomy 28:19. Salvation is by grace, but that does not change the fact that God has given us some guidelines as to how we ought to live, how we ought to conduct ourselves, here in this life.

The Commandments of God

The heart of the Law of Moses is expressed in the Ten Commandments. Did you ever notice that he did not say a thing about the Ten Suggestions? Those are not suggestions. Even in our gospel day we can get confused about that. Did you ever notice the way we conduct our services? We sing; we pray; we preach; and then we give the *invitation*. I don't recall the Lord ever *inviting* anybody to be baptized. If it is an invitation, you have the option to decline. There is no option

to decline. If you have a hope in Christ Jesus, God has commanded you to be repent and be baptized, and it is not an invitation; it is a commandment.

“And all the people that heard him, and the publicans *justified God*, being baptized with the baptism of John,” Luke 7:29. That does not mean they *caused* God to be just; rather they *declared* him to be just. They declared that God is just in all he says and does. He is just in all he requires of us. He is just in requiring us to be baptized. “The publicans justified God, being baptized with the baptism of John, but the Pharisees rejected the counsel of God against themselves, being not baptized by him.”

The Lord drew a clear, and distinct, boundary line between gospel obedience and disobedience. And he showed that water baptism is that line. Those who obey God, those who justify God, are those who are baptized in water, and those who refuse to follow the Lord in baptism reject the counsel of God against themselves.

Rejecting the Counsel of God

What does it mean when it says they “rejected the counsel of God against themselves?” Let me illustrate it this way. Some time or other you might have started to say something to somebody, and he knew what you were about to say. He had heard it before. And he tells you, “Don’t say it; I don’t want to hear it.” Let me ask you. What did he just do? **He rejected your counsel**, didn’t he? He told you, “Don’t say it; I don’t want to hear it.” It is amazing how simple this book gets, if you just let it say what it says. Don’t argue with it; just let it say what it says.

“The publicans justified God, being baptized with the baptism of John, but the Pharisees rejected the counsel of God against themselves, being not baptized of him.”

They rejected God’s counsel. In effect, they told God, “Don’t say it; I don’t want to hear it.”

When God tells us to repent and be baptized, he is not giving an invitation. That is a commandment. God gave the very best heaven had for my redemption and yours. There is nothing you can do to earn it. But God requires that we express our gratitude, not to gain heaven, not in order to become his child, but in order to enjoy that life of obedience, and blessing, that is available to us in this life.

The Consequences of Disobedience

Back to Deuteronomy. In Deuteronomy 28:20, he begins to specify exactly what he is talking about. He gives us the details. These would be the consequences if Israel failed to obey God's commands.

He has already told them, "Cursed shalt thou be in the city, and cursed shalt thou be in the field. Cursed shall be thy basket and thy store." Your flocks, your crops, and your herds, will all be under the curse. "The Lord shall send upon thee cursing, vexation, and rebuke in all that thou settest thine hand unto for to do, until thou be destroyed, and **until thou perish quickly**; because of the wickedness of thy doings, whereby thou hast forsaken me," Deuteronomy 28:20.

What does that word *perish* mean? Does it mean they would go around, perhaps, with a headache all the time? They would have a backache, an upset stomach, and just walk around in a fog? That is not what he is talking about. That is not what he means when he says they would *perish*. Perish? That means stone cold dead, six feet under. Stone cold dead in the grave.

I know there are a lot of people, who have the idea you are not going to die until *your time* comes. You are not going to die a moment before, and you are not going to live a moment longer. The Bible does not teach that, and I don't believe it. Every now and then, you may run into somebody, who has some idea of what our people believe, and he may tell you, "I agree with you Primitive Baptists on one thing; you are not going to die until your time comes; and when your time comes, you are out of here." It is strange that the one thing they pick to agree with Primitive Baptists about is something we do not believe.

Some time ago, I had the funeral of a man who was killed in a car wreck. He was not a religious man. In fact, he had no interest at all in religion. But I was the pastor of the church in the community, and they called on me to preach his funeral. He had been out on Saturday night, visiting the local drinking establishments. That was his custom. But anyway, he had drunk more alcohol than he could handle. It impaired his judgment, and he went blazing off down the road; he missed a curve, and hit a tree, and was killed instantly.

Let me ask you. Do you believe it just came his time to die, or do you believe if he had been at home with his family, behaving himself, he might have woken up the next morning in his own bed, alive and well? I don't believe God predestinated that he would die that night, any more than I believe he predestinated that he would visit all those drinking establishments.

No, the scriptures tell us, "Bloody and deceitful men shall not live out half their days," Psalms 55:23. Again, he says, "Why shouldst thou die before thy

time?” Ecclesiastes 7:17. A person can shorten his days by the way he behaves himself. God told Israel that some of them would die because of their rebellion.

Disease Pestilence and Distress

In Deuteronomy 28:21, “The Lord shall make the pestilence cleave unto thee until he have consumed thee off the land,” Deuteronomy 28:21. Disease means that somebody is sick; *pestilence* means a lot of people, or maybe, most everybody is sick. That happened to Israel from time to time. “The Lord shall smite thee with a consumption, and with a fever, and with an inflammation, and with an extreme burning, and with a sword, and with blasting, and with mildew, and they shall pursue thee until thou perish. And thy heaven that is over thy head shall be brass, and the earth that is under thee shall be iron,” Deuteronomy 28:22-23.

This word *brass* is one of those words that need interpreting. It does not mean the heavens will one day be made out of metal. It means there will not be any rain. You do not get rain out of brazen heavens. He goes on to say, “The Lord shall make the rain of thy land powder, and dust: from heaven shall it come down upon thee until thou be destroyed,” Deuteronomy 28:24.

We are very well blessed in America in a material way. When our nation was established in the late 1700's, one of the very first things the Founding Fathers did was to prohibit interstate tariffs. That provided free trade between the various states. That has been a great benefit to America. If there is drought in one area, free trade between the states has helped to take care of us. The plenty in one area offsets the shortage in another.

But we still see what can happen from time to time, and in some areas. There is a terrible drought at this time in Texas. I feel sorry for those people with all the hot weather, and no rain. Their crops are failing, and some of their wells are going dry. The ground is so dry, the experts tell us that if it started raining today, and rained for months, it would still be years before the ground itself can be healed.

In a limited way, God gives us demonstrations of what he can do over a much broader area, when he chooses to. Our nation has such great capacity. Our technology can accomplish things that stagger the imagination, but it has its limits. The western states have been on fire for weeks, and they cannot put out the fires. If we can build rocket ships, and computers, and microwaves, you would think we could put out fires. We have been putting out fires, since the dawn of time. But simple jobs become impossible, when they become as big as those fires are.

America is much more vulnerable than we have ever imagined we are. The Y2K crisis came and passed, and it did not amount to anything. But it certainly could have. The arguments people made about what was going to happen did not happen, but the possibility was there. How vulnerable we are here in America. Our heavens could become *brass*, and our rain could become *powder* and *dust*. It did happen to Israel on a frequent basis. They suffered God's wrath when they rebelled.

The Botch of Egypt

“The Lord shall smite thee with the botch of Egypt, and with the emerods, and with the scab, and the itch, whereof thou canst not be healed,” Deuteronomy 28:27. Egypt is in Africa. The *botch of Egypt* was a disease of Africa. About nineteen years ago there was another ailment that came out of Africa— Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome. Nobody ever says the whole name anymore. We just call it A.I.D.S. So far, there is no cure.

In some states, you can be prosecuted for stating publicly that A.I.D.S. is God's judgment on that immoral segment of society. It is called a *hate crime*. Well, we don't have that law in Tennessee, and I am going to tell you that A.I.D.S. is God's judgment on that immoral segment of society. He said he would do it, and he has done exactly what he said he would do. I feel sorry for the way those people are suffering. I feel sorry for anybody, when they suffer the wrath of God, but it does not change the fact that God did say he was going to do exactly what he has done.

You Will Serve Somebody

“**Because thou servedst not the Lord thy God** with joyfulness and with gladness of heart, for the abundance of all things; Therefore **thou shalt serve thine enemies**, which the Lord shall send against thee, in hunger, and in thirst and in nakedness, and in want of all things, and he shall put the yoke of iron upon thy neck until he have destroyed thee,” Deuteronomy 28:47-48. He told Israel they were going to serve somebody. Either they would serve God in the land, or they would serve the adversary outside the land.

God gave the land of Canaan to Israel as a free gift. He can do that. “The earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof,” Psalms 24:1. It belongs to him, and he can give it to whoever he wants to have it. They did not pay anything for it. He divided the land to them by lot. Every family got his own plot of ground.

The Law of The Sabbath

He commanded them to work six days, and set aside the seventh day as a Sabbath of rest. He commanded them, more than that, that they should work six years, and rest the seventh year. That seventh year was to be a *sabbatic* year. That is where we got the word *sabbatical*, an extended leave from your employment. God told them to allow the land to lie fallow the seventh year. They should not put out any crops.

The next question was: “What are we going to live on the seventh year?” God promised that he would cause the land to bring forth double the sixth year. They would not need to work the seventh year. How could he do that? He is God; he can do anything he wants to do. He promised, “Then I will command my blessing upon you in the sixth year, and it shall bring forth fruit for three years,” Leviticus 25:21.

He promised that, every time seven times seven years passed (that is forty-nine years), they could take off the fiftieth year as well. The land would bring forth three times as much the forty-eighth year. They would not have to work the forty-ninth year nor the fiftieth. “And thou shalt number seven Sabbaths of years unto thee, seven times seven years; and the space of the seven Sabbaths of years shall be unto thee forty and nine years,” Leviticus 25:8. Every time seven sabbatic years passed, they were to celebrate the *Jubilee*.

“Then shalt thou cause the trumpet of the *jubilee* to sound on the tenth *day* of the seventh month, on the day of atonement shall ye make the trumpet sound throughout all your land, And ye shall hallow the fiftieth year, and proclaim liberty throughout *all* the land unto all the inhabitants thereof: it shall be a *jubilee* unto you; and ye shall return every man unto his possession, and ye shall return every man unto his family,” Leviticus 25:9-10.

Jubilee is the Hebrew word for a ram’s horn. On the day of atonement, the tenth day of the seventh month, of the fiftieth year they were to blow on the ram’s horn, and “proclaim liberty throughout all the land.” Every bondman was to be set free, and all property was to be returned to its original owners. If anybody had been sold into slavery, he was to be set free on that day. If anybody had sold his ancestral home, or if, maybe, his grandfather had sold it, he was to get it back. They were to have total land reform every fifty years. The law also provided that the closer they got to the year of Jubilee, the less they could charge for the land, because they would have to give it back before long.

The Lord said if the land did not enjoy its Sabbaths while they were in the land, it would enjoy its Sabbaths while they were gone. Well, what happened? At the end of the first sixth years, they figured they were a year ahead; the land had

produced double that year. They intended to stay ahead; so they went ahead and worked the land the seventh year.

They thought they could outsmart the Lord. There is no record that Israel ever observed the sabbatic year. That was the reason they were carried away into bondage. The land did enjoy its Sabbaths while they were in Babylon (II Chronicles 36:21).

At the end of fifty years, they figured that if they had bought the property, it was theirs to keep. You have heard the expression: "Possession is nine tenths of the law." They figured that if they had paid for the land, and they were in possession of it, they might as well keep it. And they did keep it, until God sent Nebuchadnezzar to carry them all away into Babylon. Then they lost it all. You cannot outsmart the Lord.

A New Start Every Fifty Years

Every fifty years they were to have total land reform. What an economic benefit that would have been for the entire nation. The rich could have never oppressed the poor. Every Israelite, no matter how poor, would have his own farm on which he could earn a livelihood for himself and his family.

The rich could accumulate all the property they wanted, and keep it forever, so long as they accumulated the property inside a walled city. The Law of the Jubilee did not apply to property inside walled cities (Leviticus 25:30). They did not have to give that property back. But, outside the cities, all the farm land was to be redistributed every fifty years. So far as their economy was concerned, every fifty years, the entire nation would get a fresh start.

No nation has ever had a system so calculated to protect both the rich and the poor. There was no limit to how rich any person could become, so long as he accumulated his property inside the city. But no class of people could ever become rich in such manner that they could prevent their hard working neighbors from earning their livelihood by the own labors.

What happened? They ignored God's law. God said that if they would not serve him in the land, they would serve somebody else outside the land. If the land did not enjoy its Sabbaths while they were in the land, it would enjoy its Sabbaths when they were gone." If they did not set the captive free, and return the land in the year of Jubilee, they would themselves become captives, and others would live on their lands.

God sent an entire train of eastern conquerors. Pul the king of Assyria came, and then Tiglath-Pilezer, and Shalmaneser, and Sennacherib, and finally, Nebuchadnezzar. Nebuchadnezzar was the last. He carried the last of Israel away to Babylon. Babylon was what we call Iraq today. They stayed there seventy years. God told them how long they would stay before they left (Jeremiah 25:11; 29:10). At the end of seventy years God sent Zerubbabel to lead them home again.

But the point is simply this: Because they would not allow the land to enjoy its Sabbaths the way God commanded, the land enjoyed its Sabbaths while they were gone. Because they would not serve God, they found themselves in bondage, serving their enemies. You cannot rob God. You cannot hold out on God.

Israel Resorted to Cannibalism

But there is more. “Thou shalt eat the fruit of thine own body, the flesh of thy sons and of thy daughters, which the Lord thy God hath given thee in the siege and in the straitness, wherewith thine enemy shall distress thee,” Deuteronomy 28:53.

At first sight, that sounds like cannibalism.” Let’s back up and read it again. “And thou shalt eat the fruit of thine own body, **the flesh of thy sons, and of thy daughters**, which the Lord thy God hath given thee.” Deuteronomy 28:56 goes on, “The tender and delicate woman among you which would not adventure to set the sole of her foot upon the ground for delicateness and tenderness; her eye shall be evil against the husband of her bosom, and for her son, and for her daughter, and toward her young one that cometh out from between her feet, and toward her children, which she shall bear, for **she shall eat them** for want of all things secretly in the siege and straitness wherewith thine enemy shall distress thee in thy gates.”

What is he talking about? This is one of those verses that do not need any interpreting. It means exactly what it sounds like it means. He was talking about a time when Israel would be reduced to such distress they would resort to cannibalism.

Bear in mind that he is not talking about natives on some remote island in the South Pacific. He is not talking about some tribe in the heart of Africa. He is talking about a highly educated people, who had enjoyed the benefit of the Law of Moses for fifteen hundred years. He is talking about Jewish people in the city of Jerusalem, practicing cannibalism.

In the year 70 A.D. the Roman general Vespasian invaded the land of Palestine. He was called back to Rome, and became the next emperor of the Roman Empire. He left his son Titus in charge. Titus besieged the city of Jerusalem from April til September of the year 70 A.D. The people in the city were starving. Finally, some of them began to eat their own children. Even then, it was not a general practice. There were only a few instances of it; but it did happen.

The cannibals of the South Pacific, and the cannibals of Africa, and the Aztecs of Central America killed their enemies in battle, and ate them. Cannibalism in Jerusalem in the year 70 A.D. was worse. In the siege of Jerusalem, the Jews ate their own children. After five months, the city of Jerusalem fell; the Jewish people who survived were sold into slavery.

God wrote 2000 years of Israel's history in advance

In these last several verses of Deuteronomy 28, we have the history of the Jewish people for the last two thousand years. God can do that. All is one eternal now with him; he can write history in advance as well as he can after the fact. It is a very concise history of what has happened to them; but concise as it is, it is very clear and to the point.

“And the Lord shall scatter thee among all people from the one end of the earth even unto the other,” Deuteronomy 28:64. Jewish historians call that scattering, the *diapsora*. For two thousand years now, the Jewish people have been scattered to the four winds. “And there thou shalt serve other gods, which neither thou nor thy fathers have known, even wood and stone. And among all these nations, thou shalt find no ease, neither shall the sole of thy foot have rest. And the Lord shall give thee a trembling heart, and failing of eyes, and sorrow of mind,” Deuteronomy 28:64-65.

That is so true to their history for the last two thousand years that comment is hardly necessary. For two thousand years they have been scattered among the gentiles. They have found *no ease*; their foot has found *no rest*. What they have found has been “a trembling heart, and failing of eyes, and sorrow of mind.”

There can be no question that the Jewish people are, even today, suffering the consequence of their own rejection of God. But that does not give anybody else the right to pitch in and try to help the Lord to punish them.

In the year 1348, when the Black Death spread all over Europe, one third of the population of Europe died. The plague destroyed the entire economy of the Western World. That was used as an excuse to kill Jews and run them out of the

land. They were run out of England about the same time. The Spanish ran them out of Spain in 1492, the same year Columbus came to America. We all know the way they suffered in Germany and Poland in the thirties and forties. That has been the pattern for two thousand years. No people have ever suffered the way the Jewish people have suffered.

Let me make one point. It is one thing to make the objective statement that the Jews have suffered the chastening rod of God. When the Lord was crucified, they cried out, "His blood be on us, and on our children," Matthew 27:25. There can be no doubt that God granted that request. It is one thing to talk about that as an objective fact. It is something entirely different to talk as if we would like to pitch in and help the Lord to chastise them.

God told them the consequences, and it did happen. I read about the way they have suffered, and I learn from it, but I gain no joy in seeing the way they have suffered. We should be very careful lest we glory in the suffering of others.

"And thy life shall hang in doubt before thee, and thou shalt fear day and night, and shalt have none assurance of thy life," Deuteronomy 28:66. There has never been a people to whom this passage applies the way it has applied to the Jewish people for the last two thousand years.

And No Man Shall Buy You

"In the morning thou shalt say, 'Would God it were evening; and at evening thou shalt say, Would God it were morning, for the fear of thine heart wherewith thou shalt fear and the sight of thine eyes which thou shalt see. And the Lord shall bring thee into Egypt again with ships by the way whereof I spake unto thee. Thou shalt see it no more again, and there thou shalt be sold unto your enemies for bondmen and bondwomen, and no man shall buy you,'" Deuteronomy 28:67-68. Those Jews who survived the siege of Jerusalem were sold into slavery, and scattered all over the Roman Empire. That is how *the diaspora*, the scattering, began.

First it says, "Ye shall be sold unto your enemies for bondmen and bondwomen." That indicates that some of them were successfully sold as slaves. But then it goes on to say, "No man shall buy you." That is no contradiction. Some of them were sold, and others could not be sold. After the fall of Jerusalem, the slave market was so glutted with Jewish slaves, that sometimes there was nobody willing to bid.

That was in the year 70 A.D. I do not know what the price of a Jewish slave was in that year, but I do know what the price was 60 years later. Jerusalem fell the

second time in 130 A.D. In that year the price of a Jewish slave was a little less than the price of a plow horse. Think about that; if somebody bought a plow horse, and a Jewish slave to work the horse, he would pay more for the horse than he did for the slave. But, sometimes, they did not bring even that much. They could always sell the horse, but sometimes the slave could not be sold for any price. It is hard to imagine anything more humiliating than for a man to be valued less than an animal. Truly, "It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God," Hebrews 10:31.

I have said all of that to get to this. How do you think all of this applies to believers in this day? Do you believe that in this gospel day it is easier for gentiles to get away with sin than it was for the Jews in that day? Do you believe God is more tolerant of sin today? Do you believe he has mellowed in these last days?

Sometimes, grandparents will let the grandchildren get away with things that would have gotten their children's backsides dusted. Very often a parent says, "If I send those kids to Momma's house, she lets them get away with things she would have set me on fire for. She can keep those kids for one day, and it takes me a week to bring them back under control." Do you think God is that way? Do you think God has mellowed in these last days?

Don't you believe it. Paul dealt with this very question. Listen to what he said in Hebrews 10, "For if we sin wilfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sin for sins, but a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries. He that despised Moses' Law died without mercy under two or three witnesses. **Of how much sorer punishment** suppose ye shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant wherewith he was sanctified an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the spirit of grace," Hebrews 10:26-29. To paraphrase it, Paul is saying, "Don't think you are going to get off as light as those Jews did."

It may sound strange to talk about not getting off *as light as the Jews did* after we have been talking about all the horrific suffering they have experienced; but that is exactly what the Bible teaches. Listen to what it says.

"Of how much sorer punishment suppose ye shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God and hath counted the blood of the covenant wherewith he was sanctified an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace. For we know him that hath said, "Vengeance belongeth unto me; I will recompense, saith the Lord, and again, **The Lord shall judge his people,**" Hebrews 10:29-30.

This is not talking about eternal judgment; this is talking about judging *his people* right here and now. “It is a fearful to fall into the hands of the living God,” Hebrews 10:31.

Who is that talking about? Is he talking about the wicked who are going to suffer eternally? No. He has already explained it. He says, “**The Lord shall judge his people.**” This is talking about God dealing with his people here in this life.

In the Sermon on the Mount the Lord said, “Enter ye in at the strait gate, for wide is the gate, and broad is the way that leadeth to destruction, and many there be that go in thereat, because strait is the gate, and narrow is the way which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it, Matthew 7:13-14”

This is not talking about eternal damnation, but it is talking about some kind of *destruction*. And when God calls something *destruction*, and tells us, this destruction is in store for somebody—this side of the grave—we do well to take notice. On the cross the Lord took care of everything on the other side of the grave. But on this side of the grave, he says, “This *destruction* is waiting for you, if you continue to walk the road to destruction.”

The Way That Leadeth to Destruction

“Enter ye in at the strait gate, for wide is the gate, and broad is the way that leadeth to destruction, and many there be which go in thereat,” Matthew 7:13. There are a lot of people who will tell you the child of God cannot make shipwreck of his life. Don’t you believe it. Every one of us knows children of God who have done just that.

At this point I am inclined to give specific examples of friends of mine who have made shipwreck of their lives. They have followed that broad road, and they have brought destruction on themselves. But I fear that if I become too explicit in describing their experiences, it will be too easy for others to recognize the individuals I am talking about, and I certainly do not want to embarrass anybody. They have suffered enough; I do not want to add further embarrassment.

Most of you could furnish examples of your own. Most of us have friends, who, we are convinced, are children of God. We have worshiped with them in church. We have seen evidence of the Spirit of God in their lives. We have seen them rejoice under the power of the Spirit. Nobody could convince us they are not children of God. And yet they have made shipwreck of their lives.

How very often a child of God becomes careless and unconcerned about spiritual things. Perhaps, he is not doing anything that would get him in trouble, or even embarrass him. He is just not as spiritual as he once was. He becomes more concerned with material things than he is about his own spiritual well being. Then he begins to allow little transgressions to creep into his life.

Solomon said, "Take us the foxes, the little foxes that spoil our vines, for our vines have tender grapes," Song of Solomon 2:15. At the outset he has no trouble with the most grievous offences. He would never consider doing anything that would jeopardize his reputation. But those little foxes grow up. Little offences give way to worse transgressions. Before long he begins to cover things up, until he begins to do things he would never have considered before.

Any of you can finish the story. We all know somebody who has lost his home in the church. Perhaps, his wife finds out about his conduct, and she puts him in the street. She takes his home, his business, his bank account. He loses his home, his income, his security. One thing leads to another. Before long he is destitute. Sometimes, when a person begins to trifle with sin, it does not take long to go from comparative affluence to being a virtual derelict. How often we have seen somebody lose a profitable business, a beautiful home, a loving family, all because of his own misconduct.

He gets in distress, emotionally, physically, and financially. His health fails. His judgment failed when he began to experiment with sin; but it gets worse. His friends begin to wonder if he is losing his mind. I could give examples, with which some of you are well acquainted. They have lost everything worth having. But, again, I do not want to embarrass anybody.

In the text we quoted before, "Enter ye in at the strait gate; for wide is the gate, and broad is the way, which leadeth unto destruction, and many there be that go in thereat," Matthew 7:13. How very many of the children of God we have watched go through that broad gate of destruction.

"Of how much sorer punishment suppose ye shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God and hath counted the blood of the covenant wherewith he was sanctified an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace. For we know him that hath said, Vengeance belongeth unto me; I will recompense, saith the Lord, and again, **The Lord shall judge his people,**" Hebrews 10:29-30.

When the Lord said, "I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing" (Deuteronomy 30:19), he was not talking about eternal life and eternal death, he

was not warning against eternal damnation, but he was warning against the dreadful suffering the Jewish people have suffered for almost two thousand years now. **And he was talking about the living death** many of his people are experiencing in this day.

Indeed, "It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God" (Hebrews 10:27). Hlh

Torquemada, Thomas de

Thomas de TORQUEMADA (*See under The Spanish INQUISITION*)

Total Depravity

Total Depravity see Depravity, Total

TOTAL DEPRAVITY: J.H. Oliphant: *The nature, extent and degree of human depravity is a subject of the first importance. We can not have a correct understanding of the remedy unless we fully understand the disease. No effort is necessary to prove that sin exists among us, but the power it possesses to control men and women, the deep-seated hold it has in the human heart and affections, are what but few understand. For one to know the real evil of his own heart is sure to be attended with humility and distrust of self.*

Death Passed Upon All Men

Our first parent was made in the image of God—Genesis 1:26, but “by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin, so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned,” Romans 5:12. I suppose the one man here referred to is Adam. He was made in Gods image (morally), but we are informed that he sinned and death was the result of that sin, not only death to himself but death “is passed upon all men for that all have sinned.” In some way his sin affects us all.

By reading Romans 5:15-19, it will be plain to you that all the long race of Adam was involved in his guilt and made subject to death by it. For as by one man’s disobedience many were made sinners.” Here the disobedience of one had the effect to make many (persons) sinners. This is a deep subject and much controverted.

The justice of God in entailing upon the unborn millions of Adam’s posterity the fatal results of his sin may not appear clear to all, but there are many passages of scripture that plainly teach the doctrine. It becomes us to confess the justice of

all his actions, whether we are able to understand it or not. Whether it would be safer to us and more merciful in God to leave our destiny in *our own* uprightness, or allow Adam to represent us all, is a question of some importance, and has been ably discussed by many; for my part, I feel sure that there is as much mercy in the system that allows one man to represent us all, and even more; he was good, with no bias to evil, and knew the Lord. I say the probabilities for our safety were greater with our destiny suspended upon his action than if left suspended upon our own.

If the scriptures teach that we all became sinners by his sin, we need not labor to show the justice of the affair. It is enough for us to know that we are involved in the sin and guilt of the great head of our species. If we were not involved in the guilt we would not be in the penalty, which is death, but *we all*, from the unborn infant to the oldest man, are exposed to death, which at least is (if only temporal death) a part of the penalty, and if it be right to entail on us a part of the penalty, it would be equally right to entail the whole penalty upon us. So that when you find the principle upon which God is just in entailing temporal death (a part of the penalty) upon us, from the infant to the oldest, I am persuaded that you will be able to show his justice in passing the whole curse upon the entire race.

The Wages of Sin

This curse includes eternal death, as appears from the words, “The wages of sin is death, but the gift of God is eternal life.” Here *death* is set in pair with *eternal life* in such a way as to show that death and life are of equal duration. So, upon the whole, we are “by nature the children of wrath”—Ephesians 2:3. We are exposed to the wrath of God so that he may, in justice, at any time require our lives and consign us to eternal misery. In support of the above positions I will cite a few passages of scripture. “What is man that he should be clean, and he that is born of a woman that he should be righteous”—Job 15:14. From this text, to know that one is born of a woman is sufficient to prove that he is unholy. To this point the same writer testifies again, “Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean?” Again, “How can he be clean that is born of a woman?”

These passages do not trace our sins to our own evil actions, but to our birth, showing that we are unclean from birth. I know that these positions have been disputed, but how we can do justice to the scriptures cited, allow to them their fair meaning, and yet maintain that we are not unholy from birth, is what I *can't* see. “Behold I was shapen in iniquity and in sin did my mother conceive me.” This certainly shows that we are sinful from birth; the birth of the flesh, even though it be of the highest parentage, confers upon us a sinful nature, exposes us to God's tremendous curse, and certainly entails upon us the whole train of evils incident to our species.

None Righteous, No Not One

In Romans 3:9-19, Paul gives a careful description of ourselves, “none righteous, no, not one.” Also, see Isaiah 59:3-11,14, the same sentiment plainly set forth. This corruption of nature is universal, it has its seat in every human heart. Isaiah 64:6, “But we are all as an unclean thing, and all our righteousnesses are as filthy rags.” The whole race is set down as an *unclean thing*. Galatians 3:22, “But the scripture hath concluded all under sin.” No one of our species since Adam ever escaped death except Enoch and Elijah, nor has any one been found free from sin.

Now I ask why this universal corruption of nature unless we received it from Adam, our common head? No proposition can be demonstrated to my mind if the whole race of men, from Adam down, from the old man to the unborn infant, is not corrupt and sinful. We say that gravity draws every weighty object to the earth’s center, and none deny it, although there are thousands of objects that have never been tested. Now, I say that all men are depraved, that all are sinful, and exposed to death. I appeal to the Bible, and it testifies to the truth of my assertion. I appeal to facts, and find that every human being has been a witness to the truth of what I say, for “all have sinned and come short of the glory of God.” “There is none righteous, no, not one.”

I think we have found this depravity to be universal, and to belong to every one of our species. I think we have seen that it seizes us in our conception and birth, gives shape to our lives and characters as a tree gives quality to its fruit.

Evil Acts Come From an Evil Heart

Our disease is not altogether in our actions, which are evil, but it consists in an evil heart,” sinful *nature*, an *enmity against God*, our *tongues, lips, mouths, feet, hands*. Yea, from the sole of the feet even to the head, all is evil. It is not more certain that water runs down hill than it is that we by nature do evil. What parent has not seen this fixed tendency in his children? Who is so blind that they can’t see this tendency in all classes, the rich and poor, the wise and simple? You have but to open your eyes and you are confronted with evidences of the awful depravity of our nature. Yea, you may close your eyes and see in your own heart a sinfulness so deep, so uncontrollable that, unless you are born again, you never can enter the peaceful presence of God.

The world’s history is a commentary on human depravity; men in all ages have shown a ferocity to each other that exceeds the animal kingdom; how often have hundreds of thousands of our species met in battle array with weapons of death

in hand, thirsting for each other's blood? Wickedness has stained every step of our history; fraud and deceit are in our ways; civil government is established to control the corruptions of our nature; jails, penitentiaries and the gallows are aids to keep in check the headlong torrent; but how often does sin boil over in our legislators, who under its force, legalize fraud and theft? And how often are the judicial and executive departments overrun with sin, so that juries give in wicked decisions, judges are bribed, judgment perverted, and civil government proves a failure.

It may be asked, do not some sinners love their children, pay their debts, visit the sick, make good neighbors, etc., and if so, are they entirely corrupt and depraved? I grant there are some men, and even many men, who are unregenerate, whom we esteem as well-disposed people, but in determining how much their acts of kindness are worth before God, we, of course, must be governed by the word of the Lord.

The Savior, in Matthew 22:37, says, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment, and the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Here the whole duty of man is reduced to two propositions—duty to God and duty to man. All our right actions that are prompted by a pure love to God are good in his sight and fulfill the law's commandments, but all our actions that are prompted by other motives are evil.

We are not only tried by what we *do* but by what we *would do*. I have read Romans 3:10-19, and thought the case too bad to apply to all our race. The words "There is *no fear* of God before their eyes" seemed too strong; also, "Their throat is an open sepulcher," and "Their mouth is full of cursing and bitterness." These words seem to deny the existence of anything good in man, and yet we see traits in the unregenerate that we admire. We see natural affections in some men to a very great degree. Some infidels have been men of great natural kindness. Also, some men have been great lovers of human liberty and justice among men that were, nevertheless destitute of love to God.

Although these qualities are admirable to us, yet they are *natural* qualities, nor do they have God's glory for their object, nor are they prompted by love to God; hence they are worthless in God's sight. It is difficult to determine the *degree* of depravity that we possess, but I think it safe to say that we are as guilty in God's sight of all sin that we are hindered from committing by civil law as if we had actually committed it.

See Matthew 5:28. Here our Lord charges guilt upon the man who looks upon a woman with lust. Also Romans 7:7, "I had not known lust except the law had

said, Thou shalt not covet.” These references show that God looks not so much on what we do as what we *would* do. A little thought will make it plain that many things besides love to God lead men to uprightness of life, and yet no actions are truly valuable in God’s sight except those prompted by love to God.

God has a just right to the undivided affections of all our hearts, and to our constant and untiring service. For a mortal man to deny these to his Maker is rebellion. To have our hearts set on the creature, or self, or anything aside from God is treason, and it is no apology to say that we are honest among men, or that we are kind to the needy, or that we love anybody or thing. God *claims as his* our affections.

It is no excuse for thieves that they are honest among themselves, nor for traitors that they love each other; neither need we fancy that we have found something truly good in fallen man, when we find some that are financially honest, or some remains of human kindness among them. The thing required is pure love to God. Is there any of this in the unregenerate heart? If not he is **TOTALLY DEPRAVED**, totally destitute of the essential good that his Maker requires; he may speak with the tongue of men or angels, or give all his goods to feed the poor, or give his body to the flames, and yet he is *nothing*.

God sets no value on any action of men except what arises from love to him, and has his glory for its object. Hence, if we knew what men would do if all civil law were abolished and every sense of danger of future punishment was removed, then we might see man as God sees him. If all those feelings of self respect in men that lift them above many *low, base* acts were destroyed; if his shame of being known as a liar, a thief, an adulterer, etc., were destroyed; if every restraint were removed from our world save the one, “Love to God,” and men were left to act out what is in them, and we could contemplate man in this condition, we would see him as God sees him, we would see that “there is none good,” “they are all gone out of the way.”

Paul’s language would not be too hard for us—Total depravity would be a term sufficiently mild to describe our case. I confidently believe there is not a solitary human being on the face of the earth that has any goodness about him, save those who love God, and I as confidently believe that none love God, save those who have been born of him. “He that loveth is born of God”

No wonder our Lord taught the necessity of a new birth. The whole mass, the whole race, is ruined. Every imagination of the thoughts of the heart is only evil, and that continually. Every thought is wrong. “His heart is deceitful, and desperately wicked, above all things; who can know it.”

TOTAL DEPRAVITY: Ability to obey God: J.H. Purefoy The power to obey God is two fold, viz: natural and spiritual. Man, though dead in trespasses and sin, has the natural power to obey the moral law, but he cannot render spiritual obedience, because he is not a spiritual being til regenerated, and made a new creature in Christ. As a new creature he has the power of obedience in its two fold sense.

There seems to be a growing disposition to excuse the dead in sin for their wickedness because of their total depravity, and that they ought not to be held so strictly accountable for their wicked conduct, on the “can’t help it” theory—that they act as they do because they cannot help it—could not do otherwise. There is no warrant for such a conclusion in the Bible when rightly understood, nor is such reasonable, or in accord with the facts in the case.

Who would dare for a moment say, because of total depravity, that there is not an unregenerated woman in the world who is or who can lead a virtuous life? That of necessity she cannot help living immorally, because she has a sinful nature? Who would dare say that because of such depravity and death in trespasses and sin that mankind are of necessity compelled to lie, steal, murder, and do all manner of wickedness, and that they do that way because they cannot help it? If that was the inevitable practice and conduct of everyone dead in sin, the “can’t help it” theory would be a little more plausible, but that is not the case.

It is true that there are some things we cannot help. We cannot help being depraved in our fallen nature, but we *can* help giving way to it and not become liars, thieves, murderers, etc. We cannot be sinlessly perfect in this life by anything we can do, but can go very far in natural and moral perfection, just as the young man did who told Christ that he had kept all the commandments, that Jesus named to him, from his youth up.

Saul of Tarsus, as a natural man, an unregenerated sinner, said, as touching the righteousness of the law, that he was blameless. Others do wickedly and we cannot help it, but at the same time it is our duty to condemn wickedness of every kind on the ground that the dead in sin have the power within themselves to restrain them from wicked conduct. * * * * * Obedience on the creature’s part, both natural and spiritual, is all for this life. Natural obedience secures the good and enjoyment of it, of natural blessings, in this life. Spiritual obedience results in rest of soul, peace of mind, the joys of eternal salvation, communion with God, and communion in the delightful love and fellowship of the saints of God while they remain in this world.

Death in trespasses and sins does not release the sinner from his obligation to obey his creator. God has so fixed it that man’s temporal good is promoted by

his obedience to God, and is all summed up in one scriptural declaration, viz: “Fear God and keep his commandments; for this is the whole duty of man. For God shall bring very work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil,” Ecclesiastes 12:13-14.

David had reference to natural obedience when he asked, “What man is he that desireth life, and loveth man days, that he may see good? And the answer he gives is, “Keep thy tongue from evil, and thy lips from speaking guile. Depart from evil, and do good; seek peace and pursue it,” Psalms 34:12-14.

The apostle Paul had reference to the same thing when he said that Moses described the righteousness of the law, the “The man which doeth those things shall live by them,” Romans 10:5. “And the law is not of faith, but the man that doeth them shall live in them,” Galatians 4:12.

This natural or moral obedience to the law is the righteousness that is as filthy rags, compared with the righteousness of Christ, in which the people of God are clothed. Paul had seen enough of law righteousness to know that there was no eternal salvation in it, and said, “And be found in him, not having mine own righteousness, which is of the law, but that which is of God by faith,” Philippians 3:9.

Those who are depending on obedience to the law for eternal salvation do not please God at all; they are in the flesh, and without faith, though they may appear as models of moral obedience, “They that are in the flesh cannot please God,” and “without faith it is impossible to please him.” That is strictly true in a spiritual sense, but not in a moral sense. If the unregenerate cannot please God in a moral sense then God is no more pleased with the natural man when he tells the truth than he is when he tells a lie.

Who will dare say that? Who will say that God is not pleased with a man in a natural sense when the man is doing right according to the law of God? It will not do to strain a scriptural declaration and *force* a construction of it contrary to sound reason and good judgment. * * * * * Every sermon should be richly laden with both moral and spiritual food, that which is both for our natural as well as spiritual good in this life.

This is the only way by which the word of God can be rightly divided, giving to each one his portion in due season. In this way the unregenerated get their portion in that which is for the natural and moral good of all mankind, and the children of God get their special portion in spiritual food. Everybody saint and sinner is benefitted by such preaching. (*J.H. Purefoy, Zion's Advocate June 1898*)

Trajan

TRAJAN (*See article on PLINY*)

Transubstantiation

TRANSUBSTANTIATION: Sylvester Hassell: In 831 Paschasius Radbert, a French monk, published a book in which he promulgated and expounded his monstrous theory of transubstantiation— that the bread and wine in the Lord's supper, after having been consecrated by the priest, became the actual body and blood of Christ, the same flesh in which he was born and died and rose; and not simply the commemorative emblems of Christ's body and blood. This amazing innovation produced great opposition at first, but gradually gained ground, and was decreed as an article of faith by the Romish *Church*, at the instance of Pope Innocent III., in the fourth Lateran Council, A.D. 1215. (*Hassell's History pg 424*)

Trichotomy

TRICHOTOMY (*See under SOUL*)

Trinity, The

The TRINITY: Abridged from John Gill: Having treated of the attributes of God, I shall now proceed to prove that this God, who is possessed of all these great and glorious perfections, is but *one*. This is a first principle, and not to be doubted of. It is a most certain truth, most surely to be believed, and with the greatest confidence to be asserted.

As he is a fool that says there is no God, he is equally so, who says there are more than one. And, indeed, as Tertullian observes, if God is not one, he is not at all. This is the first and chief commandment which God has given, and requires an assent and obedience to; on which all religion, doctrine, and faith depend.

Mark 12:28-30 And one of the scribes came, and having heard them reasoning together, and perceiving that he had answered them well, asked him, Which is the first commandment of all? And Jesus answered him, The first of all the commandments is, Hear, O Israel; *The Lord our God is one Lord:* And thou shalt

love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength: this *is* the first commandment.

It is the voice both of reason and revelation. It is discernible by the light of nature. What teaches men there is a God, teaches them there is but one.

And though when men neglected the true God, and his worship, and liked not to retain him in their knowledge, he gave them up to a reprobate mind, to judicial blindness, to believe the Father of lies, who led them on by degrees into the grossest idolatry. Yet the wiser and better sort of them, though they complied with the custom of countries in which they lived, and paid a lesser sort of worship to the rabble of inferior deities, in which they are not at all to be excused from idolatry. Yet they held and owned one supreme Being, whom they often call the Father of the gods and men. The chief God with the Assyrians, as Macrobius relates, was called Adad; which, he says, signifies *one*. And with the Phoenicians, Adodus, the King of the gods; the same with dxa, *one*.

That there is but one God, is an article in the Jewish Creed, and which still continues. And no wonder, since it stands in such a glaring light in the writings of the Old Testament, and is as clearly and as strongly asserted in the New; so that we Christians know assuredly, "*that there is none God but one.*"

I Corinthians 8:4 As concerning therefore the eating of those things that are offered in sacrifice unto idols, we know that an idol *is* nothing in the world, and that *there is none other God but one.*

It is a truth agreed on by all, by Jews and Gentiles; by Jewish doctors, and heathen poets and philosophers; by Old and New Testament saints; by the holy angels; and even by the devils themselves. It must be right and well to believe it. The apostle James commends the faith of it.

James 1:19 Thou believest *there is one God*; thou doest well: the devils also believe, and tremble.

First, To give the proof of this doctrine; which may be taken partly from express passages of scripture, both in the Old and New Testament.

Deuteronomy 6:4 Hear, O Israel: The LORD our God is *one LORD*.

Psalms 86:10 For thou art great, and doest wondrous things: *thou art God alone.*

Isaiah 43:10 Ye are my witnesses, saith the LORD, and my servant whom I have chosen: that ye may know and believe me, and understand that I am he: *before me there was no God formed*, neither shall there be after me.

Isaiah 44:6 Thus saith the LORD the King of Israel, and his redeemer the LORD of hosts; I am the first, and I am the last; and *beside me there is no God*.

Isaiah 44:8 Fear ye not, neither be afraid: have not I told thee from that time, and have declared it? ye are even my witnesses. *Is there a God beside me?* yea, there is no God; I know not any.

Isaiah 45:5-6 I am the LORD, and *there is none else*, there is *no God beside me*: I girded thee, though thou hast not known me: That they may know from the rising of the sun, and from the west, that *there is none beside me*. I am the LORD, and *there is none else*.

Isaiah 45:14 Surely God is in thee; and *there is none else*, there is no God.

Isaiah 45:18 For thus saith the LORD that created the heavens; God himself that formed the earth and made it; he hath established it, he created it not in vain, he formed it to be inhabited: I am the LORD; and *there is none else*.

Isaiah 45:22 Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth: for I am God, and *there is none else*.

Isaiah 46:9 Remember the former things of old: for I am God, and *there is none else*; I am God, and *there is none like me*,

Mark 12:29 And Jesus answered him, The first of all the commandments is, Hear, O Israel; The Lord *our God is one Lord*.

John 17:3 And this is life eternal, that they might know thee *the only true God*, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent.

Romans 3:30 *Seeing it is one God*, which shall justify the circumcision by faith, and uncircumcision through faith.

I Corinthians 8:4-6 As concerning therefore the eating of those things that are offered in sacrifice unto idols, we know that an idol is nothing in the world, and that *there is none other God but one*. For though there be that are called gods, whether in heaven or in earth, (as there be gods many, and lords many,) But to us *there is but one God*, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him.

Ephesians 4:6 *One God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all.*

I Timothy 2:5 *For there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus;*

The sense of these scriptures will be observed hereafter; and partly from the perfections of God, and his relations to his creatures.

The necessary existence of God is a proof of his unity. The existence of God must be either of necessity, or of will and choice. If of will and choice, then it must be either of the will and choice of another, or of his own. Not of another, for then that other would be prior and superior to him, and so be God, and not he. Not of his own will and choice, for then he must be before himself, and be and not be at the same instant; which is such an absurdity and contradiction as is not to be endured. It remains, therefore, that he necessarily exists; and if so, there can be but one God; for no reason can be given why there should be, or can be, more than one necessarily existent Being.

God is the first Being, the cause of all other beings. He is the first Cause, and last End of all things. The mind of man, from effects, rises to the knowledge of causes. And from one cause, to the cause of that; and so proceeds on until it arrives to the first Cause, which is without a cause, and is what is truly called God. And as therefore there is but one first Cause, there can be but one God. So, according to Pythagoras and Plato, unity is the principle of all things.

God, the first Cause, who is without a cause, and is the Cause of all, is independent. All owe their existence to him, and so depend upon him for the preservation, continuance, and comfort of their being. All live, and move, and have their being in him. But he, receiving his being from none, is independent of any; which can only be said of one. There is but one independent Being, and therefore but one God.

God is an eternal Being, before all things, from everlasting to everlasting; and there can be but one. Eternal, and so but one God. “Before me,” says he, “there was no God formed; neither shall there be after me.” If then no other, then but one God.

Isaiah 43:10 *Ye are my witnesses, saith the LORD, and my servant whom I have chosen: that ye may know and believe me, and understand that I am he: before me there was no God formed, neither shall there be after me.*

God is infinite and incomprehensible. As he is not bounded by time, so not by space; he is not contained or included anywhere, nor comprehended by any.

To suppose two infinites, the one must either reach unto, comprehend, and include the other, or not. If it does not, then it is not infinite, and so not God. If it does reach unto, comprehend, and include the other, then that which is comprehended, and included by it, is finite, and so not God. Therefore it is clear there cannot be more infinites than one; and if but one infinite, then but one God.

Omnipotence is a perfection of God. He claims this title to himself, The Lord God almighty. Now there cannot be more than one Almighty.

Omnipotence admits of no degrees. It cannot be said, there is one that is almighty, and another that is more almighty, and a third that is most almighty. There is but one Almighty, and so but one God, who can do all things whatsoever he pleases. Nothing is too hard, too difficult, or impossible to him; nor can any turn back his hand, or stay and stop him from acting.

To suppose two almighties, either the one can lay a restraint upon the other, and hinder him from acting, or he cannot. If he cannot, then he is not almighty, the other is mightier than he. If he can, then he on whom the restraint is laid, and is hindered from acting, is not almighty, and so not God; and therefore there can be but one God.

God is good, essentially, originally, and inderivatively, the source and fountain of all goodness; "There is none good but me," says Christ, "that is, God," and therefore but one God.

Matthew 19:17 And he said unto him, Why callest thou me good? there is none good but one, that is, God.

The heathens call their supreme God "Optimus," the best; and there call be none better than the best. He is the "summum bonum," the chief good; and that is but one, and therefore but one God.

God is a perfect Being; "your heavenly Father," says Christ, "is perfect."

Matthew 5:48 Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect.

He is perfect and entire, wanting nothing, completely perfect. Now if there are more gods than one, there must be some essential difference by which they are distinguished from one another. And that must be either an excellency or an

imperfection. If the latter, then he to whom it belongs is not God, because not perfect. If the former, he in whom it is, is distinguished from all others in whom it is not, and so is the one and only God.

The true God is “El-Shaddai.” God all-sufficient, stands in need of nothing; for of him, and by him, and for him, are all things.

All-sufficiency can only be said of One, of Him who is the first Cause and last End of all things; and which, as he is but one, so but one God, one Lawgiver, who is able to save and to destroy. Once more, There is but one Creator; whom all receive their beings from, are supported by, and accountable to, one King and Governor of the world; one kingdom, which belongs to him; who is the King of kings, and Lord of lords.

Malachi 2:10 Have we not all one father? *hath not one God created us?* why do we deal treacherously every man against his brother, by profaning the covenant of our fathers?

James 4:12 *There is one lawgiver*, who is able to save and to destroy: who art thou that judgest another?

Were there more than one, the greatest confusion would be introduced in the world. If there were more than one that had the sovereign sway, different and contrary laws, edicts, and decrees, might be published, and subjects would not know whom they were to obey, and what their duty to be performed by them; or whose laws they should pay a regard unto. I proceed,

2. Secondly, To explain the sense in which this article of one God is to be understood.

1st, It is not to be understood in the Arian sense, that there is one supreme God, and two subordinate or inferior ones.

This is no other than what is the notion of the better and wiser sort of pagans, as before observed. And if revelation carries us no further than what the light of nature discovers, and that since the fall, and in its corrupt state, we gain nothing by it, with respect to the knowledge of God. Nor are the expressions concerning the unity of the divine Being, which are in the Scriptures leveled so much against the notion of more supreme gods, which is a notion that could never prevail much among the heathens; and is so absurd and contradictory, that there is no danger of mens' giving into it; but against petty and inferior deities men might be tempted to embrace and worship.

Besides, if two subordinate and inferior deities may be admitted, consistent with one God, why not two hundred, or two thousand?

No reason can be given why the one should not stand as much excluded as the other. And again, those deities are either creators or creatures. If creators, then they are the one supreme God; for to create is peculiar to him. But if creatures, for there is no medium between the Creator and the creature, then they are not gods that made the heavens and the earth; and so come under the imprecation of the prophet, "The gods that have not made the heavens and the earth, even they shall perish, or may they perish from the earth, and from under these heavens."

Jeremiah 10:11 Thus shall ye say unto them, The gods that have not made the heavens and the earth, even they shall perish from the earth, and from under these heavens.

To which may be added, that such are not entitled to religious worship, which would be worshiping the creature besides and together with the Creator, and would be a breach of the first command, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me."

Romans 1:25 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.

Exodus 20:1-3 And God spake all these words, saying, I am the LORD thy God, which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage. Thou shalt have no other gods before me.

2. Nor is this article to be understood in the Sabellian sense, that God is but one person; for though there is but one God, there are three persons in the Godhead, which the Sabellians deny.

[They] are so called from one Sabellius who lived in the middle of the third century; though this notion was breached before him by Noetus, whose followers were called Noetians and Patripassians, asserting, in consequence of their principles, that the Father became incarnate, suffered, and died.

And before them Victorinus and Praxeas were much of the same opinion, against whom Tertullian wrote, and who speaks of one sort of the Cataphrygians who held that Jesus Christ was both Son and Father. And even it may be traced up as high as Simon Magus, who asserted that Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, were only different names of one and the same person, according to his different way of operation. And as before his pretended conversion he gave out that he was

some great one. So he did afterwards, and said he was the Father in Samaria, the Son in Judea, and the Holy Ghost in the rest of the nations.

Acts 8:9 But there was a certain man, called Simon, which beforetime in the same city used sorcery, and bewitched the people of Samaria, giving out that himself was some great one:

Our Socinians and modern Unitarians are much of the same sentiment with the Sabellians in this respect. And some who profess evangelical doctrines have embraced it, or are nibbling at it; fancying they have got new light, when they have only imbibed an old stale-error, an ancient work of darkness, which has been confuted over and over. If the Father, Son, and Spirit, were but one person, they could not be three testifiers, as they are said to be.

I John 5:7 *For there are three* that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and *these three are one.*

To testify is a personal action; and if the Father is one that bears record, the Son another, and the Holy Ghost a third, they must be three persons, and not One only; and when Christ says, "I and my Father are one," he cannot mean one person, for this is to make him say what is the most absurd and contradictory; as that I and myself are one, or that I am one, and my Father who is another, are one person; but of this more hereafter.

John 10:30 I and *my* Father are one.

3. Nor is this doctrine to be understood in a tritheistic sense, that is, that there are three essences or beings numerically distinct, which may be said to be one, because of the same nature; as free men may be said to be one, because of the same human nature. But this is to assert three Gods and not one. This the Trinitarians indeed are often charged with, and they as often deny the charge; for though they affirm the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God, yet not that they are three Gods, but one God. For,

4. They assert, that there is but one divine essence, undivided, and common to Father, Son, and Spirit, and in this sense but one God; since there is but one essence, though there are different modes of subsisting in it which are called persons. And these possess the whole essence undivided. That is to say, not that the Father has one part, the Son another, and the Holy Spirit a third; but as the whole fulness of the Godhead dwells in the Father, so in the Son, who has all that the Father has, and so in the Spirit, and therefore but one God.

John 15:16 Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you, and ordained you, that ye should go and bring forth fruit, and that your fruit should remain: that whatsoever ye shall ask of the Father in my name, he may give it you.

Colossians 2:9 For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily.

This unity of them is not a unity of testimony only; for it is not said of them as of the three that bear record on earth, that they “agree in one,” but that they are one.”

I John 5:7-8 For *there are three* that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and *these three are one*. And there are three that bear witness in earth, the Spirit, and the water, and the blood: and these three agree in one.

But it is a unity of nature; they have one and the same infinite and undivided nature. And this unity is not an unity of parts, which makes one compositum, as the body and soul of man do; for God is a simple and uncompounded Spirit. Nor an unity of genus and species, under which may be many singulars of the same kind, but God is one in number and nature, and stands opposed to the polytheism of the heathens, who had gods many and lords many, and to all nominal and figurative deities, as angels, civil magistrates, judges, etc. even to all who are not by nature God.

I Corinthians 8:4-5 As concerning therefore the eating of those things that are offered in sacrifice unto idols, we know that an idol is nothing in the world, and that there is none other God but one. For though there be that are called gods, whether in heaven or in earth, (as there be gods many, and lords many,)

Galatians 4:8 Howbeit then, when ye knew not God, ye did service unto them *which by nature are no gods*.

Nor is this unity of God to be objected to and set aside by the many names of God, as El, Elohim, Jehovah, etc, since these are names of the one God, as one and the same man may have different names, and yet but one. Nor by the “many attributes” of God, which do not differ from him, nor from one another, but are all one in God, and are himself; though distinctly considered by us, because our understandings are too weak to take them in as in the gross, but to consider them apart, as has been observed.

Nor by the “persons” in the Godhead being more than one; for though three persons, they differ not from the divine essence, nor from one another, but by their distinctive modes of subsisting, and are but one God.

Nor are those passages of scripture which assert the unity of God to be appropriated to one person only, to the exclusion of the others; but to be considered as including each. The famous passage in Deuteronomy 6:4, which is introduced in a solemn manner, exciting attention, "Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord!" and which Christ refers the scribe to as the first and chief command, asserts that there is but one Jehovah; but not that this is peculiar to the Father, and as exclusive of the Son and Spirit; for Christ the Son of God is Jehovah, and is often so called.

Deuteronomy 6:4 Hear, O Israel: The LORD our God is *one LORD*:

Mark 12:28-29 And one of the scribes came, and having heard them reasoning together, and perceiving that he had answered them well, asked him, Which is the first commandment of all? And Jesus answered him, The first of all the commandments is, Hear, O Israel; *The Lord our God is one Lord.*

The several passages in Isaiah before referred to, and which so strongly assert the unity of the Divine Being, cannot be understood to the exclusion of the Son and Spirit.

Isaiah 44:6 Thus saith the LORD the King of Israel, and his redeemer the LORD of hosts; I am the first, and I am the last; and *beside me there is no God.*

The only Lord God calls himself "the first and the last," a title which also Christ the Son of God claims as his.

Revelation 1:8 I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, saith the Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty.

Yea in the same passage the one God styles himself the Redeemer, a name very peculiar to the Son, who agreed to be the Redeemer; came in the fulness of time as such, and has obtained eternal redemption for men: and in another of those passages.

Isaiah 45:21 Tell ye, and bring them near; yea, let them take counsel together: who hath declared this from ancient time? who hath told it from that time? have not I the LORD? and there is no God else beside me; a just God and a Savior; there is none beside me.

The only Lord God is spoken of as a Savior; and in Isaiah 45:22 Christ is represented as a Savior inviting and encouraging persons to look to him for salvation, enforcing it with this reason, for I am God, and there is none else. Now as the Father cannot be supposed to be excluded hereby, so neither should the Son and Spirit

be thought to be excluded by similar expressions elsewhere. Besides, the following verse is manifestly applied to Christ by the Apostle.

Isaiah 45:22 Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth: for I am God, and there is none else.

Isaiah 45:23 I have sworn by myself, the word is gone out of my mouth in righteousness, and shall not return, That unto me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear.

Romans 14:10-11 But why dost thou judge thy brother? or why dost thou set at nought thy brother? for we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ. For it is written, As I live, saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God.

The words of our Lord Jesus Christ, which affirm the Father to be the only true God, cannot be understood to the exclusion of himself; since Christ also is called the only Lord God, and the true God and eternal life.

John 17:3 And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent.

Jude 1:4 For there are certain men crept in unawares, who were before of old ordained to this condemnation, ungodly men, turning the grace of our God into lasciviousness, and denying the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ.

I John 5:20 And we know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we may know him that is true, and we are in him that is true, even in *his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God, and eternal life.*

Nor would he have joined himself so closely with the only true God, if he was not so. But he thought it no robbery to be equal with him, yea one with him, of the same nature, power, and glory. And besides, eternal life is made as much to depend on the knowledge of Christ as of his Father.

John 6:47 Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth on me hath everlasting life.

John 6:53-54 Then Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day.

The reason of this mode of expression, distinguishing the one from the other, is because Christ is described by his office as sent of God.

I Timothy 2:5 For there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus;

Now the reason why Christ is spoken of as distinct from the one God, though not different, is for the sake of the mention of him in his office as Mediator.

But then if he was not the one God, with the other divine persons; or the true God, and the great God, he could not be a Mediator between God and man. He could not be a daysman between them, and lay his hands on both. He could not draw nigh to God, and entreat with him about peace and reconciliation. Much less [could he] make peace for men, and be a ransom for them; as in the following verse. But after all, though there are three persons in the Godhead, as will more clearly appear hereafter, and none of them stand excluded from Deity, yet there is but one God; this is an article that must be inviolably maintained.

The doctrine of the unity of the divine Being, is of great importance in religion; especially in the affair of worship. God, the one only God, is the object of it. This is the sense of the first and second Commands, which forbid owning any other God but one, and the worship of any creature whatever, angels or men, or any other creature, and the likeness of them; which to do is to worship the creature, besides, or along with the Creator. But this hinders not but that the Son and Spirit may have acts of worship performed to them, equally as to the Father. And for this reason, because they are, with him, the one God.

Hence baptism is administered equally, in the name of all Three, and prayer is jointly made unto them; both solemn acts of religious worship.

Matthew 28:19 Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.

Revelation 1:4-5 John to the seven churches which are in Asia: Grace be unto you, and peace, from him which is, and which was, and which is to come; and from the seven Spirits which are before his throne; And from Jesus Christ, who is the faithful witness, and the first begotten of the dead, and the prince of the kings of the earth. Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood.

And this doctrine of the unity of the divine Being, as it fixes and settles the object of worship, so being closely attended to, it guides the mind right in the

consideration of it, while worshiping, without any confusion and division in it; for let the direction, or address, be to which person it may, as each may be distinctly addressed.

Be it to the Father, he is considered in the act of worship, as the one God, with the Son and Spirit. If the address is to the Son, he is considered as the one God, with the Father and the Spirit. Or if the address is to the Spirit, he is considered as the one God, with the Father and Son. And this doctrine also serves to fix and settle the object of our faith, hope, and love, without division and distraction of mind; which are not to be exercised on different objects, and to be divided between them. But are to center in one object, the one only true God, Father, Son, and Spirit; whom alone we are to make our confidence, our hope, and the center of our affections.

Jeremiah 17:7 Blessed is the man that trusteth in the LORD, and whose hope the LORD is.

Psalms 73:25 Whom have I in heaven but thee? and there is none upon earth that I desire beside thee.

As well as this doctrine carries a strong and powerful argument to promote unity, harmony, and concord among the saints; for which it is used in

Ephesians 4:3-6 Endeavoring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. There is one body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; One Lord, one faith, one baptism, One God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all.

Having proved the unity of the divine Being, and explained the sense in which it is to be understood; **my next work will be to prove that there is A PLURALITY in the Godhead;** or, that there are more persons than one, and that these are neither more, nor fewer, than three; or, that there is a Trinity of Persons in the unity of the divine essence. Some except to these terms, because not literally and syllabically expressed in scripture. I shall,

First, Prove that there is A PLURALITY OF PERSONS in the one God; or, that there are more than one. The Hebrew word Mynp which answers to the Greek word proswpa, is used of the divine persons, ynp “My persons shall go with thee,”

Exodus 33:14 And he said, My presence shall go with thee, and I will give thee rest.

and if Kynp “thy persons go not with me,”

Exodus 33:15 And he said unto him, If thy presence go not with me, carry us not up hence.

and “he brought thee out wynpb by his persons.”

Deuteronomy 4:37 And because he loved thy fathers, therefore he chose their seed after them, and brought thee out in his sight with his mighty power out of Egypt;

The word is used three times in Psalms 27:8-9, and in each clause the Septuagint has the word *proswpon*, and which, as Suidas observes, is expressive of the sacred Trinity.

Psalms 27:8-9 When thou saidst, Seek ye my face; my heart said unto thee, Thy face, LORD, will I seek. Hide not thy face far from me; put not thy servant away in anger: thou hast been my help; leave me not, neither forsake me, O God of my salvation.

That there is such a plurality of persons, will appear more clearly,

1. From the plural names and epithets of God. His great and incommunicable name Jehovah, is always in the singular number, and is never used plurally; the reason of which is, because it is expressive of his essence, which is but one. It is the same with “I AM that I AM;” but the first name of God we meet with in scripture, and that in the first verse of it, is plural; “In the beginning God (Elohim) created the heaven and the earth.”

Genesis 1:1 In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth.

[It] therefore must design more than one, at least two, and yet not precisely two, or two only; then it would have been dual. But it is plural; and, as the Jews themselves say, cannot design fewer than three.

Now Moses might have made use of other names of God, in his account of the creation; as his name Jehovah, by which he made himself known to him, and to the people of Israel; or Eloah, the singular of Elohim, which is used by him, and in the book of Job frequently.

Deuteronomy 32:15-16 But Jeshurun waxed fat, and kicked: thou art waxen fat, thou art grown thick, thou art covered with fatness; then he forsook God [singular Eloah] which made him, and lightly esteemed the Rock of his

salvation. They provoked him to jealousy with strange gods, with abominations provoked they him to anger.

So it was not want of singular names of God, nor the barrenness of the Hebrew language, which obliged him to use a plural word.

It was no doubt of choice, and with design. [This] will be more evident when it is observed, that one end of the writings of Moses is to extirpate the polytheism of the heathens, and to prevent the people of Israel from going into it. Therefore it may seem strange, that he should begin his history with a plural name of God. He must have some design in it, which could not be to inculcate a plurality of gods, for that would be directly contrary to what he had in view in writing, and to what he asserts.

Deuteronomy 6:4 Hear, O Israel: The LORD our God [Elohenu] is one LORD.

“Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord;” nor a plurality of mere names and characters, to which creative powers cannot be ascribed; but a plurality of persons, for so the words may be rendered, distributively, according to the idiom of the Hebrew language. “In the beginning everyone, or each of the divine persons, created the heaven and the earth.” And then the historian goes on to make mention of them; who, besides the Father, included in this name, are the Spirit of God, that moved upon the face of the waters, and the word of God, which said, “Let there be light, and there was light,” and which spoke that, and all things, out of nothing.

Genesis 1:2 And the earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep. And the Spirit of God [Elohim] moved upon the face of the waters.

John 1:1-3 In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God [Theon], and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God [Theos]. All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made.

And it may be further observed, that this plural word Elohim, is, in this passage, in construction with a verb singular, bara, rendered created; which some have thought is designed to point out a plurality of persons, in the unity of the divine essence. But if this is not judged sufficient to build it upon, let it be further observed, that the word Elohim is sometimes in construction with a verb plural, as in

Genesis 20:13 And it came to pass, when God [Elohim] caused me to wander from my father's house, that I said unto her, This is thy kindness which thou shalt shew unto me; at every place whither we shall come, say of me, He is my brother.

Genesis 35:7 And he built there an altar, and called the place El-bethel: because there God [ha-Elohim] appeared unto him, when he fled from the face of his brother.

II Samuel 7:23 And what one nation in the earth is like thy people, even like Israel, whom God [Elohim] went to redeem for a people to himself, and to make him a name, and to do for you great things and terrible, for thy land, before thy people, which thou redeemedst to thee from Egypt, from the nations and their gods?

[Here] Elohim, the gods, or divine persons, are said to cause Abraham to wander from his father's house; to appear to Jacob; and to go forth to redeem Israel: all which are personal actions. And likewise it is in construction with adjectives and participles plural.

Deuteronomy 4:7 For what nation is there so great, who hath God [Elohim] so nigh unto them, as the LORD our God [Elohenu] is in all things that we call upon him for?

Deuteronomy 5:26 For who is there of all flesh, that hath heard the voice of the living God [Elohim] speaking out of the midst of the fire, as we have, and lived?

Joshua 24:19 And Joshua said unto the people, Ye cannot serve the LORD: for he is an holy God [El]; he is a jealous God; he will not forgive your transgressions nor your sins.

II Samuel 7:26-27 And let thy name be magnified for ever, saying, The LORD of hosts is the God [Elohim] over Israel: and let the house of thy servant David be established before thee. For thou, O LORD of hosts, God [Eloah] of Israel, hast revealed to thy servant, saying, I will build thee an house: therefore hath thy servant found in his heart to pray this prayer unto thee.

Psalms 58:11 So that a man shall say, Verily there is a reward for the righteous: verily he is a God [Elohim] that judgeth in the earth.

Jeremiah 10:10 But the LORD is the true God [Elohim], he is the living God [Elohim], and an everlasting king: at his wrath the earth shall tremble, and the nations shall not be able to abide his indignation.

[In these] places Elohim, gods, or the divine persons, are said to be nigh to the people of Israel; to be living, holy, and to judge in the earth; characters which belong to persons.

And now, as a learned man well observes, “that however the construction of a noun plural with a verb singular, may render it doubtful to some whether these words express a plurality or not, yet certainly there can be no doubt in those places, where a verb or adjective plural are joined with the word Elohim.”

No such stress is laid on this word, as if it was the clearest and strongest proof of a plurality in the Deity. It is only mentioned, and mentioned first, because it is the most usual name of God, being used of him many hundreds of times in scripture. And what stress is laid upon it, is not merely because it is plural, but because it appears often in an unusual form of construction. It is used of others, but not in such a form; as has been observed. It is used of angels, they being not only many, but are often messengers of God, of the divine Persons in the Godhead, represent them, and speak in their name.

Psalms 8:5 For thou hast made him a little lower than the angels [Elohim], and hast crowned him with glory and honor.

And it is used of civil magistrates,

Psalms 82:6 I have said, Ye are gods [Elohim]; and all of you are children of the most High.

And so of Moses, as a god to Pharaoh, as they well may be called, since they are the vicegerents and representatives of the Elohim, the divine Persons, the Triune God.

Exodus 7:1 And the LORD said unto Moses, See, I have made thee a god [Elohim] to Pharaoh: and Aaron thy brother shall be thy prophet.

Nor need it be wondered at, that it should be sometimes used of a single Person in the Deity, it being common to them all. And since each of them possess the whole divine nature and essence undivided.

Psalms 45:6-7 Thy throne, O God [Elohim], is for ever and ever: the sceptre of thy kingdom is a right sceptre. Thou lovest righteousness, and hatest wickedness: therefore God [Elohim], thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows.

The ancient Jews not only concluded a plurality, but even a Trinity, from the word Elohim. With respect to the passage in Numbers 15:16 they say, “There is no judgment less than three,” and that three persons sitting in judgment, the divine Majesty is with them, they conclude from Psalms 82:1, “he judgeth among the gods,” Myhla [Elohim].

Numbers 15:16 One law and one manner shall be for you, and for the stranger that sojourneth with you.

Psalms 82:1 God [Elohim] standeth in the congregation of the mighty; he judgeth among the gods [Elohim].

Hence they further observes, that “no sanhedrin, or court of judicature, is called Myhla [Elohim] unless it consists of three.”

From whence it is manifest, that the ancient Jews believed that this name not only inferred a plurality of persons, but such a plurality which consisted of three at least.

Another plural name of God is Adonim; “If I am (Adoaim) Lords, where is my fear?”

Malachi 1:6 A son honoreth his father, and a servant his master: if then I be a father, where is mine honor? and if I be a master, where is my fear? saith the LORD [Adonim] of hosts unto you, O priests, that despise my name. And ye say, Wherein have we despised thy name?

Now, though this may be said of one in the second and third persons plural, yet never of one in the first person, as it is here said of God by himself; “I am Lords;” and we are sure there are two, “The Lord said to my Lord,” etc.

Psalms 110:1 The LORD [Jehovah] said unto my Lord [Ladonai], Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool.

In Daniel 4:17 the most high God is called the watchers and the Holy Ones; “This matter is by the decree of the watchers, and the demand by the word of the Holy Ones;” which respects the revolution and destruction of the Babylonian monarchy; an affair of such moment and importance as not to be ascribed to angels, which some understand by watchers and Holy Ones.

Daniel 4:17 *This matter is by the decree of the watchers, and the demand by the word of the holy ones:* to the intent that the living may know that the most High

ruleth in the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever he will, and setteth up over it the basest of men.

But however applicable these epithets may be to them, and they may be allowed to be the executioners of the decrees of God, yet not the makers of them.

Nor can anything in this world, and much less an affair of such consequence as this, be said to be done in virtue of any decree of theirs. Besides, this decree is expressly called, the decree of the most High, **so that the watchers and Holy Ones, are no other than the divine Persons in the Godhead;** who are holy in their nature, and watch over the saints to do them good; and over the wicked, to bring evil upon them. And as they are so called in the plural number, to express the plurality of them in the Deity; so to preserve the unity of the divine essence, this same decree is called, the decree of the most High.

Daniel 4:24 This is the interpretation, O king, and this is the decree of the most High, which is come upon my lord the king.

They [are called] the watcher and Holy One, in the singular number in

Daniel 4:13 I saw in the visions of my head upon my bed, and, behold, *a watcher and an holy one* came down from heaven.

2. A plurality in the Deity may be proved from plural expressions used by God, when speaking of himself, respecting the works of creation, providence, and grace. At the creation of man he said, “Let us make man in our image, after our likeness.”

Genesis 1:26 And God said, Let *us* make man in *our* image, after *our* likeness: and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth.

The pronouns *us* and *our*, manifestly express a plurality of persons; these being personal plural characters; as image and likeness being in the singular number, secure the unity of the divine essence; and that there were more than one concerned in the creation of man, is clear from the plural expressions used of the divine Being, when he is spoken of as the Creator of men.

Job 35:10 But none saith, Where is God my *maker*, who giveth songs in the night.

Ecclesiastes 12:1 Remember now thy *Creator* in the days of thy youth, while the evil days come not, nor the years draw nigh, when thou shalt say, I have no pleasure in them;

Isaiah 54:5 For thy *Maker* is thine husband; the LORD of hosts *is* his name; and thy Redeemer the Holy One of Israel; The God of the whole earth shall he be called.

[In all these] places, in the original text, it is my Makers, his Makers, thy Creators, thy Makers; for which no other reason can be given, than that more persons than one had an hand herein.

As for the angels, they are creatures themselves, and not possessed of creative powers; nor were they concerned in the creation of man, nor was he made after their image and likeness. Nor can it be reasonably thought, that God spoke to them, and held a consultation with them about it; for “with whom took he counsel?”

Isaiah 40:14 *With whom took he counsel*, and who instructed him, and taught him in the path of judgment, and taught him knowledge, and shewed to him the way of understanding?

Not with any of his creatures; no, not with the highest angel in heaven; they are not of his privy council.

Nor is it to be thought that God, in the above passage, speaks “regio more,” after the manner of kings; who, in their edicts and proclamations, use the plural number, to express their honor and majesty. And even they are not to be considered alone, but as connoting their ministers and privy council, by whose advice they act. And, besides, this courtly way of speaking, was not so ancient as the times of Moses. None of the kings of Israel use it; nor even any of those proud and haughty monarchs, Pharaoh and Nebuchadnezzar.

The first appearance of it is in the letters of Artaxerxes, king of Persia, which might take its rise from the conjunction of Darius and Cyrus, in the Persian empire, in both whose names edicts might be made, and letters wrote.

Ezra 4:18 *The letter which ye sent unto us* hath been plainly read before me.

Ezra 7:23 Whatsoever is commanded by the God of heaven, let it be diligently done for the house of the God of heaven: for why should there be wrath against the realm of *the king and his sons*?

[This] might give rise to such a way of speaking, and be continued by their successors, to express their power and glory. But, as a learned man observes, “it is a very extravagant fancy, to suppose that Moses alludes to a custom that was not (for what appears) in being at that time, nor a great while after.”

The Jews themselves are sensible that this passage furnishes with an argument for a plurality in the Deity. A like way of speaking is used concerning men, in

Genesis 3:22 And the LORD God said, Behold, the man is become as *one of us*, to know good and evil: and now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live for ever.

“And the Lord God said, Behold, the man is become as one of us;” not as one of the angels, for they are not of the Deity, nor the companions of God, and equal to him; for whatever private secret meaning Satan might have in saying, “Ye shall be as gods;” he would have it understood by Eve, and so she understood it, that they should be not like the angels merely, but like God himself. This was the bait he laid, and which took, and proved man's ruin; upon which the Lord God said these words either sarcastically:

“Behold the man whom Satan promised, and he expected to be as one of us, as one of the persons in the Deity; see how much he looks like one of us! who but just now ran away from us in fear and trembling, and covered himself with fig leaves, and now stands before us clothed with skins of slain beasts!” or else as comparing his former and present state together; for the words may be rendered, “he was as one of us;” made after their image and likeness. But what is he now? He has sinned, and come short of that glorious image; has lost his honor, and is become like the beasts that perish, whose skins he now wears.

Philo, the Jew, owns that these words are to be understood not of one, but of more. The *en kai polla*, the *one* and *many*, so much spoken of by the Pythagoreans and Platonists; and which Plato speaks of as infinite and eternal, and of the knowledge of them as the gift of the gods. And which, he says, was delivered to us by the ancients; who were better than we, and lived nearer the gods. By whom he seems to intend the ancient Jews.

This, I say, though understood by their followers of the unity of God, and the many ideas in him, the same with what we call decrees; I take to be no other than the one God, and a plurality of persons in the Deity; which was the faith of the ancient Jews; so that the *polla*, of Plato, and others, is the same with the *plhyov* of Philo, who was a great Platonizer; and both intend a plurality of persons.

God sometimes uses the plural number when speaking of himself, with respect to some particular affairs of providence, as the confusion of languages; “Go to, let us go down, and there confound their language.” [This] cannot be said to angels. Had it, it would rather have been, *go ye*, and do ye confound their language. But, alas! this work was above the power of angels to do. None but God, that gave to man the faculty of speech, and the use of language, could confound it. [This] was as great an instance of divine power, as to bestow the gift of tongues on the apostles, at Pentecost; and the same God that did the one, did the other.

So the *us* here, are after explained of Jehovah, in the following verse, to whom the confounding the language of men, and scattering them abroad on the face of the earth, are ascribed.

Acts 2:8-11 And how hear we every man in our own tongue, wherein we were born? Parthians, and Medes, and Elamites, and the dwellers in Mesopotamia, and in Judaea, and Cappadocia, in Pontus, and Asia, Phrygia, and Pamphylia, in Egypt, and in the parts of Libya about Cyrene, and strangers of Rome, Jews and proselytes, Cretes and Arabians, we do hear them speak in our tongues the wonderful works of God.

In another affair of providence, smiting the Jewish nation with judicial blindness; this plural way of speaking is used by the divine Being.

Isaiah 6:8 Also I heard the voice of the Lord, saying, Whom shall I send, and *who will go for us?* Then said I, Here am I; send me.

Not the seraphim say this, but Jehovah; for to them neither the name Jehovah, nor the work agree. And though there is but one Jehovah that here speaks, yet more persons than one are intended by him. Of Christ, the Son of God no question can be made, since the Evangelist applies them to him; and observes, that Isaiah said the words when he saw his glory, and spoke of him.

John 12:40-41 He hath blinded their eyes, and hardened their heart; that they should not see with their eyes, nor understand with their heart, and be converted, and I should heal them. These things said Esaias, when he saw his glory, and spake of him.

Nor of the Holy Ghost, to whom they are also applied,

Acts 28:25-26 And when they agreed not among themselves, they departed, after that Paul had spoken one word, Well spake the Holy Ghost by Esaias the prophet unto our fathers, Saying, Go unto this people, and say, Hearing ye shall hear, and shall not understand; and seeing ye shall see, and not perceive.

There is another passage in Isaiah 41:21-23 where Jehovah, the King of Jacob, challenges the heathens, and their gods, to bring proof of their Deity, by prediction of future events; and, in which, he all along uses the plural number.

Isaiah 41:21-23 Produce your cause, saith the LORD; bring forth your strong reasons, saith the King of Jacob. Let them bring them forth, and shew *us* what shall happen: let them shew the former things, what they be, that *we* may consider them, and know the latter end of them; or declare *us* things for to come. Shew the things that are to come hereafter, that *we* may know that ye are gods: yea, do good, or do evil, that *we* may be dismayed, and behold it together.

Isaiah 43:9 Let all the nations be gathered together, and let the people be assembled: who among them can declare this, and shew *us* former things? let them bring forth their witnesses, that they may be justified: or let them hear, and say, It is truth.

And as in the affairs of creation and providence, so in those of grace, and with respect to spiritual communion with God, plural expressions are used; as when our Lord says, “If a man love me, he will keep my words; and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him,” which personal actions of coming and making abode, expressive of communion and fellowship, are said of more than one; and we cannot be at a loss about two of them, Christ and his Father, who are expressly mentioned; and hence we read of fellowship with the Father, and his Son Jesus Christ; and also of the communion of the Holy Ghost.

John 14:23 Jesus answered and said unto him, If a man love me, he will keep my words: and my Father will love him, and *we* will come unto him, and make *our* abode with him.

I John 1:3 That which we have seen and heard declare we unto you, that ye also may have fellowship with us: and truly our fellowship is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ.

II Corinthians 13:14 The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all.

3. A plurality in the Deity may be proved from those passages of scripture which speak of the angel of Jehovah, who also is Jehovah.

Now if there is a Jehovah that is sent, and therefore called an angel, and a Jehovah that sends, there must be more persons than one who are Jehovah. The first instance of this kind is in

Genesis 16:7 And the angel of the LORD found her by a fountain of water in the wilderness, by the fountain in the way to Shur.

[Here] the angel of Jehovah is said to find Hagar, Sarah's maid, in the wilderness, and bid her return to her mistress; which angel appears to be Jehovah, since he promises to do that for her, and acquaints her with future things, which no created angel, and none but Jehovah could.

Genesis 16:10-12 And the angel of the LORD said unto her, I will multiply thy seed exceedingly, that it shall not be numbered for multitude. And the angel of the LORD said unto her, Behold, thou art with child, and shalt bear a son, and shalt call his name Ishmael; because the LORD hath heard thy affliction. And he will be a wild man; his hand will be against every man, and every man's hand against him; and he shall dwell in the presence of all his brethren.

What proves it beyond all dispute that he must be Jehovah, is, what is said,

Genesis 16:13 And she called the name of the LORD that spake unto her, *Thou God seest me*: for she said, Have I also here looked after him that seeth me?

“She called the name of the Lord, or Jehovah, that spake unto her, thou; God, seest.”

In Genesis 18:2 we read of three men who stood by Abraham in the plains of Mamre, who were angels in an human form, as two of them are expressly said to be.

Genesis 18:2 And he lift up his eyes and looked, and, lo, three men stood by him: and when he saw them, he ran to meet them from the tent door, and bowed himself toward the ground.

Genesis 19:1 And there came two angels to Sodom at even; and Lot sat in the gate of Sodom: and Lot seeing them rose up to meet them; and he bowed himself with his face toward the ground.

Dr. Lightfoot is of opinion, that they were the three divine Persons; and scruples not to say, that at such a time the Trinity dined with Abraham; but the Father, and the Holy Spirit, never assumed an human form. Nor are they ever called angels. **However, one of these was undoubtedly a divine Person, the Son of**

God in an human form; who is expressly called Jehovah, the Judge of all the earth.

Genesis 18:13 And the LORD said unto Abraham, Wherefore did Sarah laugh, saying, Shall I of a surety bear a child, which am old?

Genesis 18:20 And the LORD said, Because the cry of Sodom and Gomorrah is great, and because their sin is very grievous.

Genesis 18:25-26 That be far from thee to do after this manner, to slay the righteous with the wicked: and that the righteous should be as the wicked, that be far from thee: Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right? And the LORD said, If I find in Sodom fifty righteous within the city, then I will spare all the place for their sakes.

And to whom omnipotence and omniscience are ascribed,

Genesis 18:14 Is any thing too hard for the LORD? At the time appointed I will return unto thee, according to the time of life, and Sarah shall have a son.

Genesis 18:17-19 And the LORD said, Shall I hide from Abraham that thing which I do; Seeing that Abraham shall surely become a great and mighty nation, and all the nations of the earth shall be blessed in him? For I know him, that he will command his children and his household after him, and they shall keep the way of the LORD, to do justice and judgment; that the LORD may bring upon Abraham that which he hath spoken of him.

And to whom Abraham showed the utmost reverence and respect.

Genesis 18:27 And Abraham answered and said, Behold now, I have taken upon me to speak unto the Lord, which am but dust and ashes.

Genesis 18:30-31 And he said unto him, Oh let not the Lord be angry, and I will speak: Peradventure there shall thirty be found there. And he said, I will not do it, if I find thirty there. And he said, Behold now, I have taken upon me to speak unto the Lord: Peradventure there shall be twenty found there. And he said, I will not destroy it for twenty's sake.

And now he is distinguished, being Jehovah in human form on earth, from Jehovah in heaven, from whom he is said to rain brimstone and fire on Sodom and Gomorrah.

Genesis 19:24 Then the LORD rained upon Sodom and upon Gomorrah brimstone and fire from the LORD out of heaven;

[This] conflagration was not made by the ministry of created angels, but is always represented as the work of Elohim, of the divine Persons.

Jeremiah 50:40 As God overthrew Sodom and Gomorrah and the neighbor cities thereof, saith the LORD; so shall no man abide there, neither shall any son of man dwell therein.

Amos 4:11 I have overthrown some of you, as God overthrew Sodom and Gomorrah, and ye were as a firebrand plucked out of the burning: yet have ye not returned unto me, saith the LORD.

An angel also appeared to Abraham at the offering up of his son Isaac, and bid him desist from it; and who appears plainly to be the same with him who ordered him to do it; expressly called God, and Jehovah, who swore by himself, and promised to do what none but God could do.

Genesis 22:11-12 And the angel of the LORD called unto him out of heaven, and said, Abraham, Abraham: and he said, Here I am. And he said, Lay not thine hand upon the lad, neither do thou any thing unto him: for now I know that thou fearest God, seeing thou hast not withheld thy son, thine only son from me.

Genesis 22:1-2 And it came to pass after these things, that God did tempt Abraham, and said unto him, Abraham: and he said, Behold, here I am. And he said, Take now thy son, thine only son Isaac, whom thou lovest, and get thee into the land of Moriah; and offer him there for a burnt offering upon one of the mountains which I will tell thee of.

Genesis 22:16-18 And said, By myself have I sworn, saith the LORD, for because thou hast done this thing, and hast not withheld thy son, thine only son: That in blessing I will bless thee, and in multiplying I will multiply thy seed as the stars of the heaven, and as the sand which *is* upon the sea shore; and thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies; And in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed; because thou hast obeyed my voice.

Hebrews 6:13-14 For when God made promise to Abraham, because he could swear by no greater, he swore by himself, Saying, Surely blessing I will bless thee, and multiplying I will multiply thee.

What is here said is expressly ascribed to God. Add to this, the name Abraham gave the place on this occasion, Jehovah-Jireh, because the Lord had appeared, and would hereafter appear in this place.

The angel invoked by Jacob, is put upon a level with the God of his fathers Abraham and Isaac. Yea, is represented as the same; and the work of redeeming him from all evil, equal to that of feeding him all his life long, is ascribed to him; as well as a blessing on the sons of Joseph, is prayed for from him; all which would never have been said of, nor done to, a created angel.

Genesis 48:15-16 And he blessed Joseph, and said, God, before whom my fathers Abraham and Isaac did walk, the God which fed me all my life long unto this day, The Angel which redeemed me from all evil, bless the lads; and let my name be named on them, and the name of my fathers Abraham and Isaac; and let them grow into a multitude in the midst of the earth.

The angel which appeared to Moses in the bush, was not a created angel, but a divine person; as is evident from the names by which he is called, Jehovah, God, the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, "I AM that I AM," and from the things ascribed to him; seeing the afflictions of the Israelites, coming to deliver them out of Egyptian bondage, and promising to bring them into the land of Canaan,

Exodus 3:2 And the angel of the LORD appeared unto him in a flame of fire out of the midst of a bush: and he looked, and, behold, the bush burned with fire, and the bush *was* not consumed.

Exodus 3:4 And when the LORD saw that he turned aside to see, God called unto him out of the midst of the bush, and said, Moses, Moses. And he said, Here Amos 1.

Exodus 3:6 Moreover he said, *I am the God of thy father*, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. And Moses hid his face; for he was afraid to look upon God.

Exodus 3:14 And God said unto Moses, I AM THAT I AM: and he said, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, I AM hath sent me unto you.

Exodus 3:7-8 And the LORD said, I have surely seen the affliction of my people which are in Egypt, and have heard their cry by reason of their taskmasters; for I know their sorrows; And I am come down to deliver them out of the hand of the Egyptians, and to bring them up out of that land unto a good land and a large, unto a land flowing with milk and honey; unto the place of the Canaanites, and the Hittites, and the Amorites, and the Perizzites, and the Hivites, and the Jebusites.

To which may be added, the prayer of Moses for a blessing on Joseph, because of the good will of him that dwelt in the bush,

Deuteronomy 33:16 And for the precious things of the earth and fulness thereof, and for the good will of *him that dwelt in the bush*: let the blessing come upon the head of Joseph, and upon the top of the head of him that was separated from his brethren.

And the application of this passage to God, by our Lord Jesus Christ.

Mark 12:26 And as touching the dead, that they rise: have ye not read in the book of Moses, *how in the bush God spake unto him, saying*, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob?

Once more, the angel that was promised to go before the children of Israel, to keep and guide them in the way through the wilderness to the land of Canaan, is no other than Jehovah.

Not only the obedience of the children of Israel to him is required; but it is suggested, that should they disobey him, he would not, though he could, pardon their iniquities; which none but God can do.

And also it is said, the name of the Lord was in him; that is, his nature and perfections. And since it is the same the children of Israel rebelled against, he could be no other than Christ, the Son of God, whom they tempted; the angel of God's presence; who, notwithstanding, saved and carried them all the days of old.

Isaiah 63:9 In all their affliction he was afflicted, and the angel of his presence saved them: in his love and in his pity he redeemed them; and he bare them, and carried them all the days of old.

I Corinthians 10:9 Neither let us tempt Christ, as some of them also tempted, and were destroyed of serpents.

Again, we read of the angel of the Lord, before whom Joshua the high priest was brought and stood, being accused by Satan, who is not only called Jehovah, (Zechariah 3:2) but takes upon him to do and order such things, which none but God could do; as causing the iniquity of Joshua to pass from him, and clothing him with change of raiment.

Zechariah 3:1-2 And he shewed me Joshua the high priest standing before the angel of the LORD, and Satan standing at his right hand to resist him. And the

LORD said unto Satan, The LORD rebuke thee, O Satan; even the LORD that hath chosen Jerusalem rebuke thee: is not this a brand plucked out of the fire?

Isaiah 61:10 I will greatly rejoice in the LORD, my soul shall be joyful in my God; for he hath clothed me with the garments of salvation, he hath covered me with the robe of righteousness, as a bridegroom decketh himself with ornaments, and as a bride adorneth herself with her jewels.

To these may be added, all such scriptures which speak of two, as distinct from each other, under the same name of Jehovah; as in the above mentioned text, where Jehovah is said to rain fire and brimstone from Jehovah, out of heaven., and in Jeremiah 23:5-6, where Jehovah promises to raise up a righteous branch to David, whose name should be called “Jehovah our righteousness,” and in Hosea 1:7 where Jehovah resolves he would save his people by Jehovah their God.

Genesis 19:24 Then the LORD rained upon Sodom and upon Gomorrah brimstone and fire from the LORD out of heaven.

Jeremiah 23:5-6 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. In his days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely: and this is his name whereby he shall be called, THE LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS.

Hosea 1:7 But I will have mercy upon the house of Judah, and will save them by the LORD their God, and will not save them by bow, nor by sword, nor by battle, by horses, nor by horsemen.

Other passages might be mentioned, as proving a plurality in Deity; but as some of these will also prove a Trinity in it, they will be considered under the following head; where it will be proved.

Secondly, That this plurality in the Godhead, is NEITHER MORE NOR FEWER THAN THREE; or, that there is a Trinity of persons in the unity of the divine essence.

This I have before taken for granted, and now I shall prove it. And not to take notice **of the name Jehovah being used three times, and three times only**, in the blessing of the priest, and in the prayer of Daniel, Daniel 9:19 and in the church’s declaration of her faith in God.

Numbers 6:24-26 The LORD bless thee, and keep thee: The LORD make his face shine upon thee, and be gracious unto thee: The LORD lift up his countenance upon thee, and give thee peace.

Daniel 9:19 O Lord, hear; O Lord, forgive; O Lord, hearken and do; defer not, for thine own sake, O my God: for thy city and thy people are called by thy name.

Isaiah 33:22 For the LORD is our judge, the LORD is our lawgiver, the LORD is our king; he will save us.

And the word holy repeated three times, and three times only, in the seraphims' celebration of the glory of the divine Being.

Isaiah 6:3 And one cried unto another, and said, *Holy, holy, holy*, is the LORD of hosts: the whole earth is full of his glory.

And in that of the living creatures, in

Revelation 4:8 And the four beasts had each of them six wings about him; and they were full of eyes within: and they rest not day and night, saying, Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty, which was, and is, and is to come.

[This] may seem to be accidental, or the effect of a fervent and devout disposition of mind; but there is not anything, no not the least thing, that is said or written in the sacred scriptures, without design.

I shall begin with the famous text in I John 5:7 as giving full proof and evidence of this doctrine; "For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one," which is not only a proof of the Deity of each of these three, inasmuch as they, are not only said to be *one*, that is, one God; and their witness is called the witness of God, but of a Trinity of Persons, in the unity of the divine essence; unity of essence, or nature, is asserted and secured, by their being said to be one; which respects not a mere unity of testimony, but of nature.

I John 5:7 For *there are three* that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and *these three are one*.

I John 5:9 If we receive the witness of men, the witness of God is greater: for this is the witness of God which he hath testified of his Son.

It is not said of them, as of the witnesses on earth, that they “agree in one;” but that they “are one.” And they may be called a Trinity, inasmuch as they are *three*; and a Trinity of Persons, since they are not only spoken of as distinct from each other, the Father from the Word and Holy Ghost, the Word from the Father and the Holy Ghost, and the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Word; but a personal action is ascribed to each of them.

They are all three said to be testifiers, or to bear record; which cannot be said of mere names and characters; nor be understood of one person under different names.

If the one living and true God only bears record, first under the character of a Father, then under the character of a Son, or the Word, and then under the character of the Holy Ghost; testimony, indeed, would be borne three times, but there would be but one testifier, and not three, as the apostle asserts.

Suppose one man should, for one man may bear three characters, and stand in the relations of father, son, and master; of a father to a child of his own; of a son, his father being living; and of a master to servants under him. Suppose, I say, this man should come into a court of judicature, and be admitted to bear testimony in an affair there depending, and should give his testimony first under the character of a father, then under the character of a son, and next under the character of a master; every one will conclude, that though here was a testimony three times bore, yet there was but one, and not three, that bore record.

This text is so glaring a proof of the doctrine of the Trinity, that the enemies of it have done all they can to weaken its authority, and have pushed hard to extirpate it from a place in the sacred writings.

They object, that it is wanting in the Syriac version; that the old Latin interpreter has it not; that it is not to be found in many Greek manuscripts; and is not quoted by the ancient fathers who wrote against the Arians, when it might have been of great service to them.

To all which it may be replied; that as to the Syriac version, though an ancient one, it is but a version, and till of late appeared a very defective one; the history of the adulterous woman in the eighth of John, the second epistle of Peter, the second and third epistles of John, the epistle of Jude, and the book of Revelation, were all wanting, till restored from a copy of archbishop Usher's, by Deuteronomy Dieu and Dr. Pocock; and who also, from an Eastern copy, has supplied the version with this text, so that now it stands in it.

And as to the old Latin interpreter, it is certain that it is to be seen in many Latin manuscripts of an early date, and is in the Vulgate Latin version of the London Polyglot Bible; and the Latin translation which bears the name of Jerome has it; and who, in an epistle to Eustochium, prefixed to his translation of those canonical epistles, complains of the omission of it, by unfaithful interpreters.

As to its being wanting in some Greek manuscripts, it need only be said, it is found in many others; it is in the Complutensian edition, the compilers of which made use of various copies; out of sixteen ancient copies of Robert Stephens's, nine of them had it; and it is also said to be in an old British copy.

As to its not being quoted by some of the ancient fathers, this can be no proof of its not being genuine; since it might be in the original copy, and not in that used by them, through the carelessness and unfaithfulness of transcribers; or through copies erased falling into their hands, such as had been corrupted before the times of Arius, even by Artemon, or his disciples, who lived in the second century; who held that Christ was a mere man; by whom it is said, this passage was erased; and certain it is, that this epistle was very early corrupted; as the ancient writers testify. Or it might be in the copies used by the fathers, and yet not quoted by them, having scriptures not without it, to prove and defend the doctrine of it.

Yet, after all, it appears plainly to be quoted by many of them; by Fulgentius, in the beginning of the sixth century, against the Arians, without any scruple or hesitation: and Jerome, as before observed, has it in his translation, made in the latter end of the fourth century. And it is quoted by Athanasius, about the middle of it; and before him by Cyprian, in the middle of the third century: and is manifestly referred to by Tertullian, in the beginning of it; and by Clemens of Alexandria, towards the end of the second century. So that it is to be traced up within a hundred years, or less, the writing of the epistle; which is enough to satisfy anyone of the genuineness of this text.

And, besides, it should be observed, that there never was any dispute about it, until Erasmus left it out in the first edition of his translation of the New Testament. And yet he himself, upon the credit of the old British copy, before mentioned, put it into another edition of his translation. Yea, the Socinians themselves have not dared to leave it out in their German Racovian version, A. C. 1630.

To which may be added, that the context requires it. The connection with the preceding verse shows it, as well as its opposition to, and distinction from, the following verse. And in I John 5:9 is a plain reference to the divine witnesses in

this; for the inference in it would not be clear, if there was no mention before made of a divine testimony.

I John 5:9 If we receive the witness of men, the witness of God is greater: for this is the witness of God which he hath testified of his Son.

But I shall not rest the proof of the doctrine of the Trinity on this single passage; but on the whole current and universal consent of scripture, where it is written as with a sunbeam; according to which, a Trinity of Persons in the Godhead appears in the works of creation, providence, and grace; in all things respecting the office and work of Christ; in God's acts of grace towards and upon his people; and in their worship and duties of religion enjoined them, and practiced by them.

1. In the works of creation: as by these the eternal power and Godhead are made manifest, so in them are plain traces of a Trinity of persons; that God the Father made the heavens, earth and sea, and all that are in them, under which character the apostles addressed him as distinct from Christ his Son, none will doubt; and that the divine Word, or Son of God, was concerned in all this a question cannot be made of it, when it is observed that it is said, "All things were made by him, and without him was not anything made that is made."

Acts 4:24,27 And when they heard that, they lifted up their voice to God with one accord, and said, Lord, thou art God, which hast made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and all that in them is.....For of a truth against thy holy child Jesus, whom thou hast anointed, both Herod, and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles, and the people of Israel, were gathered together.

John 1:3 All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made.

And as for the Holy Spirit, he is not only said to move upon the face of the waters which covered the earth, and brought that unformed chaos of earth and water into a beautiful order, but to garnish the heavens, to bespangle the firmament with stars of light, and to form the crooked serpent, the Leviathan, which being the greatest, is put for all the fishes of the sea; as well as he is said to be sent forth yearly, and renews the face of the earth at every returning spring; which is little less than a creation, and is so called.

Genesis 1:2 And the earth was without form, and void; and darkness *was* upon the face of the deep. And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters.

Job 26:13 By his spirit he hath garnished the heavens; his hand hath formed the crooked serpent.

Psalms 104:30 Thou sendest forth thy spirit, they are created: and thou renewest the face of the earth.

All three may be seen together in one text, where mention is made of Jehovah, and his Word, the eternal Logos, and of his Spirit, the breath of his mouth, as all concerned in the making of the heavens, and all the host of them.

Psalms 33:6 By the word of the LORD were the heavens made; and all the host of them by the breath of his mouth.

And as in the creation of man, in particular, a plurality has been observed, this plurality was neither more nor fewer than three; that God the Father is the maker of men, will not be objected to; “Have we not all one father? hath not one God created us?”

Malachi 2:10 Have we not all one father? hath not one God created us? why do we deal treacherously every man against his brother, by profaning the covenant of our fathers?

The Son of God, who is the husband of the church, and the Redeemer of men, is expressly said to be their maker.

Isaiah 54:5 For thy Maker is thine husband; the LORD of hosts is his name; and thy Redeemer the Holy One of Israel; The God of the whole earth shall he be called.

And of the Holy Spirit, Elihu in so many words says, “The Spirit of God hath made me, and the breath of the almighty hath given me life.”

Job 33:4 The Spirit of God hath made me, and the breath of the Almighty hath given me life.

2. A Trinity of persons appears in the works of providence.

John 5:17 But Jesus answered them, My Father worketh hitherto, and I work.

That is, ever since the works of creation were finished, in which both had an hand, they have been jointly concerned in the works of providence, in the government of the world, and in ordering and disposing of all things in it; and not to the exclusion of the Holy Spirit, for, “Who hath directed the Spirit of the Lord, or being his counselor hath taught him?”

That is, in the affair of the government of the world, as follows; “With whom took he counsel, and who instructed him and taught him in the path of judgment, and taught him knowledge, and showed to him the way of understanding?” to manage the important concerns of the world, to do everything wisely and justly, and to overrule all for the best ends and purposes.

Isaiah 40:13-14 Who hath directed the Spirit of the LORD, or being his counselor hath taught him? With whom took he counsel, and who instructed him, and taught him in the path of judgment, and taught him knowledge, and shewed to him the way of understanding?

And particularly the three divine persons appear in that remarkable affair of providence, the deliverance of Israel out of Egypt, and the protection and guidance of them through the wilderness to the land of Canaan.

Whoever reads attentively Isaiah 63:7-14 will easily observe, that mention is made of Jehovah, and of his mercy, lovingkindness, and goodness to the children of Israel; and then of the Angel of his presence, as distinct from him, showing love and pity to them, in saving, redeeming, bearing, and carrying them all the days of old; and next of his Holy Spirit, whom they rebelled against, and whom they vexed, and yet, though thus provoked, he led them on through the wilderness, and caused them to rest in the land of Canaan.

Isaiah 63:7-14 I will mention the lovingkindnesses of the LORD, and the praises of the LORD, according to all that the LORD hath bestowed on us, and the great goodness toward the house of Israel, which he hath bestowed on them according to his mercies, and according to the multitude of his lovingkindnesses. For he said, Surely they are my people, children that will not lie: so he was their Savior. In all their affliction he was afflicted, and the angel of his presence saved them: in his love and in his pity he redeemed them; and he bare them, and carried them all the days of old. But they rebelled, and vexed his holy Spirit: therefore he was turned to be their enemy, and he fought against them. Then he remembered the days of old, Moses, and his people, saying, Where is he that brought them up out of the sea with the shepherd of his flock? where *is* he that put his holy Spirit within him? That led them by the right hand of Moses with his glorious arm, dividing the water before them, to make himself an everlasting name? That led them through the deep, as an horse in the wilderness, that they should not stumble? As a beast goeth down into the valley, the Spirit of the LORD caused him to rest: so didst thou lead thy people, to make thyself a glorious name.

3. The three divine persons are to be discerned most clearly in all the works of grace.

The inspiration of the scriptures is a wonderful instance of the grace and goodness of God to men, which is the foundation and source of spiritual knowledge, peace, and comfort; it is a divine work. “All scripture is given by inspiration of God,” of God, Father, Son, and Spirit; and though it is particularly ascribed to the Holy Spirit, “holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.”

II Timothy 3:16 All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and *is* profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness.

II Peter 1:21 For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.

Yet no one surely will say [this was] to the exclusion of the Father; nor is there any reason to shut out the Son from a concern herein; and we find all three dictating the writings David was the penman of.

II Samuel 23:2-3 The Spirit of the LORD spake by me, and his word was in my tongue. The God of Israel said, the Rock of Israel spake to me, He that ruleth over men must be just, ruling in the fear of God.

[Here] besides the Spirit of the Lord, who spake by every inspired writer, there is the Father, the God of Israel, as he is commonly styled, and the Son, the Rock of Israel, the Messiah, often figuratively called the Rock.

And in the same manner, and by the same persons David was inspired, all the other penmen of the scriptures were. Those writings acquaint us with the covenant of grace, no other writings do, made from everlasting before the world was.

This covenant was made by Jehovah the Father, and was made with his Son, who condescended and agreed to be the surety, mediator, and messenger of it. Yea he is said to be the covenant itself; and in which the Holy Spirit is promised, and whose part in it is, and to which he agreed, to be the applier of the blessings and promises of it to those interested therein.

Psalms 89:3 I have made a covenant with my chosen, I have sworn unto David my servant.

Isaiah 42:6 I the LORD have called thee in righteousness, and will hold thine hand, and will keep thee, and give thee for a covenant of the people, for a light of the Gentiles.

Malachi 3:1 Behold, I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me: and the Lord, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his temple, even the messenger of the covenant, whom ye delight in: behold, he shall come, saith the LORD of hosts.

Hebrews 7:22 By so much was Jesus made a surety of a better testament.

Hebrews 12:24 And to Jesus the mediator of the new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling, that speaketh better things than that of Abel.

Ezekiel 36:27 And I will put my spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgments, and do them.

John 16:14-15 He shall glorify me: for he shall receive of mine, and shall shew it unto you. All things that the Father hath are mine: therefore said I, that he shall take of mine, and shall shew it unto you.

They are all three mentioned together as concerned in this covenant, in Haggai 2:4-5 where, for the encouragement of the people of Israel to work in rebuilding the temple, it is said, “For I am with you, saith the Lord of hosts,” according to “the word that I covenanted with you;” or rather, as Junius renders it, “with the Word” by whom I covenanted “with you, when ye came out of Egypt,” (at which time the covenant of grace was more clearly and largely revealed;) “so my Spirit remaineth among you;” where may be observed, *Jehovah the covenant maker*, and *his Word*, in, by, and with whom he covenanted; and *the Spirit* standing, as it may be rendered, remaining and abiding, to see there was a performance and an application of all that was promised.

Haggai 2:4-5 Yet now be strong, O Zerubbabel, saith the LORD; and be strong, O Joshua, son of Josedech, the high priest; and be strong, all ye people of the land, saith the LORD, and work: for I am with you, saith the LORD of hosts: According to the word that I covenanted with you when ye came out of Egypt, so my spirit remaineth among you: fear ye not.

In the sacred writings, the economy of man’s salvation is clearly exhibited to us, in which we find the three divine persons, by agreement and consent, take their distinct parts.

And it may be observed that the election of men to salvation is usually ascribed to the Father; redemption, or the impetration of salvation, to the Son; and sanctification, or the application of salvation, to the Spirit; and they are all to be met with in one passage.

I Peter 1:2 Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ: Grace unto you, and peace, be multiplied.

The same may be observed in II Thessalonians 2:13-14 where God the Father is said to choose men from the beginning unto salvation; and the sanctification of the Spirit, is the means through which they are chosen; and the glory of the Lord Jesus Christ, the end to which they are chosen and called.

II Thessalonians 2:13-14 But we are bound to give thanks alway to God for you, brethren beloved of the Lord, because God hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth: Whereunto he called you by our gospel, to the obtaining of the glory of our Lord Jesus Christ.

But no where are these acts of grace more distinctly ascribed to each person than in the first chapter of the epistle to the Ephesians, where God the Father of Christ, is said to bless and choose his people in him before the foundation of the world, and to predestinate them to the adoption of children by him, in whom they are accepted with him, and where Christ is spoken of as the author of redemption through his blood, which includes forgiveness of sin, and a justifying righteousness; which entitles to the heavenly inheritance.

Ephesians 1:3-7 Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ: According as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love: Having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself, according to the good pleasure of his will, To the praise of the glory of his grace, wherein he hath made us accepted in the beloved. In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace.

Ephesians 1:11 In whom also we have obtained an inheritance, being predestinated according to the purpose of him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will.

Then the Holy Spirit, in distinction from them both, is said to be the earnest of their inheritance, and by whom they are sealed until they come to the full possession of it.

Ephesians 1:13-14 In whom ye also trusted, after that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation: in whom also after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that holy Spirit of promise, Which is the earnest of our inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession, unto the praise of his glory.

The doctrine of the Trinity is often represented as a speculative point, of no great moment whether it is believed or not, too mysterious and curious to be pried into, and that it had better be let alone than meddled with. But, alas! it enters into the whole of our salvation, and all the parts of it; into all the doctrines of the gospel, and into the experience of the saints. There is no doing without it. As soon as ever a man is convinced of his sinful and miserable estate by nature, he perceives there is a divine person that he has offended, and that there is need of another divine person to make satisfaction for his offences, and a third to sanctify him; to begin and carry on a work of grace in him, and to make him meet for eternal glory and happiness.

4. A Trinity of persons in the Godhead may be plainly discovered in all things relating to the office and work of Christ, as the Redeemer and Savior.

In the mission of him into this world on that account: he, the Son of God, was sent by agreement, with his own consent, by the Father and the Spirit; this is affirmed by himself.

Isaiah 48:16 Come ye near unto me, hear ye this; I have not spoken in secret from the beginning; from the time that it was, there am I: and now the Lord GOD, and his Spirit, hath sent me.

Isaiah 48:12-13 Hearken unto me, O Jacob and Israel, my called; I am he; I am the first, I also am the last. Mine hand also hath laid the foundation of the earth, and my right hand hath spanned the heavens: when I call unto them, they stand up together.

“I am the first and the last,” and whose hand laid the foundation of the earth, and whose right hand spanned the heaven, and who is continued speaking to verse 16, and must be a divine person; the mighty God, who is said to be sent by Jehovah the Lord God, and by his Spirit; who therefore must be three distinct persons, and not one only.

Isaiah 48:16 Come ye near unto me, hear ye this; I have not spoken in secret from the beginning; from the time that it was, there am I: and now the Lord GOD, and his Spirit, hath sent me.

Otherwise the sense must be, “now I and myself have sent myself,” which is none at all. Christ the Son of God, sent to be the Savior, in the fulness of time was made of a woman, or became incarnate. **Though he only took flesh, the three divine persons were concerned in this affair.** The Father provided a body for him in his purposes and decrees, council and covenant. The Word or Son was made flesh, and dwelt among men, and that which was conceived in the Virgin, was of the Holy Ghost.

Hebrews 10:5 Wherefore when he cometh into the world, he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a body hast thou prepared me.

John 1:14 And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth.

Matthew 1:20 But while he thought on these things, behold, the angel of the Lord appeared unto him in a dream, saying, Joseph, thou son of David, fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife: for that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost.

In the message to the Virgin, and the declaration of this mysterious affair to her by the angel, mention is made distinctly of all the three Persons.

There is the “highest,” Jehovah the Father; and “the Son of the highest,” who took flesh of the Virgin; and the Holy Ghost, or “the power of the highest,” to whose overshadowing influence, the mysterious incarnation is ascribed.

Luke 1:32 He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest: and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David.

Luke 1:35 And the angel answered and said unto her, The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God.

Christ, the Son of God, being incarnate, was anointed with the Holy Ghost, his gifts and graces without measure; whereby, as man, he was fitted and qualified for his office as Mediator. **The anointer is said to be God,** his God, the great Jehovah; the anointed, the Son of God in human nature, called therefore the Christ of God, the true Messiah; what he was anointed with was the Holy Ghost, his gifts and grace, signified by the oil of gladness.

Psalms 45:7 Thou lovest righteousness, and hatest wickedness: therefore God, *thy God, hath anointed thee* with the oil of gladness above thy fellows.

Isaiah 61:1 The Spirit of the Lord GOD is upon me; *because the LORD hath anointed me* to preach good tidings unto the meek; he hath sent me to bind up the brokenhearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound.

Acts 10:38 How *God anointed Jesus* of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power: who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil; for God was with him.

When he was thirty years of age he was baptized of John in Jordan, where all the three divine persons appeared; the Son in human nature, submitting to the ordinance of baptism: the Father, by a voice from heaven, declaring him to be his beloved Son; and the Holy Spirit, descending on him as a dove.

Matthew 3:16-17 And Jesus, when he was baptized, went up straightway out of the water: and, lo, the heavens were opened unto him, and he saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove, and lighting upon him: And lo a voice from heaven, saying, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.

This was always reckoned so full and clear a proof of the Trinity of Persons in the Godhead, that it was a common saying with the ancients, go to Jordan, and there learn the doctrine of the Trinity.

Before our Lord's sufferings and death, he gave out various promises to his disciples, that he would send the Holy Spirit, the Comforter, to them; in which there are plain traces of a Trinity of Persons; as when he says, "I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter."

John 14:16 And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever.

Here is God the Father of Christ, who is prayed unto, who is one Person; and here is the Son in human nature, praying, a second Person, the Son of God; and because he was so, his prayer was always prevalent. Nor could he be a mere creature, who speaks so positively and authoritatively, he shall give you. Then there is another Comforter prayed for, even the Spirit of truth, distinct from the Father and the Son; the same may be observed in John 14:26 and in John 16:7.

John 15:26 But when the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me.

John 16:7 Nevertheless I tell you the truth; It is expedient for you that I go away: for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send him unto you.

Christ by his sufferings and death, obtained eternal redemption for men.

The price that was paid for it, was paid to God the Father so it is said, “hath redeemed us to God by thy blood.”

Revelation 5:9 And they sung a new song, saying, Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof: for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation.

What gave the price a sufficient value was, the dignity of his person, as the Son of God.

I John 1:7 But 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.

And it was “through the eternal Spirit” he offered himself to God, which some understand of the divine nature; but it is not usual to say, Christ did this, or the other thing, through the divine nature, but by the Spirit, as in Matthew 12:28, and Acts 1:2.

Hebrews 9:14 How much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?

Besides, in some copies of Hebrews 9:14 it is read, “through the Holy Spirit.” Again, Christ having suffered and died for men, he rose again for their justification; in which all the three persons were concerned.

God the Father raised him from the dead, and gave him glory, and he raised himself by his own power, according to his own prediction, and was “declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the Spirit of holiness” or the Holy Spirit, “by the resurrection from the dead.”

I Peter 1:21 Who by him do believe in God, that raised him up from the dead, and gave him glory; that your faith and hope might be in God.

John 2:19 Jesus answered and said unto them, Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up.

Romans 1:4 And declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead.

Romans 8:11 But if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you.

5. This truth of a Trinity in the Godhead, shines in all the acts of grace towards or in men.

In the act of justification; it is God the Father that justifies, by imputing the righteousness of his Son, without works.

Romans 3:30 Seeing it is one God, which shall justify the circumcision by faith, and uncircumcision through faith.

Romans 4:6 Even as David also describeth the blessedness of the man, unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works.

Romans 8:33 Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth.

Isaiah 53:11 He shall see of the travail of his soul, and shall be satisfied: by his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many; for he shall bear their iniquities.

And it is the Spirit of God that pronounces the sentence of justification in the conscience of believers. Hence they are "justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God."

I Corinthians 6:11 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.

In the act of adoption; the grace of the Father in bestowing such a favor on any of the children of men, is owned.

I John 3:1 Behold, what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the sons of God: therefore the world knoweth us not, because it knew him not.

And through the grace of Christ, a way is opened, by redemption wrought out by him, for the reception of this blessing. He it is that gives power to those that believe in him, to become the sons of God.

Galatians 4:4-5 But when the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, To redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons.

John 1:12 But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name.

And the Holy Spirit witnesses, their adoption to them; hence he is called the Spirit of adoption.

Romans 8:15-16 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 all three appear in one text, respecting this blessing of grace; “Because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father,” where the Father is spoken of as distinct from the Son, and the Son from the Father, and the Spirit from them both, and all three bear their part in this wonderful favor.

Galatians 4:6 And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father.

Regeneration is an evidence of adoption; and an instance of the great love and abundant mercy of God; and **which is sometimes ascribed to the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.**

I Peter 1:3 Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which according to his abundant mercy hath begotten us again unto a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead.

And sometimes to the Son of God, who regenerates and quickens whom he will.

John 5:21 For as the Father raiseth up the dead, and quickeneth *them*; even so the Son quickeneth whom he will.

I John 2:29 If ye know that he is righteous, ye know that every one that doeth righteousness is born of him.

And sometimes to the Spirit of God.

John 3:3 Jesus answered and said unto him, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God.

John 3:5 Jesus answered, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.

All three are mentioned together in Titus 3:4-6, where God the Father called our Savior, is said to save by the washing of regeneration, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost; which grace of his is shed abroad in men through Jesus Christ our Savior.

Titus 3:4-6 But after that the kindness and love of God our Savior toward man appeared, 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; Which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Savior.

Once more, their unction, or anointing, which they receive from the Holy One, is from God the Father, in and through Christ, and by the Spirit.

II Corinthians 1:21-22 Now he which stablisheth us with you in Christ, and hath anointed us, is God; Who hath also sealed us, and given the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts.

[Here] God the Father is represented as the establisher and anointer, and Jesus Christ, as a distinct person, in whom the saints are established and anointed; and the Spirit, distinct from them both, as the earnest of their future glory.

6. It plainly appears that there is a Trinity of persons in the Godhead, from the worship and duties of religion enjoined good men, and performed by them.

The ordinance of baptism, a very solemn part of divine worship, is ordered to be administered, and is administered, when done rightly, “in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.”

[This is] to be understood, not of three names and characters, but of three persons distinctly named and described, and who are but one God, as the singular word name, prefixed to them, signifies. Men are to be baptized in one name of three persons, but not into one of three names, as an ancient writer has observed; nor into three incarnates; but into three of equal honor and glory.

Matthew 28:19 Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.

God alone is to be invoked in prayer, and petitions are directed sometimes to one Person, and sometimes to another.

Sometimes to the first Person, the God and Father of Christ.

Ephesians 3:14 For this cause I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Sometimes to Christ himself, the second Person, as by Stephen.

Acts 7:59 And they stoned Stephen, calling upon God, and saying, Lord Jesus, receive my spirit.

And sometimes to the Lord the Spirit, the third Person.

II Thessalonians 3:5 And the Lord direct your hearts into the love of God, and into the patient waiting for Christ.

And sometimes to all three together,

Revelation 1:4-5 John to the seven churches which are in Asia: Grace *be* unto you, and peace, from him which is, and which was, and which is to come; and from the seven Spirits which are before his throne; And from Jesus Christ, who is the faithful witness, and the first begotten of the dead, and the prince of the kings of the earth. Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood.

Whereas the saints, who are made light in the Lord, need an increase of light, prayer is made for them, that the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory, would give unto them the Spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of him, that is, of Christ.

Ephesians 1:17-18 That the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory, may give unto you the spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of him: The eyes of your understanding being enlightened; that ye may know what is the hope of his calling, and what the riches of the glory of his inheritance in the saints.

[Here] the Father of Christ is prayed to; the Spirit of wisdom is prayed for; and that for an increase in the knowledge of Christ, distinct from them both. And whereas the saints need an increase of strength, as well as light, prayer is made for them, that the Father of Christ would strengthen them by his Spirit in the inward man.

Ephesians 3:14-16 For this cause I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, Of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named, That he would grant you, according to the riches of his glory, to be strengthened with might by his Spirit in the inner man.

Zechariah 10:12 And I will strengthen them in the LORD; and they shall walk up and down in his name, saith the LORD.

And in a aforementioned text, prayer is made to the divine Spirit, to direct the hearts of good men into the love of God, and patient waiting for Christ (II Thessalonians 3:5) where again the three divine Persons are plainly distinguished; and who may easily be discerned as distinct Persons, in the benedictory prayer of the apostle.

II Thessalonians 3:5 And the Lord direct your hearts into the love of God, and into the patient waiting for Christ.

II Corinthians 13:14 The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all. Amen.

With which I shall conclude the proof from scripture, of a Trinity of Persons in the unity of the divine essence; “The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all.” Amen.

To which may be added; that a plurality of Persons in the Godhead, seems necessary from the nature of God himself, and his most complete happiness; for as he is the best, the greatest and most perfect of Beings, his happiness in himself must be the most perfect and complete. Now happiness lies not in solitude, but in society. Hence the three personal distinctions in Deity, seem necessary to perfect happiness, which lies in that most glorious, inconceivable, and inexpressible communion the three Persons have with one another; and which arises from the incomprehensible in-being and unspeakable nearness they have to each other.

John 10:38 But if I do, though ye believe not me, believe the works: that ye may know, and believe, that the Father is in me, and I in him.

John 14:10-11 Believest thou not that I am in the Father, and the Father in me? the words that I speak unto you I speak not of myself: but the Father that dwelleth in me, he doeth the works. Believe me that I am in the Father, and the Father in me: or else believe me for the very works' sake.

TWELVE and TWENTY, The Numbers (in Combination)

The Numbers TWELVE and TWENTY (in Combination) (See under *The Waters of MARAH*)

Twelve Marks, The

The TWELVE MARKS (See under *The CHURCH (Twelve Marks)*)

Two Seed Doctrine

The TWO SEED doctrine: C.H. Cayce: The eternal Two-Seed doctrine is that God made choice of certain persons from among the human family for His children to dwell in for awhile here in time. Hence, they claim to believe in the doctrine of election; but they do not believe that sinners of Adam's race were chosen to be saved in heaven. They teach, as stated, that God made choice of persons of Adam's race for His children to dwell in for awhile here on earth.

In the work which we call regeneration they teach that there is an eternal spirit or child which comes down from God out of heaven and takes up its abode in the Adam man, and remains in the Adam man and torments him until the Adam man dies; when the Adam man dies, this eternal child goes back to God where it came from and the Adam man goes to the ground where he will always remain.

The eternal Two-Seeder claims that the body of the Adam man is no part of the child of God; that the child of God is on the inside of the Adam man; the child of God is a man on the inside of the man you see. They carry this doctrine to its logical conclusion and deny the resurrection of the body, claiming that the body remains in the dust, and will not be raised again.

The eternal Two-Seeders also hold that God unalterably fixed and decreed all the wickedness that men do, and that wicked men and devils are doing God's will in their nefarious crimes and meanness as much so as is being done by His children rendering gospel service and living a life of righteousness; that the devil does the

will of God as much as Jesus Christ did in His perfect life of obedience to the law of God. (*Cayce's Editorials vol. 3, ppg 364, 365*)

C.H. Cayce: The doctrine of eternal Two-Seedism is that in the work which we call regeneration, an eternal child, or eternal spirit, comes down from God out of heaven and takes up its abode in the Adam man, and remains in the Adam man until the man dies; then that eternal child goes back to God where it came from, and the Adam man goes to the grave and remains there forever.

Thus the Adam man is not a subject of salvation. It is also taught that there are two families in the flesh—that Cain was a child of the devil by ordinary generation, and that Seth was a child of God by ordinary generation—that there are two families existing in the flesh—the family of God and the family of the devil, and that these two families have continued to exist all along from then until now. This is their teaching, although we have not learned how the devil got his family across the flood. These are some of the teachings of the Two-Seedism system, which we think are enough to show that the system is false. (*Cayce's Editorials vol. 2, ppg 104,105*)

Lemuel Potter: Elder Heardeundertook to prove in his affirmation that the people of God are a seed which existed in heaven prior to the formation of the Adam man, and that they would all go back to heaven where they came from. I do not pretend to say that I have his proposition verbatim, but this is the substance of it, and he led out in the opening of that question, with a speech for one hour, in which he made a number of scripture quotations to show that God's people were a seed. He quoted this among others: "A seed shall serve him, and it shall be counted to the Lord for a generation." And "In thee and thy seed shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed." "I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed. It shall bruise thy head, and it shall bruise his heel."

Quite a number of other texts of this character were introduced in his first speech, without a great many comments. He stated that he intended to merely lay his planks down loose, in this speech, and that he would come with his hatchet and nails and fasten them down in his next speech.

In my reply to his arguments on these proof-texts, to prove the pre-existence of God's people, I simply admitted that I believed that the Lord's people were a seed, and that was all that he had proven by these texts. I was not here to deny that God's people were a seed, but that I was here to deny that they had an eternal existence, and that there was not a single text in all the catalogue of texts that he had quoted that said anything about the pre-existence of the people mentioned in the proof-texts.

I thought then, and do yet, however, that he did about as well in proving that doctrine as any man could do. I felt very confident that he could not prove it by the Bible. He finally inquired where the Lord got his people, if they did not eternally exist. I replied that he *made them*. That I knew of no people as the subjects of eternal salvation, only the people that God made. That the Bible frequently spoke of the fact that God made his people. "Thy Maker is thine husband," is one expression of scripture, and the very idea of a Maker is the best inferential testimony that they must have been made.

Again, I do not believe that they had an eternal existence, because it was said that Adam was the first man, I could not conceive of the idea of there being a man before him, and not only was he the first man, but that he was made of the dust of the ground. This was the man that I believed had transgressed the law of God, and fallen under its curse, and became subject to death, and all the miseries consequent upon sin, and that they were the subjects of salvation. But I will not stop here to give a full detail of the arguments, any more than to say that I became more fully convinced during that discussion against the doctrine of the pre-existence of God's people than I had ever been.

I believe that God eternally knew his people, and that it was as easy a matter for him to know them before they existed as it was afterwards. I believed then, more than that, that God foreknew his people, and how he foreknew his people and they have an eternal existence I could not understand, for I thought to foreknow a thing was to know it beforehand, that is, to know it before it was, so if he foreknew his people, he knew them before they were, and the apostle says, "Whom he foreknew, them he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his son." It would be impossible for him to foreknow them, or to know them before they were, if they eternally existed.

He finally, however, made this remark, that if I would admit the pre-existence of God's people, he did not ask any boot on the question on the resurrection. So, I say today, that the non-resurrection doctrine is the legitimate consequence, and the inevitable result of the doctrine of the **pre-existence of the children of God.**

Men may talk all they wish about the doctrine of **eternal vital union, eternal children, eternal justification**, and so forth, but I do not believe in the **eternal existence of God's people**; neither do I believe in eternal vital union. Now, if a man admits the doctrine of eternal children, he may as well admit the doctrine of non-resurrection. We discussed this proposition a day and a half, after which I affirmed that there will be, in the future, a resurrection of the bodies, both of the just and the unjust, of Adam's posterity, some to eternal life, and some to everlasting punishment.

I give the substance of the proposition from memory, for I do not remember it verbatim. I argued that resurrection meant to restore to life that which once had life and that to put one man down and take another up in his place, would be no resurrection, but to lay one body down in death, and then take that same body up alive, is a resurrection, and nothing short of it is.

I believed then, and do today, that it was the Adam sinner that was saved, the same man that was made of the dust of the ground. I did not then believe, nor do I yet, that any part of him came from heaven. I believe that the very same body that goes to the grave will be precisely the same body that will be raised from the dead, and finally taken to heaven. I contended for that doctrine in this discussion. As before stated, after this discussion was over, the visits of those men ceased among the churches in our part of the country.” (*Lemuel Potter*)

[In another debate with a man named Williams, Elder Potter had this to say about whether the children of God are eternal, whether they have always existed in heaven (two seedism), or whether they are creatures of time. (Emphasis added)].

Lemuel Potter: I quote Isaiah 64:8-9, “But now, O Lord, thou art our Father; *we are the clay* and thou our Father: and we all are the work of thy hand. Be not wroth very sore, O Lord, neither remember iniquity forever; behold, see, we beseech thee we are thy people.” From this text we learn that these were the people of God. They were the clay; they were the work of God’s hand. *They never came from heaver.* Job 33:4-7, “The Spirit of God hath made me, and the breath of the Almighty hath given me life. If thou canst answer me, set thy words in order before me, stand up. Behold, *I am formed out of the clay.* Behold my terror shall not make thee afraid, neither shall my hand be heavy upon thee.” “Like as a father *pitieth his children*, so the Lord pitieth them that fear him. For he knoweth our frame; he remembereth that *we are dust.* As for man, his days are as grass; as a flower of the field, so he flourisheth. For the wind passeth over it, and it is gone; and the place thereof shall know it no more,” Psalms 103:13-16. The last text quoted proves not only that man dies, but it proves that he is of the dust of the ground and also that he is the object of salvation.” (*Lemuel Potter*)

Lemuel Potter: One man who believed in the doctrine of the pre-existence of God’s children, in reply to an article that I had written, some years ago, stated that he could not see how God chose his people in Christ, before the foundation of the world, if they did not exist then; that he did not choose them into Christ, but that he chose them in Christ, was his argument, and that they must have been there, in some sense or other, or he could not have done it.

I claim that God foreknew his people, and that he was as well acquainted with them, before they had a being, as he is after they have a being, and that he did choose them in Christ to eternal salvation, before the foundation of the world, although they had no actual being at that time.

On the subject of the pre-existence of God's children, there has been a great deal said, and the legitimate result of that doctrine is a denial of the resurrection of the bodies of God's people. I was asked, in a debate on this question once, if the people of God did not exist through all eternity, where did he get them? My answer was, *he made them*, and I refer to Isaiah 54:5, as one text that proves that he did make them, "For thy Maker is thine husband; the Lord of hosts is his name; and thy Redeemer, the Holy One of Israel. The God of the whole earth shall he be called."

From this it sounds like the church had a Maker, and I never could conceive of a maker of something that had existed from eternity. God's people were made. He made them of the dust of the ground. They were the first people in existence. The apostle Paul said, "The first man is of the earth earthly." If the earthly man is the first man, I argue that there was no man before him, hence, the earthly man is the first man.

Again the apostle says, "Howbeit, that was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural, and afterwards that which is spiritual." The natural man is the earthly man, and he was made of the dust of the earth, and there was no man before him, consequently it would be impossible for God's people to have existed before the first man existed. I published a work a few years ago, entitled, "Unconditional Election Stated and Defined; or the Denial of the Doctrine of Eternal Children, or Two Seeds in the Flesh." I sent a copy of it to all the editors of Old School Baptist periodicals in this country.

One man wrote a lengthy editorial in reply to the position I took against the pre-existence of God's children. He said, "According to Bro. Potter's views, God has no people, only as he takes them out of Adam's family and adopts them into his own." That is precisely what I believe, and I feel proud that I am understood, even if I am not endorsed, on that subject. I believe that the subject of salvation is the Adam sinner, and I do not believe that he had an eternal existence. The apostle speaks of God's people as being foreknown. "Whom he foreknew he did also predestinate, to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the first born among many brethren." Again, whom he did predestinate, them he also called, and whom he called, them he also justified," etc.

I take the position that if God's people were as old as himself, that he did not foreknow them. To foreknow a thing is to know it beforehand, and he foreknew

his people, and it was the people that he foreknew that he predestinated to be conformed to the image of Christ. I take the position that God purposed the salvation of his people, and that he saves the people according to his purpose.

The text says that we are predestinated according to the purpose of him who "worketh all things after the counsel of his own will." This is the way we are predestinated. The apostle says, "We know that all things work together for good to them that love God. to them who are the called according to his purpose."
(Lemuel Potter)

Ussher's Chronology

USSHER'S CHRONOLOGY In 1650 James Ussher, the Archbishop of Armagh, published his claim that the world was created at noon on October 23, 4004 B.C. He did not arrive at that figure by adding up the ages and lineages of the Old Testament, as is usually imagined. That cannot be done with any accuracy. In his day it was usually believed that the world was created four thousand years before the birth of Christ, and that it would last for another two thousand years after his birth. That would make six thousand years corresponding to the six days of creation. Also, Herod was generally agreed to have died in 4 B.C.

Ussher simply added the two figures and arrived at 4004 B.C. The Jewish year began in the autumn, and the Roman calendar, which was in use at the time of Christ, placed the autumnal equinox in October. Ussher chose the first Sunday after the autumnal equinox, and he placed the creation at what he thought was the creation of light, which he thought was at noon.

About the same time John Lightfoot calculated that the creation took place on October 23, 4004 B.C. at nine o'clock in the morning. In the eighth century the Venerable Bede, the British historian, chose 3952 B.C. The Jewish calendar names 3761 B.C.

Uzziah

UZZIAH: Sylvester Hassell: Uzziah, also called Azariah, succeeded to the throne of his father Amaziah, and had a long and somewhat prosperous reign. He reigned fifty-two years. He sought God in the days of Zechariah, another of the sixteen prophets whose writings are in the sacred canon. He fortified Jerusalem, increased his army, and became famous abroad. He permitted

idolatry among the people, though he did not practice it himself. Prosperity ruined him at last. He became so self-important that he attempted to officiate as priest in the temple, but Azariah, the chief priest, and eighty other priests, withstood

him and thrust him out. And while he was wroth with them for so doing, leprosy rose up in his forehead, in the house of the Lord, beside the incense altar, and he himself hastened to go out, because the Lord had smitten him. He was a leper to the day of his death (II Chronicles 26). Joel prophesied during a part of his reign, and Isaiah the last year of it, while Hosea and Amos prophesied in Israel (II Chronicles 26; II Kings 15)." (*Hassell's History* pg 128, 129)

Virgin Birth, The

The VIRGIN BIRTH Genesis 3:15, "And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and *her seed*: it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel."

Isaiah 7:14, "Therefore he Lord Himself shall give you a sign; Behold a *virgin* shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel."

Matthew 1:23, "Behold a *virgin* shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel, which being interpreted is, God with us."

Galatians 4:4, "But when the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, *made of a woman*, made under the law."

S.A. Paine: [In the following article Elder Paine was responding to the Campbellites, the self-styled *Church of Christ*.]

David, on inherent sin, says, "Behold I was shapen in iniquity and in sin did my mother conceive me." Psalms 51:5

But they say, that only proves that David's parents were sinners. If so, then you tell us, "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean?" Job 14:4.

I have had them try to impeach Job as a witness. They say if that be true then Jesus Christ was depraved, because he was born of a woman, hence came from the unclean. They forget or rather ignore the fact that God was his Father and

that his mother, Mary, was divinely prepared and made a clean source from which the babe sprang. When the angel told Mary that she should “conceive and bring forth a son,” she replied and said, “How shall this be seeing I know not a man?” “And the angel answered and said unto her, the Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee; therefore (notice, therefore, because of the power of the Highest), also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God.” Luke 1:35.

Any one, who wants to, can see how the conception and birth of Jesus differs from the common or regular process of generation. The power of the Highest is able to reverse any law of nature at his option. (*S.A. Paine Writings of S.A. Paine pg 4*)

Waldenses

The WALDENSES (Waldensians): *Sylvester Hassell:* About the year 1400, in the depths of winter, the Catholics committed great depredations upon the Waldenses who inhabited the valley of Pragela in Piedmont. About 1460 **the Inquisition** preyed cruelly upon the Waldenses in the Fernch valleys of Fraissiniere, Argentiere and Loyse—the poor and peaceful lovers of truth fleeing with their children and valuables to the tops of the mountains and hiding in caves. Their merciless enemies placed large quantities of wood at the entrances of the caves and set it on fire, and suffocated, it is said, four hundred children in their cradles or in the arms of their dead mothers; while multitudes, to avoid suffocation, leaped down upon the rocks below, and were either dashed to pieces or immediately slaughtered by the brutal soldiery. All the inhabitants of the valley of Loyse, three thousand, are said to have perished in this campaign.

In 1488 an army of eighteen thousand Catholics made war upon the Waldenses of Piedmont, who, at length losing their patience, and departing from the peaceful principles of their ancestors, armed themselves with wooden targets and cross-bows, and for a while fought in defense of their wives and children, everywhere defending the defiles of their mountains, and repelling the invaders. Some were driven by fear from public to private worship; and other conformed to Catholicism.. Evidence henceforth increase of a degeneracy from their primitive purity of faith and practice.” (*Hassell’s History ppg 468, 469*)

The Waldenses, it is held by many of the most learned authorities, were so called from **Peter Waldo**, a merchant of Lyons, who about 1160 expended his wealth in giving alms to the poor, and in translating and distributing the Scriptures. His followers were called **Poor Men of Lyons**, or **Leonists**, or **Sabbatati** (from their wooden shoes), or **Humiliati**, the **Downtrodden**; also Waldenses, **Vallenses**, or

Vaudois—the latter name being supposed to have been derived from the valleys of **Piedmont**, in Northwest Italy, where these lovers and students and adherents of the written word of God abounded. When driven by Catholic persecution from France, Peter Waldo fled to Piedmont, and afterwards to Bohemia in Germany, where he is said to have died in 1179.

As in the case of the primitive church, persecution disseminated the truth until it was found in nearly all the countries of Europe. The Waldenses were very industrious, honest, modest, frugal, chaste, and temperate, according to the universal testimony of their Catholic enemies. They held the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments to be the only standard of faith and practice; and they consequently rejected the authority of the “fathers” and the Catholic traditions, and the doctrines of purgatory, indulgences, and transubstantiation, monasticism, sacramentalism and celibacy. They held that there were only two Christian ordinances, Baptism and the Lord’s Supper, and that these were but emblems and signs of inward grace.

They were very familiar with the Scriptures, very many of them being able to repeat entire books of the Bible from memory. They condemned all taking of oaths, shedding of blood, capital punishment, and military service. The “Church of Rome” they declared it be the “whore of Babylon.” They maintained the universal priesthood of believers, and they allowed all their members, both male and female, to preach and administer the ordinances; their preachers worked with their own hands for their necessities. They taught that God alone can forgive sin. Some practiced infant baptism, and some did not; they who did baptize infants probably had been Catholics, and thus retained that unscriptural and traditional error.

The *earliest* Waldenses were not established in the doctrine of predestination, and of the redemptive work of Christ, and of our full and free justification by faith in Him; their prevailing type of doctrine is less that of Paul than of James. In the darkness of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries they were more Arminian than Augustinian in their views. They were babes in Christ, and were gradually led into the doctrine of grace.

It is highly probable, and is believed by many eminent historians, that the *Waldenses* in Northern Italy were the spiritual descendants and successors of the *Novatians*—then stigmatized as *Anabaptists*, rejecting the superstitions and corruptions of Rome, and re-immersing all who joined them from the Catholic communion.” (*Hassell’s History* ppg 440, 441)

Even “Cardinal” Hosius, chairman of the **Council of Trent**, in the sixteenth century, testifies not only to the existence, but also to the persecutions and

cheerful sufferings of the “**Anabaptists**” ever since the fourth century, when Constantine connected *Church* and state, and the people of God protested against the unholy and corrupting alliance, and were persecuted by the Second Beast.

Ludwig Keller, the present royal archivist at Munster, has mastered, more completely than any other man, the printed and manuscript sources of early Baptist history. In his book, *Die Reformation and die alteren Reformparteien, in ihrem Zusammenhang dargestellt* (*The Reformation and the Older Reforming Parties, Exhibited in their Connection*), published at Leipzig, by Hirzel, in 1885, Keller proves that, while the Lutherans and Zwinglians were *new* sects, the churches of the so-called Anabaptists, or Baptists of the sixteenth century, were but the renewal or continuation of the Petrobrusian and Waldensian churches of the twelfth century; and he gives strong reasons for accepting the old Walsensians tradition of a succession of evangelical churches from the time of the union of “Church” and State (under Pope Sylvester I. and the Emperor Constantine), and so from the time of the apostles.

While no Scripture, properly interpreted, requires that we should find at all times all of the elements of Christianity represented in any one Christian community, no Baptist can be indifferent to facts which seem to prove the persistence of apostolic teaching and practice, in a form more or less pure, throughout the centuries of ecclesiastical corruption.

The Waldenses, of the thirteenth, fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, repudiated the idea of derivation from Peter Waldo, and insisted with the utmost decision upon direct apostolic derivation. Except when restrained by temporal power, they practiced believers’ baptism.

In the latter part of the twelfth century the popes and councils pronounced repeated excommunications and anathemas against the Albigensians and Waldenses; affirmed the right of the *church* to banish them, confiscate their property and put them to death; and even ordered the temporal sovereigns, under the strong temptations of possessing the confiscated estates and of receiving indulgences, to carry these penalties into effect.” (*Hassell’s History* ppg 440, 441)

WALDENSES, their soundness or unsoundness: Sylvester Hassell: In the Protestant Confessions and writers of the sixteenth century many false doctrines are charged upon the Anabaptists— such as Manicheism, Millenarianism, Arianism, Arminianism, revolutionism, communism, asceticism, psychopannychism, (the sleep of the soul from death to the resurrection), universalism, libertinism, and opposition to holding civil offices, to capital punishment, to keeping inns or carrying on trades. In reference to these charges, it may be said

that there were numerous sects of the *Anabaptists*, and some of them were fanatical and apparently insane; some even professing to be so inspired as to be able to prophesy and to set aside the Scriptures; and some going so far into error as to believe (and be willing to suffer martyrdom for that belief) that David Joris (who died at Basel in 1556) was a second Christ, greater and better than the Lord Jesus; and some who bore the name rushing into the abominable excesses of Munster.

But of those who were the most like their brethren in preceding and succeeding centuries, we have two Confessions of Faith—the Swiss Confession of 1527, and the Mennonite Confession of 1580. The seven articles of the Swiss Confession teach the baptism of believers; the exclusion of unworthy members; communion of baptized believers; separation from the impure churches and the world; the support of needy pastors by the voluntary offerings of the members; the condemnation of Christians holding civil offices, but allowing others to do so, and enjoining obedience to civil magistrates, except when their commands are opposed to religious convictions; and the disuse of oaths.

The forty articles of the Mennonite Confession reject also the use of arms, lawsuits, revenge, all kinds of violence and worldly amusements, and divorce, except in the case of adultery. The Swiss Confession seems to imply, and the Mennonite Confession plainly declares, that the atonement of Christ was universal, and that election is conditional.

While the true *Anabaptists* or *Mennonites* of the sixteenth century had great spiritual light on most other subjects, Bible Baptists of today believe that they were greatly in the dark in regard to the conditionality of salvation. The bitter persecutions inflicted upon them, inconsistently and unscripturally, by the Lutherans, Calvinists and Anglicans, who professed to believe the doctrine of predestination, did not incline them to receive that Bible doctrine, nor indeed did they seem to devote any particular attention to its consideration. It was the ordination of Divine Providence for the Protestant Reformers to consider and elucidate that important scriptural doctrine.

The defense of another most important point of truth, neglected by all other religionists, providentially devolved upon the Baptists of that century—and this point was *the spirituality of the church of Christ*, a New Testament principle utterly inconsistent with infant or vicious membership in the church, and with alliance of Church and State. This Bible principle was in the sixteenth century regarded by Catholic and Protestant alike, as the most intolerable heresies, urgently demanding the severest vengeance of the secular arm.

The Protestants lacked sufficient confidence in God to carry out to its logical results their own fundamental doctrine, that the Bible is the only and perfect standard of faith and practice, and the inevitable corollary of that doctrine—that Christ’s kingdom is not of this world. Instead of thoroughly maintaining this scriptural position, it is an indisputable fact that the Lutherans and Calvinists actually corrupted the principles and practices of large numbers of the old Bohemian Brethren and Waldenses, and induced thousands of these simple-minded people to unite with themselves in the abandonment of New Testament ground in reference to the proper subjects of baptism and the apostolic strictness of church discipline.

In the early part of the sixteenth century, when, on account of persecution, those entertaining Baptist sentiments lay concealed, according to Mosheim, in almost all the countries of Europe, the intelligence of the Protestant movement caused them to come joyfully and hopefully out of their hiding places, but only to meet with bitter disappointment; for, if flattery failed to entice them from the simplicity of the gospel of Christ, they were heathenishly punished with fines, imprisonment, torture, banishment and death, and that, too, by men who professed to advocate the principles of Christian liberty.” (*Hassell’s History* ppg 505, 506)

Wartburg, The Castle Of

The Castle of WARTBURG (*See under Martin LUTHER*)

Welch Tract Church, The

The WELCH TRACT CHURCH: *Sylvester Hassell:* The Welsh Tract Church, whose meetinghouse is two miles from Newark, in New Castle County, Delaware, is the oldest Old School Baptist Church in the United States, and the only American Baptist Church that was regularly organized in Europe before emigrating to this country. It was constituted, in the spring of 1701, by sixteen Baptists in the counties of Pembroke and Caermarthen, in south Wales, with Thomas Griffith, one of their number, as their pastor.

A “Church Emigrant,” they embarked at Milford Haven in June, 1701, and landed at Philadelphia, September 8th, 1701. They first settled about Pennypack, near Philadelphia, where they continued about a year and a half, and where their membership increased to thirty-seven. Then they procured land in Northern

Delaware from Messrs. Evans, Davis and Willis, who had purchased upwards of 30,000 acres of William Penn, called the “Welsh Tract,” and in 1703 they removed to that location, and built, near Iron Hill, a small meetinghouse, which stood until 1746, and was then succeeded by the present substantial stone house of worship.

In the yard around the house the bodies of many of the pastors and members, who during almost two centuries, have met and joined here in the service of God. The Welsh tract Church was one of the five original churches that, in 1707, formed the Philadelphia Baptist Association (the oldest Baptist Association in America), and for many years it was the most influential member of that body.

The Philadelphia Confession of Faith, published by this Association in 1742, was the old London Confession of 1689, with two other Articles, added principally through the influence of the Welsh Tract Church—Article 23., Of Singing of Psalms (in Public Worship), and Article 31., Of Laying on of hands (on all Baptized Believers).

Until 1732 the Church Book was kept in the Welsh language; and for about seventy years the pastors were of Welsh extraction. The Welsh are the most conservative people in Europe, their language and customs having undergone no radical changes for some twenty centuries. Mr. David Benedict speaks, in strong terms, of “The order, intelligence and stability of the Welsh Baptist Churches in America, and their sound, salutary and efficient principles.”

The pastors of Welsh tract Church have been as follows; Thomas Griffith, Elisha Thomas, Enoch Morgan, Owen Thomas, David Davis, John Sutton, John Boggs, Gideon Farrell, Stephen M. Woolford, Samuel Trott, William K. Robinson, Thomas Barton (from 1839 to 1870, when he died, after having been sixty years in the ministry), G.W. Staton, William Grafton and Joseph L. Staton, the present pastor. The church owns a residence and tract of land, which the pastor occupies.” (*Hassell’s History* pp 554, 555)

Wesley, John

John WESLEY: *Sylvester Hassell:* The inconsistencies of Mr. Wesley’s system are well illustrated by the inconsistencies of his life. While first genuinely converted, as he himself says, by the writings of Martin Luther, the most predestinarian of predestinarians, he came to be the most bitter enemy of predestinarianism, denouncing it as a horrible and detestable doctrine that

represented God as worse than the devil, more false, more cruel, and more unjust. And yet Mr. Wesley's funeral sermon on George Whitefield, the extraordinary predestinarian preacher, commends the latter in the highest terms as "an eminent servant of God, who, in the business of salvation, put Christ as high as possible and man as low as possible, and who brought a larger number of sinners from darkness to light than any other man."

In the application of human wisdom to the organization of a religious society, John Wesley was, as commonly remarked, more like Ignatius Loyola than any other man; he conformed the organization of Methodism more to that of Romanism than that of any other Protestant body; and, accordingly, in nominal numerical success, he had made his society the most powerful rival of Rome.

By his famous "Deed of Declaration to the Legal Hundred," "the Magna Charta of Methodism" (Made in 1784, when he was eighty-one years of age), bequeathing the property and government of all his chapels in the United Kingdom to a hundred of his traveling preachers and their successors, on condition that they should accept as their basis of doctrine his Notes on the New Testament and the four volumes of his sermons published in or before A.D. 1771, he surpassed even the worldly wisdom of Catholicism, and made himself not only the *infallible* but the *eternal* pope of his society.

So his twenty-five Articles of Religion are declared, in the Methodist Book of Discipline, to be *unalterable*. This makes Wesley the last and greatest teacher of the human race, and places him above Christ and his Apostles, as we are required to look through the medium of Wesley at all the Divine teaching, and to accept forever his interpretation of the doctrine and precepts of the Bible.

How can any of the dear children of God be willing thus to substitute the headship of a sinful and fallible mortal for the headship of Christ? (*Hassell's History ppg 334, 335*)

Whitefield, George

George WHITEFIELD: *Sylvester Hassell:* George Whitefield (1714-1770), a native of Gloucester, England, was, probably, the most persuasive preacher since the days of the Apostles. After years of early dissipation and then years of rigid Pharisaism, which was so excessive as almost to carry him to his grave, he experienced a hope in Christ in 1735, before the conversion of either of the Wesleys or any other member of the Methodist "Holy Club" at Oxford. He began to preach in 1736, and, at the solicitation of the Wesleys, he embarked for Georgia in December, 1737.

Excluded from the pulpits of the Established “Church of England,” he began open field-preaching in 1739. On preaching tours he visited Scotland twelve times, Ireland three times, and America seven times; and he preached in almost every important district in England and Wales. His audiences sometimes numbered ten, twenty or even thirty thousand. He had a rich and powerful voice. In the thirty-four years of his active ministry it is estimated that he preached eighteen thousand sermons, or, on an average, ten a week, often in the open air, and with great vehemence of voice and gesture.

His style was severely simple, and his language that of the common people. He made no display of human learning or reasoning. He spoke most fervently from his heart, and what he said went to the hearts of his hearer. Even such unspiritual persons as Hume and Franklin, Bolingbroke and Chesterfield, were naturally overwhelmed by his resistless eloquence.

But the glory of Whitefield’s preaching was its heart-kindled and heart-melting gospel. So simple was his nature that glory to God and good will to man had so filled it that there was room for little more. Having no church to found, no family to enrich, and no memory to immortalize, he was simply the ambassador of God, and inspired with its genial, piteous spirit, he soon became himself a living gospel.” “Of no other preacher,” remarks Mr. Lecky, “could it be more truly said that he preached ‘as a dying man to dying men.’” His favorite maxim was that a preacher, whenever he entered the pulpit, should look upon it as the last time he might preach, and the last time his people might hear.

To his vivid imagination Heaven and Hell, death and judgment, appeared palpably present. His voice was sometimes choked with tears; he stamped vehemently on the pulpit floor; every nerve was strained; his whole frame was convulsed with emotion. He had nothing of the arrogant and imperious spirit of Wesley. A more zealous, a more single-minded, a more truly amiable, a more purely unselfish man, it would be difficult to conceive.

Very few men have passed through so much obloquy with a heart so entirely unsoured, and have retained amid so much adulation so large a measure of deep and genuine humility. There was, indeed, not a trace of jealousy, ambition or rancor in his nature. With almost childish simplicity he was always ready to make a public confession of his faults.

On the question of predestination and election, there was, after Wesley preached and printed his “Sermon of Free Grace,” in 1740, a temporary alienation between him and Whitefield, and, after the latter’s death, an entire separation between their respective Societies. After the publication of Wesley’s “Sermon,” in

consequence of drawing a lot, as already mentioned, Whitefield wrote him: "I have often questioned whether in so doing you did not tempt the Lord. A due exercise of religious prudence without a lot would have directed you in that matter. Besides, I never heard that you inquired of God whether or not election was a gospel doctrine. But I fear, taking it for granted it was not, you only inquired whether you should be silent or preach and print against it. I am apt to think one reason why God should so suffer you to be deceived was, that hereby a special obligation should be laid upon me faithfully to declare the Scripture doctrine of election, that thus the Lord might give me a fresh opportunity of seeing what was in my heart, and whether I would be true to his cause or not. Perhaps God has laid this difficult task upon me, even to see whether I am willing to forsake all for him or not." He reminded Wesley of the latter's own confession that the Lord had once before given him a wrong lot.

Under the Holy Spirit's effectual blessing of his own eternal truth reached by Edwards and Whitefield, there was, for some twenty-five years, a great revival of spiritual life in the British American Colonies, from 1734 to 1760; and it was, as the learned and accurate Professor Henry Boynton Smith shows, like all the genuine reformations of the church in modern times, a staying of the prevailing Arminianism, and a revival of scriptural predestinarianism, of the great Bible truths of God's sovereignty, and of salvation by grace alone, and justification by faith alone.

Generally throughout the Colonies there were large in gatherings into the Congregational, Presbyterian, and Baptist communions. At the beginning of the Revolutionary War, three-fourths of all the American churches were predestinarian; and the people of this country were more honest, earnest, sincere, truthful, serious, solemn and reverential than they have ver been since (see Prof. J.L. Diman's "Religion in America, 1776-1876," published in the Centennial Number of the North American Review, January, 1876).

After the demoralizing influences of the Revolutionary War had, to a considerable extent, passed away (for the demoralization of the people is much the worst result of wars), there was, at the close of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth century, under similar predestinarian preaching and similar Divine blessing, another extensive spiritual revival in the United States. (*Hassell's History ppg 549- 551*)

Will, The or Free Agency

The WILL, or Free Agency: J.H. Oliphant: We have seen that sin has dominion over men in nature, and rules them as a tyrant, so that the aims and desires of men in nature are sinful.

1st. We might show that it has blinded men with ignorance. Ephesians 4:18, “Having the understanding darkened, being alienated from the life of God through the ignorance that is in them,” etc. Romans 10:3, “Being ignorant of God’s righteousness they go about to establish their own righteousness,” etc.

Their going about is not to obtain the righteousness of Christ, but to establish their own. They are not ignorant of the being of God, for they are taught by the works of God that he exists—Romans 3:18. But the nature of his law, the justice of God in that law, is what men by nature are ignorant of. By carefully reading Romans 7:7-14, we will see that Paul, though versed in the *letter* of the law, was, nevertheless, ignorant of the law, and so is every unregenerate sinner on earth.

When Paul became acquainted with the law he experienced a death. He saw the law was *spiritual*, and he was but natural; it required purity and perfection, and he had neither, and under such a knowledge of the law he ceased going about to establish his own righteousness, and submitted to the righteousness of God. This is what no natural man will do if left to pursue his own course; he will believe *his own goodness* is acceptable; he will call in question the justice of God in requiring *perfection* of an imperfect being; he will argue his own cause, apologize for his sins in many ways, but when once made acquainted with the law he gets such a knowledge of sin as he never had before. “For by the law is the knowledge of sin;” without this knowledge he never *will* nor *can* see the real propriety of a redeemer; he will naturally oppose the doctrine of imputed righteousness, and if he be of a *religious turn* his religion will proceed upon the Pharisee’s ground.

If he has a place in his system for Christ, it is not the place the Bible assigns him; Christ with him only makes up what he lacks. But a man made wise and cured of ignorance on this subject realizes the need of a redeemer, the propriety of imputed righteousness and the magnitude and riches of God’s grace; he sees the law as *spiritual* and himself but natural; he is great in naught but sin, and feels and owns himself to be justly condemned; he views Christ as “a covert from the tempest;” he discards not only *all* his evil deeds, but (wonderful to tell to some) he discards all his *good* deeds, and confesses himself to have nothing to secure the favor of God.

2nd. The affections are perverted. He loves darkness rather than light.”—John 3:19. Though light and truth are desirable, yet he loves darkness better; he pursues evil by choice; John 12:43; “They love the praise of men more than the praise of God.” Though Balaam was convinced that the end of the righteous was a blessed end. Yet he had no heart for their life or company. It is not *natural* for men to love God, but supernatural, as no stream can rise above its fountain. So no natural man will of himself love God. No doubt it is all men’s duty to love God; his great mercy to us in a thousand ways claims our love, and unregenerate men know that God has a just claim on their affections, yet they set their hearts on the *creature*, and not the *creator*, on the *gift* and not the *giver*.

There is a great variety of taste among men in nature. Some pride in riches, some in great learning, some in fame, etc., but not one of the many millions of Adam’s race voluntarily and untouched by grace, loves God. God only is worthy of love, and yet everything else, though temporal, must share the love of fallen man, while God, the great benefactor of all, must go unloved until he change the heart of the fallen creature. That men by nature do not love God is apparent by the course of men’s lives; they toil both with hands and mind for worldly things.

The great question is, “What shall we eat and what shall we wear?” “How shall I and mine have the pre-eminence?” The Bible, though the best of books, and so acknowledged, is neglected, and the time spent in reading is devoted to something human, and often false, while God’s word is allowed to lay untouched on the shelf.

The mind is taken up with worldly things. “Every imagination of the thoughts of his heart is evil and that continually”—Genesis 6:5. How busy the mind is in contriving ways to promote self, and self-interest, for this life, while the great matters of eternity are allowed to go unconsidered. Often in his imagination he rolls in wealth, or sits on high places, and receives the applause of men, but never does hold fellowship with God in this way. Psalms 10:4, “God is not in all this thoughts,” he “does not like to retain God in this thoughts.” He may, in a way, think of God, but he never thinks rightly of him; he never has one correct thought of his Maker; all subjects are pried into by him, but the one needful. “The Lord knoweth that his thoughts are vanity”—Psalms 94:11.

Men are wholly taken up with this world, although they have no assurance of remaining here long. The new birth, which is the gracious work of God, rectifies these disorders of men, sets their hearts on the *Giver* and on the *Creator*, and on “things above,” leads them to change their company and books, and occupy their thoughts in self-examination and often in prayer to God. Sin, as a disease, manifests itself in perverting the whole man, his love, mind, body, and all that pertains to him; while grace meets all these needs by renewing the mind,

changing the affections, etc. Bodily distempers, as smallpox, measles, fever, etc., are things that men by nature try to avoid and hate, but the real malignity of sin lies most in the fact that men love the disease and hate the remedy.

The only remedy for sin is that that cures and rectifies the enmity (for “the carnal mind is enmity against God”), and sets the heart on the Lord. The cure is *not affected* by the joint effort of God and the sinner, for the poor sinner has no heart in the cure, no love for the remedy, and while he admits the need of a Savior, he defers the matter till some future time, and this deferring would never stop unless God interposes his own almighty power in illuminating the mind, taking away the heart of stone, and giving one of flesh, etc.

3rd. The will (being determined and decided by the mind and affections) is perverted, and on this part of the subject I desire that the writer and reader should take great pains. In order that men serve God and come to him as a Savior, there are three things necessary: 1st. They must have physical power, sufficient strength and natural ability, and this, I presume, all *living* men have; but little strength of this kind is needed to come to Jesus, it requires no long journey to reach him, no gold nor silver, nor yet the consent or aid of our fellow creatures; all men have a sufficient amount of natural power to come to him. 2nd. A sufficient amount of *mental* power, and, fortunately, the *foolish* of this world have a sufficient amount of *mental* power to come to Christ. Often men of weak and ordinary minds have a saving knowledge of Christ, while some that are extremely wise know nothing of his love and are utter strangers to his gospel. 3rd. They must have a will to come, they will not be *brought* against their will, and, if they have no *will* to come, though they may have the necessary natural power and the mental ability, they *can not* come. God has given all men sufficient *natural* power and sufficient *mental* power, but all men have not the *will* to come to him. All men know that they should forsake their sins, and that God has a just claim on their affections, yet they “will not come to him.” Jesus says, John 6:65, “No man can come unto me except it were given him of my Father.”

One reason why he “can not” is not for lack of *mental* power nor *natural* power, for all have that, but for want of *will*. There is a “great difference between *natural* and *moral* ability;” the sinner’s inability to come is not *natural* but *moral*. If a man be commanded to look without eyes he is not responsible for not looking, because of his *natural* inability to look; if he is commanded to compute the distance to the stars, he is not responsible for not obeying because of his *mental* inability; but if he have *mental* and *natural* ability and disobeys on account of his own *unwillingness* to obey, he is culpable.

Now here is the ground upon which I rest the justice of God in the condemnation of the finally impenitent. God has made them able *naturally* and *mentally* to obey him; they have natural power to repent of their sins, to obey God's requirements, and are sensible that they should, but they *will not*.

Porter in his Compendium of Methodism, says: "There is nothing in God, nothing in his election or reprobation, nothing in the sinner's infirmities of intellect, heart, or will, to make it impossible for him to come to Christ and be saved." He adds, "*no, nothing.*"

I grant there is nothing in God, or election, or reprobation, that prevents, but I deny there "is *nothing* in his *will*." "He will not come," and as long as he is unwilling to come, just that long he *can not* come. The same writer, on page 239, argues that God has made all men able to come to Christ; that there is a certain amount of grace given to every man which makes him *able*, and this supposed ability to come makes it just and right in God to condemn those who do not come."

There is no criminality in not doing what we have no *natural* or *mental* power to do, but the sinner's ability is *moral*, and to cure this inability he must be made **willing**, and if all men are cured of their unwillingness, what hinders the salvation of all? The courts of our land do not punish persons for not doing those things they have no power to do, naturally or mentally, neither do we suppose the Lord does, but a lack of will is no apology for sin among men. Nor do we believe God owes it to his creature, man, to cure this species of inability.

Did the prisoner at the bar ever plead that he should have been made *willing* to obey the laws, or would such an excuse be considered good? Certainly not.

And so we say that men in nature are unwilling to come to Christ, to have him reign over them, and their inability to do these things lies principally in their *unwillingness* to do them. "If they were willing the things would be done." Nor is God under obligation to make them willing. What court ever felt bound to make his subjects *willing* to obey the laws in order that he might of right punish them for not obeying? If they were *willing*, then in heart they would be parallel with the laws, and the punishment could with safety be remitted; and so if the sinner is *willing* his service is accepted of God.

The sinner's will is free from any external restraint. There is nothing in God that prevents him from coming; he voluntarily and freely prefers "darkness rather than light;" he willingly lives in sin, and knowingly acts the part of a traitor against God. He is sensible that God has a just right to his heart and service, and yet his free will withholds these from God. It is not reprobation that keeps him

from God, but his own evil heart; nor election, for the great end of election is salvation and not damnation. He is the sole author of his own ruin. “The carnal mind is enmity against God.”

If it be *enmity*, it will not change itself, and if ever made willing, God must make it so. Some speak of *free will* as if they understood the sinner is able to change his will this way or that at his own option, to move his will this or that way, as you move your foot; such is not my view of *free will*. The will, like every other faculty of man, is perverted, and against God. There are certain things we naturally hate, and never can love them until their nature is changed into harmony with ours, or until ours is changed into harmony with theirs.

So there are certain things we naturally love. The mother naturally and freely loves her child and *can not* do otherwise. So men are naturally opposed to God, and this opposition being natural, they *will not* lay it aside. We do not naturally love or serve God; it is spiritual. “He that loveth is born of God”—John. Some have urged that if the will be so settled against God, he can not come to God; if the moral bias against God be such that no human being *can*, or, rather WILL overcome it, it follows that accountability would cease; that if the bias to, and habit of, sin be so fixed in sinners that they can not avoid it, then all blame is removed from the sinner.

The argument runs that in order for blame to attach to a sinner he must be capable of resisting temptation, *i.e.* his will must not be so settled in sin that he can not do otherwise; and so on the other side, in order for men, angels, or even Christ, to be entitled to credit for uprightness, they must *morally* be capable of sinning, and so on this ground Christ, it is claimed, was capable of sinning, for, say they, “If he were not, who should honor him for his faithfulness;” and so if the sinner were not *capable* of loving God, who could or would blame him for not loving him?

In order to prove that Christ was capable of sinning, the various places where he is said to have been tempted of the devil are referred to. The argument runs: “You could not be tempted to fly to the moon, for you have no ability to do so;” “neither could you be tempted to do anything that you have no ability to do, so Christ was tempted, and the fact that he was tempted proves him to have been capable of sin.”

This seems at first sight to be *sound*, but by a little examination it will be seen that the whole system is built on a misunderstanding of the nature of the sinner’s ability do good, and the Savior’s inability to do evil. Christ evidently knew how to sin, and had sufficient natural power to do so, but *morally* he had no power.

Holiness occupied the throne of his heart, and no power could dethrone it; it was his *fixed* bias to holiness that rendered him *impregnable*.

“It is impossible for God to lie.” This impossibility grows out of his own innate purity; it is his essential glory that he is so good that he can not do evil, and it is certainly true that the stronger the *bias* to good in man be, the more virtuous he is. If a man be so inclined to honesty that he COULD NOT meditate murder or theft, it would be to his honor.

The mother can not destroy her child, because she has no moral ability; she has the physical power and knows how, and yet she *can not* do the deed, and it is greatly to her honor that she can not. The virtuous woman *could not* meditate living the life of the prostitute, and we esteem it a virtue in her.

It may with safety be laid down as a maxim or an axiom, *that the stronger the bias to good in any being the more virtuous*. The best men on earth are those who are the most firmly fixed in the habits of virtue, and in our Savior there is no possibility of the overthrow of his own native holiness. We love those best who are most firmly biased to good.

Now, with reference to evil, the same manner of reasoning is good. Milton represents Satan as saying:

“What! Though the field is lost, all is not lost;
The unconquerable will, and steady revenge, immortal hate,
And courage never to submit or yield * * *
To wage by force or guile eternal war.”

Here Satan is represented as having an unreconcilable bias to sin, no love to God, and by reason of his moral bias to sin he is “unreconcilable;” but does the fact that he can not but meditate sin excuse him from blame? By no means; if his inability to love or serve God grew out of any mental or physical derangement he would not be *blamable*, but it is in his *moral bias* to evil that his inability lies. No argument can reach him.

I do not say that God has no power to cure his inability. Jeremiah 13:23, “Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his spots, then may ye also do good that are accustomed to do evil.” Here, to do good is put as impossible; if this impossibility were *physical* or *mental* there would be no blame attached. I grant; but it is moral, and therefore there is blame in the case.

If your son fails to obey you for want of natural power, he is excusable, but if he apologize for disobedience, saying I hate *you* and love your enemy, I know that I

live upon your bounty, and am fed and clothed at your expense, but my *aversion* to you was so great that I *could not* obey you. This excuse might be true, but such inability only makes the sin the darker. Some persons may be so fixed in habits of vice, as theft, murder, adultery, etc., that it may be said they can not cease from such sin, but this kind of a *cannot* is no apology for sin.

Now in this way we urge that unregenerate sinners are incapable of coming to or obeying God; they know it is their duty, and that to live and die in sin is attended with ruin, but still their native aversion to God holds them in sin; by nature they would sooner die than cast themselves at the feet of Jesus as helpless wretches.

From this reasoning I get another axiom, "*The greater the bias to sin any being has, the more worthy of censure and blame he is.*"

4th. But have I not in this and the previous chapter shown man to be averse to God? Are we not crowded with evidences to this fact daily? Look at the kind of lives the great masses of men live. See them wholly given up to serve self in one way or another. Listen to the conversation we hear in public assemblies, in the streets, and say if man's heart is not wholly set upon earthly objects and not on the Creator. Reader, if you have a heart to "entertain a Savior God," let me quiz you about how it ever came to pass that your heart was made a fit temple for God to dwell in. How was this ever brought about? What hand first loosened the bands of sin and gave you to see your need of a Savior? Whence have you this great *willingness* to bear or suffer anything for Jesus's sake? Let us be sure to trace these great mercies to their true source, and when we do we will sing:

"Twas the same hand that spread the feast
That sweetly forced me in,
Or I had still refused to taste
And perished in my sin."

"Thy free grace alone
From the first to the last
Hath won my affection
And bound my heart fast."

Oh, can you ever forget God's great mercy to you in leading you to see your lost state, when you on bended knees confessed your sins and prayed for mercy? Who changed your heart and will? You ever must say that by the grace of God, I am what I am. "It is God that worketh in you both to will and to do of his good pleasure"—Paul. "Thy people shall be willing in the day of thy power—David.

5th. But if you are an unregenerate man, what do you think of this matter? Do you not feel inwardly an aversion to God, his ways and word? Do you not prefer for the present to live in sin without God? Do you not feel the force of the words, "Ye will not come to me that ye might have life?" These words describe your case. Your affections are here on earth. God has demonstrated to you that he has a just right to your service, and if you were now summoned to death you would be left entirely without excuse. It is your own obdurate, perverse will that lies between you and all good. You are an accountable being, and know it.

Oh, think what arguments prove too weak to move you. Though the work of death is all around you, it moves you not. Though the Bible points to a state of endless torment, and you in the depths of your heart believe it, yet you venture another day, another week, or year, and so years of sin and rebellion are multiplied. The solemn, awful warnings of death unheeded; the threatenings of the *eternal God* are tampered with; the sweet message of the gospel treated as a fable. Oh, think how fearful the spell that binds you. The earth yields her harvest under the influences of warm showers and balmy air, but you, as the barren rock, or the thorny field, yield no love to God who alone is worthy of love.

The heavens declare the glory of God—every star, every planet and constellation is full of speech. The whole earth is vocal with God's praise; every living thing and creeping thing, in its way, points us to God and praises his great name. Yet poor, sinful, evil man denies him his service, prefers darkness to light, evil to good, though that evil be connected with endless torment, and that good with endless life. What must be the awful, killing power of sin if it thus chains men down to the constant and unvarying love of evil? (*J.H. Oliphant Principles and Practices of the Regular Baptists 1885*)

Works of Supererogation

WORKS of Supererogation (*See under Works of SUPEREROGATION*)

Works, Salvation By

Salvation By WORKS: Harold Hunt: What is the ultimate cause of our salvation? Are we saved wholly and solely by the grace of God, or is there some cause in us that merits salvation? Does God save those who deserve to be saved,

or does he save those who really ought to burn in the flames of eternal damnation.

Most of us know too much about ourselves, and our own track record, to think we could expect to be saved for heaven, based solely on our own merit. We have failed too often; our record is too faulty. If one transgression was sufficient to condemn Adam and all his posterity to eternal damnation, then surely none of us could hope to look to our own record as the basis of any claim on God and his goodness. The carnal pride of man is such that we would like to find something in ourselves that merits salvation, and at some moment, we might actually think we have some claim on God, but after we have thought about the matter, and after we have considered even a few of our transgressions, we have to admit that it is not so.

The main point of contention between those who truly believe the Bible and others has to do with that one question: Are we saved wholly and solely by the grace of God, or is there some cause in us that merits salvation? Most any Christian will admit that salvation is by grace. The Bible states that fact too clearly for anybody to deny it, but what does the Bible mean when it talks about salvation by grace?

Actually, the question revolves around the nature and attributes of God. Much of the confusion about the Bible would be resolved if we could only acknowledge what the righteousness of God requires. Most people have an entirely inadequate idea of what God is like, and what his righteousness requires. Somehow, the majority of religious people seem to have gotten the idea that all God requires of them is a good average. They seem to have the idea that what God requires is that we do good more often than we do bad---if our good outweighs our bad, then we will be alright.

A mighty scales

One of the earliest recollections I have is of one day when I was very small. My grandmother took me on her knee, and began to explain to me what God expected of me. Now, my grandmother was one of the finest people who ever lived. I suppose most folks believe that about their grandmother, but my grandmother was— she was one of the finest of all people. And she was a very religious person. She was confused about religion, but she was sure that what she had been taught was right, and she was very devoted to it. She explained to me that there was a day coming, when I would stand before God in judgment, and I would be confronted by everything I had ever done. She explained that there would be a mighty pair of scales, and all of my good works would be placed on one side of the scales, and all of my bad works would be placed on the

other side of the scales. Whichever outweighed the other would determine where I would spend eternity. If I had more good works than I had bad works, I would spend eternity with God in heaven, and if I had more bad works than I had good works, I would suffer eternal woe and misery.

Well, to a little three or four old boy that sounded reasonable enough, and I am sure that my grandmother was sure she was arguing God's case for him. She was trying to encourage me to build up a dependable record of good works.

A good average

What my grandmother did not realize was that she was pleading for a very low standard, and she was allowing that standard was sufficient to gain a home in eternal heaven. It is amazing how people can fail to realize what they are saying in matters of religion. Do you see? Without having the slightest idea of what she was saying, my grandmother was arguing that all God requires of us is a good average—all he requires is that our good outweighs our bad.

That was not what she meant to say at all. She did not believe any such thing. She was a highly moral person, and she had no idea of what she was saying. She had been taught that in order to gain eternal heaven, we must produce more good works than bad works, and if our good outweighs our bad, we will be good candidates for heaven. She did not realize that if that was right, all God requires is a good average.

Absolute perfection

Why, the law of the land is not that lenient. Suppose a person is arrested for some crime, and his attorney tries to argue for a good average, do you suppose the jury is going to be impressed? It does not matter that there are more banks he did not rob than there are banks which he did rob. They are only interested in the one bank he did rob. They are not interested in all the people he did not kill, they are only interested in the one person he did kill.

In its own way, the law of the land demands absolute perfection, and it will not accept anything less. You may not think the law of the land demands absolute perfection, but it does. The law does not deal with every moral infraction of which you may be guilty. For instance, it is wrong for you to think mean and spiteful thoughts about your neighbor, but the law of the land does not deal with mean and spiteful thoughts. It is wrong for you to entertain base and lustful thoughts about your neighbor's wife, but the law does not deal with base and lustful thoughts.

But while the law does not deal with every sinful deed of which you may be guilty, with regard to those offenses with which it does deal, the law demands absolute perfection. The law does not forbid you to think mean and spiteful thoughts about your neighbor, but it does forbid you to take a club and hit him over the head. It forbids you to take a club and hit so much as one person. In that regard, the law of the land demands absolute perfection, and it will accept nothing less. It does not forbid you to think base and lustful thoughts about your neighbor's wife, but it does forbid you to give free reign to those thoughts and assault your neighbor's wife. Again, in that regard, the law demands absolute perfection. It does not really matter that you may have repressed your impulses more often than not, one offense is sufficient to bring you into conflict with the law.

The law of God is different from the law of the land in that it forbids every transgression of every kind. The law of the land demands perfection with regard to those offenses with which it deals. The law of God demands perfection with regard to every transgression. It will not tolerate so much as one sin, and just as surely as one act of murder will bring on you the full force of the law of the land, were it not for the grace of God, one hateful thought would bring on you the full force of the law of God, and that one offense would be sufficient to doom you to eternal damnation.

As plausible as it may sound at first, the argument that our home in heaven depends on whether our good deeds outweigh our bad deeds would not even satisfy a court of law in our day, and it certainly will not satisfy the justice of God. The only thing that will satisfy divine justice is the imputed righteousness of Jesus Christ. If the absolute righteousness, the absolute perfection, of the Lord Jesus Christ has not been imputed to our account, we will never see eternal heaven.

If you stand before God in eternal judgment with so much as one sin charged to your account, you can never stand justified before him, and you cannot expect to spend eternity in heaven with him. The one sin of Adam was sufficient to condemn the entire race of mankind, and one sin on your part is enough to separate you from God for all eternity. A good average will not do. If your sins—all of your sins—have not been charged against the person of the Lord Jesus Christ, and if the pure and spotless righteousness of the Lord Jesus has not been credited to your account, eternal damnation will be your doom.

What God requires

The main reason people sometimes get the idea they can be justified before God by their own works is that they do not have the slightest idea of what the

righteousness of God requires. They have no idea of how righteous God is, and they have no idea of what the righteousness of God requires of them. The Bible is filled with statements about what the righteousness of God requires, but it seems that most people have failed to notice.

Job 25:4-5 is just one example. “How then can man be justified with God? or how can he be clean that is born of a woman? Behold even to the moon, and it shineth not: Yea, the stars are not pure in his sight.”

The stars are the purest things in all of creation, and yet, this text says that even the stars are not pure in his sight. Consider for a moment how pure the stars are. Heat is the universal purifying agent. The stars are the hottest things in the universe, and they must, of necessity, be the purest things in the universe.

About two years ago, several people on the West Coast became sick from eating contaminated meat. One little boy died. The meat was contaminated with something called E Coli bacteria. The authorities advised people that if they would start cooking all meats at a higher temperature, the bacteria would be killed. To that extent the meat would be purified; the bacteria would be killed.

A few weeks later, the water system of Milwaukee, Wisconsin became contaminated. Again, people began to get sick. The authorities advised people to boil their drinking water. The heat would kill the bacteria. Sufficient heat does have a purifying effect.

In refining silver, the ore is heated to a high enough temperature to melt the silver. The impurities rise to the surface and they are skimmed off. That process is repeated over and over until no more impurities can be removed. The Bible talked about that. Psalms 12:6, “The words of the Lord are pure words; as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times.”

Heat has always been relied on as the universal purifier, but none of those examples even remotely compares to the purity of the stars. The stars are the hottest things in all of creation. As hot as they are, the stars are so pure that our minds cannot even imagine how pure they are. They are pure beyond our comprehension.

Astronomers estimate the temperature of the stars in the tens of thousands, or even the millions, of degrees. They tell us the stars are so hot that even the metals in the stars, the iron and so on, are in a gaseous state. Iron melts at 2785 degrees, and it boils at 4755 degrees. It literally vaporizes (it becomes a gas) at 4755 degrees. Those of us who never deal with such high temperatures have difficulty thinking of iron in a gaseous state, but it does vaporize if you get it hot

enough. Astronomers tell us that every particle of iron in the stars is in a gaseous state.

As any substance is heated, the tiny little electrons that spin around the nucleus of the atoms of that substance begin to spin faster and faster and faster. The hotter the material becomes, the faster the electrons spin. And the faster they go, the more they spin off and break away from any other atom that may have attached itself to that atom. When the material becomes so hot, every atom breaks away from every other atom. Finally, every atom stands alone. Every atom is free from every contaminating atom. The substance is as pure as anything in nature can be.

That is how hot the stars are, and that is how pure they are, but listen to what the text says, “How, then, can man be justified with God? or how can he be clean that is born of a woman? Behold even to the moon, and it shineth not; Yea, the stars are not pure in his sight.” There is no way anything in nature can be made any more pure than the stars, and yet not even the stars are pure in God’s sight.

Those of you, who think you can get to heaven on your good average, have never realized how righteous God is, and what righteousness he requires of us. If the stars are not pure in his sight, do you suppose that with all your impure thoughts and impure deeds, you could ever stand justified before God based on your own merit?

The only thing that will satisfy God is absolute perfection, and the only source of absolute perfection is the imputed righteousness of the Lord Jesus Christ. The only way you will ever stand justified before God is for God to look at you and see, not your track record, but to look at you and see the righteousness of his Son credited to your account.

If we are honest with ourselves, we have to admit that our record is too faulty, and our sins are too many, for us to ever expect to be justified before God by our works. If our judgment is based on our works, we will be lost world without end.

What about the saints in the Bible

It is obvious that none of us in this day could be justified by our own works, but what about the saints we read about in the Bible? Were they not such men that they could have been justified by works? They were so faithful, and they performed such notable deeds, you would think that, perhaps, some of them might have earned some kind of merit with God. During the remainder of this booklet we will look at some of those men. We will look at Adam and Noah, and Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and Moses and David, and the apostle Peter. I

believe we can demonstrate that if salvation is not wholly and solely by the imputed righteousness of Jesus Christ, that not even those men could ever live in eternal heaven. If salvation is not by grace, not even the most eminent saints could be saved.

You can be sure that if none of those men of God could be saved, based on their own merit, there is none of us, sinners that we are, who would stand a chance. If not even the stars are pure in his sight, you can be sure that you and I could never qualify.

The justice of God requires absolute perfection. Unless we have always, at all times, and in every instance, refrained from every transgression, no matter how insignificant we may think that transgression may have been, we can never expect to be justified before God by our own works.

There is nobody, outside of the Lord Jesus Christ, who fits that description. There is nobody who has always done exactly what was right, and in our hearts we know that to be a fact. That is why those people, who claim they expect to be justified before God by their works, invariably fear death so much more than those who are trusting only in the imputed righteousness of Jesus Christ. No matter how they may protest to the contrary, in their hearts they know they could never stand before God justified on the basis of their own merit, and because of that, they usually come to the hour of death terrified.

Both by precept and by example the Bible teaches that our salvation for eternal heaven is based solely on the imputed righteousness of Jesus Christ. It is a simple matter to produce a long list of proof texts proving that salvation is by grace.

Ephesians 2:8-9, “For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of ourselves: it is the gift of God, not of works, lest any man should boast.”

Titus 3:4-5, “But after that the kindness and love of God our Savior toward man appeared, 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.”

II Timothy 1:9, “Who hath saved us, and called us with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began.”

The first text says that our salvation is not of works; the next text says that it is not by works; and the third text says that it is not according to our works. God

knew there would be those who would try to evade the clear teaching of the Bible, especially on the subject of salvation by grace. So he moved the apostle to say the same thing three different ways. He cut off every avenue of escape for those who would deny the simple fact that salvation is by grace and grace alone. It is not based on any merit of our own.

We will not multiply proof texts to show that the Bible teaches salvation by grace. It is clear enough that salvation by grace is the doctrine of the Bible. It is safe to say that every person, who claims to believe the Bible, acknowledges that the Bible teaches salvation by grace. They disagree vigorously about what is actually meant by that expression, but all will agree that salvation by grace is the doctrine of the Bible. In this little booklet we are interested in showing what that expression means, and in showing that the Bible teaches that doctrine by example as well as by precept.

The Bible records the lives of the most eminent saints, and the Bible record of their lives shows that not even those men could be justified before God by their own works. The Bible is very faithful to provide a clear and accurate account of its characters. It records their faults as faithfully as it records their virtues, and the Bible account leaves us without a doubt: unless salvation is by the imputed righteousness of Jesus Christ, there will nobody be saved. Consider with us, if you will, some of those characters and see if you can find one that could have been saved by his own good works.

Adam could never make it

If there was ever anybody who had an opportunity to be justified by works, Adam did. There was nothing wrong with Adam as God created him. God created him *able to stand, but liable to fall*. He did not have to do what he did. His sin was willful and deliberate. In his original creation Adam did not have the sinful nature, that inborn appetite for sin, that you and I have. He sinned against light and knowledge. He could have kept God's commandments. He did not have the positive bias toward sin that has dominated the heart and mind of every person who has been born since his day. And still he sinned. Consider his case.

Except for the Lord Jesus Christ, Adam was the brightest man who ever lived. One hundred rocket scientists all rolled into one could not have equaled the genius of Adam. Does the Bible say that? Well, no, it does not say that in so many words, but it does demonstrate it. God gave a simple demonstration of how smart Adam was.

Genesis 2:19, “And out of the ground the Lord God formed every beast of the field, and every fowl of the air; and brought them unto Adam to see what he

would call then; and whatsoever Adam called every living creature, that was the name thereof.” Think about that. Adam gave names to every living creature on earth. Nobody knows for sure how many different species of living creature there are, because scientists cannot agree on what actually constitutes a species. A lot of scientists claim there are over 300,000 different species. The smallest estimate I have ever seen says there are over 17,000. Suppose the smaller number is correct. Suppose there are only 17,000 different species. That still means that Adam came up with over 17,000 names for the different living creatures.

That is a monumental task, just to come up with that many different names. Just think of the difficulty of even coming up with that many different combinations of sounds. If you and I were trying to do that, it would not be long until we would have exhausted all our ideas, and we would have a baboon, a bowboon, and a booboon. All our names would begin to sound alike; we could never keep them separated.

The brightest of all men

Not only did he come up with all the necessary names, he came up with appropriate names. The names stuck. The text says, “Whatsoever Adam called every living creature, that was the name thereof.” Whatever name Adam came up with actually became the name of that living creature. “That was the name thereof;” that was what people called it. We have trouble naming churches and making the names stick. There are churches all over the land that have one official name, and another name by which most people know it, and in some cases not many people even know the proper name of that church; it is so commonly called by another name. If the name Adam provided had not been suitable to the creature to which he attached it, eventually people would have begun to call it by a different name, but the names stuck.

Not only did Adam come up with thousands of appropriate names for all the different living creatures, he remembered what he had called them. He remembered the names—all those thousands of names—and he remembered which animal each name identified. Most of us have trouble meeting three or four people at a time and keeping the names straight. Adam could keep thousands of names straight the first time.

Let me ask you: did you ever study a foreign language in school? No doubt, many of you have. What was the hardest part of learning the language? Building a vocabulary, right? That is the most difficult part, and the most important. For that matter, if you can build a sufficient vocabulary, you can manage to get by with very little knowledge of grammar. If you know enough

words in any language, you can string words together, in some fashion, and the other person can usually puzzle out what you are trying to say.

Suppose somebody is learning a foreign language, and he goes to the local Waldenbooks, or B Daltons, or some other bookstore, and buys a dual language dictionary, perhaps a Spanish-English, or a French-English dictionary. The larger dual language dictionaries usually have about 15,000 entries from each language. That is about the same number as the smallest estimate of the number of different kinds of living creatures in the world. Now suppose he sits down, reads the dictionary, and lays it on the shelf. He will never need to consult it again, because he has already read it; he knows the foreign language equivalent of all the words listed.

Do you know anybody who could do that? No, of course not. To learn that many different foreign language words you have to drill, drill, and drill for years. There is nobody on earth who could sit down, read the dictionary, and remember all the words he had read. But Adam could. Adam remembered what he had named every creature. If he had not remembered, who could have told him?

Not only could Adam have remembered every entry in the dictionary, he could have first written the book, and then he could have remembered what he had written. That is essentially what he did in giving names to every living creature. There is nobody today who could even come close to that.

We hear a lot nowadays about the great power of our subconscious mind. We are told that we only use about 3 per cent, or maybe 10 per cent, of our total brain power. Well, I have no doubt that is right. Our brains do not function at full capacity. But the thing those people do not tell you—because they probably do not know—is that when Adam sinned, he blew most of the circuits. Our brains do not function the way Adam's brain did. Our brains have been crippled by Adam's sin, and all the cultivation, and all the education, and all the self-help courses in the world will never put it back.

There are those who will tell you the serpent tricked Adam into doing what he did. But you can be sure that the serpent did not trick Adam. The devil is smarter than you and I are, but Adam was too bright for the devil to outsmart him. God knew somebody would come along with that notion. That is why he moved Paul to say, "Adam was not deceived (he was not tricked), but the woman being deceived was in the transgression," I Timothy 2:14. Adam knew exactly what he was doing. Adam knew God was telling the truth, and the serpent was lying, but he acted as if it was the other way around. He acted as God was lying, and the serpent was telling the truth.

The serpent began by saying, “Yea, hath God said....” He challenged the honesty of God. Satan has been a liar from the beginning; he is the Father of Lies. John 8:44, “Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own, for he is a liar, and the father of it.”

When Adam partook of the forbidden fruit, he acted as if the serpent, the father of lies, was telling the truth, and God, the very embodiment of truth, was lying. Let me ask you: do you believe that anybody who makes God out to be a liar, and more than that, who acts as if God is a worse liar than the devil himself, can expect to get to heaven by his own righteousness?

Let me tell you: if salvation for heaven is by works, Adam will never make it.

Bible makes it clear enough that Adam was a child of God. The skins God provided as a covering for the nakedness of Adam and Eve were symbolic of the imputed righteousness of Jesus Christ, the lamb slain for the sins of his people. The symbolic lesson is that Adam's sins were atoned for by the shed blood of Jesus Christ, and that he is clothed with his imputed righteousness. Adam was a child of God, and we shall see him in heaven one day, but it will not be by his own righteousness. Based on his righteousness he would never make it.

Could Noah make it

What about Noah? Was Noah such a character that he deserved to be saved? Was his life so attuned to the will of God, that he had some claim on God. Did God owe it to Noah to save him?

Noah lived in what was probably the most wicked age of the world. No matter how wicked men may be, as they grow older, they generally begin to calm down somewhat. The thought of dying seems to have a sobering effect. In Noah's day people lived to be close to a thousand years old. Considering that fact, and considering that Noah was born when the earth was just a little over a thousand years old, it is a mathematical fact, that during Noah's day most everybody who had ever lived was still living.

Very few people had ever died. In an age when death seemed to be only a remote possibility, we cannot imagine how wicked people must have been. The Bible tells us, “God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually,” Genesis 6:5. Think about that. He says their thoughts were *only evil*. They did

not think about anything else, and more than that, they thought about it *continually*. They thought about nothing but evil, and they thought about it continually.

In Genesis 6:11 he tells us, “The earth also was corrupt before God, and the earth was filled with violence.” There was nowhere to hide. The earth was *filled with violence*. The entire earth was a Lebanon, or a Bosnia, or a Somalia. As wicked as the world is today, it is not that bad yet. We are getting there, but we are not there yet.

One righteous man

But in the midst of that wicked generation, there was, at least, one righteous man. Genesis 6:8-9, “But Noah found grace in the eyes of the Lord. These are the generations of Noah: Noah was a just man, and perfect in his generation, and Noah walked with God.” In that wicked age this one righteous man *walked with God*.

God determined to destroy the entire world, and all the wickedness in it, but he chose Noah to be the one man through whose family he would preserve the human race. All of mankind would perish except Noah and his family, and it would be that family who would repopulate the new world. No other person on the planet was so honored as Noah was. After God had swept the world clean by the waters of the flood, Noah would stand at the head of the entire family of man. Except for his daughters-in-law, every person on earth, from that day forward, would be a descendent of Noah. No other person on earth was so honored and so blessed as he was.

Noah’s drunkenness

After the flood we are told that “Noah began to be an husbandman, and he planted a vineyard. And he drank of the wine, and was drunken; and he was uncovered in his tent. And Ham, the father of Canaan, saw the nakedness of his father, and told his two brethren without. And Shem and Japheth took a garment, and laid it upon both their shoulders, and went backward, and covered the nakedness of their father; and their faces were backward, and they saw not their father’s nakedness. And Noah awoke from his wine, and knew what his younger son had done unto him,” Genesis 9:20-23.

Notice that Noah woke from his wine and “saw what his younger son had *done* unto him.” Ham did more than look. Those people have been around for a long time, and their conduct had always been repulsive to decent, moral people.

Noah was blessed as no other man on earth was blessed. He was honored as no other man on earth was honored. When the world was literally filled with violence and wickedness, Noah walked with God. Later, when the earth had been swept clean of all the sin and violence, you would think it would have been easier for him to live a godly life. Instead, Noah sinned. He planted a vineyard, and made wine, and got stinking, stumbling, falling down, passed out, stark naked, drunk.

If salvation is by works, Noah will never make it. A good average will not do. The law of God demands perfection, and Noah was certainly not perfect. Now, Noah was a child of God. There can be no doubt; “Noah found grace in the eyes of the Lord.” Noah will be in heaven, but he will not be there because of his own righteousness; he will be there because he was a subject of grace. He will be there because of the imputed righteousness of Jesus Christ.

Abraham the father of the faithful

What about Abraham? If there is anybody in the Bible that we might expect to have earned a home in heaven, it is Abraham. He is the father of the people of Israel, and one of the most notable characters in all of human history. We call him the Father of the Faithful. We are amazed at his great faith. Who could forget Abraham and Isaac on Mount Moriah? In Genesis 22, we read that God told Abraham, “Take now thy son, thine only son Isaac, whom thou lovest, and get thee into the land of Moriah; and offer him there for a burnt offering upon one of the mountains which I will tell thee of.” Abraham did not hesitate. He rose early the next morning and started on his way.

I have to confess that there is a lot I do not understand about what transpired on the mountain that day, but God knew exactly what he was doing. He knew exactly the way this matter was going to work out, and he knew what Abraham's response would be. He declares “the end from the beginning, and from ancient times the things that are not yet done, saying, My counsel shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure,” [Isaiah 46:10](#). God is never surprised. He knows exactly what lies ahead.

Abraham did not. He did not know how far this matter would go, but he was convinced that he and the boy would go up on the mountain, and he was convinced that he and the boy would come back down again. When he got to the mountain, he told the servant to stay at the foot of the mountain, and he said, “I and the lad will go yonder and worship, and come again to you.” He did not say, “The lad and I will go yonder and worship, and I will come again to you.” He fully expected that Isaac would come back down off the mountain with him. Paul says that he accounted that God was able to raise him up, even from the

dead, from whence also he received him in a figure,” Hebrews 11:19. Abraham was convinced that God would raise him up, even from the ashes, if the matter went that far.

Sometimes I hear somebody use the expression, “If I know my own heart.” Let me tell you; you don't. None of us entirely understands his own heart. Jeremiah said, “The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked; who can know it,” Jeremiah 17:9. I gave up long ago trying to figure out other people; I don't entirely understand myself. There is ever so much I do not understand about myself. I do not always understand why I am the way I am, nor why I do the way I do. But as little as I understand myself, I am sure that I know myself well enough to know that I could never do what Abraham did. My wife and I have four children, and I cannot tell you how much I love those children; they mean more than life to me. I have one son, and he is a very special person to me. There is no way I could take my son up on that mountain the way Abraham did with Isaac. I am sure there is no way I could ever be so submissive as Abraham was. His faithfulness is more than I can understand.

If that was all the Bible told us about Abraham, we might get the idea that Abraham could have been saved by works. Such faith is more than we could expect from any father. But there is more. The Bible is the most accurate of all books. It is more faithful to the facts than any other book that has ever been written. The Bible does not hide the faults of its characters. It tells about their strengths, and it tells about their weaknesses. And they did have weaknesses, even the best of them.

He put his wife at risk

God promised to give the land of Canaan to Abraham, but he had no sooner arrived in the land than he passed right on through. There was a famine in the land, and Abraham went to Egypt. In Genesis 12, we read, “And it came to pass, when he was come near to enter into Egypt, that he said unto Sarai, his wife, “Behold now, I know that thou art a fair woman to look upon; therefore it shall come to pass, when the Egyptians see thee, that they shall say, This is his wife, and they will kill me, but they will save thee alive. Say, I pray thee, thou art my sister; that it may be well with me for thy sake; and my soul shall live because of thee. And it came to pass, that, when Abram was come into Egypt, the Egyptians beheld the woman that she was very fair. The princes also of Pharaoh saw her, and commended her before Pharaoh, and the woman was taken into Pharaoh's house.” The providence of God took care of Sarai. He did not allow the matter to go as far as it might have.

Now, Abraham did not entirely lie in the matter. In Genesis 20 he explained that Sarai was “the daughter of my father, but not the daughter of my mother, and she became my wife.” What he told was half true, but I had rather anybody would tell me a whole lie, than a half truth any day. It is easier to spot a whole lie.

Pharaoh was a much more honorable man than Abraham gave him credit for being. When he discovered what Abraham had done, he told him, “Now, therefore, behold thy wife, take her and go thy way.” Think about that. Abraham, the Father of the Faithful, was run out of Egypt for lying.

And, more than that, after he left Egypt and arrived in the land of the Philistines, he did the same thing all over again. You would think he would have learned. He placed his wife at risk in Egypt, and then he repeated the same thing with Abimelech, the Philistine king (Genesis 20). And again, the king, who had every right to be offended with Abraham, instead, very graciously restored him his wife.

Later, we learn that Isaac did the same thing with regard to his wife, Rebecca (Genesis 26:6-11). He obviously learned it from his father.

I am sure that I could not do what Abraham did at Mount Moriah with regard to Isaac, but I am also sure that I could not do what he did in Egypt with regard to his wife. Before I would place my wife at risk the way Abraham did Sarai, I am sure I would insist that we just sit down in the desert and starve. I cannot imagine that we could ever get in such distress that I would place my wife in such peril as Abraham did Sarai. It is hard to think of anything more despicable than what Abraham asked of Sarai, and to consider that he might actually go through with it is more than we can imagine.

The simple point is that if salvation is by works, Abraham will never make it. We are running out of people to be saved by works. If Adam and Noah and Abraham and Isaac could not be saved by works, is there anybody who could? We cannot escape the conclusion that if salvation is not by the sovereign, unmerited grace of God, nobody will be saved.

Jacob the supplanter

What about Jacob? He was Abraham’s grandson. When we speak about the origin of the people of Israel, we generally speak of *Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob*. His name means *supplanter*, but God honored him by changing his name to Israel, which means *a prince with God*. We still refer to the people of God as *Spiritual Israel*, and we refer to *National Israel*. His name has been emblazoned

across the pages of history as few names ever have. Could Jacob have been saved by works? I don't think so.

The very first thing the Bible records about Jacob is that he attacked his brother. A newborn baby is very limited in his ability to attack anybody, but to the best of his ability, as soon as he was born, Jacob attacked his twin brother Esau. "His hand took hold on Esau's heel" Genesis 25:26. If you think I am misinterpreting that action, read the remainder of the Genesis account of the relationship between Jacob and Esau, and see if that entire relationship is not marked by Jacob's mistreatment of his brother.

The name *Jacob* means *supplanter*; it signifies a con-man, a con-artist, a trickster. The name fit. Jacob could not be trusted. He was the sort of man you did not do business with if you could get around it, and if you did trade with him, you made sure to count your change.

Jacob was a homebody; *a plain man dwelling in tents*; he was his mother's favorite. He stayed at home and learned to cook, while his brother Esau was an outdoorsman, a hunter (Genesis 25:27-30). Esau was the favorite of his father Isaac. One day, Esau had been out hunting, and he obviously stayed too long. He enjoyed hunting and he stayed out until he was so hungry he thought he was going to die. When he finally made it back home, he asked Jacob to "Feed me, I pray thee with that same red pottage, for I am faint" (Genesis 25:30).

We are always hearing about the close relationship between twins, and no doubt, what we have heard is generally true, but Jacob was not at all interested in helping his twin brother. Instead, he asked Esau to sell him his birthright. Esau was the oldest son of Isaac, and the birthright properly belonged to him. In that day there was a great emphasis placed on being the oldest son in the family. There was no greater possession than that birthright, and the oldest son would not readily give it up. How could he relinquish his place as the firstborn in the family, the head of the family? But Jacob would not feed him, unless he agreed to sell his birthright. It did not matter that Esau appeared to be at the point of dying, and that he actually thought he was dying. Esau was his twin brother, but Jacob would not raise his hand to help him; he wanted the birthright. He was a *supplanter*, a con-man, a trickster. He wanted that birthright, and he would use fair means or foul to get it.

He cheated and stole from his brother

In effect, he told his brother, "You can starve for all I care, I will not feed you, unless you sell me your birthright." This was his twin brother who thought he was dying, but Jacob would not raise his hand to help him. Esau was vulnerable, and Jacob intended to take advantage of the situation. Esau agreed to sell the

birthright. He said, “Behold, I am at the point to die: and what profit shall this birthright do to me” (Genesis 25:32)?

Now, Esau was not innocent in the matter; Genesis 25:34 says that Esau *despised his birthright*. But I am not on Esau’s case; right now we are looking at Jacob. The name Jacob means *supplanter*. The name fit; Jacob defrauded his brother out of his birthright. It does not matter that Esau failed to place the value he should have placed on the birthright. That did not diminish the guilt of Jacob. Jacob was clearly unfair in his dealings with his twin brother.

Jacob's chicanery did not stop there. Years later, when their father thought he was dying, Isaac sent Esau into the field to “make me savoury meat, such as I love, and bring it to me, that I may eat; that my soul may bless thee before I die” (Genesis 27:4). It was the custom for the father, the patriarch of the family, to pronounce a blessing on the firstborn son just before his death. The blessing belonged to Esau, and Isaac thought the time had come to bestow that blessing.

Their mother Rebekah heard what Isaac said to Esau. She called Jacob and suggested that he pretend to be Esau, and take the blessing that belonged to his brother (Genesis 27:6-10). At first Jacob was not anxious to make the effort. He said, “Behold, Esau my brother is a hairy man, and I am a smooth man: My father peradventure will feel me, and I shall seem to him as a deceiver; and I shall bring a curse upon me, and not a blessing” (Genesis 27:11-12). But Rebekah would not be outdone. She provided Jacob with “skins of the kids of goats upon his hands, and upon the smooth of his neck” (Genesis 27:16). Now, in his dying state, Isaac could feel of Jacob and not detect the difference.

It is not reasonable to think that Rebekah had time to prepare those skins during the short time that she also prepared a meal for Isaac, and still help Jacob to go in to his father before Esau could return. She had obviously been waiting, and preparing for that opportunity for some time. As soon as Jacob saw how the trick could work, he was more than willing to make the effort. He wanted his brother’s blessing all along; he just did not want to get caught.

He took “the savoury meat and the bread which she had prepared,” and went in to his father, and told him, “I am Esau thy firstborn; I have done according as thou badest me” (Genesis 27:17,19). His father was skeptical; he wanted to know, “How is it that thou has found it so quickly, my son (Genesis 27:20)? Jacob just kept on lying. He said, “Because the Lord thy God hath brought it to me.” Jacob was a con-artist; it did not bother him to lie to his old blind daddy.

Isaac said, “Come near, I pray thee, that I may feel thee, my son, whether thou be my very son Esau or not (Genesis 27:21). Jacob allowed his father to feel of him

to see if he was really Esau. Isaac said, "The voice is Jacob's voice, but the hands are the hands of Esau," and he asked him again, "Art thou my very son Esau?" Jacob assured him that he was.

I have heard it said that you can always spot a liar; a liar cannot look you in the face. But that is not right; that only applies to amateur liars. I have known some liars, who could put on their most honest face, look you squarely in the eye, and lie through their teeth. Jacob was that kind of liar. He had this matter of lying down to an art. He could lie to his old blind daddy, get caught, and lie again, and get caught again, and just keep on lying until his daddy finally believed him.

He could do all of that in order to steal his brother's blessing. He defrauded his brother out of his birthright; then he stole his blessing. I am sure nobody would argue that his deal with Esau with regard to the birthright was fair. If anybody ever took advantage of the vulnerable situation of somebody else, Jacob took advantage of Esau. But, at least, they did make a deal. Esau contributed to his own downfall in the matter of the birthright. But, when it came to the blessing, Jacob did not bother to make any kind of deal; he just deceived his daddy, and stole the birthright.

The point is that, if salvation is by works, Jacob will never make it. Nobody who lies, and cheats, and steals, the way Jacob did could ever expect to be justified by works. He was one of the most blessed of all characters. He was clearly a child of God. God changed his name to Israel, which means *prince with God*. His name is firmly fixed on the pages of history as few names have ever been. To this day the Jewish people call themselves by his name. We refer to the people of God as *spiritual Israel*. But the record is clear enough: if salvation is by works, Jacob will be lost world without end.

Moses the lawgiver

So much for Jacob, what about Moses? It was by the hand of Moses that God delivered to Israel the best system of law any nation ever possessed. We like to talk about the insufficiency of the Law of Moses, and the Law certainly was insufficient to get anybody home to eternal heaven. But, the Law was never intended to save anybody for heaven, in the first place. There have been those who tried to use the Law as an instrument of salvation, but God never intended it for that purpose.

The Law was totally insufficient as a means of saving souls from Hell, but it was entirely sufficient for the purpose for which God intended it. The Law was intended as a system of government for a particular people at a particular time, and it was perfectly suited to that purpose. It was also intended as a system of

worship for a particular people at a particular time, and it was perfectly suited for that purpose.

For the purpose for which it was intended, the Law of Moses was the best system of law ever possessed by any nation. How can I wax so bold as to make such a statement? For this reason: God was its author, and you can be sure that whatever God does is the best.

But while Moses was blessed to deliver the system of law that has ever since born his name, not even Moses could be saved by works. Moses was a murderer. He killed a man. Exodus 2:11-12, “And it came to pass in those days, when Moses was grown, that he went out unto his brethren, and looked on their burdens: and he spied an Egyptian smiting an Hebrew, one of his brethren. And he looked this way and that way, and when he saw that there was no man, he slew the Egyptian, and hid him in the sand.”

I know that somebody may try to justify Moses by claiming that this was a case of justifiable homicide. He saw an Egyptian mistreating one of his Hebrew kinsmen, and he flew into a rage and killed him. If it was not justifiable homicide, it must, at least, have been something less than cold-blooded, first-degree murder. There must have been some justification for what he did.

But was there any justification? Did Moses fly into a rage, and act on the spur of the moment? No, he did not. Go back and read the text again. Notice that in verse eleven there were three people present. There were Moses, and the Hebrew slave, and the Egyptian, who was smiting the Hebrew. But notice that in verse twelve Moses *looked this way and that way*, and only when he had made certain (or at least he thought he had made certain) there was nobody looking, then *he slew the Egyptian and hid him in the sand*.

An interval of time had passed. There were only two people present in verse twelve when Moses committed the crime. Moses had plenty of time to consider the matter. He had time to plan what he was going to do, and wait for the best opportunity, and then put his plan into action. Given those facts, any third string lawyer could prove premeditation.

Not only could Moses not gain heaven by works. If his case had been brought to trial, he would have been hard pressed to stay out of the penitentiary.

David the son of Jesse

Let us look at just two more examples. The Bible is very careful to record its characters just as they were. And just as they were, they demonstrated very clearly that not even the most eminent saints could have been saved by works.

David is the foremost Old Testament figure of the Lord Jesus Christ. He is such a clear type of the Lord that it is not always clear whether we are reading about David, the son of Jesse, or the Greater David, the Son of God. He is such a clear figure of Christ that, on at least one occasion, he is referred to as *the Messiah*. II Samuel 23:1 refers to him as *the anointed* of the God of Israel. In the original language, the word that is translated *anointed* is *mashiyach* (Messiah), and it is one of the titles of the Lord. It is the Hebrew equivalent of the Greek word *christos* (Christ), and of the English word *anointed*. The Holy Spirit was making it entirely clear that he was a type of the Lord.

But David was far from being innocent. David arranged to have Uriah, the husband of Bathsheba killed in order, hopefully, to conceal his own transgression.

Joab, and the armies of Israel were besieging Rabbah, the capital of the Ammonite nation. David remained at home in Jerusalem (II Samuel 11:1). He was walking on the roof of his house; (in that arid land houses had flat roofs) and he saw Bathsheba washing herself. That does not speak very well for her; she should have been more careful. David sent for her; they sinned, and Bathsheba sent word that she was *with child* (II Samuel 11:5). David had Joab to place Uriah in the place where he knew he would be killed in battle.

David was one of the most highly blessed of all characters. The Bible describes him as a man after God's own heart. He was a man who loved God, and feared God. Most of the time he tried very hard to do the right thing, but no man who commits adultery, and arranges for the murder of the husband of his lover could ever expect to gain heaven based on his own goodness. If salvation is not wholly and solely by the sovereign grace of God, David will never make it.

The facts are no different with the apostles. The apostles were honest and good men. They were such men as God was willing to entrust with the gospel. There were such men as God was willing to use in the first planting of the church. But they were just as surely sinners, and just as surely in need of a Savior as anybody else. Without the grace of God not one of them would ever see heaven.

Peter the foul-mouthed fisherman

We will look at just one of them. Peter was as close to the Lord as anyone ever was. John thought of himself as the Lord's favorite, and he often referred to

himself as the apostle whom the Lord loved. But even though he was, no doubt, entirely sincere in that conviction, he was no closer to the Lord than Peter was. But as close as Peter was to the Lord, and in spite of the great personal affection the Lord had for him, not even Peter could have been saved by works. Peter is like the rest of us; his faults are not hard to find.

For one thing, Peter always had something to say, whether he knew what he was talking about or not. He did not always know what was going on, but that did not usually stop him from talking. In Matthew 17, we read, “And after six days Jesus taketh Peter, James, and John his brother, and bringeth them up into an high mountain apart, and was transfigured before them: and his face did shine as the sun, and his raiment was white as the light. And, behold, there appeared unto them Moses and Elias talking with him. Then answered Peter, and said unto Jesus, Lord, it is good for us to be here: if thou wilt, let us make here three tabernacles; one for thee, and one for Moses, and one for Elias.”

That was not what he needed to say. Jesus Christ is Lord. He is due all our devotion. We do not need separate tabernacles for any of the saints, not for Moses, nor Elijah, nor anybody else. Peter would have done well to listen, and that is exactly what God told him. Listen to Matthew 17:5. “While he yet spake, behold, a bright cloud overshadowed them: and behold a voice out of the cloud, which said, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased; hear ye him.”

Think of that. God interrupted him before he could finish what he was saying, and told him he needed to listen: “Hear ye him.” In other words, “Peter, this is not a time to talk; this is a time to listen.” Consider anybody so determined to put in his two cents worth, that God speaks from heaven to let him know that he needs to shut up and listen. And more than that, he lets him know that we do not need three tabernacles. It is Jesus, and Jesus alone, who is God’s *beloved son*, and all the honor belongs to him. No doubt, Peter was entirely sincere in the matter, but he was far too quick to speak.

Peter was very much like a child. A child wants to do whatever he sees anybody else do. In Matthew 14, the disciples were in a ship “in the midst of the sea, tossed with waves for the wind was contrary.” We are told that “in the fourth watch of the night Jesus went unto them, walking on the sea. And when the disciples saw him walking on the sea, they were troubled, saying, It is a spirit; and they cried out for fear.” They thought he was a ghost. No doubt, there had been sailors who had drowned in that lake, and they thought the lake was haunted. They believed in ghosts back then too.

“But straightway Jesus spake unto them, saying, Be of good cheer; it is I; be not afraid. And Peter answered and said, Lord, if it be thou, bid me come unto thee

on the water.” Peter had absolutely no need to walk on the water; he just saw the Lord walking on the water, and, like a child, he wanted to try it. His impetuosity got him in trouble on that occasion too, but you already know the rest of the story.

Such a dangerous temper

Peter had a terrible temper. He had such a temper that when he got all riled up, you did not want to be within his reach. You probably remember the night when they came to arrest the Lord. “Judas then, having received a band of men and officers from the chief priests and Pharisees, cometh thither with lanterns and torches and weapons.....Then Simon Peter having a sword drew it, and smote the high priest's servant, and cut off his right ear,” John 18:3,10. I never have believed that was exactly what Peter intended to do. The man dodged. Peter meant to take off his head. He did have a violent temper.

In all fairness to Peter, we need to remember that he had promised the Lord that very night that he was willing to die with him, and that is exactly what he thought he was about to do. Matthew 26:34-35, “Jesus said unto him, Verily I say unto thee, That this night, before the cock crow, thou shalt deny me thrice. Peter said unto him, Though I should die with thee, yet will I not deny thee. Likewise also said all the disciples.” When Peter said that, he meant it. He was ready to die with the Lord.

When Peter saw that crowd, he thought the time had come. Peter had no idea he was a match for that entire crowd. When he waded in with his sword swinging, he thought he would very soon fall; he would very soon be dead. How could one man stand against that entire mob. But, before he fell, he intended to take as many of them with him as he could. He would die with his Lord, but he would not die quietly.

But no matter how we may explain his actions, the fact remains; he was impetuous; and it was very common for him to speak, or act, without thinking. Sometimes his quick temper was a danger to those around him.

More than that, it appears that before the Lord called him, he had a foul mouth. The Lord had told him, “This night, before the cock crow, thou shalt deny me thrice,” Matthew 26:34. Peter did not think that was right, but it was. Later that night he was challenged three times, and after the third time we read, “Then began he to curse and to swear, saying, I know not the man,” (Matthew 26:74). Let me ask you, do you believe cursing and swearing was a brand new experience to Peter that night, or do you believe it was probably an old habit that

just came back on him. I am personally convinced that it was an old habit, a habit he had learned to control after he came in contact with the Lord.

An old habit

I never read that account without calling to mind a story I heard several years ago. I am told that it is a true story. There was a man who had a terrible problem with profanity. It seemed that he could not talk without cursing. It was just a part of his vocabulary. After awhile, somebody invited him to attend church, and he did. He began to attend on a regular basis. Attending church, and hearing the gospel preached in power can have an effect on our lives. He cleaned up his conduct; he cleaned up his language, and finally he asked for a home in the church. He was received, and baptized, and for several years he was a faithful member of the church. Then one night in a rather heated conference meeting he rose to his feet to state his opinion on some subject they were considering, and in the heat of the moment, he lapsed back into his old habit. He came out with some expressions that just shocked that little congregation. No sooner than he had said it, he realized what he had said, and he just dropped down on the seat. He buried his face in his hands, and cried like a whipped child. His weeping shook the pew where he was sitting. Nobody said a word. The entire congregation just sat there, all wide-eyed and slack-jawed. Nobody knew what to say.

When he finally regained his composure, he rose to his feet. His voice was trembling and breaking. He said, "Brethren, you all know what happened. I would not have done it for the world, but what is done is done. Brethren, you know your duty, you must do your duty." He sat back down.

That little church had a wise old pastor. He said, "The brother is right, we do know our duty," and he said, "Brethren, I have seen enough repentance to satisfy me; I will entertain a motion to accept the brother's acknowledgment."

It appears that is what happened to Peter on that terrible night. But, no matter how we may explain it; the fact remains: nobody who curses and swears, and denies he even knows the Lord could ever expect to be saved by works.

Nobody who tries to kill another human being, no matter how convinced he may be that his actions are right, could expect to gain heaven by his own merit.

Brethren, we are running out of possibilities of anybody who might be saved by his own merit. If Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob could not be saved by works; if Adam, and Noah, and Moses, and David would not be saved by works; if none of the apostles and prophets could be saved by works, is there anybody who could?

No, brethren, the facts are clear; if salvation is not by the sovereign, unmerited grace of God, then nobody will be saved. If God only saves those who deserve to be saved, heaven will be empty.

But we can all thank God that salvation is not based on our accomplishments. Our hope of eternal heaven is based wholly and solely on the grace of God, as it is revealed in our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ. Zechariah said that on that grand day, "He shall bring forth the headstone thereof with shoutings, crying, Grace, grace unto it," Zechariah 4:7. When we stand before him, we will not say, "Works, works, works." We will not boast of our track record, but rather our cry will be, "Grace, grace, grace; thanks be unto God for his abounding grace."

Worms, Diet Of

Diet of WORMS (*See under Martin LUTHER*)

Wycliffe, John

John WYCLIFFE: Sylvester Hassell: John Wycliffe (born 1324, died 1384) was almost as stringent a predestinarian as **Thomas Bradwardine**. "He went far beyond Augustine himself in his polemical hostility to everything that seemed verging on Pelagianism, to all worth or ability on the part of the creature; his doctrine amounting, in fact, to the denial of free-will and of contingency. He affirmed that the original eternal ground of all things, including sin and the punishment of sin, was the Divine predestination; but still he would not throw back the causality of evil upon God, no more than ascribe the cause of darkness to the sun. While sin was necessary, its guilt and punishment was equally necessary." "In a severe Augustinian Predestinarianism," says Milman, "the more austere churchmen and all the first Reformers (or they would hardly have dared to be Reformers) met as to its theory, if not its application." "Wycliffe's predestinarian Augustinianism," says J.R. Green, formed the groundwork of his later theological revolt."

Of the first forty years of Wycliffe's life little is known; but much is known of his last twenty years. He was a pupil, a graduate, a master, a doctor, and a professor in Oxford University, an institution second to none in Europe, except the University of Paris, and in Oxford Wycliffe stood without a rival. He was a man of slender frame, genial disposition, immense energy, immovable conviction, and of austere plainness and purity of life, "The unsparing assailant of abuses, the boldest and most indefatigable of controversialists, the first reformer who dared, when deserted and alone, to question and deny the creed of

the Christendom around him, to break through the tradition of the past, and, with his last breath, to assert the freedom of religious thought against the dogmas of the papacy.”

In many ways did *Divine Providence* favor him, and prepare the way for his important lifework. The long and intolerable exactions of the papacy, the removal of the pope to Avignon and his subjection to France (the inveterate enemy of England), the death of Pope Gregory XI when he was proceeding against Wycliffe, the ensuing Schism in the papacy itself, one pope cursing, warring against, and weakening the other, the favor and protection, at different time, of King Edward III., and of one of his sons, John of Gaunt, Duke of Lancaster, and of Joanna, widow of the Black Prince, another son of Edward III., and of Queen Anne of Bohemia, the wife of King Richard II. of England, and of the citizens of London—all were clear providences favoring the success of the reformatory ideas and plans of Wycliffe.

Another prominent and remarkable feature of the life of Wycliffe was the *progressive* development of his views of Scripture truth; in his daily study and spiritual understanding of the Scriptures he discovered more and more of the unscripturalness of Romanism, and “he was thus carried along one step to another in his progress as a reformer.”

His progress was not only in the *Protestant* but in the *Baptist* direction; and I am persuaded that, if he had lived longer, and additional Divine light had been given him, he

would have been a thoroughgoing Bible Baptist. No man perfectly understands the Scriptures; we all now see through a glass darkly; it is only at the time and to the extent that the Holy Spirit opens our understandings that we discern spiritual things.

Wycliffe first denounced the corrupt *practices* and then the corrupt *doctrines* of Romanism leading to those practices. It is said that in 1360 he made a vigorous assault on the manifold impositions and corruptions of the Mendicant Friars, dwelling on their blasphemy in comparing their institutes to the gospel, their founder to the Savior; branding the wealthier Friars as hypocrites who, professing mendicancy, had all the pride and luxury of wealth; and the poorer as able bodied beggars, who ought not to be permitted to infest the land.

The English Parliament, in 1376, declared that the taxes paid in England to the *Church* of Rome amounted to five times as much as those levied by the king; a great portion of these taxes was squandered on the luxuries and vices of the pope and his cardinals. In 1213 King John had basely surrendered his kingdom to the pope, and agreed to pay him an annual tribute of a thousand marks (about three thousand dollars).

After 1332 the yearly payment was in arrears, because paying such a tribute was virtually subsidizing France, which country was at war with England. Pope Urban. Re-demanded this tax in 1365. Wycliffe wrote a powerful argument in resistance to this demand, and maintained that the pope had no temporal power.

The English king and Parliament refused to continue the payment, and the pope has never revived his claim.

On an embassy, in 1374, to the papal legates at Bruges, Belgium, in reference to the extortions of Rome, Wycliffe discovered still more of the papal corruptions, and on his return he declared that Christ was the only Head of the church, and that the pope was Antichrist. In 1375 he was made, for a short time, chaplain to the king; and, in 1376, *rector* to Lutterworth. In 1377 he was summoned to answer at St. Paul's in London, before the "Archbishop of Canterbury" and the "Bishop of London," for erroneous opinions; but he was delivered even from trial by the favor of the powerful John of Gaunt who accompanied him. In 1378 he was delivered from trial in a similar case at Lambeth by the favor of some citizens of London who were present, and by the command of the Princess Joanna. In the same year his persecutor, Pope Gregory XI., died, and the papal Schism occurred. Preaching had been almost entirely abandoned by the rich, worldly, corrupt and indolent Catholic clergy.

Wycliffe, longing to bring home to the great body of the people the words of eternal life, encouraged many who believed and understood some important scriptural truths to go forth as "poor preachers." "Barefoot, and clad in long russet garments of coarsest material, and, being unmarried, content with food and lodging, they passed two and two through the land, denouncing everywhere the sins of all sorts and conditions of men, but with an especial emphasis the sins, the luxury, the sloth, the ignorance of the clergy.

They declared, with simplicity and earnestness, the plain truths of the gospel in the vernacular tongue. Not one in five hundred of the people could read; and their ministers did not preach to them. The naked truths of the Scriptures shook, thrilled, enthralled the souls of men so that the adversaries of Wycliffe soon complained that half of England was infected with Lollardy." Wycliffe taught that preaching the gospel was the highest office in the world, and that the life of the preacher should give emphasis to his preaching; that, like Paul, he should not seek to obtain gold, silver or apparel of his hearers, but work with his own hands and be content with the barest necessities, and follow the pattern of Christ in poverty, self-denial and renunciation of the world; also that all the ministers of Christ were on an absolute footing of equality; that, as in the apostolic church, there should be no other offices than presbyters (or Elders) and Deacons; that there should be no popes or prelatical *Bishops* over these, because Christ is the only Head of the church.

He said that Christians need not visit the heathen for the purpose of converting them and dying as martyrs; but they could do plenty of preaching in England soon to win the crown of martyrdom—a prediction sadly verified in the next two centuries. The tithes, he said, should be given to the poor, while preachers should be satisfied with the voluntary contributions of their flocks.

Watt Tyler's insurrection in 1381 was caused, as the latest and best historians agree, not by religious, but by political grievances—the people demanded a

better government and the abrogation of the poll tax. Wycliffe did not encourage and was not at all responsible for it.

In the same year the English Parliament passed the first English statute against heresy, enjoining the arrest, trial and imprisonment of heretics. Weak and corrupt men wrested Wycliffe's teaching from their spiritual connection, and made such applications and perversions as he never intended; just as there were political commotions at the same time with the Donatist movement in North Africa in the fourth century, and in connection with the Lutheran Reformation in the sixteenth century.

Having already denounced, as utterly unscriptural, papal pardons, indulgences, excommunications, absolutions, pilgrimages, image worship and saint worship, Wycliffe in 1381 boldly declared his disbelief in the doctrine of transubstantiation, the chief support of medieval Catholicism; he maintained that, in the elements of the Lord's Supper, Christ was not bodily, but only spiritually and sacramentally present; the ordinance of baptism he also retained, but did not regard it as essential to salvation.

Condemned by Oxford University, and deserted by John of Gaunt and numerous other followers, he fearlessly stood by what he believed the Scriptures taught him, declaring that the Scriptures are the only ultimate authority in all matters of faith and practice; that all the good in man is due to grace, and that our eternal salvation is the work of Christ alone.

The greatest work of his life was the translation of the entire Scriptures into the English language from the Latin vulgate, completed in 1384, the year that he died—for this most important work God had prepared and preserved him. Only portions of the Psalms had before been rendered into English, and that for the clergy, not for the common people. Wycliffe's enemies soon complained that "laymen and even women knew more of the Scriptures than the best educated of the clergy." God had prepared a people to receive the truth; and now he sent them the truth.

"An eager appetite for scriptural knowledge," says Mr. J.J. Blunt, "was excited among the people, which they would make any sacrifice and risk any danger to gratify. Entire copies of the Bible, when they could only be multiplied by means of amanuenses, were too costly to be within the reach of very many readers; but those who could not procure "the volume of the book" would give a load of hay for a few favorite chapters, and many such scraps were consumed upon the persons of the martyrs at the stake. They would hide the forbidden treasure under the floors of their houses, and put their lives in peril rather than forego the book they desired; they would sit up at night, sometimes all night long, their doors being shut for fear of surprise, reading or hearing others read the word of God; they would bury themselves in the woods, and there converse with it in solitude; they would tend their herds in the fields, and still steal an hour for drinking in the good tidings of great joy." As in the time of Samuel's childhood, "*the word of the Lord was precious in those days.*"

I believe that Wycliffe was a child of God in Babylon. He came out of Babylon in one sense, but not in another—he denounced her abominations, but he did not leave her communion. She showed her deadly hostility to him by persecuting him all that she could during his life, and by burning his books at Prague in 1410, and burning his bones at Lutterworth in 1428. His ashes were cast into the River Swift, which, as Fuller and Wordsworth remark, conveyed them through the Avon and the Severn into the sea, and thus disseminated them, as his teachings were disseminated, over the world. How vain for man to fight against God! The truth is indestructible.

Episcopalian historians, of the High-Church order, give thanks that the Protestant Reformation of the sixteenth century did not occur in Wycliffe's time and was not his doing; as otherwise the Catholic substratum of their own communion might have altogether disappeared. This congratulation will give Bible Baptists a still higher opinion of the spirituality and scripturalness of Wycliffe's teachings. Even Mr. Trench (in his *Medieval Church History*) admits that, notwithstanding the severe persecutions of the next two centuries, "the Lollards lived on; and when the Reformation came at last, these humble men, as we may well believe, did much to contribute to it that element of sincerity, truth and uprightness, without which it never could have succeeded." And Mr. Jennings (in his *Ecclesia Anglicana*) plainly shows the un-protestant and Romanist spirit of his objections to

Wycliffe by repeatedly ridiculing the idea of "all religion being gotten from the Bible, each reader being his own commentator."

The English Lollards flourished most in the ten years after Wycliffe's death. In 1394 they petitioned Parliament for a reformation of the "Established Church" on more scriptural principles, but without success. In 1399 Thomas Arundel, "Archbishop of Canterbury," aided Henry VI. In his usurpation of the English throne; and Henry agreed to pay him, and thus retain the support of the hierarchy by persecuting the Lollards.

(*Hassell's History* ppg. 456-460) (See also Thomas BRADWARDINE, Thomas, John HUSS and JEROME of Prague)

Zedekiah

ZEDEKIAH: Sylvester Hassell: Mattaniah, the uncle of Jehoichin, under the name of Zedekiah, was made king over the miserable remnant [of Jews left in the land by Nebuchadnezzar] Zedekiah rebelled in the eighth year of his reign, and, upon the approach of the Babylonian army, professed penitence; but, as soon as the army turned away, he again broke his covenant with Babylon. Having defeated the king of Egypt, Nebuchadnezzar resumed the siege of Jerusalem, and took the city the third and last time, fulfilling the word of the Lord which he

spake by the mouths of his prophets, “I will wipe Jerusalem as a man wipeth a dish, wiping it and turning it upside down,” II Kings 21:10-13.

Nebuchadnezzar took Zedekiah, slew his sons before his eyes, then put out his eyes, bound him in fetters and carried him to Babylon, and kept him a close prisoner till he died. He made a public example of seventy-four distinguished men of Jerusalem, who had been engaged in the rebellion, by putting them to death. He sacked the temple completely. “He burnt the house of the Lord, and the king’s house, and all the houses of Jerusalem, and every great man’s house he burnt with fire.” He demolished the walls of the city, rooted and burnt out the population, leaving the city a heap of rubbish and smouldering ruins. With the exception of a few poor people, who were left in the fields and vineyards, he carried all away to Babylon as prisoners. “So Judah was carried away out of their land,” (II Kings 24:17; 25:1-21; Jeremiah 39:1-10; 52:1-23).” (*Hassell’s History pg 133*)

Zwingli, Ulrich

ZWINGLI, Ulrich: Sylvester Hassell: Ulrich Zwingli (1484-1531), the able, scholarly, eloquent, clear-headed, bold-hearted and patriotic leader of the Reformation in German Switzerland, despising papal threats and gold, advocated, like Luther, the doctrine of justification by faith alone, and salvation by grace alone. He declared, at the daily risk of his life, that tradition is worthless, and the Scriptures are the only standard of faith and practice; that the mass and image and saint worship are idolatry; that Christ is the only sacrifice for sin, and the only mediator between God and man. In 1523 he went so far as to deny the scripturalness and propriety of infant baptism; but he afterwards retreated from this position.

The Swiss Reformation was more rapid and more thorough than the German—one cause being that Switzerland was a republic, and Germany a monarchy. In the conference at Marburg (1529) Luther and Zwingli agreed in fourteen and a half articles; but in the last half of the fifteenth article, in reference to the nature of Christ’s presence in the Lord’s Supper, they did not agree. Luther maintained the doctrine of consubstantiation (the next thing to the Roman Catholic dogma of transubstantiation), that the true body and blood of Christ are present in, with and under the bread and wine; while Zwingli maintained that the body and blood of Christ are only spiritually or emblematically present with the literal elements—that the Greek verb *esti* (translated is—“This *is* my body”) means *signifies*, as it

does in numerous other passages in the New Testament, as well as in other Greek literature. The Seventh (or last) Edition of Liddell and Scott's Greek-English Lexicon, the highest authority on the Greek language, shows that Zwingli was correct; as do many passages in the Scriptures.

It is said that Zwingli had transcribed and memorized the entire Greek New Testament, especially the epistles of Paul. At the close of the Marburg conference, Luther would not accept Zwingli's extended hand of fellowship, but afterwards consented to give him the right hand of peace and charity; and in his "Short Confession of the Lord's Supper" (published in 1544) Luther atrociously stigmatized Zwingli as a "heretic, liar and murderer of souls."

In a war between the Protestant and Catholic cantons of Switzerland (October, 1531) Zwingli, by the earnest request or command of the Canton of Zurich, attended as chaplain, and, with twenty-five other Protestant ministers, was slain on the battle-field of Cappel. He had, before leaving home, predicted his own death, and had bidden his weeping wife and children a most tender final farewell, and committed them to the care of God.

The learned, gentle, laborious, afflicted, spiritual, almost Baptist **John Ecolampadius**, of Basel (1482-1531), the associate of Zwingli, as Melancthon had been of Luther, overcome with sorrow at the death of Zwingli, followed his friend the next month to the grave, his last moments being full of light and peace. Calling his three little children around him, the eldest of whom was barely three years old, he took their little hands and, "Eusebius, Irene, Alethea, love God, who is your Father." To the ten pastors kneeling around his bedside he gave the most affecting exhortations, and then said, "I have something new to tell you; in a short time I shall be with the Lord Jesus." His doctrinal views were expressed by him in one brief sentence: "Our salvation is of God; our perdition of ourselves."

Zwingli was succeeded at Zurich by the mild and energetic **Henry Bullinger** (1504-1575). Who exercised great influence on the "Anglican Church," and who composed the "Second Helvetic Confession," one of the most elaborate and valuable of the Reformed Creeds. Ecolampadius was succeeded at Basel by the teacher and preacher, Oswald Myconius (1488-1552), who brought into its present shape the "First Confession of Basel." (*Hassell's History* ppg 489, 490)