



ESSAY,
IN DEFENCE OF SOME
FUNDAMENTAL DOCTRINES
OR
CHRISTIANITY;
INCLUDING
A REVIEW
OF THE WRITINGS OF ELIAS SMITH.

By GILBERT McMASTER,
Pastor of the United Congregations of Galway and Duaneburgh, N. Y.

But these are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God: and that believing ye might have life through his name. *John.*

SCHENECTADY :
PRINTED BY RIGGS AND STEVENS.


1815.

ADVERTISEMENT



Early in the last winter, by request, the author examined in a discourse some Socinian errors. A number of those who heard it, expressed a wish to see it in print. That wish, in connexion with other occurrences, induced him to give the discussion a greater expansion, and, accordingly, he cast it into the form of an Essay.

The publication, by unforeseen events, has been delayed beyond the expected time. If, however, it would have been useful two months ago, it will not be less so at present. The subjects discussed are important. The design of the Author has been to aid the plain inquirer, in his search after truth ; and to guard the more uninstructed against fundamental errors. How far his essay is calculated to accomplish those ends, is not for him to judge. He commits it and the reader to the blessing of Him, who is the way, and the truth, and the life.

Galway, April 10, 1815.

AN ESSAY, &c.

INTRODUCTION.

If any man preach any other gospel unto you, than that ye have received, let him be accursed. This sentence is calculated to arouse the attention of man, to the importance of evangelical truth. In that man, whose paltry pride forbids him to submit his faith to the authoritative testimony of God, and whose spirit cannot bow to travel, even to heaven, in the vulgar road, this apostolic denunciation awakens sentiments, very far from accordant with that system, through which it pleases God to maintain an intercourse with man. “The christian character is simply a conformity to the whole religion of Christ.—But this implies a cordial admission of that whole religion.” But alas! too many are found, assuming the general character of advocates of the christian scheme, who have no cordial friendship for its distinguishing articles. These, in general, lay claim to an enlarged charity, and superior liberality of mind. Opposed in heart to the essential doctrines of the gospel, and yet charmed with the grandeur of some of its general principles, while too decent to mingle in the motley throng of unprincipled infidels, they grasp the name of christian, and to maintain, with some degree of consistency, their claim to it, profusely deal out to more correct believers, the epithets of *bigot*, and *illiberal*. That they may be permitted, without rebuke, to unchristianize christianity, and unfeelingly to stigmatize its genuine friends, they invoke the patronage of universal charity, and plead with fervor for liberality of mind. These affect the appellation of “philosophical believers.” This charity for which they contend, is the same benevolent affection for error and its advocates, as for truth and its

friends ; and their liberality, is a spirit of indifferece towards right and wrong. How different is modern, popular charity, from that recommended to notice by apostolic authority! *Charity rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth.* The enquiry would not be unprofitable, that would conduct us to correct views of liberality. It is certainly something very remote from a spirit of neutrality, in an important cause. It is a virtue, and, therefore, cannot partake of the nature of a degrading vice.

The liberal man is capable of taking an extensive view of the relations and importance of things, and is disposed to confer no greater consequence upon the individual objects presented to his view, than what properly belongs to each ; he is at the same time inclined to appropriate to each its relative worth, and, in respect of it, conduct himself accordingly. In such an one, we trace the operations of true liberality. It dignifies the character to which it belongs, while that spurious state of mind, the offspring of ignorance and vice, which has usurped, in cases not a few, the appellation of liberal, narrows the heart, leads to false views of moral obligation, and so far as its influence extends, demoralizes society.

What then? Shall men, in things of religion, be in a state of perpetual hostility? Shall the empire of the *Prince of Peace* never be united? Must each contend for his dogma? The Church of God is indeed lamentably distracted, and in that distraction all parties have a guilty hand. But can the malady be cured by an unprincipled abandonment of fundamental doctrines, merely to obtain a momentary repose, from the pains of contest? Such repose would be that of death, to the interests of vital godliness. Never let the christian forget the importance of religious truths ; but let him weigh every one in the balance of the sanctuary, and according to its value, let his estimation of it be. Let him beware of associating truth in any combination foreign to its nature ; and, for this connexion, expending that zeal which is due to truth alone.

Among the friends of evangelical truth and order more ought to be done, in removing obstacles out of the

way of a return to unity in the faith and profession of the gospel, than has been effected. For this purpose every mere party consideration, and every form, not stamped with the seal of divine authority, should be sacrificed on the altar of concord. We must, however, take care to immolate no principle of truth, to sacrifice no moral obligation.

To avoid these evils, the constitution of the church ought constantly to be kept in view, and the design of the erection of that society, must never be forgotten. The great end proposed to be accomplished by the ecclesiastic communion of saints, is the glory of the Divinity, as displayed in preparing them for, and introducing them into the heavenly rest. The production and promotion of holiness, are indispensable to the attainment of this end ; for *without holiness no man shall see the Lord.* This holiness consists in a moral correspondence between man's dispositions, and those beings to whom he is related ; and between his conduct, and the obligations resulting from the relations in which he stands. This adaptation of human dispositions and conduct, to our relations and obligations, implies an adequate acquaintance with the character of those to whom we are so related. The connexion between us and our Creator, is the most intimate, and important of any other ; it is the foundation of all others. The most important species of knowledge is that which relates to God and man ; and the errors entertained respecting them, are the most dangerous. *My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge.* He who mistakes his own and his Maker's character, will carry that mistake into the whole of his intercourse with God. His religious services will receive their character from the opinions he embraces respecting God ; respecting man ; and the way of access to the divine presence with acceptance. If the principles upon these subjects, to which we give entertainment, be correct, and our conduct in unison with them, we may reasonably hope for that divine satisfaction to the heart, which flows from evangelical communion with our God. But to indulge the hope, that the spirit of God will sanctify the visions of our own minds, and the devices of our own hearts, so as to make them an effectual mean of our salvation, is a

presumption too bold for sober reason. Upon the footing of falsehood instead of truth; of superstition instead of the institutions of heaven, God will not hold a gracious communion with man. *In vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men.* The sum of the matter is this, the church of God is erected to prepare men for glory; this preparation is effected by the promotion of holiness; holiness is promoted by a blessed intercourse between God and the soul; the principles upon which this intercourse proceeds, are those unfolded in the gospel revelation: *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.** The importance of religious truth is much greater than numbers have been disposed to acknowledge. False principles must give mistaken views of God. These remarks are made with the design of calling to this subject, the attention of such as have been in the habit of thinking, that it is a matter of no moment what we believe, if our hearts be sincere; if the heart be right, it matters not for the head. Yet we are assured that, if the head be sick, the heart will be faint. The sentiment is usually exhibited to mask designs against the truth. It originates with an enemy, and can only be embraced by such, or by the very unwary.

The gracious expectant of future bliss, in whose heart concordantly reign, zeal for the glory of God, and the purest benevolence to man, is pained at the progress of error in principle, and weeps over the widely spread desolations of the house of God. Her strongest walls have been those partitions which separate her children from one another. In man's imperfect state, it would indeed be a miracle, had he not gone to extremes, while with the best intentions he, on the one hand, advocated the importance of truth and order, or on the other contended for unity, peace and forbearance. In public sentiment, for some years past, a remarkable revolution has taken place. The evils of party spirit have been very generally seen, confessed and lamented. In this revolution, it would be too much to suppose, that the happy medium has been

* 1. John, i, 3.

found between the cause of the little factionist, who finds his petty fame, or paltry interest involved in heading or supporting a mere party; and of his, whose glory, blazoned by the plaudits of a thoughtless crowd, is procured by the hire of Zion's sacred aisles and altars to the unholy, who, for a time, may find it convenient to occupy them.

Making due allowance, however, for extremes to which men may go, in the ardent pursuit of an important object, it will probably be admitted, that there is a visible approximation, upon the whole, to a more desirable state of things; amongst some, a more reasonable estimation of those things, which really rise no higher than circumstantial, while the attention and zeal of others are awakened, to the importance of the great principles of religion and of morals. Much, however, remains to be done; the man of liberal mind, while viewing the divisions of the church, will find an abundance to censure; but, indiscriminately, he will not refer the whole mass, of the causes of those divisions, to bigotry and superstition. From the labours of the reformer, who would do so, we must expect but little aid. He proceeds in the dark. The enlightened friend of Zion will, with firmness, inquire into the remote and proximate causes of existing evils, and, carrying in his hand, the torch of divine revelation, will inquire how *those* evils may be remedied, without running into others, no less pernicious.

That system which would lay aside all creeds, and subordinate standards in the church of God, in the present state of religious opinion, can by no means be considered in a favourable point of view. That they have been abused in many cases, is readily admitted, that they may yet be abused is more than probable; but will laying them aside remedy existing evils? Were all the confessions of faith in existence, with one consent, committed to the flames, would the professors of religion be really any more united, by such a measure, in the love of the truth? Would not, in such an event, the church be transformed into a Babel? A Babel too, where, to the unintelligible jargon of confusion, would be added a war more fierce than before, from the approximation to

each other, of contending elements. *How can two walk together except they agree?* Without an union, in the great and obvious doctrines of christianity, there can be no profitable communion; and beyond such doctrines, in fixing terms of communion in the church, none should go. Lamentable as existing divisions in Zion are, more deplorable would it be, should, as human nature now is, all parties, with their opinions, attempt to mingle in one body. The consequence would be a hitherto unexampled religious contest, or an united burying of every distinguishing principle and institution of christianity. This would be a price too dear for such an union.

It will be much better for those, who justly claim to be branches of the great community of the christian church, to forget all *mere* party contests, to look back to original principles, and to expunge, from their respective systems, the cumbersome rubbish of adventitious circumstances, which mar the beauty and simplicity of the church's primitive constitution. Let her friends, in the mean time, indulge in a liberal intercourse upon general principles; thus, while they guard against the insidious wiles of the enemies of the christian faith, they will be preparing the way for the blessed enjoyments of that day, when God shall give to the people a pure language, and when they shall call upon him with one consent.

Among the indications of better days, to the church, drawing near, is a growing regard for the religious education of youth. The assertion and application of the great principles of ecclesiastical order, as it respects the rising age, in the different churches called evangelical, would produce a great revolution in favour of the best interests of religious community.* Let man's obligations to subserve, in every relation of life, the system of grace be understood, as paramount to all others; in the application of religious discipline, in public and in private, let this be kept in view; and our families and congregations will open no door for innovation, by adventurers in religion. The nurture thus communicated to the mind, and the restraints thus imposed upon vicious affections, will evince their salutary effects, through the

* See note, No. I, at the end of the work.

blessing that God usually bestows upon such means, in lives of piety and virtue.

That there has, heretofore, been an alarming defect in the system of religious education, appears in the numbers that are ready to become the prey of the lowest order of impostors, not from any uncommon share of viti-osity of mind, but from defect of information. Landa-ble exertions have been made to send the gospel to, and to indoctrinate in its principles, the heathen, while at our doors, and perhaps in our congregations, many have been permitted to pass through the different stages of life, between infancy and advanced years, as really un-acquainted with the peculiar doctrines of the gospel, as the untutored savage.

Characters of this description have too generally been permitted, undisturbed, by the visit of the evangelical missionary, according to any efficient plan, to pass along unnoticed. They were also considered unworthy the zeal of those, who, under the masked appellation of *rational christians*, were the pioneers of infidelity. These, under the imposing show of superiority in literature, in scientific attainments, and liberality of sentiment, addressed themselves to that class of society, who prided themselves in the idea of possessing an order of intellect superior to other men. The cottage of the uninstructed, was thus equally free from the intrusion of *rational christianity*, so called, and avowed infidelity. Paine was among, if not the first, who carried to the dwellings of the illiterate, the maddening cup, *deism*; but his "Age of Reason" was premature. "The age of inquiry" and similar publications of an Elias Smith, an illiterate but cunning missionary of Socinianism, should have preceded the publication of the deistical works of Thomas Paine, in order to give them their full effect. The appearance of this man, and the industrious, yet in some respects underhand, circulation of his books, gave occasion to the publication of this essay. My object has been to state the truths of the gospel, and plainly to support them by the testimony of scripture. Those who are acquainted with these doctrines, as stated by the Churches of the Reformation, and advocated by their most eminent divines, will perceive that I tread, doctrinally, in

their footsteps. I affect not to invent any thing that has not, in some form, been exhibited before. It is sufficient that we follow them, who through faith and patience inherit the promises.

I have not often directly noticed the confident assertions, in which this class of Socinians, headed by E. Smith, abound; and in which consists their greatest strength; nor do I know, that a minute attention to particular misrepresentations, would be of any utility to men of that description. It does not appear that they are inclined, very attentively, to examine evidence; nor is it difficult for them to believe, at least to advocate, incredible things, when suitable to their purpose. It has been well said, "that error is in its nature flippant and compendious, it hops with airy and fastidious levity over proofs and arguments, and perches upon assertion, which it calls conclusion." This is true of Socinians generally, and more especially so of this modern class of that description of people. If the following pages shall be a mean of confirming any of the humble followers of the Lamb, in the faith of the gospel, or of preventing any of the more uninstructed class of professors, from the influence of those heresies, destructive of the best intents of man, the labor of the writer will not have been in vain.

It is with reluctance that any notice has been taken, personally, of Elias Smith. Vanity appears to be a predominant feature of his character; a vain, if unprincipled, man will be pleased in being noticed, whether in the way of approbation or opposition; such gratification I wish not to be, in any degree, instrumental in bestowing. There is also, a rude vulgarity in his manner, as a writer, that forbids, a respectful attention. If therefore, less respecting him be found in Chap. VIII, than was expected, what is now stated will be my apology. It is also hoped, that such as are in full possession of the evidence of the truth which he opposes, will be in no danger of seduction by his wiles, and will have no disposition to remark, upon the rudeness of his manner. First and last, it was with some reluctance I noticed the subject, as advocated by this humble patron of heresy. Respect for truth, and regard for those who were likely

to be entrapped by his snares, though standing to me in no other relation than that of fellow mortals, were the considerations that ultimately prevailed, to induce me, to offer the following sheets to the public. If any shall think that my sentiments, towards the errors of this, and other Socinian sects, are not sufficiently indulgent, I can only say in way of apology, that I consider them directly hostile, to the essential glory of the great God our Saviour.

CHAPTER I.

ON THE TRINITY.*

SECTION I.

PROOFS FROM THE OLD TESTAMENT.

IN the great majority of the articles of human knowledge, we rise no higher than to an acquaintance with facts. Comparatively few of mankind think of inquiring after the reason of those things with which they are conversant. The few who, professing not to be satisfied with this vulgar cause, have devoted their attention to demonstration, have made but slow progress, and indeed are obliged in general to stop, just as they pass the threshold. The few years granted to man on earth; the multiplicity of action, to which he is called, together with the limits set to his physical and intellectual powers, forbid him to wait long to inquire into the nature and reason of things. The experience of ages, the instincts of nature, and the revelation of God, have furnished him with facts, as materials, with which he is chiefly to be employed in the multifarious scenes of life. The man who will credit nothing but what he can demonstrate, or do nothing but by rules, the principles of which he perfectly understands, is an unfit member of society, as at present constituted, and indeed will not long be an inhabitant of our world.

The great things of religion are conveyed to us by testimony, and are great objects of faith. The first principle of all religion, that God is, is such. The constitution of things announces to us the existence of a great

* In this Essay it is intended to state the truths of scripture, in opposition to the following errors :

1. That the doctrine of the Trinity is a fable.
2. That Jesus Christ is no more than a man.
3. That the Holy Spirit is only an influence, or operation.
4. That the soul is mortal.
5. That Adam's fall, original sin, the covenant of grace, the incarnation of Christ, are fables.
6. That the death of Christ was not intended to reconcile God to man—that the atonement is for all men—that the guilt of sin was not imputed to Christ—that he suffered only as an example.
7. That the wicked shall be annihilated.
8. That females have a right to be public teachers of religion, &c.

creative and preserving cause. But whether this cause be one, or more; whether supremely good, or possessing qualities of mingled character, good and bad, the voice of nature does not so distinctly declare. That God is one, and that he is unmixedly good, is much more a dictate of revelation than of nature. When declared by competent evidence, reason indeed confesses it, and sometimes, in her giddy moods, claims it as a truth of her own discovery.

But reason amidst her proudest claims, must, in silence, yield an acknowledgement of the feebleness of her powers, when it is queried; "Canst thou by searching find out God?" No, no. The measure of such knowledge is "higher than heaven and deeper than hell—it is longer than earth, and broader than the sea." This fact should prepare man, humbly to embrace whatever revelation God may be pleased to give of himself. And as all that relates to God is great, so whatever he reveals is to us important. Since, then, no created mind can pretend to grasp, in its narrow comprehension, all the fulness of the eternal Godhead, why should we, in the ravings of folly, pronounce any modes of the Divine Subsistence, which God may be pleased to reveal, absurd, merely because we are incapable of demonstrating how it can be? Rather let us with pious confessions of humility, bow before the incomprehensibility of God, acknowledging that we are as nothing before him.

These remarks apply to the doctrine of the
TRINITY.

This doctrine has ever been received in the church of God, and by her sons most distinguished for piety, science and native talent, deemed fundamental to the whole edifice of grace. What though the term be not literally found in the sacred page? Is this really the reason why it is rejected? We know the anti-trinitarian does not so conscientiously revere the phraseology of the sacred page, as to experience any squeamishness upon this head. We find the doctrine of the unity of Deity in a plurality of persons, as a great stream flowing through the whole extent of revelation, from which proceeds every cheering rivulet of truth, that has any reference to the religious state of man. Let us now at-

tend to the instruction communicated upon this mysterious subject, so far as to have a specimen of the ample evidence of the truth. I shall select the following inspired witnesses:

Moses furnishes the following proofs. Upon opening the book of Genesis, i. 1. 2, we are met with a declaration of a plurality of agents. *God created the heavens and the earth—The spirit of God, moved upon the face of the deep.* This is that same spirit who garnished the heavens, who breathed into man's nostrils the breath of life, and made him a living soul.

But Gen. i. 26. furnishes more explicit testimony of this truth. Man, the most important part, the lower creation, was to be formed. The display of the Divine character in his constitution is such, that it is represented as the effect of counsels; *Let us make man.* With whom could God consult? Who could be a fellow worker with the great I AM, in making man after the Divine image? *Let us make man in our image.* Man was made in the image of God. While all admit the unity of Deity, the obvious import of the holy language just recited, conducts the candid inquirer to consider the GODHEAD in some sense more than one. The idea of plurality by the terms US and OUR, is at once conveyed to the mind. In what respect plurality may be affirmed of God is not now the inquiry.

As we proceed we find the evidence accumulate, Gen. iii. 5. *Ye shall be as Gods*, was the seductive language employed in the temptation of the old serpent. *Gods* is the same word before rendered God; but compare this with ver. 22. And Jehovah God, literally JEHOVAH the Gods said, *Behold the man is become as ONE of us.* Is it possible for a plain, and upright believer in the truth of the inspired word of God, to read this declaration and not perceive the great article of the christian faith, taught in it? ONE of us, where, in every respect, there is but one, is not intelligible language.

Gen. xi. 6. 8. presents a proof of similar character. JEHOVAH said—*let us go down, and there confound their language.* Jehovah is the speaker, and he it was that scattered them abroad, upon the face of all the earth; yet this JEHOVAH says, *let us go down.* To him who

wishes to believe God rather than the sophistical quibbles of men, the import of these testimonies will be obvious.*

That Moses should employ such phraseology to a people, prone to idolatry, is remarkable, and that at the same time, when he was enforcing upon them the doctrine of the unity of God, in opposition to the multiplicities of heathen deities. The employment of these *pluralities*, under such circumstances, was not without necessity, and loudly proclaims to us, that they who, in the unity of the Divine *Essence*, recognise only one manner of subsistence, know not the true God, whom to know is everlasting life.

In Genesis xix. 24. the truth under consideration, is still farther evident. There we read, JEHOVAH *rained upon Sodom and upon Gomorrah, brimstone and fire from JEHOVAH out of heaven.* Here is JEHOVAH in one character, raining fire from JEHOVAH in another character. To understand this, we must review Chap. xviii. There we learn that these visitants, in the form of men, appeared to the Father of the faithful; one of these is repeatedly declared to be JEHOVAH, see verse 13, 17, 20, 26. Yet he appeared in the fashion of a man. Was not this the personal wisdom of God, whose delights were with the sons of man, and who, with joy, anticipated the day, when, in human flesh, he should actually tabernacle in the habitable parts of the earth? This was the angel JEHOVAH, the angel whom Jacob recognised as the God of Abraham, and Isaac, the angel that redeemed him from all evil, and whose blessing, as the highest portion he could leave them, he implored with his dying breath, upon the sons of Joseph his favorite child.† When we read that the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment to the Son; and when we learn that it is the part of the Son, though existing in the form of God, to appear in fashion as a man, when we learn that the mysterious wheels of providence, as represented in the prophecy of Ezekiel,‡ are directed by one, whose appearance was that of a man, we can be at no loss to perceive who the Jehovah is, that rained fire from Jeho-

* See note, No. II, at the end of the work.

† Genesis, xlviii. 15, 16.

‡ Ezekiel, i. 26.

vah. And whether, as some suppose, this Jehovah actually appeared at Sodom, in human form, as he did the day before to Abraham, directing the fiery tempest, or not, we see *Him* to whom all judgment is committed, executing upon this place the wrath of God.

Another item from Moses shall close his testimony. You will find it in Numbers, vi. 24, 25, 26. While the well instructed saint reads this benediction—*Jehovah bless thee—Jehovah make his face shine upon thee—Jehovah give thee peace*—his mind is led at once to the Apostolic blessing, 2 Cor. xiii. 14. *The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost be with you all.* Here is a triformed blessing, in sentiment corresponding to that, with which Aaron and his sons were commanded to bless the children of Jacob. The blessings of Zion, under the gospel economy are certainly not inferior to those pronounced at the foot of Horeb; nor can we suppose the object of Apostolical worship, inferior to that of the Aaronical. The latter was Jehovah, addressed under three forms; the former is the *Father, Son, and Holy Spirit*. If, however, the Son and Spirit be not Jehovah, then the christian object of prayer is inferior to that of the Israelitish, and the blessings supplicated for the children of the gospel Zion, will correspondently sink before those intreated for, and bestowed upon the wandering pilgrims of Arabia's desert! This, the believer in the truth of ancient prophecy, or of the gospel of Christ, will not be willing to confess. While then in Num. vi. 24, 26, we see a plurality in Jehovah declared, and that plurality more than intimated to be Three; we also recognise in 2 Cor. xiii. 14, the equality of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost.

That the above repetition of the name Jehovah, intimated something mysterious, the Jews have never been unwilling to confess. That he stood in distinct characters was evidently the opinion of the Masorites.*

This testimony of Moses, furnishes something more than presumptive evidence of the great truth which we advocate. We now pass on to consider the testimony of

AUGUR.

This is found Prov. xxx. 4. *What is his name and his*

* See Note, No. III, at the end of the work.

Son's name, if thou canst tell? That the true God is spoken of in this place, will scarcely be doubted, when the works ascribed to him are considered—He gathereth the winds, bindeth up the waters as in a garment, and establisheth the ends of the earth. He also possesseth a perfect acquaintance with heaven above, and with the earth below, which is intimated by his ascending into heaven and descending, that is, he is every where present. These things are denied to the Sons of men; but ascribed to one whose name none can tell. By his name we are to understand himself, that is, the divine nature, as in Psalms, xxix. 2. and other places, and by telling his name is pointed out, a perfect comprehension of his perfections, and ability to explain them. Such acquaintance with the divine character, belongs to God alone; therefore, the query implies a strong negation. None can tell his name, that is, none can comprehend so as fully to explain the glories of his nature, *who hath gathered the winds in his fists, who hath bound the waters in a garment, and who hath established all the ends of the earth.* But he is declared to have a Son, whose name is equally incomprehensible; *What is his Son's name, if thou canst tell?* In those early ages, this Son was acknowledged as existing; he *was set up from everlasting,* and the obedience of the nations was due to him. Psal. ii, 10, 12. *Ye kings—ye judges of the earth—kiss the Son, lest he be angry and ye perish.* The application of this, in the New Testament, to Jesus Christ, leaves the scripture believer at no loss, to ascertain who the person is, intended by *his Son, who established all the ends of the earth.*

Let us now attend to the testimony of the seraphic
ISAIAH.

To establish a plurality of subsistences in the Godhead, Isaiah, vi. 8. is a striking proof: *I heard the voice of Jehovah saying, whom shall I send, and who will go for us?* When in the luminous beams of New Testament discovery, we examine this scripture, we can, at once, trace the great fundamental doctrine now under consideration. *Whom shall I send?* Jesus the second in order of the Eternal Three is the head of all the ambassadors of God. From him have they received their commission.

Moses was a servant in the ancient church, but over it Jesus as a Son had a claim of property, being the builder thereof. From Jesus, immediately, did the Apostles receive their commission. Was their commission confirmed by a signature inferior to that of Isaiah? Certainly not. Then is Jesus, who commissioned them, not less than God. It was *Jehovah* who sent Isaiah forth with a message to Israel. But neither Isaiah, nor the evangelical messengers, simply represented the Messiah: they were through the mediator the messengers of the holy Trinity. Compare together 1. Cor. i. 1—2. Cor. i. 1. and Acts, xiii. 2. Paul was an Apostle of Jesus Christ by the will of God, and was called also by the Holy Ghost, to the work of the ministry; immediately, however, he received his commission from Jesus Christ, to be exercised in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost. Compare this with the scripture from Isaiah, which we are considering; to the candid mind, if comparing spiritual things with spiritual, scripture with scripture, be a proper mean of ascertaining the mind of the spirit, it will appear obvious, that the *JEHOVAH*, who says, *whom shall I send?* is the great head of the church, Jesus Christ, and the us, to be represented, is a plurality of persons in the Deity.

Another part of Isaiah's testimony is worthy of our attention, chap. lxi. 1, 2. *The spirit Lord Jehovah is upon me, because Jehovah hath anointed me to preach good tidings, &c.* The Redeemer has applied this scripture to himself, in his Mediatorial character, Luke iv. 18. It is the same person who speaks, chap. xlviii. 16. *The Lord God and his spirit hath sent me.* It is the Lord who speaks, he is sent by the Lord God and his spirit. The spirit anoints him, and Jehovah sends him, yet it is Jehovah who is sent. To the person in the least acquainted with the gospel of Christ, the point is too plain to require farther illustration. Jehovah sends, his spirit sends, Jehovah is sent, How? He condescended to take our nature; *He took on him the seed of Abraham.* In our nature, and as our Mediator, he voluntarily engaged to accomplish the will of Deity. In that assumed character he was sent, and anointed by the spirit. The spirit was not given by measure to him. Joh. iii. 34.

God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten son, that whosoever believeth on him might not perish. This is he who was sent and anointed.

Let us farther hear the testimony of the prophet
DANIEL.

His evidence is contained in chap. ix. 17. *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.* The people of the Jews had sinned; from the highest to the lowest rank among them, all were guilty. The sanctuary was desolate. They needed present compassion, but in their numbers there was no name of worth, sufficient to insure a favorable reception to the prophet's prayer. He presents to him a name, however, for whose sake he was heard. 'This was the Lord, ADONAI, the same whom Jehovah addresses in Ps. cx. 1. *The Lord said unto my Lord, sit thou at my right hand, &c.* Which the Redeemer of men applies to himself, and which from the whole tenor of scripture doctrine, it seems must be applied to him. There never was a name given among men, whereby salvation could be had, but that of Jesus, who assures us, that whatsoever is asked in his name shall be obtained. These declarations of the Lord of glory, and of his disciples, furnish us with a key to unlock the shrines of the prophets. The Lord was known to Daniel as mediator, for whose sake God heard the prayers of his servants. This Lord was in the fulness of time made under the law, and appeared in the form of a servant; though he eternally existed in the form of God, so as to think it no robbery to be equal with God. From the Old Testament I only adduce another proof. It is found in the prophecy of

HOSEA.

Consult chap. i. 7. There Jehovah says, *I will have mercy upon the house of Judah, and will save them by Jehovah their God.* To those who receive the testimony of God concerning his son; that *there is not salvation in any other*; that salvation is by Jesus Christ alone; and of Jesus Christ and his salvation, God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets, since the world began; the language of Hosca will not be dark. JE-

HOVAH saves his people, by JEHOVAH, even by that *Highest Lord*, Luke i. 76, before whose face the Baptist went to prepare his way. The reader will remark, that this scripture establishes these two facts: First, that the name JEHOVAH, a name never given to any mere creature, belongs to distinct persons; and secondly, that one of these is the illustrious Saviour, of whom all the prophets have given testimony.

These testimonies from the Old Testament, past all doubt, prove that in what the New Testament denominates, the GODHEAD, and the Old Testament JEHOVAH, there are more modes of subsistence than one. The testimonies, thus adduced, are but a sample of the abundance which those sacred pages afford. That the most striking and pertinent, are selected, I shall not affirm; but should the attentive reader be affected by them, as the writer is, no hesitation, upon his mind will remain, that in the unity of Deity there is a plurality of persons, and that this plurality is THREE.

SECTION II.

PROOF FROM THE NEW TESTAMENT.

In the administration of Baptism, one of the most solemn rites of our sacred worship, we find the authority, and doctrine of Three recognised, as standing upon an equality, as respects excellency and prerogative.

Go ye, said the Saviour, about to ascend in his humanity, *Go ye, and teach all nations, baptizing them, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*. Whatever is implied in baptizing in the name of the Father, that also is involved in baptizing in the name of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. This commission makes no distinction, nor is there any parallel instruction that would lead us to suppose a difference, in the honour ascribed to each. In the solemn confession that is made, in the reception of this seal of the righteousness of faith, and in the Divine annunciation of authority, it would be passing strange to suppose, that there is no proper recognition of what peculiarly belongs to God. And if there is any such recognition,

it respects not one alone, but all the three. Nor, under such circumstances, can we suppose, that he, who declares to erring mortals, *I am a jealous God*, would permit to be associated with him any mere creature. *My glory I will not give to another*, is a declaration which precludes all such association, and presents to us an evidence which ought not slightly to be set aside, that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, are one God.*

The beloved disciple, John xv. 26, adds farther to the evidence of this truth. *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*. So he speaks, chap. xiv. 26. of the "*Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things*". These testimonies, taken in their proper connexions, furnish a strong proof of the Trinity in unity. The spirit is promised to testify of Christ, and to teach all things. He is qualified for this; for he *searcheth all things, even the deep things of God*. To this task none is adequate, but an infinite mind; since the spirit executes it, we are at no loss to draw the proper inference. He is sent from the Father, in the name of Christ, yes, he is sent by Christ himself. Jesus then is not inferior to him, and since we have seen that the spirit, to whom Jesus is not inferior, cannot be less than infinite, it obviously follows, that Deity properly belongs to them all.

I adduce another proof from 2 Cor. xiii, 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*. These blessings involve all the fulness of the gospel promise. Each of them implies nothing less than eternal life, a gift which none inferior to God can give. As this has been already considered,† I proceed.

To another explicit testimony, found, John v. 7. *There are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one*. The great subject of record is Messiah, as appearing to effect our salvation from sin and wrath, which he does by the blood of the everlasting covenant, and by the sanctifying influence of grace. Of this we have indu-

* See Note, No. IV. at the end of the work.—† Vide page 14.

bitable evidence; the spirit has borne ample testimony to its truth. The spirit, however, is not the only witness in heaven: there are three celestial witnesses of this subject. The Father is one, the Son himself, whose name is the Word of God, Rev. xix. 13. is the second, and the Holy Spirit is the third. *These Three are One.* Admit this evidence to be given under the influence of the inspiring spirit of truth, and it seems difficult to find reason, even to quibble against the doctrine of the Trinity.* Of this truth we shall have more ample evidence in the following sections, and being willing to abide by my resolution of brevity, as well as to relieve my reader's patience for a little, I close this section.

—*—

CHAPTER II.

SECTION I.

JESUS CHRIST IS A DIVINE PERSON.

To the serious man, no subject can be of greater moment than that which relates to Jesus Christ. His safety, his duty, and dangers, are all connected with this article of christian faith: his safety depends upon what his Saviour *can* do for him, his duty must be proportioned to the excellency of his Redeemer, and his crime, in refusing to him the glory due to his name, will be great, in proportion to the glories of his character. It is, then, a matter of importance for us to know, whether he be merely man, or whether he be also God. Should it ultimately appear that he is Divine, and we, pertinaciously or heedlessly, treated him as a mere man, who shall intreat for the remission of our crime? The bold assumptions of the Unitarian, when viewed in the light of the beams of the Son of righteousness, to the convinced sinner, and humble saint, must appear fraught with impiety.

The truth upon this subject will appear, should we examine the names by which the Saviour is made

* See Notes, Nos. V. and VI, at the end of the work.

known. Names are employed to distinguish objects, and wonderful indeed would it be, should the great Eternal have appropriated no name, by which he might be known from every other object of thought. Such appropriation is however made, and applied under such circumstances, as preclude the possibility of mistaking the object, to which these names belong. From those thus applied, I shall only select that of JEHOVAH. My argument is this: if the scriptures exclusively appropriate the name JEHOVAH to the true God; to whatever person we find that name properly applied, that person we are authorized to conclude is properly Divine.

In illustrating this argument, I shall show that the name JEHOVAH, which imports, *independent, self-existence*, is exclusively appropriated to the true God. Psal. lxxxiii. 18. *Thou whose name alone is JEHOVAH, art the MOST HIGH over all the earth.* He who is MOST HIGH over all the earth, is past doubt the true God; his name is, in this scripture, pronounced to be JEHOVAH, to the exclusion of all others from any title to it. If then, we find this name applied to Jesus Christ, the argument will be conclusive, that he is the true God.

To establish this important point, let us turn to those portions of sacred writ, that confessedly speak of the Saviour of men, both in the Old and New Testaments. Among others let us consult Mark, i. 2, 3. *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.* The voice of one crying in the wilderness, is the Baptist, in the exercise of his ministry. He prepares the way of the Lord. In order to this he goes before his face. Who is this Lord, whose way the Baptist prepares? who is the illustrious personage, before whose face he goes? All confess this Lord, this personage to be Jesus the Saviour. But who is Jesus? The prophet answers this question; for Mark and Isaiah speak of the same person. Mark speaks of Jesus; Isaiah calls him by the name JEHOVAH. Isa. xl. 3. *Prepare ye the way of JEHOVAH.* Is farther evidence required? Turn to Acts iv. 12. *Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is none other name under heaven, given among*

men, whereby we must be saved. The writer of this passage is speaking of Jesus Christ. He exhibits him to us as the only Saviour; *Neither is there salvation in any other.* Compare this with Isa. xliii. 11. *I, even I, am JEHOVAH, and beside me there is no SAVIOUR.* That spirit who dictated the prophet's declaration, is the author of the evangelist's testimony. Salvation is the matter of Isaiah's song, and the Saviour, JEHOVAH, is full in his view. JEHOVAH indeed speaks by him. The same subjects occupied the Apostle's attention, when he uttered the declaration under our view. Who can doubt that Peter, full of the Holy Ghost, and Isaiah spake of the same personage? This personage is Jesus, and to him the name JEHOVAH is appropriated, a name never given to any but God; Jesus then is, to employ an apostolical phrase, *The true God.**

We have evidence of this no less explicit, Rom. x. 13. *Whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord, shall be saved.* Need I detain to show that the Lord spoken of, is Jesus our Redeemer? Consult what goes before, and what follows. He is presented as the object of faith, exhibited in the preaching of the gospel, verse 11, 12, 14. To be so exhibited is the prerogative of Christ—*We preach Christ*, is the Apostolic testimony. The 13th verse now under consideration, is quoted from Joel ii. 32. *Whosoever shall call on the name of JEHOVAH shall be delivered.* Joel, under the direction of the inspiring spirit, speaks of the only Saviour, who was to appear in Zion, to give deliverance to his people; this was Jesus, Paul quotes this prophetic declaration, and speaks of JEHOVAH, who is the alone Saviour. Both speak of the same person; for we cannot suppose the Holy Ghost, in employing precisely the same language respecting the same subject; to mean different works or different persons to perform those works.

Another proof of this we have, Num. xxi. 5, 7. *The people spake against God—JEHOVAH sent fiery serpents among the people—the people said, We have sinned; for we have spoken against JEHOVAH.—* Compare this with 1 Cor. x. 9. *Neither let us tempt Christ, as some of them also tempted, and were destroyed of serpents.* JEHOVAH

* 1 John v. 20.

punished the Israelites because they spake against him; but it was Christ according to Paul whom they tempted, and for sinning against him they were punished.

Without fear of contradiction, then, we assert, that in the whole compass of the sacred volume, the name Jehovah is applied to no created person, as his proper name. We have, however, seen it by inspired writers, applied to Jesus Christ. This argument, which of itself seems conclusive, in proving the Deity of Christ, receives additional support from the appropriation of attributes to him, which God can only claim. This, to the enquirer after truth, opens a field of extensive instruction. I purpose only to introduce him to the investigation to which it leads. Let us consider the attribute of eternal duration as belonging to him.

SECTION II.

ETERNAL DURATION.

This attribute, in its proper acceptation, belongs to none but God. At Beersheba, Abraham called upon the name of *Jehovah, the EVERLASTING God.** He, who is the refuge of his people, is the **ETERNAL GOD.†** And by the Psalmist, probably Moses, he is celebrated as everlasting; *From everlasting to everlasting thou art God.‡* This perfection of Deity, in its full extent, is applied to Jesus Christ. He is described as the **EVERLASTING FATHER.§** He, who is so called, is the *Prince of Peace*; he is none other than the "Son given." This name of Father, let it be remarked, is not applied to him to denote his relation to the other persons of the Godhead; but as he is related to his people, he is, and each of the blessed **THREE** may be so denominated. The point is farther illustrated by Mic. v. 2. and Mat. ii. 6. compared. In the former place, the ruler of Israel is spoken of, *Whose goings forth have been from of old, from EVERLASTING*; in the latter portion, we find the prediction directly applied to Jesus. In our nature he appeared at Bethlehem, and as our Mediator fed his people, *in the majesty of the name of the Lord his God.*

* Gen. xxi. 33.—† Deut. xxxiii. 27.—‡ Psal. xc. 2.—§ Isa. ix. 6.

Let it not pass unnoticed, that while, as man, he appears in the fulness of time, *his goings forth have been from everlasting*. Eternal actings are here ascribed to our Redeemer, he must then have had an eternal existence; this in our nature he had not, we must consequently refer those actings to a nature of which they are predicable. This conducts us to Deity, subsisting in the mode of the SECOND of the eternal THREE. Thus we see the great mystery of godliness, *God manifested in the flesh*.

To these testimonies of the eternity of Jesus, we may add that in Joh. viii, 58. *Before Abraham was, I AM*. The quibbling of the Unitarian, upon this declaration of the faithful and true witness, is impertinent in the extreme. Let the christian attend to the connexion in which the words stand. Our Lord replies to a question of the Jews in the preceding verse: *Thou art not yet fifty years old, and hast thou seen Abraham?* Yes; replies the Saviour, *Before Abraham was, I AM*. I AM was the name of the God of Israel, by which he declared himself to Moses; this was the everlasting God whom Abraham worshipped, and of course it is not strange that he was before him. Here our Lord applies to himself the name, which denotes the self-existence of God, and declares that he, as the independent Being, was before Abraham. Thus he replies to their objections in verse 53, 57, and confirms what he intimated in verse 56, that he was greater than Abraham. Take it in any other sense, and there is no reply to the Jewish objection. Expound the declaration otherwise, and it borders upon nonsense. "Before Abraham was, I am the Christ," is the Unitarian gloss; that is, before Abraham, the Messiah was predicted. But is this a reply to the question, *hast thou seen Abraham?* Certainly not; whereas the obvious construction of the words, which assert his Deity, presents a plain reply to it, and a refutation of the objection which it involves. Thus we see Jesus to be the great I AM, before Abraham, even the eternal God.

A testimony no less striking we find in John xvii, 5. It is a portion of the Saviour's prayer. *O Father, glorify thou me, with thine own self, with the glory which I*

had with thee before the world was. Before the world was, is an expression of the same import with eternity; that which existed before the creation must be eternal; here Jesus informs us by this solemn supplication, that he had an existence before the world was, and enjoyed with the Father unclouded glory; he *was daily his delight, rejoicing always before him*. Thus Joh. i, 1, 2. *He was in the beginning with God, and he was God, and all things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made*.

But why multiply evidence of this truth? The time indeed would fail to tell it all, I shall only direct my reader, under this particular to another, it is found Romans xvi, 25, 26. *The mystery which was kept secret since the world began, 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*. The mystery spoken of is the full exhibition of gospel grace, it is to be made known to all nations, in order to produce the obedience of faith; and this according to a commandment. But whose gracious voice do we hear speaking peace to him that is far off, and to him that is near at hand? At whose high behest is it, that the messengers of the mystery of grace go forth to every land? Hear the voice of him who spake as never man spake, Mat. xxviii, 19. *Go ye, said the ascending Saviour, teach all nations, baptizing them—preach the gospel to every creature*. Jesus gave this command, before this, Jerusalem was the place where men ought to worship, the wall of partition still stood between Jew and Gentile, the Redeemer levelled this wall, and issued forth the mandate of grace, *Go and teach all nations*. But Paul, one of those whom he first sent to the benighted nations, declares, in the language recited above, that this is the commandment of the EVERLASTING GOD. The ancient prophets indeed, under the inspiration of the spirit of Christ, intimated that such an order should be given: but given it was not till Jesus, whom Paul denominates the *everlasting God*, issued the command. That eternity in its highest import belongs to Christ, the Son of God, is a truth, obvi-

ous as if written by a beam of light. Let us next consider him as unchangeable.

SECTION III.

IMMUTABILITY.

Among the numerous objects presented to our senses, we find none immutable. The seasons, as they roll around the year, are in perpetual change, and with them varies the face of nature. Mutability stamps the character of man. His relations, affections, resolves, are stable in nothing but in change. To converse with immutability we must rise above this world. To this dignified exercise we are invited; the *Father of lights, with whom is no variableness nor shadow of turning*,* solicits our attention. He claims this high attribute as his own; *I am Jehovah, I change not*.† Whatever semblance of immutability may be found among the highest orders of created being, is only a faint image of the original, as it belongs to the Deity. This essential perfection of the eternal GODHEAD, belongs to Jesus the Son of God. *Jesus Christ the same yesterday, and to day, and for ever*.‡ The context proves that it is the person of Jesus, who is the subject of this immutability; the apostle exhorts them to stedfastness in faith and obedience; he enforces this by the example of their pious teachers, now called to enjoy the crown of righteousness, whom they are called to remember, and the end of whose conversation; their peace, their confidence, and joy at their departure from earthly scenes, they are called upon to consider; to this he encourages them, by the immutability of the Saviour; teachers might die, but Jesus is the same, his word therefore is ever precious; and to those who keep the faith, in time to come, he will grant the same joys and glory, as to those who saved him in times past; for he is the SAME for ever. The vision is doubted, because it is true; *Thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail*.§ Take the foregoing verses in connexion with this. The Son is addressed ver. 8. *Thy throne is for ever and ever*. It is a quotation from

* Jam. i. 17.—† Mal. iii. 6.—‡ Heb. xiii. 8.—§ Heb. i. 12.

the 45th psalm; when we hear a description of the Son of God, the king of Israel; but it is not the only testimony to his Deity; he is spoken of in the 102 psalm, as the *Creator of the Universe—Thou hast laid the foundations of the earth, &c.* The prophet and the apostle are both led to contemplate the magnificence of creation, and the grandeur of Divine perfection, as manifested thereby. But yet they were certified that the point in duration was rapidly hastening on, when the vast creation, as under its present order, would be covered with the curtains of a moonless night—*They shall all wax old, they shall perish, and as a vesture shall they be folded up, and they shall be changed; but THOU ART THE SAME, and thy years shall not fail*.* But who is He that amidst this awful revolution, this tremendous ruin of nature, shall continue the same? It is He who laid the foundations of the earth, and whose hands formed the heavens. But who is he? He is the Son of God—*Unto the Son he saith thy throne, O God, is for ever—And thou Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth, &c.* Unless this quotation from the 102 psalm, as well as the former, from the 45th, be applied to the same person, the introduction of it is impertinent, and too much in the style of the author of the N. J. Dictionary. To suppose, the disciple of Gamaliel, not to say the apostle of Christ, capable of such incoherence, in the discussion of an all-important point of faith would indeed be unreasonable. The manner in which he connects this testimony with the former, by the confirmation, *and*, makes it evident that the same person is spoken of. The tenor of the apostle's argument can leave no doubt. He is proving from Old Testament scripture that Jesus is superior to the most favoured saints, and highest order of creatures. He is higher than angels—He is the only begotten Son of God—He is God, not by virtue of office, power, or any thing adventitious, but in virtue of eternal, immutable excellency, as appears from the inspired testimony respecting him, as the creator of all things, and as unchangeable. Such is an outline of the apostolic argument; it is natural and consistent. It proves that Jesus is spoken of in the scriptures, quoted

* Ver. 8. 10, 11.

from Psalms, 45 and 102, and of course that he is the creator, is God, and consequently unchangeable.

SECTION IV.

OMNIPOTENCE, OMNIPRESENCE AND OMNISCIENCE,
BELONG TO CHRIST.

Omnipotency is the prerogative of the true God. *I am*, said he to Abraham, *the Almighty God*.^{*} Compare this with Isa. ix. 6. There Christ is called the ALMIGHTY God; and in Rev. i. 8. He claims the name ALMIGHTY. *I am Alpha, and Omega, the beginning and the ending, saith the Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the ALMIGHTY*. This testimony unites the attributes of eternity and omnipotence, and ascribes them to Jesus Christ. Let us again proceed to consider him, as omniscient and omnipresent.

To be every where present, and intimately acquainted with all things, belong to God alone. *I Jehovah search the heart, I try the reins. Thou, even thou only, knowest the hearts of all the children of men.*[†] His omniscience and omnipresence are both asserted by the prophets; *Can any hide himself in secret places that I shall not see him? saith Jehovah. Do not I fill heaven and earth?* These attributes are, in the most unqualified mode, ascribed to Jesus Christ. While he dwelt with men in a tent of clay, he had no need that any should testify of man: *for he knew what was in man.*[‡] From his throne on high we hear him declare; *All the churches shall know that I am he which searcheth the reins and hearts. And I will give unto every one of you according to your works.*[§] Have we not seen these ascriptions of perfection exclusively claimed by Jehovah? They are the legitimate prerogatives of him who walketh in the midst of the golden candlesticks, who holdeth the stars in his right hand, who is the first and the last, and who was dead and is alive. It is Jesus the Son of God who says, *I am he which searcheth the reins and hearts: I will give to every one of you according to your works*. But it is Jehovah alone according to the confession of the roy-

^{*} Gen. xvii. 1.—[†] Jer. xvii. 10.—[‡] 1 Kings viii. 39.—[§] Job. ii. 25.—^{||} Rom. ii. 23.

al prophet, and that of the weeping Jeremiah, who searches the heart and tries the reins, *to give every man according to his ways*. That Jesus possesses the perfections of Jehovah is then evident. The perfection of omniscience was ascribed to him by his disciples. *Now are we sure that thou knowest ALL THINGS.*—Lord thou knowest ALL THINGS; *thou knowest that I love thee.*^{*} These testimonies, the more attentively they are examined, will the more evidently appear to be altogether different, from what is sometimes found to have been revealed to the prophets, or what is ascribed to any in way of compliment. *I am he who searcheth the heart*, is a style too lofty for any whose knowledge is derived. This is confirmed by his being our advocate and intercessor—*We have an advocate with the Father—He ever liveth to make intercession for us.*[†] To accomplish this important trust, he must be intimately acquainted with all the numerous and diversified circumstances of his people. Who can know these but God alone? From the evidence now before us it appears, that an acquaintance with the hearts of the Sons of men, is an exclusive prerogative of the true God; that this prerogative belongs to our Redeemer, he declares that all his churches shall know; those assemblies then which do not know, or confess this truth, are, by the sentence of him, whose eyes are like a flame of fire, excluded from the number of the churches amidst which he graciously walks. That he is omniscient appears again, from his omnipresence—This we have seen is an incommunicable attribute of God. Indeed no finite being can be, at the same time, in more places than one. Our Redeemer is every where present. *No man hath ascended into heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man who is in heaven.*[‡] As if he had said, to be acquainted with celestial things in their extent, connexion and glory, it is requisite to be in heaven; to obtain this information for the church, none has ascended thither; the Son of man, however, came down from thence to reveal the things of the Kingdom of God, and though now, as to his humility, he is present before you, yet as to his Deity he is even now in heaven. Thus the lan-

^{*} John xvi. 30 and xxi. 17.—[†] 1 Job. ii. 1.—Heb. vii. 25.—[‡] Joh. iii. 13.

guage of our Lord is plain, and consistent with the tenor of scripture ; forced from this connexion, it is involved, obscure and contradictory.

Ascended in our nature the heavens shall retain him, as robed in humanity, till the consummation of all things. Yet he is ever present with his people, in their twos and threes, as well as in their crowded assemblies. *Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them.** To weaken the force of this, it is said by some, that his presence means his authority, in virtue of which they meet. This gloss, however, confutes itself ; according to it, the language of our Lord is to this amount : Where two or three are gathered together, according to my authority, appointing such meetings, there is my authority in the midst of them ! Did he who spake as never man did, really speak thus ? No, no. Amidst enemies and infirmities the disciples of the Redeemer need the everlasting arms of omnipotence to support and defend them, in their progress through life. This support, this protection is promised them ; *Lo I am with you always, even unto the end of the world.†* The personal presence of Jesus with his disciples, is farther evident, from the very solemn and expressive language of Paul : *I give the charge in the sight of God, who quickeneth all things, and before Christ Jesus—I charge thee before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ. Preach the word,‡ &c.* That Jesus is a witness of their transactions, as well as God the Father, is fully imported by the apostolic language, not by report, nor by a visit to every particular church in his humanity ; but by that power whereby he knoweth all things, and in consequence of that perfection whereby he is present in all the assemblies of his people, however, numerous, and however scattered, through every region of the globe. That Supreme dominion which he exercises over heaven, earth and hell pre-supposes the attributes of omnipotence, omniscience, and omnipresence, to be his. *His kingdom ruleth over all.* Is it reasonable to suppose that the God of glory would commit, the whole management of the universe, to a mere creature ? A man of limited faculties ? The weight of such govern-

ment is too onerous for the shoulders of created existence. Let us now turn to a few of those scriptures, which speak of the equality of the Son with the Father.

SECTION V.

JESUS IS EQUAL WITH THE FATHER.

In the whole of this investigation, the reader will keep in remembrance, that our faith must rest upon the testimony of God, and not upon the ingenious cavils of men. What then says the scripture upon the subject of this section ? Omitting to adduce numerous testimonies, establishing our position, I present the following : John x. 30. *I and my Father are one.* That Father, who in the preceding verse is declared to be greater than all, than all the highest powers of creation, is one with Jesus, not in person, but in essence, power and glory, as he is Divine. The declaration of their unity, made by Christ, as well as the gift of eternal life, which he bestows, and the safety which he affords to his people, against the attacks of every hostile power, excludes him from the all, than which the Father is greater. And though in another place he asserts, that the Father is greater than he, the attentive reader of the scripture, will readily perceive that he speaks of himself, not in his necessary, but assumed character. That the Jews understood him to assert his equality with God, appears from their words and wrathful acts, as recorded in the subsequent verses. *Thou makest thyself God,* was their accusation. Does he contradict their conclusion ? He does not. He asserts his equality with the Father, in other terms, ver. 37, 38. which further provokes the enemies of his person and mission—*Therefore they sought again to take him.*

This doctrine is yet made more evident, if possible, from Joh. v. 18—*The Jews sought the more to kill him, because he said, that God was his Father, making himself EQUAL with God.* Does Jesus, or his pious biographer, John, contradict or explain away this inference ? By no means ; for while he admits, implicitly, his mediatory character, he also asserts his Divinity. The works which the Father doeth, the same doeth the Son.

* Mat. xviii. 20.—† Mat. xxviii. 20.—‡ 1 Tim. vi. 13—2 Tim. iv. 1.

The Divine nature, which mysteriously belongs to both, is the omnipotent principle of operation. *The Father raiseth up the dead, and quickeneth them; even so the Son quickeneth, whom he will.* And, upon this footing, he claims the same worship that is given to the Father.* I appeal to the candor, of even the uncandid, to say, whether this language became a mere man, who was sent plainly to teach the truth. Should hardened disingenuity venture to assert the affirmative, in saying yes, a blush must suffuse its flinty visage.

He justly claimed a oneness with the Father; *For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily.*† Jesus is not, like believers, said to be *filled with all the fulness of God*; this latter expression of fulness is infinitely inferior to the former. The one means the gifts of God; but Godhead, means not the gifts of God, but the divine nature itself. In Christ then dwells *the Godhead, the fulness of the Godhead, all the fulness of the Godhead.* But what is all the fulness of the Godhead? Who can tell? What is his name, and what is his Son's name, if thou canst tell? It imparts all the boundless excellency of deity. It does not *tabernacle* in him, but *dwells* in him; it has not a symbolical residence, but a real habitation; *it dwells in him.* Through his humanity, and the acts of his mediation, beams of divine perfection shine forth; but in the glorious person of Immanuel, the fulness of deity, as in a dwelling place, permanently resides. The question now to be answered is; can all this glorious fulness dwell in any creature? He who can believe that, all the fulness of Divine perfections and glory, can *substantially* dwell in a limited being, one would think, could not be stumbled at giving credit to, even his own imaginary absurdities, of these eternal and necessary modes of subsistence in Deity.

The Deity of the Redeemer is asserted in the remarkable language of the same Apostle, recorded in Phil. ii. 5, 6, 7, 8. *Let this mind be in you which was 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 &c: That Jesus had a*

* Joh. v. 21, 23.—† Col. ii. 9.

glory of which, in some respect, for a time he was divested, is evidently declared; that this obscuration arose from his assumption of a servant's form, and being made in the likeness of man, appears from the connexion of the words, as well as from the general voice of scripture. Previously to this he existed in the form of God, so as to think it no robbery to be equal with God. The expression, *form of God*, indicates nothing really inferior to Deity; that this is so, appears from the expressions, *form of a servant, likeness of man, fashion as a man*; was not Jesus really a man? Was he not really a servant? Are we not taught so by the phraseology, *form of a servant*, as here applied to him? Will not the expression, that he *existed*, and as is imported, that he *previously existed* in the *form of God*, as decidedly prove that he is really God, as the other will that he was really a servant, and a man? If any thing were wanted to make more plain, plain even to the shaming of infidelity itself, we have it in the decisive language of inspiration—*He thought it not robbery to be EQUAL with God.* For any creature, however, to claim equality with God, would be the highest grade of impious madness, and an attempt at no common description of robbery. Jesus thought it none; the Father himself recognized his claim, even in the view of his suffering—*Awake, O sword, against the man that is my FELLOW*; and when preparing him for those sufferings, by introducing him into our world in a servant's form, he gave testimony to his Deity in that command, which the seraphim and cherubim of glory are bound to regard, and which they with alacrity obey: *Worship him all ye Gods*; or as we have it in the New Testament form: *Let all the angels of God worship him.*

The character of an agent is known from his acts. Upon them he usually stamps a character, by which he may no less distinctly be recognized, than by names or attributes. Let us then turn and contemplate some of the Saviour's works.

THE WORKS OF CHRIST.

Creation, the first communication of dependent existence, is the distinguishing work of Deity. By it is made known the existence of the eternal power and Godhead.* This work is very expressly ascribed to Jesus the Son of God. As this fact is refuted by our modern christians, and opposed not by argument, nor scripture testimony; but by confident assertion, and low evasions, I shall present you with the evidence of the oracles of truth—*In the beginning was the word, and the word was God. All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made.*†

This testimony is remarkable. THE WORD, is an appellation of the Son of God, chiefly employed by this apostle—*His name is called the word of God.*‡ When the Three Divine witnesses, in heaven, are spoken of, the Son is denominated the *Word*; *There are Three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost.*—Of this WORD it is affirmed that he is God, and to mark his distinct personality, he is said to have been *with* God; and that no doubt may remain, as to the truth of his Supreme Deity, he is pronounced to be the creator of all things; the idea is repeated in still more emphatic language; *Without him was not one thing made, that was made.* That the whole creation is here intended, we are compelled to believe, if language be capable of teaching us that truth. So evident is this, that most, if not all, unitarians, are reluctantly compelled to grant it. But say they, the LOGOS is only a property of Deity, his wisdom or power. Let us only read the first 14 verses of this chapter, in connexion, and the absurdity of this hypothesis will be obvious. Who can conceive that John, under the plenary inspiration of the Holy Spirit, would begin to tell us that God's wisdom was God, and that this attribute was with God; that John Baptist came to bear witness of the light that was in this wisdom, but in the mean time to beware of supposing that John was this attribute of

* Rom. i. 20.—† Joh. i. 1. 3.—‡ Rev. xix. 13.

God—That this attribute came to his own, the Jews, but they received him not; that this attribute, the wisdom of God, was the only begotten Son of God, and was made flesh, &c. Who, I ask, can believe that such nonsense can be the language of reason or common sense, not to speak of inspiration at all? The fact is, the Son of God, the Saviour of men, was known under the name of the LOGOS. The Gnostics held that the world was not the creation of the Supreme God, but the work of an inferior and evil agent.* In opposition to them, John asserts that the creation is the work of the Supreme God, and that the LOGOS is God, a distinct subsistence in the Godhead, and the creator of all things; that John came to bear witness of him, who is declared to be the light of the world; that, as the morning star announces the approach of the rising sun, so the Baptist, as the harbinger of the Sun of righteousness, proclaimed the advance of the gospel day. That he might come to his own, to that people who were visibly in covenant with him before, and whom he, in their ancestors, had conducted through the wilderness, and had settled in the promised land, that he might come to them according to ancient promises, he assumed our nature, *he was made flesh.* The facts asserted are in themselves mysterious, passing the comprehension of finite man, but that the facts are asserted is very plain, viz: that Jesus is the word; that he is God; that all things were made by him; and that in human nature he, for a time, tabernacled with men. If any thing more were necessary to make this evident, we have it in the pitiful absurdities of those who deny it, whether they rank among the philosophic disciples of Dr. Priestly, or appear in the humble train of the illiterate Elias Smith.

In language no less emphatic, does Paul ascribe to him the creation of *all things.* *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 by him all things consist.* *He made the worlds.* He upholdeth all things by the word of his

* See Note, No. VII, at the end of the work.

† See Note, No. VIII, at the end of the work.

power.* These passages are of similar import; the first communication of dependent being, and the continuation of that being, by the exercise of the same creative energy, are ascribed to him, and that with a precision, which can admit of no mistake, in him who reads, unless previously determined to cavil. To tell us, that all intended by this magnificent ascription, is only the introduction of a new dispensation, in which some principles of natural religion will, more clearly, be unfolded than they had been by the sages of Greece or Rome, is so evidently to belie the decisive declarations of inspiration, that charity cannot compel us to suppose any attentive reader of the sacred record, cordially receiving the darkening gloss. But suppose that, it is no more than an economical establishment that is intended, still we are pressed with an evidence of the Redeemer's pre-existence; for it is asserted that he created the *worlds*. He is, as appears from this, the author of more dispensations than one, he must, then, have existed before the one then present. This admission would, however, be fatal to all who admit him to be no more than Mary's Son.

From these sickening perversions of perverted minds, let us return, and make a remark on the bearing of this evidence upon our point. It is said, *All things were created by him, and for him*. He is the *efficient* and the *final* cause of all things. A glory belonging to no mere creature; for *the Lord hath made all things for himself*. Jehovah does indeed employ, in the execution of his plans, subordinate agents; but in the glory belonging to him, as the final cause, he admits no companion; yet of Jesus it is said, not only *by him*, but *for him*, were all things made. That the Son is a person in Jehovah appears then, from his creating and preserving work, and from his being the final cause of these works.

Passing over the evidence of his Deity, arising from the whole, and every part of the work of redemption, let us fix our attention upon those last scenes, in which he will be the great agent, at the winding up of the economy of time; the resurrection of the dead, and the final

* Col. i. 16, 17.—Heb. i. 2, 3.

judgment. The acts of those awful days, will be the acts of God. To him it belongs, by his power, to raise the slumbering nations of the dead, and on the last tribunal none is capable to preside but God; *God is judge himself*.* It is, however, an arrangement of the eternal counsels, that the Son shall raise the dead, and judge the world. *The Lord Jesus Christ shall judge the quick and the dead—We must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ.*† He also shall raise the dead. These acts, these decisions, are such as belong to Deity alone. Can we suppose that the fate of unnumbered myriads of intellectual beings, could be, by the Father of mercies, committed to the decision of a creature? Upon the acts of that last tribunal, are suspended the destinies of the whole empire of God. None less than God shall fix those destinies. The fact, that the judgment of the last day, and the execution of that judgment, are, in the arrangements of Jehovah, placed in the hand of the Son of God, proves that Son to be more than human—declares him to be God. Would it be sober to say, that God has given to a creature omniscience and Almighty power? Hence, then, from the habitations, and minds of professed christians, all the blasphemous contradictions of the opposers of the Saviour's deity. He who raises the dead, judges the world, and pours forth his wrath, upon the damned, is God, the object of the christian's love, worship and pious fear, this is Jesus Christ; *For as the Father raiseth up the dead, and quickeneth them; even so the Son quickeneth whom he will. For the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son: that all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father.*‡

SECTION VII.

JESUS IS AN OBJECT OF RELIGIOUS WORSHIP.

That man exalted to places of power, and employing that power with which they are intrusted, for the promotion of the interests of society, should receive that respect which is due to their authority, their talents, and

* Ps. 1.—† 2 Tim. iv. 1—2 Cor. v. 10.—‡ John v. 20, 22.

influence, is readily conceded. Such honours God himself awards them, and good men are happy in rendering to them their testimonies of respect. But these are essentially different from that subjection of soul, that holy invocation and confidence, implied in the religious worship, rendered by the highest order of creatures to the Supreme Being; and whether required by God, or given by his saints, is sufficiently marked, to be known from every species of homage, lawfully rendered to beings of inferior grade. The sanction of the Redeemer is stamped upon that law—*Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.** Against the crime of idolatry, and all its degrading results, the whole tenor of scripture decidedly operates. Let us hear, however, what is due by divine requisition to the Son: It is demanded, *That all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father.†* *This is his commandment; That we should believe on the name of his Son Jesus Christ.‡* Accordingly we find the saints characterized, by calling upon his name.§ And we are assured, *Whosoever believeth on him shall not be ashamed.* Rom. 10. 11. He and the Father are presented as equally objects of faith: *Ye believe in God, believe also in me.¶* But *Cursed is the man that trusteth in man.^a* Jesus received religious worship while upon earth,^b and in heaven the Angels are not inattentive to the divine command—*Let all the Angels of God worship him.* In number ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands, we hear the inhabitants of heaven sing: *Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour, and glory.* Yes, the universal voice of holy intelligences unite in saying, *Blessing and honour, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, AND UNTO THE LAMB, for ever and ever.^c* Upon this subject, the Unitarian seems peculiarly pressed, and is compelled, conscious of his defeat, while retreating, to hide his disgrace under the covert of the language of triumph. But how evanescent is that covering! Touch the shadowy cloud of verbiage, by which he attempts to conceal the truth, and

* Mat. iv.—† Joh. v. 23.—‡ 1 Joh. iii. 23.—§ Act. ix. 14.—¶ Joh. xiv. 1.
a Jer. xvii.—b Joh. ix. 38.—c Heb. i. 6.—Rev. v. 11, 13.

it evanishes into something lighter than air. The whole weight of his argument, and spurious criticism, amounts to this—The word rendered *worship*, frequently means, the respect that is given to men in eminent stations; therefore the command given to all, to HONOUR THE SON, *even as they honour the Father*, does not mean religious worship!!!

Such is the logic, not only of the lower grades of the oponents of truth; but also of those who, under a specious show of extensive acquisitions in literature, affect to exclude from the ranks of liberal minded men, all who question the authority of their positions. The man who duly respects the authority of God, as expressed in his word, will little regard either the assumed haughtiness of the sciolist, or the ribaldry of the unlettered leader of a sect.

Successfully might we argue our cause, from the relation in which Jesus stands to the church of God; from his being the Redeemer of the saved; from his supremacy above all whom God has ever employed to reveal his will to men, and from the consideration that, though condemned for blasphemy in *making himself equal with God*, yet was he perfectly innocent. Resting the decision which the attentive reader will form, upon the evidence adduced, I shall now proceed to offer a few thoughts, on the union of Deity and humanity, in the person of Christ.

SECTION VIII.

JESUS, THE SON OF GOD, IS DIVINE AND HUMAN.

This is purely a matter of revelation. No page of creation's mighty volume, intimates to us by a single hint, the mysterious subject of this section. And if we, on this subject, would act the part of the faithful in Christ Jesus, we must ascend above that evidence, which the constitution of mortal things affords, and fix the intellectual eye upon the immutable truth of him who cannot deceive. His word we have in the sacred pages of the inspired writings; let us attend to the instruction it communicates.

In turning over those pages that directly speak of Christ, we find the following declarations concerning him; *God sent his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh. God sent forth his Son made of a woman, made under the law—who being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God:—And was made in the likeness of man—Unto us a child is born, and his name shall be called the mighty God.** To an inquiring mind, when the attention is turned, without previous instruction upon the subject, to these scriptures, I apprehend no small difficulty would occur, in reconciling some, if not all, of these declarations, as belonging to the same subject. Indeed it would be impossible to do it. When we read that, *God sent forth his Son, made of a woman*, is it not at once suggested that, as his Son, he existed, previously to his being made of a woman? This idea is still more strengthened when we are informed that, *Being in the form of God, and thinking it not robbery to be equal with God, he was made in the likeness of man.* If language ever conveyed to the mind of man a correct idea, this now recited proves, that Jesus is both God and man; that he existed previously in the form of God, and he was subsequently made in the likeness of man. His name is called the mighty God. He is properly so named. He is then the MIGHTY GOD. But he is also A CHILD BORN. This is yet more decisively taught in the following testimony—*Of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever.†* Let the unperverted mind of an honest reader be the expositor of this, and he will say, this scripture asserts that Jesus has a human nature, here denominated, as in many other places, *flesh*; this he has derived from the Israelites; but he is also God, *who is over all, God blessed for ever.‡*

Let the piously inquisitive reader proceed, and concerning his Redeemer, he will find such things affirmed of Christ, as cannot really belong precisely to the same subject. He will find omniscience ascribed to him;§ he will also find him increasing in wisdom, and declaring that he knows not when the last day shall be.¶ *What*

* Rom. viii. 3.—Gal. iv. 4.—Phil. ii. 6, 7.—† Rom. ix. 5.—‡ Vide page 28, 29.—§ Mar. xiii. 32.—¶ See Note No. IX, at the end of the work.

*things soever the Father doeth, these also doeth the Son.** Yet we find in him a will distinct from that of the Father. *Not my will but thine be done.* As in the Father, we find his understanding infinite, yet in him there is also an understanding that is limited; his will and that of the Father coincide in operation and essence, yet he has a different and subordinate will. These things cannot be predicated of the same subject. We must believe that in him, who is our mediator, there are natures to which these things will agree.

This view of the subject is still farther evident, from a consideration of various opposing circumstances, uniting in him who is the author of our salvation. Hear his affectionate language to his disciples: *It is expedient for you that I go away. I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world; again I leave the world, and go to the Father.†* He at the same time gives them assurance that he is not absent from them; *Lo I am with you always, even unto the end of the world.‡* *Where two or three are gathered together, in my name, there am I in the midst of them.* He is represented to us as a *child born*, and at the same time the *everlasting Father.*§ *He was crucified through weakness, liveth by the power of God; yet he is himself the mighty God.* 2 Cor. xiii. 4—Is. ix. 6. If Jesus be not Divine and human, tell me ye who deny it, how you will reconcile all these declarations. You say, he is only a man, yet he came *forth from the Father*, and went *again to him*. He leaves the world, yet is ever in it to protect his disciples—*His goings forth have been from of old, even from everlasting, he is the everlasting Father*, yet he was also a *child born*, an infant of days. He discovered the feebleness of humanity; he trembled, he bled and died, and, for his resurrection life, he is dependent upon the power of God; yet he is the mighty and the everlasting God. Let the infidel sneer, and in his madness, despise the faith of the saint; the christian beholds in these a glorious, though mysterious, description of him who is the author of his salvation. His hope shall not be shaken.

* John v. 19.—† John xvi. 7, 28.—‡ Mat. xxviii. 20—chap. xviii. 20.—§ Isaiah. ix. 6.

The union of deity and humanity is still more expressly declared—*The word was made flesh, and dwelt amongst us, and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father.** That Word which is, in the beginning of the chapter, called God, and by whose agency all things were created, is here, unequivocally, declared to be the Son of God, *the only begotten of the Father*, and also to have been *made flesh*. The apostle Paul is no less decisive.—*Great is the mystery of Godliness; God was manifest in the flesh.†* And again—*For as much then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same. For verily he took not on him the nature of angels; but he took on him the seed of Abraham.‡* Language cannot more explicitly declare that, he, who is the captain of our salvation, had an existence before he appeared in fashion as a man.—The children were partakers of humanity—He also, for that reason, *took part of the same*. He was active in this assumption, and must have had an existence. It was promised as the woman's seed,§ and as EMMANUEL,|| he was expected by the church of God. It was requisite for him to be Divine, that he might be able to deliver, and be a proper object of confidence—*Blessed is the man that trusteth in the Lord*. It was also indispensable that he should be man; for it was requisite that he should be made *perfect through suffering*. His humanity qualified him to die, his deity made him strong to deliver his chosen.

* Joh. i. 14.—† 1 Tim. iii. 16.—‡ Heb. ii. 14. 16.—§ Gen. iii. 15.
|| Mat. i. 22, 23.

CHAPTER III.

THE PERSONALITY AND DEITY OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

SECTION I.

THE SPIRIT'S PERSONALITY.

It is not intended, after what has already been said, to detain the reader long with the evidence of the truth, upon the subject of this chapter. Those, against whose heresy we would guard you, with no small confidence assert that what the scriptures mean by the spirit of God, the Holy Spirit, and the other appellations of this agent, is no more than a divine influence, energy, or operation. We believe that the spirit of God is a distinct personal Agent; this we are confident is the doctrine of the scriptures of truth; and that your faith may not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the truth of God, to his testimony we direct you. When in serious, plain, didactic, language, we find applied to a being, personal pronouns, we are authorized to conclude that being a person. Do we find such an application in the case under consideration? To be satisfied of this, read the following declarations: *The Holy Ghost whom the Father shall send in my name, HE shall teach you all things—HE shall testify of me—HE shall glorify me.** Our Lord's departure, in human nature, from earth was near. He is plainly and affectionately administering comfort to his disciples. He promises them the presence and aid of the Holy Spirit, whom he speaks of as a person.

Of him he speaks as accomplishing that, which, in propriety of language, can be done only by a person; he *teaches*, he *guides*, he *intercedes* and he *comforts*; these are offices which a person alone can execute: *The Spirit maketh intercession for us. I will pray the Father and he shall give you another comforter—even the Spirit of truth.†*

The rank which he holds amongst those confessedly persons, is something more than presumptive evidence

* John, xiv. 26.—chap. xv. 26.—chap. xvi. 14.—† Rom. viii. 26, 27.
—John, xiv. 16, 17.—Heb. i.

of his personality. The Father is a person, and the personality of the Son is denied by none. Why then is the Spirit so often spoken of in conjunction with them? Would it not seem remarkably incongruous, when speaking of two persons, to rank with them a mere energy as a third? In addressing two persons in a solemn act of worship, how inconsistent, to place with them a mere operation, as an object of that homage! Yet this inconsistency, this outrage against propriety, must be the result of denying the personality of the divine spirit: for he is ranked with the Father and the eternal Word—*There are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, and the Word, and the Holy Ghost.* Are the two former persons? Is not the third spoken of as such? Baptism is administered in the name of *Father, Son and Holy Ghost*; who can believe that a mere energy is intended by the last? To baptize in the name of an energy or operation, can be intelligible only to those, who, despising the humble track of common men, have unshackled themselves from all legitimate rules of interpretation, and on the pinions of absurdity, soared beyond the regions of common sense.

Personal powers belong to this agent—*The Spirit searcheth all things, yea the deep things of God.** The Spirit of God knoweth the things of God. To search, so as to understand, proves a personal agency, and personal powers of agency. Sovereign volition is likewise his. The Apostle enumerates various gifts of God to christians, *wisdom, knowledge, faith*, together with miraculous powers; the *gift of healing, of prophecy, &c.* But, adds he, *all these worketh that one and the self-same Spirit, dividing to every man severally as HE WILL.†* *As he will*; this expression proves that he has a will, which is a personal power, and that, in its exercise, he is sovereign. By this the truth of his personality and Deity, are both established; for it is *the same God that worketh all in all.*

To him are also ascribed those affections which indicate a person. The love of God to man is celebrated in the oracles of truth, and is one of the most powerful motives to evangelical obedience. While the love of God

* 1 Cor. ii. 10.—† 1 Cor. xii. 4—11.

and the love of Christ are presented to constrain the soul, *The love of the Spirit** is also adduced, as a motive to prayer. Vexation and grief are affections of which a person is alone susceptible. These are ascribed to the divine spirit: Ancient Israel *rebelled and vexed his Holy Spirit.†* We are commanded not to grieve him; *Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God.‡* We need not to be told, that God cannot be the subject of such affections as men; we know this; but some important idea is conveyed to us by these expressions, and whatever it is, it implies personality in him who is spoken of. This is the point now before us, and not what is the precise idea of grief, vexation and love, when applied to the Divine Being.

Were any more evidence required, we have it in those personal acts, commands and prohibitions of the Holy Ghost. Take as a sample the following: He gives life to the soul; *It is the Spirit that quickeneth.§* He places pastors over the churches; *Take heed to all the flock over which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers.¶* He sends forth the messengers of reconciliation, having previously called them according to the order of the church; *The Holy Ghost said, separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them—So they being sent forth by the Holy Ghost departed.‡* He presides in the judgments of the courts of God's house, and decides what is fit; *It seemed good to the holy Ghost—to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things.‡* In their movements he employs a supremacy, and directs their progress; *They were forbidden of the holy Ghost to preach the word in Asia. They assayed to go into Bithynia; but the Spirit suffered them not.‡* What mind, not pertinaciously determined upon absurdity, can suppose that, in a plain narrative of personal transactions, a mere influence would be thus personified?

I add only one consideration more. To be sinned against, is peculiar to a person, and to a person having claims upon the transgressor. Among the unnumbered forms in which sin appears, there is one which is pronounced unpardonable. This is a sin peculiarly against

* Rom. xv. 30.—† Isa. lxiii. 10.—‡ Eph. iv. 30.—§ John vi. 63.—

¶ Acts, xx. 28.—‡ Acts, xiii. 2, 4.—b Acts, xv. 28.—c Acts, xvi. 6, 7.

the Holy Spirit; *Whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him.** To sin against an influence or operation, in the style of common sense, is not easily understood.

To prevent objections, it may just be remarked, that such language as is employed in reference to the spirit of God, can by no means be referred to the personifications, found in figurative language, of qualities or inanimate things. Let an example be given, in which a mere influence, under such circumstances as relate to the Divine Spirit, has been so uniformly personified. We find him ranged with other persons, spoken of as a person, acting as one, possessing powers belonging only to personality, and all this in plain and simple narrative, which admits not of the licensed interpretation of metaphorical style. The assumption, that the Holy Ghost is only an influence or operation, is for ever set aside by the distinction, which the scriptures make between him and his agency; *For to one is given by the Spirit the word of wisdom; to another the word of knowledge, by the same Spirit. That one and self-same Spirit worketh all of them.†* Never was an agent more obviously distinguished from his agency, than is the Spirit of God from his influence. I need not add, that the hypothesis of those who deny his personality, make him and his agency to be identically the same. Is it not remarkable that men, rather than confess the truth, will advocate nonsense, and attempt to make the oracles of God speak absurdity? Such is the conduct of man, when he sets aside the counsels of God.

SECTION II.

THE DEITY OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

The doctrine advocated in these pages will still be kept in view; that in the ONE JEHOVAH are *three distinct persons*. The personality of the third we have seen confirmed; that he is Divine, appears by the names which belong to him.

* Mat. xii. 32.—† 1 Cor. xii. 8, 11.

He is called God, not in any subordinate acceptation of that name, but in its highest sense; *Why hath Satan filled thine heart to lie unto the Holy Ghost. Thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God.** It ought to be remarked that this testimony teaches us, that the Holy Spirit is distinguished from men; he is stated to be the object against whom the sin is committed, and the aggravation of that sin, arises from its being committed, not against any creature, but against God. They had lied to the Holy Ghost, they had agreed together to tempt the Spirit of the Lord; this was more heinous than the same crime against man—it was lying unto God. But unless the Holy Spirit was God, how could lying to him be lying unto God? It is obvious that, in this place, the Holy Spirit is denominated God, in the highest sense of that term.

He is also known under the incommunicable name, *Jehovah. I heard the voice of the Lord, [JEHOVAH] saying, whom shall I send, and who will go for us? Then said I, here am I, send me. And he said, go, and tell this people, hear ye indeed, but understand not; and see ye indeed, but perceive not.†* It is JEHOVAH who says to the prophet, “Go;” but who is this Jehovah? A New Testament expositor, Paul, informs us; he declares it was the Holy Ghost who thus spake by Isaiah. *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.‡*

Here, it must be observed, the criticism that asserts, that the same name is applied to different subjects can have no place. It is not the name, but the subject, of which both the prophet and the apostle speak. That person who gave the command to Isaiah, is declared to be JEHOVAH, this Jehovah, the apostle declares to be the *Holy Ghost*. No conclusion can be more fair, than that the *Holy Spirit* is *Jehovah*; he is truly God. To establish the same truth, compare Numb. xii. 6, with 2 Pet. i. 21. Luke i. 68, 70. Numb. xiv. 11, with Isa. lxiii. 10. Psal. lxxviii. 56. To these scriptures, out of many, I only refer, in order that I may not exceed the limits I have prescribed to myself.

* Acts, v. 3, 4.—† Isa. vi. 8, 9.—‡ Acts, xxviii. 25.

We have still further a demonstration of the Spirit's Deity, in the attributes ascribed to him. He is *eternal*. We have before seen, that *eternity* is properly an attribute of Deity; *Christ through the ETERNAL SPIRIT, offered himself without spot to God.** Angels and the souls of men are immortal, but, in all the book of God, they are not said to be eternal. The eternity of the Holy Spirit is manifest, from his being the Spirit of God.

He is omniscient. He *searcheth all things, yea the deep things of God.†* This no creature can do; for *who can by searching find out God.‡* The inspiration of the prophets prove him omniscient. The page of prophecy contemplates the great movements of the church of God, and embraces the great events of the world, so far as connected, which is very extensively, with the church. An acquaintance with the sorrows of the children of grace, is indispensable to the Spirit, as the comforter; such an acquaintance none but God can have.

He is omnipresent; *Whither shall I go from thy Spirit?§* We have before been called to contemplate him as one of the celestial witnesses, in heaven, continually testifying to the truth and importance of salvation, by the Son of God; upon earth he dwells, in the saints, as in a temple; and with their Spirits bears witness, that they are the children of God. He never departs from them; but abides with them as a Spirit of life and of joy.

The Deity of the Spirit is evinced by the worship that is given him. Baptism is administered in his name.¶ Whatever of honour, in this solemn service of the church, is given to the Father, no less is given to the Spirit; for it is administered in the name of the one as well as of the other. The solemn benediction, *The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all||*, has already been considered. It proves him to be an appropriate object of worship. Again, hear the pious and intelligent prayer of the same apostles, *The Lord make you to increase and abound in love—To the end he may establish your hearts unblamable in holiness before God,*

* Heb. ix. 14.—† 1 Cor. ii. 10.—‡ Job, xi. 7.—§ Psal. cxxxix. 7.

¶ Mat. xxviii. 19.—|| 2 Cor. xiii. 14.

*even our Father, at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ.** God the Father is here spoken of as distinct from our Lord Jesus Christ; and another is addressed as Lord, and as the hearer and answerer of prayer, this is *the Lord the Spirit*. The same mode of address we have again; *The Lord direct your hearts into the love of God, and into the patient waiting for Christ.†* That the person named God, is the Father, will be admitted by all, the love of God is the highest exercise of the soul, and a patient or persevering waiting for Christ, an important duty. The direction of the heart into these exercises, belongs peculiarly to a third person, this third person, is that Lord who is known as the *Spirit of grace*; That he is the Spirit of grace, and director of the heart, and, as such, an object of prayer, proves him to be really God. The works of the Spirit establish the truth of his Godhead. *By his Spirit he garnished the heavens.‡* Elihu gives this testimony; *The Spirit of God hath made me.§* The true God is the author, and he alone, of created existence. He has given to nature all its beauty, order and power. If these things be properly ascribed to the Spirit, he is properly Divine. Consult at leisure, Gen. i. 2. Psal. xxxiii. 6. and civ. 30. Isa. xxxiv. 16. and xl. 6, 7. Compare also Act. xxvi. 8, with Rom. viii. 11.

I pass over the great abundance and variety of evidence, which arises from a view of his other works, probatory of the Deity of the Spirit; such as his agency about and over the church, his sanctifying and preserving the saints, his conferring gifts, which Deity alone can bestow, &c. I advert only to one consideration more. Jesus seems to be the Son of God, in a two-fold sense, as he is Divine, and as he is human; as respects his Divine personality he is necessarily the Son of the First of the illustrious Three. As respects his humanity, it appears he is also called the Son of God, in some such sense as Adam is so denominated; *The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee; therefore also that holy thing which shall be borne of thee, shall be called the Son of God.¶*

* 1 Thes. iii. 12. 18.—† 2 Thes. iii. 5.—‡ Job xxvi. 13.—§ Job xxviii. 4.

¶ Luke i. 35.

It is because of his formation, immediately by the Holy Spirit, that he, as respects his humanity, is called the Son of God ; but if the Holy Spirit be not God, what force is there in the reason for so denominating the humanity of our Lord ? None at all. With this, I close the evidence of the Deity of that Spirit, upon whose agency the saint relies for all the aid he needs, in the important services of life ; to him he looks for all the preparation requisite to qualify him, for an introduction to the realms of everlasting peace.

I just advert to an exception, that may be made against the Supreme Deity of the Spirit ; it arises from what is said of his being a gift, being sent, and the like, which import inferiority. This objection will not bear close examination. By a figure of speech, very common, in scripture, the gifts of the Spirit are sometimes called by his name, as in Prov. i. 23. Act. x. 44, 45, &c. The scriptures uniformly exhibit an economy, in which the Father, Son, and Spirit, accomplish respectively an appropriate part. The acts of each are subservient to the perfection of the grand design ; but this by no means indicates an inferiority of the one person to the other. The plan, according to which they should act, and the order of their operations, were fixed by mutual consent. Does this import personal inferiority ? Certainly not. If allowed to illustrate these mysterious relations, and transactions, by what takes place in the social transactions of life, we find men acting in subordinate relations, whose personal accomplishments are not inferior to those from whom, according to the station they occupy, their orders are received. In essence and perfection, we then conclude, the Spirit is the same with the Father and the Son. To conclude, I propose to the candid consideration of such as may scruple the correctness of the doctrine I have advocated, the following queries. Let the answers be such as will satisfy a conscience that respects the word of God.

Are we certainly able to comprehend all the modes of the Divine subsistence ?

Is it impossible for omnipotence to unite two natures in one person ?

Does not Scripture seem to countenance such an union, in the person of Jesus Christ ?

If Christ be *no more* than man, did he upon all occasions, and in the most conspicuous manner, teach this ?

Is there any rule, by which we may know a Divine person from a mere creature ? What is it ?

Is there any rule by which we may know a person, from a mere attribute, or influence ? What is that rule ?

CHAPTER IV.

ON THE IMMORTALITY OF THE HUMAN SOUL.

Whether the soul of man shall survive that shock, which reduces the body to an unanimated mass, or whether it shall, with the tangible part of our present constitution, sink into a state of insensibility, to all that is good or evil in the universe, is important to be ascertained. The influence, upon the mind, of the sanctions of the system of moral order, under which we are placed, will, in no small degree, depend on the conclusions in which we rest upon this subject. As the materiality of the soul is usually, if not always, an opinion, embraced by those who contend for its mortality, I shall offer a few thoughts upon that hypothesis.

SECTION I.

IS THE HUMAN MIND MATERIAL ?

I do not assert that the immateriality of mind is necessarily connected with its immortality ; but I may be allowed to assert, that the supposition of matter being so organized, as to exhibit all the phenomena of mind, is destitute of evidence to support it. It seems to be the opinion of those called materialists, that what is denominated mind, is the result of a certain modification of matter, and consequently, when this modification is destroyed, the mind is no more ; the soul becomes extinct.

Whether we consider the ancient or modern hypothesis of the materialist, it will be found an assumption unsupported by evidence. This will appear by pursuing the following thoughts.

In man, as he is constituted, we find that which is solid, extended visible, and of itself inactive ; to this we give the name of body or matter. We are conscious also of possessing a principle, to which qualities belong, that no investigation has discovered, in any portion of matter, however curiously modified. The man who employs his reason about the several parts of creation, subjected to his remark, assigns to the same class, those things which are found to agree in the same essential properties ; but where, amongst some objects, he can perceive no common quality, in which they agree, it is his uniform practice, to consider them as different things. We do not here inquire into the essence either of mind or of body—We know these only by their qualities ; and so far as we are instructed by experience, in the knowledge of matter, does it appear, that any thing can be more remote from it, than that which thinks, which wills, abstracts, imagines, feels remorse upon transgressing the law of God, and that derives satisfaction from the testimony of an approving conscience ? Who was it that has seen a piece of earth, so organized, as to be capable of any of these operations, not to speak of the numerous other powers implied in the intellectual, active and moral faculties of man ?

Inactivity has been properly reckoned a quality of matter. All our experience justifies this ; and also proves, that to us something belongs which is active. Leave the body merely to itself, and it will never move ; when the active principle of our constitution operates, motion is the effect. But is it reasonable to refer these opposite attributes to the same subject ? It would be as reasonable to say that light is a property of darkness.

Mere organization of body, to the rational inquirer, will not account for any of the distinguishing phenomena of the mind of man. So far as discovered, this organization is as perfect in the *Ouran-Outang*, as in the human subject ; a great naturalist* informs us that, “all

* Buffon.

the parts of this animal's head, limbs and body, external and internal, are so perfectly similar to the human, that we cannot compare them together, without being amazed at an organization so exactly the same. The tongue and all the organs of speech, are the same in both ; and yet the *Ouran-Outang* does not speak. The brain is absolutely the same in texture, disposition and proportion, and yet it does not think. An evident proof this, that mere matter alone, though perfectly organized, cannot produce thought, nor speech the index of thought, unless it be animated with a superior principle.” Has God formed this creature, and preserved it as a witness to confound the bold assumptions of visionary men ? Some respectable men have thought so.

The moral effects of this system are to be dreaded. It tends to remove from man all distinctions between right and wrong ; it gives him no higher place than an involuntary machine, operated upon by mechanical force. All the functions of man, says a late advocate* of materialism, “All his functions must be regulated by the laws of mechanism, and of consequence all his actions proceed from an irresistible necessity.” “Mechanism is the undoubted consequence of materialism.” Thus man is at once divested of all that renders him accountable. The moral sense is put down from its throne, and whatever other sentiments may be experienced, praise and blame can have no place. William Godwin has taught the true application of this material and mechanical doctrine ; he instructs us to consider the knife and the murderer who employs it, as respects criminality, in the same point of view. “A knife is as capable as a man of being employed—and the one is *no more free* than the other as to its employment.” Toward the murderer and his bloody deed, we are taught to entertain no other kind of emotion, than toward the infectious miasmata, or the air which conveys it to us ; there is, according to this doctrine, as much criminality in the one as in the other ! “Our disapprobation” says he, “of vice, will be of the same nature as our disapprobation of an infectious disease.”† Such is the result of this mechanical system. This perhaps explains the reason of the rude opposition

* Priestley.—† Polit. Just. B. 4. chap. 8.

to the terms, *moral law*, *moral conduct*, and the like, of which we have lately heard so much. Those who talk so, do not admit any morality or immorality to exist, all is *mechanism* with them. The absurdities, which reflecting men sometimes have adduced, to shew the unreasonableness of the materialist's hypothesis, have, by the daring advocates of that doctrine, Priestly and Darwin, been avowed. The former more than intimates, that both reasons and ideas are material; and the latter expressly attempts by argument and ridicule, to prove that our ideas are material; being nothing more than the "configuration of the fibres, which constitute the immediate organ of sense."* May we not say, that the man, who seriously believes the various, and most abstract exercises of mind, are all material things, had better be left to his dreams, until he shall be awakened to the exercise of common sense?

I shall close this section in the words of two great men; the first, a profound adept in moral science, speaking upon this subject says, "We are certainly entitled to say, that matter and mind, considered as objects of human study, are *essentially* different; the science of the former resting ultimately on the phenomena exhibited to our senses; that of the latter, on the phenomena of which we are conscious."—"The scheme of materialism proceeds on a misapprehension of the proper object of science; the difficulty which it professes to remove being manifestly placed beyond the reach of our faculties. Surely, when we attempt to explain the nature of that principle which feels and thinks, and wills, by saying, that it is *a material* substance, or that it is the result of material organization, we impose on ourselves by words, forgetting, that matter as well as mind, is known to us by its qualities and attributes alone, and that we are totally ignorant of the essence of either."† My next quotation is from a man of observation, whose testimony will not be weakened by the consideration, that he was more conversant in his inquiries, with the functions of the body than with the faculties of mind. "The NATURE of the mind," says he, "is different from that of the

* Vide Priestley's *Disquisitions*, and Darwin's *Zoonomia*.

† Vide Stewart's *Philosophy of the human mind*.

body, as is proved by an infinity of circumstances, especially by ideas and affections of the mind, to which nothing in sensation is analogous. For *what is the colour of pride?* or *what the magnitude of envy or curiosity?* To which there is nothing similar in animals; neither can that good, which is desired by it, glory, and the acquisition as it were of new ideas, be referred to any *corporeal pleasure*. Is it possible that the body can possess two kinds of forces, so that its infinite particles should unite into one mass, which do not preserve their own affections only, and represent them to themselves, but also join together into one common thinking whole, differing from the attributes of all, and yet capable both of receiving and comparing these attributes? Is there any instance of a body, which, without an external cause, passes from rest to motion, without the action of some other cause, as is very easily observed, with regard to the mind? Yet this mind, so different from the body, is connected with it by the most intimate ties," &c.* These are the sentiments of an eminent physiologist, and a profound metaphysician, whose judgments were not warped from truth, on this subject, by a previously formed system.

SECTION II.

THE SOUL IS IMMORTAL.

In man's primitive state, there was no principle of dissolution implanted in the constitution of his nature. We find, notwithstanding, in consequence of his subsequent moral conduct, that, according to an appointment of righteousness, all men must die. All the evidence we have, from testimony and experience, confirms to us the moral certainty of the death of the body. We have no such certainty, upon principles of reason, that the soul shall cease to be an active and intelligent agent. The prudent man, therefore will not assert, that the soul shall die with the body; it is another substance than matter, and is governed by different laws.

* Vide Haller's *Physiology*.

God bestows upon his creatures no gift in vain ; he has, however, made us capable of mental improvement without end. No sufficient reason can be assigned for this, if, after the lapse of a few years, we must cease for ever to be. Man is distinguished from the inferior orders of nature, by his moral capacities and powers ; he has a sense of obligation, to which the most sagacious of the other tribes on earth, are utter strangers. Corresponding to this sense of moral obligation, are the hopes and joys of the children of evangelical virtue, and the remorse, terror and forebodings of the votaries of vice. "That which thus struggles within the jaws of death, must be immortal," was the involuntary confession of one who lived an infidel ; and how often has the good man triumphed, in hope of immortal glory !

Notwithstanding the intimations which we have of immortality, from the constitution of mind, and the principles of the Divine government, we must rest our certainty of the truth of it upon the testimony of God, contained in his word. To this let us briefly advert. That the soul, when the body dies, does not cease to live, appears from a great variety of scripture evidence, manifesting itself in numerous forms.

The reasoning of our Lord upon the following declaration of Jehovah to Moses, proves the existence of the soul in a separate state ; *I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob.** Upon which our Redeemer reasons thus : *God is not the God of the dead, but of the living ;* yet he declared himself to be the God of Abraham, hundreds of years, after that patriarch had ceased to live among mortals ; he then lived with God, though he resided no more in this world, with men. His body died, but his soul survived. This was a silencing reply to the infidel Sadducees, who, like some in our own days, said, *there is neither angel nor Spirit.†* They denied the existence of the Spirit, when separated from the body ; our Lord, by a fair deduction from a divine declaration, in opposition to them, proves the separate existence of the spirit. And if the soul of Abraham, more than three hundred years after

* Exod. iii. 6. 16—Mat. xxii. 32.—† Act. xxiii. 28.—‡ Mat. x. 28;

the death of his body, lived, why may not the souls of all others survive the dissolution of the body ?*

The freedom of the soul from death is taught, by our Redeemer, in the following words ; *Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul.†* The persecutor and the murderer may kill the body, and if the soul be material, or the result of organized matter, they could kill it too ; but the fact here asserted, that when they kill the body they cannot kill the soul, proves, at least, that it dies not with the body.

Again, in the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, we are taught that the soul survives the death of the body. That this is a parable, does not weaken the evidence it contains in behalf of this truth. It was intended to convey instruction ; and, among other articles of importance, we are taught the separate existence of the soul, and that it immediately enters into its destined state. *And it came to pass that the beggar died, and was carried by the Angels into Abraham's bosom ; the rich man also died, and was buried ; And in hell he lifted up his eyes being in torments.‡* The bodies of both were as insensible as the earth, to which they were consigned ; but their souls survived the stroke that laid their bodies low, and, immediately, they are described to be in very different states.

To a similar conclusion we are conducted by the following testimony ; *I saw under the altar the souls of them that were slain for the word of God, and for the testimony which they held.§* By pagan persecution, many of the witnesses of the Saviour's cause were cut off by a violent death ; the body, those monsters of cruelty could kill ; but the soul escaped to glory. "Mr. Lowman observes very well, that this representation seems much to favour the immediate happiness of departed saints, and hardly to consist with that uncomfortable opinion, the insensible state of departed souls, till after the resurrection."¶ "The souls of the martyrs were under the altar, living in the enjoyment of the benefits of the great sacrifice, and of the reconciliation with God, which that sacrifice secured to believers.—The fifth

* See Note, No. X, at the end of the work.

Mat. x. 28.—† Luke xvi. 22, 23.—‡ Rev. vi. 9.—¶ Bp. Newton in loc.

seal exhibits, in a safe state of conscious activity, the souls of christians, immediately on their separation from the body; and accordingly, sets aside the idea of the Materialists, that death affects the soul as well as the body.*

Another proof of the separate and conscious existence of the soul, we find in the language of Paul, while in an elevated style, he describes the happy privileges of the Hebrews, who were converted to the christian faith; *Ye are come unto Mount Sion.*—*And to the Spirits of just men made perfect.*† “This is a most decisive proof, that the souls of believers enter into a state of perfect happiness when they die, as far as this can consist with being separated from their bodies.”‡ The Church of God on earth, here denominated Sion, is connected with that happy society in heaven, who, having come out of great tribulation, their robes being washed in the blood of the Lamb, now stand perpetually before the throne of God, and serve him in his temple; these are the perfect ones who shall neither hunger, nor thirst any more, and from whose eyes every tear is wiped away by Emmanuel’s indulgent hand, Rev. vii. 14—17. To fellowship with this company the gospel invites the sinner, and into communion with them he enters, when he, by faith, submits to the righteousness of God. He is then entitled to be a *partaker of the inheritance of the Saints in light.*§

Let the reader, who still hesitates to believe the immortality of the soul, attend to the record left us, by the Apostle of the Gentiles, of his, and his fellow-sufferers hopes and desires, in reference to a future state. *We know, that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands eternal in the heavens. We are always confident, knowing that, whilst we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord—we are willing rather to be absent from the body and to be present with the Lord. I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart and to be with Christ, which is far better.*¶ This language indicates a distinguishing privilege, desired with an ardour of no common degree; this privilege is the immedi-

* M’Leod on the Revelation.—† Heb. xii. 22, 23.—‡ Scott.—§ Col. i. 12.
—¶ 2 Cor. v. 1, 6, 8. Phil. i. 23.

ate and gracious presence of the Lord Jesus Christ, not in the ordinances of his grace upon earth, for that was already enjoyed; but in the *building of God, that house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens.* A confidence is expressed of obtaining this high privilege, and we are informed, that one circumstance alone excluded them from the object of their desires, and realization of all their hopes; this circumstance was their connexion with the body, which is designated by *the earthly house of this tabernacle*; when that tabernacle should be dissolved, when they should be separated from the body, then would they *be present with the Lord.* Than this, no language can be more explicitly probatory of the subject in dispute. It puts to silence every opposing hypothesis, and gives confidence to the good man, who longs for immortal felicity. It is hoped none will suggest the absurd idea, that our Apostle, wearied out with the toils of life, and hostility of wicked men, sought a refuge from those ills, in the sullen regions of unconscious existence. Is this what he means by the presence of the Lord? Is this state of gloom, what he intends by the building of God, the house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens? No such thing. Independent of the strong and expressive style employed in this scripture, we cannot believe that this active, and ardently zealous Apostle of the Saviour, who, with fervour, loved his Master’s cause, would esteem it gain, so ignobly to leave the glorious contest, in which he had been engaged, and, for ages, be willing to retire to the silent abodes of insensibility. Had this soldier of the cross fallen so far from the vastness of his designs, as to be satisfied to become the companion and prey of worms, rather than, under the banner of the cross, “contend for the faith once delivered to the Saints,” and thus glorify his God, and benefit the family of human-kind? Whatever the modern advocates of materialism may think upon the subject, far other views occupied our Apostle’s mind; hear his language; *The time of my departure is at hand—Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give me at that day*—The crown is secured, it shall be given on the day of his departure.

The prayer of Stephen, while suffering under the hands of cruel persecutors, is full in point. *Lord Jesus receive my Spirit,** is his prayer. In which we see not only a proof the Deity of Jesus, he being addressed by a dying martyr full of the Holy Ghost, as an object of religious worship; but also of the existence of the Spirit, when separated from its material tenement. The force of this testimony cannot be evaded, by the suggestion of the superior attainments of modern times in physical science, by which some pretend to have ascertained, that matter and mind are the same; for we are informed that he was full of the Holy Ghost, and it is intimated that his address to the Jews, and his prayer to his Redeemer, were both dictated by that celestial Agent. The candid inquirer will readily prefer this testimony of the Spirit of God, to the unsupported conjectures of visionary theorists, or the confident assertions of presuming infidelity.

This evidence is corroborated by the occurrences, on the day of the crucifixion of the Saviour of men—*Father, into thy hands I commend my Spirit: and having said thus, he gave up the ghost.†* What was predicable of our Lord, as respected the constitution of mere humanity, is predicable of all men; for he was in all things “made like unto his brethren.” If he, then, had a spirit which he yielded up, and committed to his Father at his death, distinct from his body, so have his brethren, like unto whom it behooved him to be made. Or, shall we again be obliged to listen to the worse than idle conjecture, that he spake according to the vulgar apprehensions of an illiterate age? or that he was mistaken? Let those who fear not God, amuse themselves with such dreams of impiety; but they are warned of the consequences. God will not be mocked with impunity.

The assurance given to the penitent malefactor on the cross, is an additional evidence upon this subject—*Verily I say unto thee, To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise.‡* That day the body of Messiah was consigned to the sepulchre, but his spirit, which he commended into the hands of his Father, he was confident would be admitted into the mansions of the blessed, and thither, he

* Acts. vii. 59.—† Luke, xxiii. 46.—‡ Luke, xxiii. 43.

assured the dying penitent, his spirit should also go, as a monument of his power to save. Thus the righteous when *taken away from the evil to come, enter into peace; they shall rest in their beds, each one walking in his uprightness.** Soul and body shall be beyond the reach of those, who would disturb their repose; the body rests in the grave from the toils of life, and the spirit, freed from the burden of moral depravity, is still engaged in conscious activity; each one shall walk in his uprightness.

The Spirit of man is considered as distinct from his body by Solomon; *Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was: and the Spirit shall return unto God who gave it.†* The Spirit of man is distinguished from that of the beast, the one goeth upward, the other descends to the earth.‡

To this doctrine I am aware that objections are made; it is not my design to fill my pages with an extensive examination of them, as I am persuaded those who cordially receive the testimony already adduced, will not be disposed to assign much weight to such brutalizing cavils, equally hostile to the truth of God, as degrading to the dignity of man. To the following, I briefly advert—

Obj. 1.—Man has not immortality; for God alone is said to have it. 1 Tim. vi. 16.

Reply 1.—God has it independently, and necessarily; in which respects no creature can possess it.

2. Creatures may have a communicated immortality; thus it is our duty to “seek for glory and honour, and immortality;” and at the resurrection of the just. “This mortal must put on immortality;” yet then it will be true, as well as now, that God alone has immortality, absolutely and independently. As the communicated immortality of the body, after the resurrection, will not be at variance with the absolute immortality of God, so neither is the present immortality of the soul, inconsistent with the declaration that God alone has immortality.

Obj. 2. It is affirmed, that “the dead are *no more*; that man and beast have one breath, so that a man hath

* Isa. lvii. 1, 2.—† Eccles. xii. 7.—‡ Chap. iii. 21.

no pre-eminence above a beast, as the one dieth, so dieth the other."*

Reply 1. These declarations are not to be understood absolutely. The dead are indeed *no more* what they once were, but they are not annihilated; their bodies moulder into dust, or enter into other forms; their spirits go to their destined abodes.

2. The language employed in Eccles. iii. 16—20, is plainly a description of those who give themselves up to sensual indulgencies. They, so far as sense can discover, live and die like the brute; man, in these enjoyments, has no pre-eminence above the beast; but, while this is true, as respects the body and mere sensual gratification, the preacher teaches us that the case is different, very different, as respects the spirit—*The spirit of the beast goeth downward to the earth, that of man ascends, it returneth unto God who gave it.* If any shall, however, contend, that there is, in no respect, any difference between the spirit of man and that of the beast, so far as he is concerned, I shall not dispute the fact, but shall leave him to enjoy his brutal triumph.

The man who attends to the operations of his own mind, and submits his faith to the instruction of the Book of God, with disgust must turn away from such brutalizing doctrine. Independent of scriptural revelation, the immortality of the soul is rendered probable. "That it is immortal," said a great man,† upon his death-bed, "that it is immortal I am convinced, the existence of the Deity is a proof that spirit exists, why not then the soul of man? and if such an essence as the soul exists by its nature, it may exist for ever. I should have believed in the immortality of the soul, though christianity had never existed; but *how* it acts separated from the body, is beyond my capacity to judge." What reason made probable, revelation renders certain; *Life and immortality are brought to light by the gospel.* The good man hears a voice from heaven declare; *Blessed are the dead that die in the Lord.* He trembles at the thought of separation, even for a day, from the active service, and holy communion of the blessed God; yet, under the influence of the spirit of grace, he desires to depart. He knows he

* Eccles. iii. 19, &c.—† C. J. Fox.

shall enter immediately upon a higher state of being, and therefore esteems it, gain to die. To the wicked, death is the king of terrors, he is conscious of guilt, and dreads the idea of immortal existence. As he chose to live a brutal life, so will he desire, in death, to be the companion of brutal herds.

"What is that dreadful wish? The dying groan
Of nature, murder'd by the blackest guilt.

A monstrous wish, unborn till virtue dies."—YOUNG.

Let not the thoughtless sinner amuse himself, with the vain idea of escaping from the hand of justice, by stealing into a state of unconscious existence. It will be found an idle dream. "MAN IS ACCOUNTABLE"—I strengthen my argument with the testimony of an advocate of religion and virtue, amiable, as he is known to be learned and eloquent,—"**MAN IS ACCOUNTABLE—MAN IS IMMORTAL.** And the knowledge of this stamps value on existence, and renders human action grand and awful. These truths announced, this world rises in importance. Its transitory scenes assume a more fearful aspect, and awaken a more solemn interest.....A revelation proceeding from God, sealed by a thousand martyrdoms; confirmed by a thousand prophecies; demonstrated by a thousand miracles, has put human speculation at rest for ever, and settled, imperatively settled, the question of man's eternal destiny. Yes, you are now, forming your characters and pronouncing your doom for a duration that has no measure, because it has no end!"*

CHAPTER V.

ON MAN'S MORAL STATE.

By the moral state of man, I understand the dispositions of his mind, in reference to virtue and vice, and the estimate to be formed of him, when his character is examined according to the law of his Creator. This estimate, in the scale of moral excellency, when formed ac-

* See Dr. Nott's Address to the Graduates of Union College, 1811.

according to what he is, as destitute of the special influences of grace, must indeed be low. The wickedness of man is too great to be denied; the evidences of a mind morally depraved, too numerous to admit of refutation. While woes are found to accompany man, from the first moment of his existence, through all the stages of life, till its close; while in all the relations into which he enters, he perceives sorrows interwoven with their delights; while in associations the most congenial with human wishes, and the most necessary for his improvement and happiness, he dare not confide in his companions, unless laws, most salutary, and formed by common consent, be armed with a penal sanction, to guard against a violation of the compact; while circumstances, such as these exist, not to dwell upon the dreadful, though necessary forms, in which penal ills appear, the evidence of human depravity will be too clear to admit of denial. The inquirer after its existence, alas! when he retires within the recesses of his own bosom, and accurately compares the tenour of his dispositions, with what it ought to be, will there have testimony, more than sufficient, to prove that *the heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked*. But whence is this wickedness? Was man created with those evil propensities at first? Or has he, since his creation, contracted this depravity? These inquiries are important; and according to the sentiments which we entertain, in respect to them, will be our estimate of the Divine character, and our exertions in relation to reform.

The revelation of God is explicit, in its discoveries, upon those points. *God made man upright*; formed him after his own image, possessing a correct, and extensive knowledge of his relations, obligations, and privileges, together with a holy mind, the powers of which were in the most perfect harmony of order. But man transgressed, and God, being offended, gave him over to punishment—with the first transgressor all his descendants fell. I am aware of the misrepresentations which have been given of this subject, and the odious epithets by which it has been described. These, to the sincere inquirer, are no arguments, and, of course, produce no conviction; he leaves them to produce their effect on

minds of lighter character, and who are more likely to be pleased with shadows, than with what is real. He knows, and he feels its importance, and therefore will not pass it lightly over. The attention of my reader is solicited, while I attempt to prove, that all mankind are born into the world, morally depraved and guilty; and that this state of depravity and guilt, is intimately connected with the first transgression of Adam. To the proof of these positions I devote two short sections.

SECTION I.

ALL MANKIND ARE INTRODUCED INTO THE WORLD, MORALLY DEPRAVED AND GUILTY.

However contrary to the prejudices we entertain, this humiliating doctrine may be, our opposition to matter of fact will make it no better. It is no man's interest to be deceived; a disagreeable truth had better be credited than a delusion—a delusion which can, only for a little time, conceal the truth. The great depravity of mankind has already been adverted to; this depravity is universal. Where, or when lived the mere descendent of Adam, to whom any could point, and say, there is an example of perfect freedom from sin; there is one, who in unspotted holiness, has passed so far through life. Such a character the sun has not beheld. The circumstances in which the various individuals of the human family have been, are very different; but however different their constitutional conformation; the climate, where they dwelt; the example set before them; the systems according to which their education was directed; we find, among them all, an agreement in one point; a disconformity to the perfect law, under which God has placed them. The universal disconformity establishes the fact of a universal propensity to sin; unless it should be maintained, that an effect, universal, and uniform in its appearance, in every age, is without an adequate, correspondent cause. This will not be asserted. To an universal principle of depravity, as its proper cause, we trace this tendency. The dreadful-ness of its nature appears in its powerful opposition to

every mean of moral reform, devised by God or man. Inattention to the beauties of moral order, insensibility to the greatness and goodness of God, and stupid disregard to their own eternal interests, are features of the moral character of the great majority of those, who have the gospel of the Son of God in their hands, and who are privileged daily with access to the institutions of his grace. Did this depravity arise from inauspicious circumstances, and not from nature, nature too, tainted with a principle of disregard to holiness, some happy exempt, among the infinitely diversified variety of circumstances, would occasionally appear; but none such does really appear. The cause of this universal divergence from the perfection of rectitude, will be found more deep and permanent, than in mere circumstances; it is in the degraded nature of man; *Ali have sinned and come short of the glory of God. There is none righteous, no not one.* To evade the force of these remarks, it will not avail to talk indefinitely, of this universal depravity, arising from a perverse exercise of will; the whole weight of this is removed, by examining whence it so universally happens, that this faculty of the soul acts perversely—It must flow from some perverse principle, very closely connected with the mind of man.

The universal empire of death, proves the universality of the reign of sin—*Sin hath reigned unto death. The wages of sin is death.** What God, in an extended exercise of his sovereignty, *might* do, in furnishing the innocent, we are not prepared to say; but all the rules of government employed in the direction of his moral empire, so far as we can observe, actually forbid us to suppose, that he *will* inflict pain, upon any subject of his government, that is perfectly pure and innocent. It is, however, an appointment of heaven, that all men must die, and appear before God in judgment. There is no intimation in the whole book of God, that death, simply considered, is not a calamity, nor is there any intimation, that calamities befall the innocent; *Who ever perished being innocent? Or where were the righteous cut off?†* The father of the faithful, the aged friend of God, Abraham, while pleading for Sodom's preservation, ex-

* Rom. v. 21, and vi. 23.—† Job iv. 7.

pressed his confidence, that the judge of all the earth would do right, that he would not slay the righteous with the wicked; * yet ye find death, as an overwhelming flood, carries away generation after generation, the man of hoary hairs, and the infant of an hour, and that often with accompanying circumstances, which compel the confession of moral depravity.

The sufferings and death of infants have ever appeared to me facts, most strikingly confirmatory of the doctrine of original sin. They are subjects of the divine government, and, toward them, justice is to be exercised—They are in the hands of the Father of mercies, he so orders his dispensations, respecting them, that in infancy they suffer, frequently very exquisitely, and are often cut off by death. If they be innocent in the sight of God, how comes it to pass, that with sinners they are swallowed up? Why does the ruler of all not give charge to the deep, and to the devouring flame, to spare those innocents, against whom justice has no charge? How comes it to pass that they, in common with others, are the victims of superstitious idolatry, and of savage war. In the city of Sodom, can we suppose there were not ten infants? The population, where crimes had become so crying, must have been great, that infants were numerous is not too much to presume; yet, amongst them, ten innocents could not be found! Had they been there, for their sakes, the city would have been spared. While Sodom, with her sister cities of the plain, remains a monument of God's displeasure against sin, that monument will declare, that among the thousands of babes which probably were there, ten, who were free from depravity, could not be found.

Whatever may be said of death, as it stands in relation to the arrangements of grace, in which relation it shall be overruled to the good of the saints, it can never in itself be considered as a blessing. The necessity for its being overruled, proves it, in itself, an evil.

Let the disputer of this world, then, approach the couch of a dying infant, watch the progress of its dissolution, and mark the symptoms of its pains; pronounce it perfectly innocent, and then, if he can, "justify the

* Genesis xviii. 25.

ways of God to man ;” let him show that equity and mercy are amply displayed, in the infliction of torturing pains upon the expiring babe ! *Death reigned, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam’s transgression.** They sinned not actually as Adam did.

It will not be understood, that this doctrine decides upon what the *final* state of those infants shall be ; it only decides that they are sinners, and if grace does not interpose, their latter end cannot be happy. But God is gracious, and through a mediator he can consistently pardon, and sanctify, and bless the guilty sinner. If any, in the effusions of benevolence, shall assert, that all infants, dying in infancy, are made perfectly blessed, I shall never contradict him. I do not know but it is so. But if it be so, *it is through the grace of God in Christ Jesus ;* and this, if conceded, at once establishes our position. That salvation is through the grace of the Redeemer, the whole voice of scripture teaches us. Salvation, by Jesus Christ, necessarily implies, that the saved were previously in a ruined state. *Jesus came not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance. He came to save that which was lost.* Does he save infants ? Is it through his redemption that little children are admitted into the kingdom of God ? If so, without that redemption, they could not have been admitted there ; they were of course guilty, polluted, and unfit, by nature, for heaven. Shall any have the hardihood to deny this ? Then, in contradiction to the testimony of God, it must be shown, that there is another Saviour than Jesus, and another way of acceptance with God, than through the blood of atonement. We ought, however, to believe God rather than man ; *Neither is there salvation in any other : for there is none other name under heaven, given among men, whereby we must be saved.†* Is there one of the human family admitted to the joys of heaven, who cannot join in this celestial song ? *Thou wast slain and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood, out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation.‡* No ; not one, but will most cordially unite in ascribing glory to that grace, by which he is saved. This effectually over-

turns the whole fabric, of those who deny the doctrine of original sin, as held by evangelical believers. Those, who are innocent, need no redemption by Christ ; infants as well as others have redemption through his blood, and are thereby proved to have been sinners ; for, *Christ hath suffered, the just for the unjust—He came into the world to save sinners—He shall save his people from their sins.** The scriptures uniformly speak of two ways only, by which mankind could ever expect salvation ; upon the footing of the law, or that of grace. The former is impossible ; for if salvation were by the law, *then Christ is dead in vain.†* Except for sinners, Jesus did not appear as a Saviour ; *In due time Christ died for the ungodly.*

The foregoing considerations appear conclusive, to prove that all, young and old, are under sin ; but we have yet farther evidence of this humbling truth. The necessity of a transformation of soul, in scripture, denominated, *regeneration, being born again, made partakers of the Divine nature, &c.* in order to the enjoyment of God, affords a striking proof of primitive depravity. The uniform tenour of scripture leads us to consider mankind as divided into two parties ; one of these, we find, distinguished by what they are, according to nature ; the other, by what grace has done for them. The forms of expression, in which these descriptions are given, are various, and often figurative ; the doctrines taught are, however, very plain ; so plain that he who runs may read.

The remarkable interview between our Lord and Nicodemus, recorded in the 3rd chap. of John’s gospel, unfolds to us this truth, a truth too little understood by many who talk much about it ; *Except a man be born again, or be born from above, he cannot see the kingdom of God.* This he afterwards explains, by being *born of the Spirit.* He instructs us to believe, that it is not the one who is born into the world, according to the order of nature, that can be admitted to heavenly glory. This is only being *born of the flesh*, and that which is *born of the flesh is flesh—and flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God.‡* The amount of all this is, that every one, by nature, is morally carnal and depraved, that, in

* Rom. v. 14.—† Acts. iv. 12.—‡ Rev. v. 9.

* 1 Pet. iii. 18.—1 Tim. i. 15.—Mat. i. 21.—Gal. ii. 21. iii. 21.—† 1 Cor. x. 50.

this state, none can see God in mercy; that, as they have borne the image of the earthly Adam, so they must also bear the image of the heavenly; in one word, the necessity for the implantation of principles of virtue and holiness, in the heart, is asserted, in order to the formation of a new character, conformable to the will of God; without which implantation of a divine principle, none can have the character of the true christian.

The above change, is that which is intended by *the washing of regeneration*, and is effected by *the renewing influence of the Holy Ghost*.^{*} It is the same with *putting on the new man*, which is accompanied with the *putting off the old man which is corrupt*.[†] The subject of this change becomes *renewed in the spirit of his mind*, and is *made partaker of a divine nature*. Thus he becomes *a new creature*, Rom. xii. 2.—2 Pet. i. 4.—2 Cor. v. 17. None is in a state of salvation except he be *in Christ*, for there is not salvation *in any other*; none is in Christ unless he be born again—*If any man be in Christ he is a new creature*. Are any of the children of men in Christ, while in infancy? If we reply to this in the affirmative, then must those infants be *new creatures*, born *from above*, created anew in Christ Jesus, delivered from the *old man*, which is corrupt; *all things* as respects their spiritual state, having become new. If the oracles of heaven distinctly teach any truth, it is this, that we are, *by nature, children of wrath*.[‡]

The assertion with which I closed the foregoing paragraph is scriptural, and its truth is illustrated by the additional testimonies which follow. These I purpose only to quote leaving them to my reader, as subjects of meditation, without attempting much illustration of my own.

Adam begat a son in his own likeness, after his image—Adam lost the image after which he was created, and now being a sinner, the fruit of his body is like himself. *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*.[§] The testimony of God is, that *the imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth*.[¶] The expression, *from his youth*,

[†] Tit. iii. 5.—[†] Eph. iv. 22, 24.—[‡] Eph. ii. 3.—[§] Gen. v. 3. and vi. 5.

[¶] Gen. viii. 21.

means from infancy; compare the original word with Exod. x. 9. *We will go with our young*. Moses intended that infants, as well as the aged should leave Egypt. *Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? Not one*.^{*} God's decision respecting mankind, is; *They are altogether become filthy*. The affirmation of Job just cited, this being so, is full of force, to which add; *What is man that he should be clean? and he which is born of a woman, that he should be righteous?* Hear the Psalmist trace the streams of actual transgression, to the fountain of original depravity; *Behold I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me*.[†] This was not peculiar to David; it is affirmed of all; *The wicked are estranged from the womb: they go astray as soon as they be born, speaking lies*.[‡] Thus it appears, that *the heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked*. Jer. xvii. 9. Therefore, *out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, murders, &c.* Mat xv. 19. It cannot be otherwise; *Because the carnal mind is enmity against God*. Rom. viii. 7. And all have this carnal mind who are not renewed by the spirit of grace; for *that which is born of the flesh is flesh*; and thus it is, that we are *by nature children of wrath*.[§] Hence also is justified the saying of the wise man; *Foolishness is bound in the heart of a child*.[¶] From this proceeds that frowardness of character, by which he is described; *The way of man is froward and strange.—The heart of the sons of men is full of evil, and madness is in their heart while they live*.^{||}

To anticipate objection, I beg leave to offer a remark upon the terms *flesh* and *carnal mind*. It is not the design of our Lord, when he says, *that which is born of the flesh is flesh*, to inform us, that they who are born of human beings are human beings, this would have been impertinent. The acceptation of the term *flesh* is obvious; it is man's corrupt nature, as he is a sinner, opposed to God; hence to *walk after the flesh* is to follow the course dictated by a sinful disposition—*In me, that is, my flesh, dwelleth no good thing*, that is, in my sinful nature, as such, is nothing holy. The excommunicated person^a was delivered to Satan; the end was,

^{*} Job xiv. 4, and xv. 14.—[†] Psal. li. 5.—[‡] Psal. lvi. 3.—[§] John iii. 6.—[¶] Eph. ii. 3.—^{||} Prov. xxii. 15.—^{||} Prov. xxi. 8.—^{||} Eccl. ix. 3.—^a 1 Cor. v. 5.

that the flesh might be destroyed; that is, that his sinful dispositions being removed, his spirit might be saved. Thus by being flesh, as born of it, is to be understood the inheriting by birth, a sinful and morally defiled nature; *Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? Not one.* Thus it will appear, that the *carnal mind* is one, under the influence of sin, leading it to eternal death; for *to be carnally minded is death*, while *to be spiritually minded is life and peace*.

Thus the universal sinfulness of man, appears from matter of fact, as furnished by observation. A propensity to this is discovered in the earliest indications of character, and, as reason dawns, this propensity develops itself, often in dreadful acts of depravity; and that in defiance of example, warnings, instructions, and convictions to the contrary. This we refer, as to its proper cause, to an inborn principle of moral turpitude. This principle of deformity involves in guilt its subject; hence disease and other woes prevail, and ultimately death triumphs over all ages and descriptions of human-kind. Such is the nature of human crimes and human guilt, that there is no deliverance, but through the redeeming blood of the Son of God; and such our feebleness, through the influence of spiritual disease, that, without the reviving influence of the Spirit of God, we can have no part in the redemption of his Son; *No man can come unto me, except the Father, who hath sent me, draw him.* All this melancholy description, is confirmed by the ample testimony of the word of God, a small, and only a small portion of which, has been selected from the abundance that the sacred volume affords. The conclusion to be drawn from the whole is, that man is by nature sinful, and that without the aids of the grace of God, bestowed through the Mediator, he can do nothing good and acceptable before his Maker; *An evil tree cannot bring forth good fruit.*

SECTION II.

MAN'S STATE OF DEPRAVITY AND GUILT, IS INTIMATELY CONNECTED WITH THE FIRST TRANSGRESSION OF ADAM.

Guilt is the obligation, under which the sinner lies, to suffer punishment. Where there is sin, there must also be guilt. In the foregoing section, our chief attention has been turned to the depravity of the human family; this depravity exposes its subject to a correspondent punishment. The human family, by reason of their descent from a corrupt ancestor, inherit a nature morally defiled; and that ancestor being their legal representative, all his acts, while employed in that character, are to be accounted theirs. By Adam's first transgression a fountain of pollution was opened, the streams of which not only defiled the whole of his own nature, but likewise spread themselves over the whole extent of his race, "descending from him by ordinary generation." That act, by which the friendly relations, subsisting between him and his God, were broken off, in virtue of his representative character, in its legal connexion, belongs to his posterity; that is, on account of it they are liable to punishment. We shall now examine the evidence of the representative relation in which Adam stood to his posterity. We are authorized to consider the original parent of mankind, standing in the place of his descendants, as a public person, from what God is represented as saying to him, in which evidently, with himself, all his posterity is included. *And God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it; and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth.** Had this command to *multiply and replenish the earth* with inhabitants, by which marriage is authorized, respect to Adam and Eve only, or to them and their posterity? In virtue of this order, addressed to the original pair, are not their descendants authorized to enter into the matrimonial relation? Then, certainly, what was thus said to the first of human-kind, respected their posterity, not

* Gen. i. 28.

less than themselves. To this add, what is said in the grant of dominion over all things, in this lower world, and the right to use the fruits of the earth as food; I ask, was Adam and his wife alone included in this grant, or, with them, did it extend to their children, in all generations. Without doubt to their children in all ages. In the sentence passed upon the woman was she alone, or she and all her daughters, who should be mothers, included? *Unto the woman he said, I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy conception; in sorrow shalt thou bring forth children.** Experience teaches that God contemplated, with Eve, her daughters. The same conclusion is obvious from what was said to Adam, *Cursed is the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life; thorns also and thistles shall it bring forth to thee—In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread—dust thou art and unto dust thou shalt return.†* Who are involved in all that is here spoken? Who eats bread in sorrow? Who returns to the dust? For whose sake is the earth cursed? The history of the world sufficiently answers these queries. Adam is immediately addressed; but his posterity is also intended. Facts verify this; the sorrows of life, the barrenness or infertility of the earth, the universality of death, all conspire to designate the sons of men, as involved in those sentences of woe. These remarks prepare the way for a more direct consideration of the representative character of Adam. Of this we have evidence, in the penalty annexed to that positive law, under which he was placed. *In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.‡* Was his posterity included in what has been already considered as spoken to Adam? Why not in this? Has not that declaration, *dust thou art, and unto dust thou shalt return*, its foundation in the penal sanction under consideration? If the one relates to the first man and his posterity, so does the other. This also implies a promise of life; for had he obeyed, he would have lived in perfect freedom from all the numerous ills, to which he was subjected; the same may be said of his descendants.

Subsequent parts of divine revelation cast on this subject additional light. *In Adam all die.§* Here we have

* Gen. iii. 16.—† Gen. iii. 17—19.—‡ Gen. ii. 17.—§ 1 Cor. xv. 22.

proof of his representative character. It has been already made evident, that death is a punishment, the apostle declares that *all die*, and he shews in or by whom; it is *in Adam*. How did Adam come to die? Certainly because of his sin; but *in or with him all died*, their and his death has the same procuring cause, otherwise they could not, in truth, be said to die with him, that is, in or by or with him, to have *their* death insured, as much as was his own.

The view of the subject is strengthened, by the testimony of the apostle, in Rom. v. 12, &c. *By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned.* Thus it is affirmed—1. That *death hath passed upon all men*; that is, the sentence of death has passed, and the execution shall pass upon all in due time; this sentence is implied in the declarations of God to man, *In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die; and unto dust thou shalt return.* 2. That this death passed upon all, by reason of Adam's sin; *By one man sin entered—and death by sin.* 3. That this passing of death upon all is just; *for that, or because all have sinned*, that is, all have sinned in the one man, by whom sin entered into the world, and on account of that sin, the sentence of *death passed upon all men.* That no doubt may remain upon the mind, that this is the case, the same idea is repeated, in various forms of expression; thus in ver. 15, it is asserted, *Through the offence of one many be dead—and in the following verses we read, The judgment was by ONE to condemnation—By ONE MAN'S offence death reigned—By the offence of ONE judgment came upon all men to condemnation—By one man's disobedience many were made sinners—Thus, by one man, sin hath reigned unto death.* It seems impossible to employ language that would more forcibly prove the truth, that the first man stood as the representative of his posterity. If he did not stand to them in this relation, where is the justice, on account of, or by his one offence, of causing *judgment to come upon all men to condemnation*? If Adam stood not our representative, how, by his disobedience, can *many be made sinners*? And, if mankind by this act of his, as their public head, were not chargeable with guilt,

how, in the name of all that bears the semblance of justice, could the God of equity allow, that, *by one man's offence*, death should reign? The apostle's expression in ver. 14, is remarkable; *Death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression*—This declaration gives weight to the preceding view of this subject. In all ages sin has been in the world, and death its inseparable companion; it reigned, from Adam to Moses, over those abandoned sinners, who, after the similitude of Adam's transgression, actually trampled upon the authority of the Supreme Lawgiver; but it reigned not over such alone, it even reigned over them who *sinned not after the similitude of Adam's transgression*; and who were they who did not thus *actually* sin? Certainly infants are intended; for over them, in its usual modes, death had prevailed, as well as in its more awful forms, when, by the universal deluge, the conflagrations of Sodom, and such like means, it reigned over so many who were incapable of actual sin, committed in their own proper persons. This reign of death, even over them, was by *one man's offence*, the first offence of Adam, for he is the *one* intended.

To the candid, we would hope, these observations, and the extensive train of reflections to which they are calculated to give rise, would be sufficient, to establish the fact, of the first man sustaining the character of the representative of all his race. The truth of the position, however, is farther confirmed, by adverting to the parallel instituted between Adam and Jesus Christ; the offence of the one is set in contrast with the righteousness of the other; the obedience of Jesus is set in opposition to the disobedience of Adam; we have death by the one, by the other life.* It is as evident that misery comes upon men through the sin of Adam, as that felicity flows to us through the righteousness of the Mediator; and it is no less obvious, that the one is a representative, as well as the other.

The first of mankind was constituted the representative of his descendants, according to a divine appointment. This has been usually denominated a covenant;

* Rom. v. 15—19.—1 Cor. xv. 22.

but, however, proper this denomination, it must be expected, that this divine arrangement wanted some of those circumstances, which generally accompany such transactions among men. The absence of these circumstances gives occasion to quibblers, very unfairly indeed, to oppose the thing in substance. The substance of a covenant we have, in the transaction between God and Adam, we have distinct parties, an express penalty, and an implied promise of good, and the condition, upon which, this good was to be expected; and to the whole a mutual consent. This is a covenant.

It is implied in the representative character of Adam, which has been already considered; for, if he was a representative, he must have been so by some constitution; that constitution, by what name soever it may be called, will be found to embrace every essential principle of a covenant.

That a covenant arrangement was made with Adam, is not only implied in facts and in principles of religion, but is matter of express testimony. I shall not insist at present on the declaration of the apostle, Gal. iv. 24. *These are the two covenants*—from which divines, of no mean name, have argued to prove the existence of a covenant made with Adam, which, however, being violated by transgression, secures nothing now to those who are under it, but *bondage*; for the sin, the guilt incurred in transgressing it, *hath reigned unto death*. We have a testimony more explicit; *They like Adam have transgressed the covenant*—“Our translators set the word *Adam* on the margin. But in Job xxxi. 33, they translate the very same word, *as Adam*. This word occurs but three times in scripture, and still in the same sense. This is the proper and literal sense of the word: it is so read by several, and is certainly the meaning of it.”*

If apostate Israel, *like Adam*, broke covenant with God, then must Adam have been under a covenant obligation, otherwise he could not have violated it. The whole of this corresponds with the discoveries made to us, respecting the only ways, in which it was ever possible for man to be saved—The tenour of the old establishment made with Adam was, *The man that doeth these*

* Boston on the Cov. of works.

*things shall live by them.** By this plan, salvation for man, is now impossible; for *by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight.†* Salvation is now attainable, only through *the blood of the everlasting covenant.*

I shall close this section by offering a few very brief remarks, on two or three objections against the doctrine of man's moral state, as represented in the preceding pages, which are very frequently made by the unthinking part of mankind—It is objected,

1. That it is unjust for one to suffer for another's sin; *Every one shall die for his own iniquity.*

Reply 1. So far as mankind are considered individually, and their transactions merely personal, it is admitted that one shall not bear the sin of another; among mankind there is no dispute on this principle.

2. Wherever a representative connexion is established, the acts of the representative, in that character, are not to be considered as his own, any farther than he is a component part of the body represented. He and the represented are ever considered as a moral person; his acts are theirs, and upon this principle, a principle that enters into the very constitution of society, and has its origin in the social constitution of man, the great majority of our most important affairs, in this world, is transacted. But it is objected

II. That we cannot reasonably suppose any arrangement made by a good, wise and just God, suspending the eternal welfare of the human race, upon the acts of any individual; much less upon the conduct of an individual who, he knew, would sin.

Reply 1. God has so constituted mankind, as is intimated above, that business, very important and interesting to them, must be managed by representatives; yet the creator foresaw, at the same time he thus constituted mankind, that much perfidy and abuse of trust would take place among men, often involving individuals and nations in awful distress. Such a fact as this can imply no charge, against the order God has seen proper to establish for transacting human affairs; and as little cause of complaint is furnished, by such an arrangement as

* Rom. x. 5.—† Rom. iii. 20.

that which we contend was made with Adam, as our public head. It was only a particular application of the same general principle, by which God directs the government of the affairs of men.

2. It is vain to surmise and dispute against stubborn matters of fact; our world is replete with sin and wretchedness; we are informed that this state of sin was introduced by *one man*, Adam, and that by his *one offence, judgment came upon all men to condemnation.* *By one man's disobedience many were made sinners.* Men may dispute, but their disputations cannot change the nature of things. Death has reigned, and will reign, and prove by that very fact, that all over whom it does reign are sinners.

3. The objection is as forcible against the creation of any man, as against the establishment of such a covenant representation, as that in which we believe: God foresaw that all men would sin, as perfectly as he foresaw that Adam would transgress. The cavils of the atheist against the perfections of Deity, because of existing evils, are as reasonable, as the impertinent quibbles of the disputer against this covenant of God with man.

III. It is objected, that it is absurd to suppose that God would create an unholy being, and equally shocking to suppose the guilt of another imputed to one that is holy; every one therefore is born upright and free from guilt.

Reply 1. It would indeed be opposite to all ideas which we can form of the Divine excellency, to suppose, that God infuses into any creature immoral principles; but there is nothing absurd in supposing, that God preserves the lives of sinners; nor is it absurd to suppose, that in his providence, every living creature should generate its kind. *Sinful Adam begat a son in his own likeness.* This is indeed the order of the God of nature.

2. We have already proved that Adam and his family, are not to be considered as separated in this business; the guilt of his first sin lies upon the whole moral person, as that person was represented by him; nor are we to consider the depravity of nature, and liableness to punishment ever separated. Which has the precedency, in order of nature is, perhaps, not worth while to inquire.

Wherever there is depravity we shall find guilt, and, without being depraved, none shall ever be punished; the judge of all the earth will do right. After what has been said, I trust it is unnecessary to offer any thing more, in opposition to the latter part of the objection. Let the universal perverseness of mankind, and the sufferings of those *who have not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression*, be the refutation of all such heresy.

Thus we have seen the appointment of Adam, to be the public head and representative of his posterity. We have traced the evidence of his woful lapse, and with him all his children appear involved in guilt. *By one man sin entered into the world*, and it has reigned unto death. Such is the moral state of man.* It is now time that we should turn, and inquire after the means of deliverance. This conducts us to another chapter.

CHAPTER VI.

ON THE ATONEMENT OF CHRIST.

SECTION I.

THE NATURE AND NECESSITY OF THE ATONEMENT

How can man be justified with God?† To this query of the Shuhite, human reason has failed in giving any satisfactory reply. The gospel alone furnishes correct information on this important point. Yet vain man busies himself to discover some other mode of acceptance with God, than through the atonement of Jesus. Whatever mitigation the crime of heathens may admit of, in employing their rites, not being acquainted with the provisions of grace, those who are placed under an economy of salvation, are excluded from a right to their apology. Correct views of the doctrine of the atonement are of

* See Note, No. XI, at the end of the work.

† Job xxv. 4.

the last importance, according to the opinions we form of its nature and necessity, will be the degree of our reliance upon it, and the influence produced by it, upon our tempers and lives. It is to be regretted, that since all who assume the christian name, admit into their respective systems, nominally, the doctrine of redemption or atonement, many of them are found really to oppose it, in its scriptural acceptation. The outlines of what the scriptures teach on the subject, will be found in the following pages, to which the reader's attention is requested.

In order correctly to understand the doctrine of the atonement, we must recollect that it is made by a mediator, properly qualified for the important work of mediation. The necessity for such a character, and such a work, supposes the guilt of man; while the original parent of mankind, in freedom from moral evil, enjoyed the delightful scenes of Paradise, there was no necessity for a mediator. The contraction of guilt gave occasion to the work of mediation. God, as the lover of holiness and vindicator of moral order, cannot entertain with approbation the violator of his law, nor treat with kindness the enemy of rectitude; *The wages of sin*, by his award, *is death*. That the sinner may live, reconciliation between him as the offender, and God, who is offended, must be effected. Revelation declares, and reason assents to the declaration, that this accommodation must take place, through the intervention of a mediator. This personage must be properly qualified; it is requisite that he should be duly concerned for the great interests of each contending party; that he should be free from every species of crime; that his dignity, personal or acquired, be such as to command the respect of the party offended; and that in the proposed work he be approved. All these qualifications meet in the *one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus*. *He is holy*; his dignity is equal with that of the Father; and he is the chosen of the Father for this purpose; *Behold*, says he, *mine elect, in whom my soul delighteth*.

In treating of this subject, it must still be kept in view, that without the mediation of Jesus, there is no access for sinners to God; *No man cometh to the Father*,

but by me. *We have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous: and he is the propitiation for our sins. Through him we have access unto the Father.* Neither is there salvation in any other.* But having proved the truth of his mediatory office, and, upon a sure foundation, established the truth of the infinite dignity of the Mediator's person, the next important question, respects that work of his, upon which our acceptance with God depends.

I shall not now detain you to examine that sentiment, which resolves the whole business of the mission of the Saviour, into an exhibition of the important doctrines of natural religion, accompanied with an assurance of the resurrection of the just. We believe as well as the unitarian, that Jesus unfolded the principles of natural religion, and also confirmed those of supernatural revelation; but we believe this was not all he did; *he was wounded for our transgressions*; he became the author of eternal redemption; he is the Saviour, the only Saviour of his people. But by what acts does he justify the appropriation of this lofty title to himself? He taught indeed the will of God. He shed beams of light on the pages of nature's book; but the title of *Saviour*, was never given to a mere instructor, however famed. It is employed in the sacred volume of inspiration, and was understood, as well as employed, by the nations where the disciples of Jesus resided. But where is the writer, inspired or profane, that ever applied it to him who only trod the peaceful paths of science, or confined himself to the exposition of morals? It was applied uniformly to the hero. The man of valour, who, upon the field of death, met and vanquished the oppressors of his country, brake the prison-doors, struck off the captive's chains, and declared them free, was, in the grateful acclaim of an emancipated people, pronounced a *Saviour*. In this respect we are called to contemplate the captain of our salvation, justifying the exclusive appropriation of this title to himself—*Besides me there is no Saviour*. In this character, behold him coming from *Edom*, and with dyed garments from *Bozrah*, glorious in his apparel, travelling in the greatness of his strength, speaking in

* John xiv. 6—1 John ii. 1, 2—Eph. ii. 18

righteousness, and mighty to save. He spoiled principalities and powers, he made a shew of them openly, triumphing over them in his cross.* It was on the cross he triumphed over sin, there he procured an everlasting righteousness for our redemption. The great work of Jesus was, to offer himself a propitiatory sacrifice for the redemption of sinners. Man had sinned against God; Deity would by no means clear the guilty; Jesus offers himself unto God; the design is to propitiate Jehovah, that he may deal favourably with man. This view of the subject is justified, by the whole inspired account of what Jesus has done. Examine the import of the following scriptures; *The son of man came to give his life a ransom for many. My blood is shed for many, for the remission of sins.† Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation—who was delivered for our offences. In due time Christ died for the ungodly—while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us—Being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him. For, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his son.‡ 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. Christ our passover is sacrificed for us—Christ died for our sins—we have redemption through his blood—who gave himself a ransom for all—He by himself purged our sins—Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many—God loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins—Ye were redeemed with the precious blood of Christ.§* I have been thus ample, in the quotation of these scriptures, that the reader may see the importance attached to the sufferings and death of Christ; and after duly considering these, and parallel portions of the book of God, he will, with the evangelical believer, not hesitate to admit, that the great business of the Saviour was, *to give his life a ransom for many, by tasting death for every son who shall be brought to glory.*

An important inquiry hence arises; how is it consistent with perfect equity, that Jesus should thus suffer, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God?

* Isa. lxiii. 1—Col. ii. 15.—† Mat. xx. 28 and xxvi. 28.—‡ Rom. iii. 25, iv. 25, v. 6—10.—§ 2 Cor. v. 21—1 Cor. v. 7, and xv. 3—Eph. i. 7—1 Tim. ii. 6.

Heb. i. 3, and ix. 28—1 Joh. iv. 10—1 Pet. i. 18, 19.

The man, whose mind is subjected to the authority of inspired truth, will not long remain in doubt as to the reply. Jesus appeared under the guilt of his people's sins, that is, he was liable to suffer on account of their transgressions; he occupied their place, as *their representative*. This is abundantly evident; *The Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all*—Therefore his punishment was just. *For the transgression of my people was he stricken.** If neither chargeable in his own person, nor as a representative of transgressors, how could he, on any principle of right, be punished? In his own person he was innocent, yet he was wounded, he was bruised, his soul was made an offering for sin; it was, however, for our sins. *He was wounded FOR OUR transgressions; he was bruised FOR OUR iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon him—He bare the sins of many—His own self bare OUR sins in his own body on the tree.†* He is *the Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world. He was made sin, or rather a sin offering, for us.‡* I ask, how could Jesus take away sin, how could he be made sin, or a sin offering, unless our sins, in some respect, were made his own? The turpitude of sin could never be his, nor was it possible that our transgression, literally considered, could be that of Jesus. The liableness to suffering, however, might be transferred. This was transferred; upon no other ground could the sinner be saved; *the wages of sin is death*. If man escapes from this punishment, it must be by the transfer of it to his substitute; the punishment itself cannot be justly transferred, without the transfer of the obligation to suffer. This obligation to endure the penalty of the law in case of transgression, is what we understand, in this discussion, by guilt. This opens to us the doctrine of imputation, and leads to an explanation of the doctrine of the imputation of sin to Jesus Christ, as our representative and mediator. Neither sin nor righteousness, nor any thing else, can justly be imputed to a person, except it be his, in the sense in which it is imputed to him. How, then, did it come, that Jesus, who was separate from sinners, was

* Isa. liii. 6, 8.—† Isa. liii. 5.—Heb. ix. 28.—1 Pe. ii. 24.—‡ John, i. 29.—2 Cor. v. 21.

obliged to suffer? for it appears the cup of wrath could not possibly pass from him.

In answering the query just now proposed, we are conducted to a consideration of an arrangement, formed in the counsels of the blessed THREE. This, in the reformation churches, has usually been denominated the covenant of redemption, or the covenant of grace. Against this covenant, by those who love not the truth, many bitter things have been spoken. It is the consolation of the good man, that *the foundation of God standeth sure*. However men may rage, that which God hath settled shall remain. It seems impossible for any Bible-believer to refuse the existence of such a transaction. Did Jesus the Son of God, in our nature, really suffer? Could he suffer, without being under an obligation to do so? Was the guilt, on account of which he suffered originally his own, or was it contracted by our sins? If originally *not* his own, but *ours*, could it be made his, without his consent, and his Father's will? In assuming this obligation, did not the Father and the Son propose the accomplishment of an important end? Was not the fulfilling of this obligation, by submitting to punishment, the great mean of accomplishing that end? Do we not find then, an arrangement formed between those Divine persons? Let the reader demand from the *Socinian* or *Unitarian* a scriptural answer to the above queries, in succession, and the result will be the proof of a covenant, which, because of the price of the Redeemer's blood, by which its blessings flow to man, is called a COVENANT of REDEMPTION; and because of the unmerited kindness, in which the whole plan originated, and which also appears in conferring all its benefits, is justly denominated a *covenant of grace*. Why quibble about words, when the ideas conveyed by them are clearly understood, and, at the same time, consonant to the word of God?

Additional evidence of this arrangement we may find, in this consideration, that, without it, there was no merit in all the sufferings of the Son of God. A good being, and above all the blessed Deity, cannot be pleased by *mere suffering*. Whenever it is required by the Divinity, it is for the accomplishment of some important

purpose. Is there merit, then, in the sufferings and death of Messiah? Yes, there is; *we have redemption through his blood*. Then, his were not mere unordered sufferings; they were inflicted and borne, in pursuance of a grand design; all was according to plan. Unless this consideration be kept in view, we can have no correct apprehensions of the merits of the Saviour's death.

The authority of scripture allows the belief of this covenant. Of Jesus it is said, *He is the Mediator of a better covenant—and was made surety of a better testament*.^{*} The word translated *testament* is the same with that rendered *covenant*, and, accordingly, might have been construed, *Surety of a better covenant*. He is then pronounced a *surety—the surety of a covenant*; by covenant he was so constituted, and in that covenant, he became surety for all that his people owed to the justice of Deity. By this we are led to understand the import of the apostle's prayer—*The God of peace, through the blood of the everlasting covenant, make you perfect*.†—And that language in the prophet; *By the blood of thy covenant, I have sent forth thy prisoners out of the pit wherein is no water*.‡ Here then, we have an *everlasting covenant*, a *surety* of that covenant, engaged to redeem sinners, and by his blood, shed according to its provisions, whence it has its denomination of *the blood of the covenant*, he delivers from misery, and makes perfect the saved. The same covenant is intended in the following record—*The counsel of peace shall be, or has been, between them both*.§ That is, between Jehovah and *the man whose name is the BRANCH*, the builder of the temple of the Lord, and bearer of the glory. It was in this covenant, upon his engaging to be the surety thereof, that the promise of eternal life was made to Jesus, as the head of ransomed men—*In hope of eternal life, which God, that cannot lie, promised before the world began*.¶ Before the foundation of the world, a promise of eternal life was given; before the world began there must have been a personage to whom God gave this promise; the promise was predicated upon Messiah's making his soul *an offering for sin*. In this arrange-

^{*} Heb. vii. 22. & viii. 6.—† Heb. xiii. 20, 21.—‡ Zach. ix. 11.—§ Zach. vi. 13.—¶ Tit. i. 2.

ment we have all the essentials of a covenant. And it is suitable, that, as misery overflowed the human race, by the breach of a covenant, so blessings, through the fulfilling of the terms of another, should descend upon man; accordingly Jesus is given *for a covenant of the people*.

But was it necessary that atonement should be made, in order to open a channel, in which mercy might flow to fallen man? Could not God, by an absolute act, have pardoned sinners? In speaking of what is possible or impossible with God, it becomes mortals to speak with caution. It might satisfy all, in this case, that God has been pleased to save none, but *through the blood of the everlasting covenant*. And indeed, it will not be an easy task to overturn those reasons, adduced to prove that, consistently with his own perfections, God could not have passed by sin with impunity. To consider God indifferent to the violations of his law, or favourable, without a proper expression of displeasure, to those chargable with such atrocity, is not duly to apprehend the character of the world's Ruler and Judge.

The fact, that the Father of mercies spared not his own Son, when standing in the place of sinners, loudly speaks the necessity of his punishing sin. His word was pledged, and gave assurance, that the soul that sinned should die. He is necessarily good and holy. That he, from the perfection of his nature, should treat with kindness a holy and good being, is reasonable to suppose; nor does it appear unreasonable to admit, that the same essential perfection of nature, should render it necessary, to treat the sinner as he deserves. These ideas when followed in their various connexions, to do which is not at present my intention, furnish strong evidence of the awful, and necessary claims of justice.*

In taking a retrospective view of what has now been advanced, we shall ascertain the proper idea of atonement. Man has appeared a ruined sinner, unable to relieve himself, whilst God declares he will by no means acquit the guilty; the Mediator, constituted voluntarily, by the appointment of the Father, according to covenant arrangement, interposes to take away sin, by the sacri-

* See Note, No. XII, at the end of the work.

fice of himself; and thus effect a reconciliation between God and men. Accordingly the page of inspiration informs us, that he was appointed, *to make reconciliation for the sins of the people*; and that, *while we were yet enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son.** Jesus by his death propitiated, by fulfilling the demands of justice, the Divinity, and thus secured, according to the promise of the covenant, those sacred influences, by which the sinner's enmity against God shall be removed, and the alienated parties be brought into a state of reconciliation. Thus we see two points necessary to be accomplished, in order to a state of peace between sinners, and the Supreme Ruler of the world; the turning away of that wrath which is revealed against the sins of men, and the removal of the depravity of the human heart. The former is effected by the ransom of the Redeemer's blood; the latter by that purifying grace, which is given us on behalf of Christ. Any one of these two parts, separated from the other, would be of no avail. Both are secured by Jesus, and therefore the atonement is complete. In that celestial plan of grace, according to which God administers his favours to man, is fixed the times for completing his gracious designs to the individual objects of his love.

SECTION II.

THE EXTENT OF THE ATONEMENT—OBJECTIONS.

The value of the atonement is confessed by the saint on earth, and its glories are celebrated in the songs of heaven. *Thou hast redeemed us by thy blood*, is a delightful portion of that celestial hymn, in singing which the nations of the saved unite. Its unspeakable value no christian can attempt to depreciate. But alas! even among the saved of the Lord, when we come to details, what diversity of sentiment here prevails! All christians indeed agree in the general nature of the atonement, and confess its fitness, if not its absolute necessity. In this agreement and confession, they unite against the Socinian and the infidel, who oppose, with vehemence, the

* Heb. ii. 17—Rom. v. 10.

whole system of atonement by expiatory sacrifice. But for whom was atonement made? A knowledge of what the oracles of truth teach, in answer to this question, appears requisite in order to a correct understanding of the general doctrine. There is, probably, no reader of this essay, who knows not that opinions very different, are entertained as to the extent of the redemption of Christ; some contending that it is universal, while others suppose they perceive sufficient evidence that it is limited. None indeed can doubt, that the boundless grace of our redeeming God, had such been his pleasure, was adequate to the redemption of every sinner. This is no subject of debate. The question is, For whom did God design the Redeemer's blood, as an expiatory offering, to be sufficient? Let us not now hazard a rash opinion; rather let us inquire,

1. Whether any specific end was proposed to be answered by the Saviour's death?

To act without proposing the accomplishment of an end, is unworthy created wisdom, even in its lowest forms. To suppose Deity capable of it, is not indicative of due reverence of his infinite perfection. A careful observation of his works, in their humblest grades, will furnish proof against the idea of his acting without proposing an end. Since his wisdom is displayed in the constitution of nature, making the various parts of the complicated machinery, subservient to the order and efficiency of the whole, shall we doubt, that in the chief of his ways, the plan of man's salvation, he specifically ordained the accomplishment of an end, worthy of his wisdom and goodness to devise, and of his power to effect? *He worketh all things after the counsel of his own will.** To act without design is the signal of folly; to act for the attainment of a proper end, by suitable means, is the grand distinction of wisdom. The glory of his name, in the complete salvation of ruined sinners, was God's design in the plan of grace; *That he might make known the riches of his glory on the vessels of mercy.†* Having ascertained that an end was proposed to be accomplished by the death of Christ, let us,

* Eph. i. 11.—† Rom. ix. 23.

2. Examine more particularly what that end was, which God proposed to accomplish by that awfully mysterious event. It will generally be admitted, that he *came into the world to save sinners. This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptance.** In order to effect this salvation, it was intended that a redemption should be made; *God sent forth his Son, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law.†* Accordingly we have redemption through his blood. This redemption was in order to reconciliation—God set him forth to be a propitiation. Rom. iii. 25. The propitiation having removed the variance between the parties, the justification of the sinner was intended to follow. He has procured a righteousness for us—We are *justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Jesus Christ‡*. His redemption was intended to secure adoption into the family of God, with all the privileges of his children; *God sent his Son, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of Sons. And if children, then are we heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ.§* Sanctification is another blessing, implied in salvation by Christ, and intended to be effected through his blood; *That he might sanctify the people with his own blood, he suffered without the gate. Christ loved the church, and gave himself for it; that he might sanctify and cleanse it.¶* The completion of his work, is the eternal blessedness of those for whom he died; *That he might present it to himself a glorious church—Having obtained eternal redemption for us.||*

Between the end proposed of the Father, and that designed by the Son, to be effected by his appearance and death, there is a perfect correspondence. *He gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us from this present evil world, according to the will of God and our Father."* What then appears to have been the end proposed in the Divine counsel, to be effected by the death of the Mediator? A review of what has just been stated shows, that, eternal, complete salvation is the end proposed; this salvation necessarily implying deliverance from the curse

* 1 Tim. i. 15.—† Gal. iv. 4, 5.—‡ Rom. iii. 24.—§ Gal. iv. 5—Rom. viii. 17.
—¶ Heb. xiii. 12—Eph. v. 25, 26.—|| Eph. v. 27—Heb. ix. 12.—a Gal. i. 4.

of the law; reconciliation by his death; *For when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son*—pardon of sin, and acceptance before him; adoption into his family; sanctification of heart and life; together with an inheritance, incorruptible, undefiled, and one that fadeth not away. Let us next enquire,

3. Are proper means appointed, and suitable agents engaged, actually to instate the sinner, in the full possession of the blessings of this great salvation? The reply to this inquiry, it is presumed, will, with one consent, be given in the affirmative. Of the suitableness of the external means of salvation, the gospel revelation, and all its holy institutions; of the fitness of the internal means, the awakening and enlivening influences of heavenly grace, none can entertain a doubt. The agents who superintend and give efficacy to these means, are none other than the ETERNAL THREE, whose co-equal power and glories, we shall not now hesitate to confess. *It is God that worketh in us to will and to do*, even that God who doeth what pleaseth him, in heaven and in earth. The almighty GODHEAD, in the three persons, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, is engaged, effectually, to apply, the redemption of the Saviour. Whatever was intended to be accomplished, shall be accomplished. Impotence cannot withstand omnipotence. *My counsel, saith God, shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure.* In Jesus' blood there is an abundant virtue, to save all whom God intends to save, and in Jehovah's arm of grace, there is no defect of power to accomplish all his pleasure. The hearts of men are in his hand, and that omnipotence of grace, which has conquered the deadness and obstinacy of sinners already saved, has energy to effect every triumph of a similar description, which he may please. To refuse this tends to subvert the system of grace; *for by grace are we saved.* Opposition to it conducts deluded man, towards the cheerless regions of atheism. An end, worthy of the Divinity, being proposed, suitable means being appointed for the attainment of that end, and agents having all the resources of boundless wisdom, goodness, and power, being engaged, by the fittest means, to accomplish the designed end, leave no place for doubt as respects the certainty of its

accomplishment. If the pleasure of Deity was, that, through the redemption of Christ, all the children of men should be saved, there is no hesitation as to the event. Facts, under such circumstances, are good interpreters of intention. Let us then inquire in the

4. Place, shall all be saved? In the uniform tenor of scripture—in the decisions of the day of judgment, and even in the conduct of many, with whom we associate, we may find an answer in the negative. Multitudes neither are, nor ever shall be freed from the curse of the law—nor be reconciled to God—nor justified—nor adopted—nor sanctified—nor glorified.—The consequence is either, that we have not rightly stated the proposed ends of the death of Christ, or that God's design shall be frustrated, or that a part of the human family only, was intended to be saved. The first supposition, that the ends of Christ's death, as revealed in scripture, have been mistaken, we do not admit. A plan to save man, deficient in any particular stated above, would be essentially defective. By it NONE COULD BE SAVED.* Such a defective plan God would not devise. That his plans could be frustrated we shall not even suppose, and therefore at once, we shall embrace the inference, that those who shall ultimately be saved, and they alone were destined to salvation, in the purpose of God, and in the undertaking of Christ. To extend the Divine purpose beyond what God accomplishes, is not consistent with the perfect harmony of his attributes. To stretch the atonement to those, whom God did not purpose to be benefited by it, would be too trifling for infinite wisdom. Let us view the plans and operations of heaven, as they really are, in perfect harmony, with one another. The purpose of the Father, the atonement by the Son, and the saving energy of the Spirit, in the business of salvation, refer to the same objects. Jesus is not more merciful, than the Father and the Holy Ghost.

Let none reproach, in these displays of sovereignty, the ever blessed and gracious God. *He will have mercy, on whom he will have mercy*—The whole of human-kind are guilty before him. They all deserved to die. Had he caused the sentence of justice to have been executed

* See Note, No. XIII, at the end of the work.

upon the whole, no charge could have been brought against his goodness. They would have suffered for their sins. If he is pleased to save a part, say, if you please, a majority by countless numbers, and it is his pleasure to pass by some, leaving them in their sins, and to just misery, who can complain? Who dare find fault?

To the doctrine now stated we are aware of numerous objections. These objections have been considered. They all proceed upon false principles, in theological reasoning. The limits of this essay do not permit much attention to be given to them. Let us then be contented with a brief notice of a few.

Obj.—God is good, he is unchangeable, and does not need to be reconciled to man. The atonement was never intended to produce any change in God.

Reply.—God is good and unchangeable—these perfections require that he treat the subjects of his government, according to their character; that he deal kindly with the orderly; that he punish the transgressor, according to his criminality; and that, in his own person, unless a substitute be found to take his place, the sinner shall bear his guilt.

The immutability of God did not prevent him from treating Adam, when upright, in a manner different from what he did, when a sinner. The atonement changes no purpose of God, but it makes it fit for him to treat the sinner, for whom the atonement is made, in a mode different from what would be proper, if no such satisfaction had been given. The atonement is the medium, through which God shows favor to sinners. The same objection is equally strong against prayer—God is good and unchangeable, prayer can produce no change upon him, therefore he cannot require it, nor is it useful. This is, however, false reasoning; and so is that against the atonement being made to God.*

Obj.—Repentance and reformation are all that God requires of us, this is the atonement; this Jesus effects, by instructing us in the gospel.

Reply.—In this respect, which is the true Socinian sense of atonement, all the prophets, and apostles, and teachers sent of God, made and still make atonement!

* See Note, No. XIV, at the end of the work.

These instructed and acted for the benefit of sinners, but did not atone for them. Repentance and reformation do not make atonement. Without penitence of mind and reformation, sinners are indeed, unfit for heavenly happiness; but these do not secure it. "We may as well affirm that our former obedience atones for our present sins, as that our present obedience makes amends for antecedent transgressions." The dictates of natural conscience teach, that repentance does not expiate for past crimes. Hence the multiplicity of sacrifices, among the nations who have been destitute of the gospel. To this divine revelation lends its sanction—*Without shedding of blood there is no remission. We have redemption through his blood.*

Obj.—This demand of atonement, by suffering, represents God in an unamiable point of view.

Reply.—Does the connecting of the dreadful sufferings, which we often witness, in this life, with moral evil, represent God as unamiable. If not, where is the force of the objection? It has none. *The wages of sin is death.*

Obj.—But if the atonement be not intentionally made for all, then the gospel cannot be preached to all.

Reply.—The gospel never has been preached to all. It never will be preached to all the sons of Adam. Many have been adjudged to their place, for sin, who never heard the gospel. Many have lived and died, in every age, who never heard of Jesus Christ.

The preaching of the gospel does not consist in telling every one, that Christ has died for him; but in explaining the nature of the plan of salvation; in urging the duty of faith in the Saviour; and in giving assurance, that whosoever believeth shall be saved. All this may be done, were the number to be saved much smaller than it is. The ground of faith is, not the Divine intention respecting the atonement; but the revelation of grace, that all who believe shall be saved, together with an assurance, that it is the duty of all wherever the gospel comes, to appropriate, by faith, that salvation which it offers.

To that offered salvation I recommend my reader. It is worthy of all acceptation. None ever have or ever

will cast themselves upon it in vain. It is your privilege to have its blessings proposed for your acceptance; it is your duty to embrace it. A refusal of it will add to that guilt which is already too heavy for you to bear. It is free, it is perfect, it is adapted to our condition. Let it not then be proposed to us in vain.

CHAPTER VII.

SHALL THE WICKED BE ANNIHILATED?

Upon this subject we find the following sentiments: "When the word, destruction, is used to describe the last end of the wicked, it is to describe an end of the soul and body forever." After quoting a variety of scripture to prove, that the wicked shall be destroyed, the writer says, "If all this can take place, and yet the wicked exist eternally in a state of misery, then I confess language is an imposition, and we must conclude that the Bible says one thing and means another." "This earth will be dissolved—this will make this whole globe a lake of fire;—Here wicked men and devils will be destroyed"* &c.

The whole weight of this opinion rests upon the meaning of the words, *second death*, *destroy*, *destruction*, and a few others of similar import. No reason is assigned why these words *must* mean annihilation, when applied to the final state of the wicked. The writer says so, and he always calculates largely on the credulity of his reader. He admits that the word *destroy* does not always mean annihilation; he says it "signifies to demolish a building—To take away a man's life"—In opposition to his system of reducing men and devils to nothing, it would be as safe to assert, that God will never annihilate any creature, natural or moral, which he has formed. To believe this, would be more reasonable than the opposite assertion.

To *torment* and to *destroy*, are employed as signifying the same thing. Compare Mat. viii. 29, with Mark i.

24. In the former the evil spirits inquired, *Art thou come hither to TORMENT us before the time?* In the latter, *Art thou come to DESTROY us?* These, when taken in connexion with other scriptures, teach us the import of destruction, when applied to the wicked.

This wild opinion is contrary to the equity of the Divine dispensations. Different degrees of crime require different degrees of punishment. Annihilation would place them all on the same ground. This, however, shall not be the case; for every one shall receive according to his works.

The life that is purchased for the believer, is the eternal enjoyment of God, in a state of blessedness. Into this life, after the last judgment, shall the righteous enter. *The righteous shall go into life eternal.* Mat xxv. 46. Is this life any more than a mere continued existence? What more? does it imply happiness? Is it not the felicity of that state, that chiefly entitles it to the appellation of life? * The punishment of the wicked, the second death, is contrasted with this happiness; both are pronounced eternal. The punishment is everlasting, the worm never dies, the fire shall never be quenched, there is no rest day nor night, the smoke of their torment ascends up for ever and ever. †

In the destruction of the wicked, God will manifest the greatness of his power. Were annihilation this destruction, in that would be no display of power. A mere absence of his power is all, that is requisite to effect this. Maintaining them in being, while punished in justice for sin, would be such a display—*God willing to make his power known endured—the vessels of wrath fitted to destruction.* Rom. ix. 22. Nature has no independent powers. Its various parts exist by the energies of God. Let him withhold these energies, and instantly all shall crumble into non-existence.

* The term *life* seems to be used by our Redeemer for *happiness*, in Luke xii. 15. *A man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth.* That is as Guise remarks, "The happiness of the present life, and satisfaction of the soul, does not consist in an affluence of earthly possessions"—Happiness is expressed by the term *life*; death as properly means misery. When it is asserted, that death, punishment, destruction, &c. mean non-existence, ask the asserter how he knows. Call upon him to prove that God ever has, or ever will, annihilate any creature, that he has made. Much idle talk would be prevented, by calling for proof in place of assertion and declamation.

† Rev. xiv. 11—and xx. 10—Mark ix. 43, 49.

The language employed, respecting the future state of the wicked, is by no means reconcileable with their non-existence. Everlasting punishment, when no one is to be punished; the smoke of torment ascending for ever, when there is none tormented, or to be tormented; having no rest day or night, when there is neither body nor soul to rest, or be uneasy, are modes of expression which reasonable and good men, will not be ready to palm upon scriptures of truth.

The writer above quoted intimates, that the devils also shall be burnt up in the conflagration of the earth. This is in character with the rest of his opinions. Yet it appears, he thinks all will be restored, after having suffered the pains of annihilation; for this annihilation shall be annihilated. Reduction to non-existence, and the second death he holds to be the same thing, this is that which shall be the punishment of the wicked; yet, says he, "death is to be destroyed." This he says is to be one of the four things that shall "be as though it had not been." When the apostle says, *The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death*; the intelligent reader will not suspect him for giving us the information, that annihilation shall be annihilated! This was reserved for "the age of inquiry."

The ample evidence which the word of inspiration furnishes, in proof of the actual punishment of the finally impenitent being endless, sets aside the idle visions of those who talk of annihilation. To discuss the subject of endless punishment is not now required.* What has been said is sufficient to meet, and silence the assertion of the wicked being consigned to non-existence.

The impious and immoral tendency of the sentiment, invites, to guard against its progress, the attention of every good member of society. The man who is so far degraded, in his own estimation, from the dignified rank of a moral being, as to believe, and declare, that he has no more of an immortal soul than his horse, † will very

* The author was called upon sometime ago, to investigate the subject of *universal salvation*. The result of that investigation is promised to the press.

† Mr. King, a preacher in the Smithite connexion, in a conversation with Mr. Porter, as related, in his sermon on Jude 4, said—"I used to think that I possessed an immortal soul, which at the death of my body would go to a state of happiness or misery; but I have now no more belief that I possess an immortal soul, than that my horse does."

probably exhibit, practically, in life, a system of horse-like morals. For him, society should prepare a correspondent system of regulation. Such an opinion must debase the mind. Those who believe and act according to it, are unfit companions for the virtuous expectant of a happy immortality.*

CHAPTER VIII.

REMARKS ON THE SENTIMENTS AND ORDER OF THE SMITHITES.

The sect generally known under the appellation of **SMITHITES**, is of modern origin. The distinguishing sentiments which they embrace are, however, not new.† Respecting what are deemed the most important doctrines of religion, they stand upon the Socinian or Unitarian side.

Their leader and founder, Elias Smith, it appears was once a preacher among the evangelical anti-pedobaptists. It is not my design to become the historian of the tales that are circulated respecting him, were I certain that they are correct, much less am I disposed to engage in such a task, when the only evidence is the rumour of the day. His sentiments may be those of a profligate, and they may be espoused by the man of more decent manners; but they cannot be the practical faith of the humble saint. With him, as the zealous advocate of pernicious opinions, I have only to do.

From a calvinistic baptist, he became a preacher of universal salvation, according to the system of Winchester. To be in connexion with any existing denomination, was inconsistent with the views ultimately entertained by this man. He became, of course, the head of a party. Having declared hostilities against the essential doctrines of christianity, his virulence has been manifested against every section of the christian Church.

* Such as wish to see a further investigation of the subject of the foregoing chapter, will find it accurately examined, by the late Dr. Edwards, in his book against Dr. Chauncy—Chap. v.
† See Note, No. XV, at the end of the work.

He makes war against creeds, and covenants, and discipline, and literature, and doctorates, with an enmity, rude as it is bitter. He seems disposed to form a party, and accordingly addresses himself to those, whom he supposes will be satisfied, to hear of the banishment of articles of faith, of codes of order, of learning and of those restraints, which the best men, in every age, have deemed proper to be laid upon the licentiousness of mankind. He affects to be acquainted with the systems of religion in different ages and countries, and yet, it appears, wishes to be understood as the inventor of the opinions which he holds; not one of which, however, absurd or heterodox, has not had an advocate, more able far, to recommend it than himself.

The followers of Mr. Smith, assume the general name of *christian*, and profess to lay aside every system but the New Testament. The only rule of interpretation which they profess to adopt, is to adhere to the letter of the scripture,* not excepting even the prophetic parts, where symbolical language is so frequently employed. In the application of this rule, it will be found that their leader, who, it is believed, is their chief writer, is not uniform. And though professedly opposed to creeds, he endeavours, indirectly, to introduce his books, among his disciples, to occupy the same place that confessions of faith do, among christian communities. And it will be found, that his votaries pay as much regard to those crudities, as most christians do to the subordinate standards of their respective communities. Of his "Age of Inquiry," a scurrilous invective against every thing that bears the image of truth or order, he speaks thus: "I do not recommend this little book to you as a rule; but as an index pointing to the rule Christ has given." It is, he says, "calculated for the benefit of the rising generation in leading them into truth—Let them read it *instead* of the catechisms."†—Of his New Testament dictionary, he says, "I have written in such a way as is calculated to assist young preachers."—His claims are far from humble. He indeed does not propose to give to people a rule, a supreme rule I presume, but only "to assist

* See Note, No. XVI, at the end of the work.

† Age of Inquiry, page 6.

young preachers," and to supply the place of the catechisms with his "Age of Inquiry."

He has engaged a variety of character in his service, male and female. As his pioneer, a woman, has visited various parts. Nancy G. Cram, exhibits as a preacher in connexion with Mr. Smith. In his "Herald of Gospel Liberty," he very respectfully notices her services. It is understood she has a husband and some children; but conceiving the obscure pursuits of a life of domestic virtue, not well adapted to her talents, or perhaps being better pleased with the service to which she is called by E. S., than with the society of her husband and children, she appears in the character of a public preacher. She is remarkable, neither for that delicacy of mind, which is the ornament of her sex, nor for that information and good sense, by which so many of them are characterized. She is abundantly gifted with that spirit of her head, which opposes literature, order, and whatever christians usually have considered, as of vital importance to the interests of religion. She indeed does not profess to entertain her audience with any thing like what well informed men call a regular discussion; she never studies, and *compliments* her Maker with being the author of her crude invectives. She exhibits her discourse, as it is given her from above! Such, it is said, is her language.

Mr. S. has written a number of books. In them is little diversity of sentiment. The same cheerless train of thought, with very little variety of dress, he repeats in his various volumes. Into his New Testament Dictionary, he has compressed all the stores of his knowledge, and, if not the forms, certainly the substance of all the books he has written. He quotes scripture in abundance; but it often appears to be at random. His expositions are most arbitrary; he rarely condescends to assign any reason, except his own assertion, that so it must be. He boldly, and in general briefly, asserts his opinion, and then adds a string of scripture citations, not as would appear, really to establish the truth of his positions upon the basis of divine authority, but to mitigate the alarm of the more timid class of his readers; and with others, who rarely think, being pleased with a

mere jingle of words, to give currency to his opinions under an imposing garb.

It is but justice to remark upon the vanity of his boasting. He vaunts not a little of his own, and his coadjutors' success, in gaining proselytes, and, in triumph, proclaims, that "the old doctrine of election is becoming contemptible." So he says of every fundamental doctrine in christianity. He adds to the number of his partizans—But who are they? Not any who have been in regular standing with any church; not any of the intelligent, moral and pious members of the community. The reader will readily conclude, that his doctrines and order are not likely to make them better. Observation of facts will justify this conclusion. They may oppose the fundamental doctrines of grace, with the fury of blinded passion, but not from a conviction that they are untrue. Mr. S. himself does not know, or, if he know, misrepresents our view of the doctrines of the gospel.* His followers, in general, never professed any principles of religious faith, and of course, though they accede to him, they diminish not the number of the advocates of evangelical truth. The truth, however, is the reverse of what he states. The great doctrines of the gospel, as held by Calvinists, never had more zealous advocates, in our country, than at present. Their number, too, is increasing.

It is proper that I lay before my readers a specimen of the sentiments of this man, and his party.—A comparison of his opinions with the doctrines of the gospel, as delineated in the Bible, will enable every honest inquirer to judge of them in justice.

Under the denomination of Anti-Christ he includes, among others, *Lutherans, Calvinists, Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Baptists*—And of the fundamental articles of their faith respecting God, he speaks in the following manner:

"Thousands declare that God is *three* instead of *one*. The spirit of Anti-Christ leads its friends to persecute all who do not believe that the Father is *three persons* instead of *one*.—Fables are such doctrines and laws as are not named in the scriptures. 1. The Trinity. 2. The covenant of grace, &c. In all, said in the scriptures, of God the creator—there is no mention of the Trinity, or *three persons* being *one person*." New Test. Dict. p. 41, 168, 196.

* See Note, No. XVII, at the end of the work.

Who believes that the Father is *three persons*? Who says that *three persons* are *one person*? The author knew, and still knows, that this is false testimony. He cannot produce *one*, no, not *one*, who holds that *three persons* are *one person*, or that *one person* is *three*. These indeed are contradictions; but they are of E. Smith's manufacturing. Whether the scriptures speak of a Trinity or not, let the reader decide from the evidence already adduced. We say that God, *in essence* is one, and that this one essence subsists in three distinct and necessary modes, which we call persons. What is contradictory, in this, either to scripture or to reason? When Mr. S. again opposes the doctrine of the Trinity, let him not form absurdities of his own, and represent them as the opinions of others; but let him, if he think he can, meet the question fairly as it is held, and stated by Trinitarians. Again he ask, and replies to the question,

"Who is Christ? He is the son of man, being from Adam through Mary his mother.—Adam was made of the earth—The woman was made of the man, and Christ was made of the woman. In all the glorious things said of Christ there is no mention of his divinity, his being God-man, his *incarnation*, the human and divine nature, the human soul of Christ, his being God the creator, and yet, the son of the creator; these things are the inventions of men"—p. 95, 96. "Jesus Christ is the only begotten of the Father—is a son in a way different from all of them; and, on this account, all the angels worshipped him as their superior—Page 67. Many conclude that Christ is the creator of heaven and earth.—If this is true, Deists only believe the truth; for if Christ is—the creator of all things, the scriptures are an imposition on the world." 196, 197.

Such are some of E. Smith's opinions respecting Jesus the Saviour. We are taught in scripture, to believe, that *The first man is of the earth, earthy; the second man is THE LORD FROM HEAVEN.** Mr. S. it seems, was not prepared to give the lie to the apostle directly. He does so, however, indirectly. The apostle says, Christ, "the second man is the Lord from heaven." No, says E. Smith, Adam was made of the earth—the woman was made of the man, and Christ of the woman. The conclusion is, that Christ is as really of the earth as was Adam; and of course, the apostolic distinction between Christ and the first man is impertinent. Christ is not the Lord from heaven, according to E. S. but is of the earth, earthy: for the man is of the earth and is *earthy*, the woman is of the man, and is of the same nature,

* 1 Cor. xv. 47.

earthy; Christ is of the woman, and must also be *earthy*! Yet earthy, and mere man as he is, Christ is allowed by Mr. S. to be omnipotent, and to have all power in heaven and earth. "Christ is head, a ruler, having all things under his command, being head over all men and things." I am the ALMIGHTY, Rev. i. 8. "This, says Mr. S. evidently is applied to Christ." Page 34, 206. Is any, who is not God, capable of universal empire? Is any *Almighty* but the Eternal? Mr. S. it appears, believes that one who is *merely earthy* can be endowed with omnipotence.

But says he, "there is no mention of his divinity"—The contrary is shewn in chap. ii. "Nor any mention of his *incarnation*." Yet we read, the word, who was in the beginning, *with God*, and who *was God*, *was made flesh.** This is what we understand by the incarnation of Christ. *Verily he took on him the seed of Abraham.* We really do think this is very like a mentioning of the incarnation. "There is no mention of the human nature," or "the human soul of Christ." Indeed! And yet Mr. Smith, who professes to believe nothing but what is in the New Testament, upon this subject, teaches that Christ is a man, and the Son of man. A man and the Son of man, yet no human nature, nor human soul belonging to him! Who was it, upon a memorable occasion, that said, *My soul is exceeding sorrowful?*—"There is no mention of the human and divine nature." Mr. S. says he committed to memory most of the New Testament. It is pity he so often forgets very important portions of it. *My kinsmen are Israelites—of whom as concerning the flesh, Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever.†* As to what belongs to him, as man, in this text called *flesh*, it was of the Israelites; but this was not all, *he is over all, God blessed for ever.* Is this not mentioning something of the "God-man," of "the human and Divine nature?" But still, "There is no mention of his being God the creator, and yet the Son of the creator." Yes, there is mention of both: *The word (the Son) was God. All things were made by him. Unto the Son he saith, Thy throne, O God is for ever and ever—And, thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the*

* John, i. 1, 2, 14.—† Rom. ix. 5—5.

*foundation of the earth; and the heavens are the works of thine hands.** Do not these scriptures mention him as "God the creator," and at the same time, "the Son of the creator?" If not, we shall be glad to know, in what terms, these facts can be more clearly revealed.

Mr. S. admits that Christ is "the *only begotten* of the Father, a Son in a way different from all others; and, on this account, all the angels worshipped him as their superior." He holds him to be the Son of God, in virtue of the extraordinary formation of his humanity. But was this more out of the usual course, than the formation of Adam? Was it as much? Was not Adam's formation as extraordinary as that of the human nature of Christ? If so, had not Adam as good a title to be denominated the ONLY BEGOTTEN of the Father as Christ? It is granted the mode of their formation was different; but the latter was not more extraordinary than the former. To the claim of ONLY BEGOTTEN, the one is not less entitled, on this ground, than the other. Both cannot be equally entitled to that relation, and therefore it is just to conclude, that he, to whom it is ascribed, has it for a higher reason. Besides, if extraordinary formation entitled Christ, as Mr. S. alleges, to the worship of angels, why did it not give a claim to Adam for the same?

"Many conclude, says Mr. S. that Christ is the creator of heaven and earth." Certainly; all who believe the scriptures conclude so. But, adds he "If this is true, Deists only believe the truth; for if Christ is the creator of all things, the scriptures are an imposition on the world."

So then, it appears Mr. S. would not believe the scriptures, did they, if that were possible, in still more explicit language than they do, teach that the ONLY BEGOTTEN SON of God is the creator of the world! He would rather believe that the Bible, in defiance of all the splendor of the evidence of its divinity, is an imposition upon the world, than admit that he, upon whom the millions of the saved depend for their redemption, is the creator of the heavens! So say the deists. He and they unite in fundamentals, and for them, as men of kindred spirit with himself, he feels respect. Under the word *infidel*, he says, "There are many infidels, who do not appear to possess a spirit of enmity against the gospel, and they are not always the worst of men." Mr. S. pro-

*John i. 1-3—Heb. i. 8-10.

fesses to have searched the scriptures, to find the original meaning of particular words. He furnishes us with various specimens of his success; from among which I shall notice one; it is the term *Lord*, as applied in the New Testament to our Redeemer. "Jesus Christ is called Lord," he says, "for two reasons." One of these reasons is, "Because the word in the Saxon language, originally meant one who gave bread to the poor." Because the English word *Lord* is derived from two Saxon words, which signify to give bread; therefore, Jesus Christ is called by the Greek word *Kurios*, which signifies one possessed of authority! Such is the logic,* and critical skill of this man. By such impudent nonsense are the simple often deceived.

"Spirit," says the author of the New Testament Dictionary, "signifies, the influence or operation of God, called the spirit of God". p. 344. Thus he sets aside the personality and Deity of the Holy Ghost. I add nothing, in refutation of this, to what is said in chap. iii, to which I refer. Again, of man he says,

"The first man was made mortal in every sense of the word. There is no immortality about him. p. 258. All said of the immortal never dying soul, &c. is unscriptural. p. 221. It is the life of the man, and that which can die." 343.

Thus it appears that Adam was made a subject of death—doomed in his creation state to suffer, not only a separation of soul and body, but also an extinction of mind, with the dissolution of body. The scriptures teach us, that death is the wages of sin, and that death entered into the world by sin. Rom. v. 12, 21. From this it appears, that mortality is always connected with sin as its procuring cause. Was man then made a sinner? Was he formed, by his righteous Creator, a violator of the law of love? If not, how was it, that there was "no immortality about him?" Or, is it so, that death is not the wages of sin? This man, it appears, is as regardless of self-consistency as he is of truth. In

* The following is a specimen of reasoning exhibited, in print, by a gentleman, who, as an instructor, lately visited our benighted shores. It will match E. Smith's criticism. "See Dr. Hemmenway's treatise on infant baptism: and especially Mr. Peter Edwards' book entitled "Candid Reasons," &c. which books I do not hesitate to pronounce unanswerable, particularly that of Edwards, because he was long an eminent baptist minister, and was well qualified, therefore, to take up the subject: and because he writes against Mr. Booth!" The man who can reason so, need not hesitate to pronounce any thing, for he will never be without an argument. I mean nothing disrespectful to the works of Dr. Hemmenway and Mr. Edwards.

his sermons on the prophecies, page 204, 205. We find the following sentiments :

"The word *immortal* and *immortality* is never applied to any thing but that which was once mortal. It always refers to the body. Jesus Christ is called immortal because he was once mortal, 1 Tim. i. 17. It is plain here (1 Tim. vi. 14, 16) that Jesus only hath immortality in himself." Again; "There is but one who has immortality in himself; who is in his nature incorruptible, which is the invisible God; he only has immortality, 1 Tim. vi. 16. Paul declares that the unseen God is the only one who hath immortality in himself."—N. Test. Dict. p. 220.

I offer the above, as a specimen of the numerous self-contradictions of this leader in heresy. In the above quotations we find, that immortality can be grafted only on mortality!—that it refers only to matter or body—That God is immortal; therefore, he must once have been mortal, and must even now have a body; for immortality always refers to the body." "Jesus Christ only hath immortality in himself"—"The unseen God only hath immortality in himself"—Therefore Jesus is the unseen God. Here we have asserted the extreme of atheism, and an orthodox sentiment respecting Christ, as God! E. S. perhaps intends to occupy both sides of the way, so that when he is pressed upon one side, he may pass to the other. There is scarcely a doctrine in which Smith may not be brought, *vs*, Smith.

I had purposed to remark more particularly on his opinions respecting the atonement, the evil of sin, justification, sanctification, annihilation of the wicked, &c. I confess myself wearied in examining contradictions and absurdities. My reader, after the sample above given, will, I trust, be disposed to release me from any farther direct attention to Mr. Smith. I shall therefore, close my extracts with the two following :

"There is no account of a Sabbath, or a day of rest, until the law was given to the Jews at Mount Sinai, and then it was given only to the Jews, and to them only until Christ came.—Jesus Christ never ordered his followers to keep the Sabbath.—Constantine was the first, who ever made a law to observe the first day as a christian Sabbath."—p. 325, 326.

The arguments of infidels and Socinians are employed by E. Smith, in his "Herald of Gospel Liberty," to cast reproach on the sacred institution of the Sabbath. He and his followers represent every day, as equally holy; they place the observation of the christian Sabbath, on the same footing with the superstitious observance of days of canonized saints, and do not spare to ridicule the weakness of those, who suppose, that the profanation of

the Sabbath is calculated to bring down, upon a people, the judgments of God.

The same ideas, respecting the Sabbath, are entertained by the Socinians in England. One of their champions, Mr. Belsham, holds that, "To a true christian every day is a Sabbath, every place is a temple, and every action of life an act of devotion. Whatever is lawful or expedient upon any one day of the week, is, under the christian dispensation, equally lawful and expedient on any other. A virtuous man is performing his duty to the Supreme Being, as really, and as acceptably, when he is pursuing the proper business of life, or even when enjoying its innocent and decent amusements, as when he is offering direct addresses to him in the closet, or in the temple."* "And thus," remarks Dr. Magee, "a christian may be employed, through the entire of his life, in worshipping his God, *by never once thinking of him*, but merely pursuing his proper business or his *innocent amusements*!

The busy and distracting scenes of life require, that man should occasionally turn aside to reflect upon the interesting subjects presented by religion—Reason says, that the social principles of our nature should be employed in the services of devotion, and the improvements of a pious activity. These require, to accomplish any valuable end, the appropriation of a portion of time. The state of society demands that the time, appointed for one, be set apart for another. God has done this. A seventh portion of our days is consecrated, by divine appointment, to the special services of religion. *God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it.*† On that day he ceased to create, and thereby set an example, to the sons of men, to rest from their toils. *He sanctified it*; he set it apart to a holy service. This he did at the beginning, which proves that the institution of the Sabbath was not a Jewish rite, but one founded in the nature of things, and common to all men. It was appointed to be observed in commemorating the completion of the work of creation, and in contemplating the magnificent display of God's perfections in his finished works. The reason

* Vide Belsham's Review, as quoted by Dr. Magee, Discourses on the Atonement—Page 63.—† Gen. ii. 3.

of the first institution still continues, substantially, in force ; the law of course, itself, remains. The economy of grace employs the Sabbath in its service ; *There remaineth a rest* (the keeping of a Sabbath*) *to the people of God.* *For he that is entered into his rest, he also hath ceased from his own works, as God did from his.*† In these verses the work of redemption, by the Mediator, is contrasted, with the work of creation by God, as Creator. As a day of holy resting was observed in commemoration of the latter, so one of similar repose remains to celebrate the former.

The division of time into weeks in most, if not in all nations, is presumptive evidence of this original institution. The happy effects of a conscientious attention, to the duties of the sacred Sabbath, evince the wisdom of its institution. The profanation of it is deeply marked, by spiritual, as well as temporal judgments. When once the Sabbath and its religious services are generally disregarded, all sense of moral obligation will shortly disappear from the abodes of men. Religion will languish, and the correct morals, that are nourished by the sanctifying ordinances of christianity, will wither and die. Then shall the foundations of society be shaken, and confidence be a stranger in the intercourse of men. Let the general tenour of character manifested by the correct observers of the Sabbath, and that of those who condemn it, be my vouchers for the truth of what is now asserted. I appeal to experience and observation, as well as to the scriptures of truth. Let those institutions where Socinian errors have been taught, for any considerable length of time, honestly say, whether, among their disciples, the number of infidels or humble christians be the majority !

Constantine was the first civil ruler, who gave the sanction of state authority to the first day of the week, as the christian Sabbath ; but it is unfair to intimate, that this day was not observed as a Sabbath before. From the resurrection of our Lord, christians employed that day, statedly, in the most solemn acts of devotion. It was, because christians observed it as a Sabbath, that Constantine lent his civil sanction, requiring its obser-

* So it reads in the original.—† Heb. iv. 9, 10.

vation. They observed it, in virtue of a divine appointment. It was not in vain, that they, uniformly, met upon the first day of the week, instead of the seventh, which Israel observed. Had it been merely an invention of their own, it would have been vain.*

I add a specimen of E. Smith's mode of expounding prophecy, in which he confidently conceives himself to excel all his predecessors and cotemporaries.

"It appears to me that the nation of France, and some leader will lead the Jews into the promised land. It is possible that Bonaparte may be the man.—They may think the man, who leads them into their land to be the Messiah. It appears from the prophecy, that they will appoint themselves one leader or head to go before them. Hos. i. 11. If this text does not refer to such a time, I cannot tell what it means."—*Sermons on the Prophecies*—Page 65, 66.

Thus, Mr. S. informs us, if Hos. i. 11. refers not to the Jews appointing Bonaparte to lead them into Palestine, and to them, taking him for Messiah, he knows not what it means ! Happy expositor ! While some have made Napoleon Antichrist, Mr. Smith's returning Jews will make him *their Christ* ; and in this they will not essentially differ from Mr. Belsham (with whom it is a pity Mr. S. is not a little better acquainted, as he would often help him out of difficulty) who holds, that Bonaparte was the creator of Europe, in much the same sense that Jesus Christ is the creator of the world.† I shall dismiss the consideration of the order of this society, with a remark or two upon the employment of females, as public preachers. This furnishes an evidence of the state of unblushing impudence at which mankind may arrive. Here is a proposal to reform the world by the religion of Christ, denying, in the mean time, every distinguishing doctrine of that religion, and employing agents, excluded, by divine authority, from the place of public teachers. Such is the state of society, that this imposture obtains advocates. This dereliction of respect to the due order of society, is, however, not peculiar to our age or country. If it furnishes any apology for the persons concerned, or for the practice, other times, countries, and persons have borne the reproach of giving countenance to a similar departure, from the laws of correct regulation. The church in *Thyatira* suffered that woman, *Jezebel*, to teach and to seduce the servants of the Lord ;‡ for which toleration, that church was

* Mat. xv. 9.—† See Note, No. VIII, at the end of the work.—‡ Rev. ii. 20.

sharply reprov'd. The seventeenth century produced an Antoinette Bourignon and a Jane Leadley. In our own times, among others, Ann Leese and Jemima Wilkinson, make a conspicuous figure. The claim of Mr. Smith's female teachers are equally valid, with that of the whole catalogue of those *famous* dames, from *Jezebel of Thyatira*, down to *Jemima Wilkinson of Cumberland*. And, if in the age of apostolic purity, some were seduced by the arts of Jezebel, why should it be deemed strange, that, in what many reckon a more degenerate time, there should some be found the victims of the seductive address, of the female heralds of *Smithite christianity*?

I request the reader, to consult with care, the portions of scripture, directed to in the margin. There will be found, in all ordinary cases, the prohibition of the female from public teaching, and from the exercise of public authority over men. The duties of the female are, by a divine authority, prescribed*; a due attention to them will leave to her no time for those employments, which God has assigned to men. If the Divine Being, in any instance, departs from the usual order appointed by himself, and calls a female to extraordinary services, we have reason to expect an extraordinary evidence of the divinity of her mission. Without such proof, the orderly members of community will mark, with decided disapprobation, all such outrage against social relations and the order of the church of God, as female domination over the understanding and conscience of mankind, exercised in a pretended preaching of the gospel.

It has been objected, however, that *Euodias* and *Syn-tyche*, laboured with Paul in the gospel.† But did they labour in publicly preaching the gospel? How would such a supposition agree with the positive prohibition of female speakers in the church? *It is not permitted unto them to speak—it is a shame for women to speak in the church.* In attending to private acts of charity, in waiting upon the afflicted female disciples of Christ, in ministering to their wants by their property, and to their comfort by their counsel and prayers, they would indeed labour in gospel acts. But those matrons did not so far

* 1 Cor. xiv. 34, 35—1 Tim. ii. 11—14, and v. 14—Tit. ii. 3, 4, 5—Eph. v. 22—1 Pet. iii. 5, 6—Prov. xxxi. 10, 23.—† Phil. iv. 2, 3.

abandon the virtue of their sex, nor so impiously trample upon the sacred order of the church, as to *usurp authority over the men*. It appears, that aged females, in the apostolic age, were employed by the church, not as Ecclesiastic office bearers, but to carry into effect some of the benevolent designs of the faithful toward the distressed. These obtained the name of DEACONESSES, or female servants, whose duty it was, especially, to attend the table.* These women supplied the wants of those poor, whom it might have been improper for the Deacons to have visited. "Some, particularly the eastern churches, elected DEACONESSES, and chose, for that purpose, matrons or widows of eminent sanctity, who also ministered to the poor."†

No countenance, by those ancient and temporary arrangements, is given to the practice of enthusiastic or idle women, who, forsaking their proper business, and casting off those virtues, which should ornament their character, justly expose themselves to the animadversions of such of mankind, as retain any sense of decency and propriety. Where is the good man, that could, without shame and distress, see his wife, his daughter, or his sister, abandon the restraints and safety of her home, and become the strolling associate of men, whose fair fame is, perhaps, not well established? Let every friend of order, then, discountenance all such outrage upon the decencies and happiness of life.

I now close my strictures upon the sentiments and order of this motley sect. I close it with the conviction, that its founder is a man, destitute of regard to religious truth—that his object is to collect a party—that, for this purpose, he aims at confounding the views of the simple, and that, so far as he succeeds, he conducts the victims of his intrigue, toward the dreary wastes of skepticism. Of these things, I presume, every one will be satisfied, who can have the patience to read his profane banter, his virulence against order, and his unblushing abuse of every thing, distinguishing in the system of Christianity.

* In the proper and primitive sense of *diaconos*, it is a servant who attends his master, waits on him at table, and is always near his person," &c.

† Mosh. vol. i. 102,

Campbell on Mat. 20, 26.

CONCLUSION.

In concluding this work, I earnestly beseech my reader to review the evidence of the doctrines, I have attempted to defend. Compare those doctrines with the whole tenour of the book of God. But remember that the spirit, who dictated the contents of that book, can alone unfold to the inquiring mind its sacred treasures. Seek in humble prayer, the aids of this Spirit, in all your inquiries into the will of God. A disposition to inquire is laudable ; but to be profitable it must be well directed. A solid, rational, and manly investigation of truth is something far different from a continual fluctuation of mind, created by every gewgaw of novelty. Against this, guard, with care, your own hearts ; guard your children from its pernicious influence.

It is an indispensable duty to consider our present condition, as we are fallen sinners. Let the magnitude of human guilt be felt upon the conscience, and the malignity of moral evil, as a malady, be known ; the consequence will be, a deep conviction, that for his salvation, man needs more, infinitely more, than simple instruction and a perfect example. He will perceive that, *without shedding of blood there is no remission*. The nature of the atonement occupies a very conspicuous part of the gospel revelation. The Deity of him who has made that atonement, is distinctly marked. Deny the God-HEAD of Jesus, and the language of inspiration, respecting him, the songs that celebrate the love of God to man, degenerate into unwarrantable hyperbole. Then the atonement is a blank ; there is nothing to meet the demands of justice ; nothing to silence the accusations of conscience ; the throne of God is still surrounded with terrors, and man is without hope.

Blessed be God this is not the case. Jesus is Divine, and a sufficient atonement is made. *Things hard to be understood*, in the present state of mental improvement, we readily confess belong to this subject. It cannot be otherwise. We are strangers in God's empire. Our acquaintance with things is but commencing. We are a mystery to ourselves. God is to us all mystery. To an *apprehensive* knowledge of him we may indeed attain.

This is highly important to the saint. To another state of being he, however, looks forward, where, possessing greater compass of mind, he shall understand more of the things of God. Yet, never will he have reached the point, where deeps unexplored will not still remain.

It is, notwithstanding, grateful to the man, who is piously inquisitive, to hope, that in the heavenly state, his mind will be in a continued approximation, if the expression be allowed, to that inaccessible eminence, whence the Omniscient eye descries every object of thought. In this progression, is it visionary to suppose, that the point in duration is advancing, when the humblest intellect among the heirs of grace, shall find the range of thought, at which the Seraph is now astonished, too limited for its expanded view. Then, with wonder, will saved sinners look back on the darkness, the narrow systems, the follies and disputes of men.

This world is, however, not the place of such extended vision. Here we must live by faith. By faith in the Son of God, and in obedience to his will, let us, then, direct our way to the summit of loftier hills than earth affords, where, in communion more intimate with the Spirit of light, than is suitable for an earthly sanctuary, our acquaintance with the wonders of THE DIVINITY shall be enlarged.—AMEN.

NOTES.

NOTE NO. I.—SEE PAGE 6.

Children, placed by the providence of God, within the territory of the Church, are proper objects of her care, and subjects of her order. Those children, who belong to families, the heads of which make a consistent profession of faith and obedience, are to be esteemed members of the church. They are her property. When their relation to her is solemnly recognized, it is her *indispensable duty*, to superintend their education. It is no small gratification, to see this subject taken up by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, in the United States. It is devoutly hoped, that the great principles asserted in the report of their committee, in 1812, proposing "a plan for disciplining baptized children"—will be ratified in due form, and, with prudent firmness, be carried into full effect. The happy results to the interests of religion, from the adoption of such a measure, by a body so extensively influential, as the General Assembly, would indeed be great. Every head of a family should be acquainted with the principles of that report.

NOTE NO. II.—SEE PAGE 13.

Some have attempted to invalidate the force of the argument, drawn from the use of the plural number, *ALEIM*, or *ELOHIM*, as the name of the Supreme Being. They suppose he speaks after the manner of monarchs, who employ that form of expression, in issuing forth their decrees. The language of Eastern monarchs, however, as recorded in scripture, does not justify nor even allow the supposition. See among other instances the following:—"Give me the persons—Pharaoh said unto Joseph, I have dreamed a dream—I have heard say of thee—In my dream, behold, I stood upon the bank of the river—Only in the throne will I be greater than thou. I make a decree, &c. I Artaxerxes the king do make a decree—Is not this great Babylon that I have built?"* &c.

The fact is, that the limitations of monarchy, in modern times, have given occasion to the plural form, in which kings have spoken; and, in it, is implied the concurrence of the members of their cabinets. Even the modern pluralism, of monarchical expression, has very little resemblance to that which God employed. When, or where, did any monarch express himself thus? *The man is become as one of us.*

To urge, as some do, that the name, *ALEIM*, is in the singular number, betrays, to say the least, great inattention. The word is really plural, being regularly formed from the singular, *ALE*. Mr. Parkhurst says, "It may be doubted whether *ALE*, in the singular, be ever in the Hebrew scriptures used as a name for Jehovah the true God"—It is used, however, "for the false God of the Chaldeans." Hab. i. 11. and for the idol of the Sepharvites. 2 King. xvii. 31.

NOTE NO. III.—SEE PAGE 14.

With those who have most extensively and impartially examined the opinions of the ancient Jews, there is no doubt of the doctrine of the Trinity having been received among that people. The comments of their Doctors, long before the christian era, are remarkable. Many of them used the names, Father, Son and Spirit, while they taught, that the doctrine of distinct personality, was not inconsistent with the unity of essence. Some of them asserted, that this mysterious doctrine was taught in the construction of the name *Jehovah*. In expounding Deut. vi. 4. one of them said, the first *Lord* or *Jehovah*, is God the Father; the second, *Our God*, is God the Son; because he is called by the prophet, *Emmanuel*, *God with us*; the third *Jehovah*, is the Holy Spirit; and the fourth word, *One*, is indicative of the unity of essence in this Trinity of persons.†

NOTE NO. IV.—SEE PAGE 19.

Against the argument for the Deity of the Son and the Spirit, from Baptism being administered in their name, it is objected, that it does no more than recognize Christ as a faithful teacher, and the New Testament dispensation, as of Divine appointment. The Israelites were baptized unto Moses, and, in the same sense, christians are baptized in the name of Christ. Such is the mode of interpretation, adopted by those who are inimical to the Deity of the Son of God.

This objection is not valid; for, it takes for granted the matter in dispute. It supposes Jesus to be no more than a messenger commissioned of God, as Moses was. This should be proved before it be brought forward as certain. The expression, *Baptized unto Moses*,‡ is not of the same import, with being baptized in the name of Christ. The most that can be intended by the former, is, that the Israelites, through the instrumentality of Moses, were baptized. The preposition, *eis*, as properly signifies *by*, or *through the ministry of*, as *unto*; and so it is rendered by Tremellius. *And all were baptized by Moses.*¶ In this they received him as a true prophet; but they were not baptized in his name. Paul was a true apostle, and believers received him as such, and some were baptized by him; but he baptized not in his own name.||

* Gen. xiv. 21—and xli. 15, 40—Ezra vi. 8—and vii. 21—Dan. iv. 30.—

† Rabbi Ibba.

‡ See an Essay on the doctrine of the Trinity, and the authorities referred to, by the author of *Horæ Solitariae*. ———— 1 Cor. x. 2.

¶ Et omnes per Musche baptizati sunt—He adds in a note, Per manum Musche—By Moses' hand. So the Syriac version has it. ———— 1 Cor. i. 14.

NOTE NO. V.—SEE PAGE 20.

The authenticity of 1 John v. 7. has been doubted. The controversy, in consequence of this, has given occasion to much learned labour. It is not found in some ancient manuscript copies; but it is found in others. The Orthodox can prove their doctrine without it, although it is a most comprehensive, and clear summary of the evidence for the truth of the *Trinity*, which is scattered over the sacred pages of scripture. Whether, then, is it more probable, if fraud be in the case, that those, who did not want it, should forge it, or, that those, against whom it operated with a force not to be parried, should omit it in some of their manuscripts? The Orthodox were not formerly accused of vitiating the sacred text; this was not the case with their opponents. Were its genuineness disproved, it would make nothing for the Anti-trinitarian. The christian would then say, "It is a Bible truth, but it is not taught in this place."

It is not true, that the orthodox have assented universally to the heterodox hypothesis respecting this text. With what face could the following declaration be made? Having declared the text an interpolation, the writer* proceeds: "There is not indeed, among the learned in Europe at this time. (1805) any pretension to the contrary. It is granted on all hands, that John never wrote the passage." Indeed! From whom has Mr. Sherman this information?

What though some writers, of the fourth century, have not quoted this text in their writings? What though it be not found in some ancient copies? Does it follow that those, in which it is found, are spurious? Surely not. Jerome made his translation in the fourth century. He admitted the text to be in all the best Greek copies, and, with severity, animadverted upon the want of it in the old Latin version. It was quoted by Cyprian about A. D. 250, as scripture. "It is written," says he, "of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, that *these three are one*." More than once he mentions these words; *These three are one*. Without hesitation, he quotes it as what was known to be scripture.†

Without the 7th verse the passage seems incomplete. In verse 8. Three witnesses are spoken of on earth—*The spirit, the water, and the blood*. By the *spirit* we understand the gifts bestowed upon the early christians; by the *water*, the purity of the christian system, as symbolized by the washing in baptism; by the *blood*, the atonement, as significantly represented in the Lord's supper. These were all upon earth, and, because men were employed in their administration, they are represented in ver. 9. as the testimony of men, agreeing, however, in establishing the great truths implied in the Messiahship of Jesus. The witnesses, on earth, are evidently contrasted with the witnesses in heaven; the witness of God, Father, Son, and Spirit, with that of men. Take away ver. 7, and the contrast is lost; and instead of force and precision, we have indistinctness, and something like tautology.

NOTE NO. VI.—SEE PAGE 20.

Upon the mysterious doctrine of the Trinity, I have not indulged myself in attempts to explain the modes of personal subsistence. The nearer we keep to the language of scripture, respecting this subject, we are the more safe. It has not proposed to explain the manner of the Divine Existence, probably, because we could not comprehend it, or form any profitable idea thereof. But respecting God we are taught very important facts, and among others, that the Divine Being subsists in *three* distinct, necessary, and eternal modes; to these, for want of a better term, we apply the denomination of *persons*, as corresponding more nearly than any other, in our language, to that employed in the sacred languages in which the scriptures were written. After reviewing the evidence produced from scripture, in proof of this doctrine, it would be impertinent in any, on this side of infidelity, to adduce such objections as the following:

1. To say that three are one, and one is three, is a contradiction.

To say that three are one, and one is three, in the same sense, would indeed be a contradiction; but to assert, that, in one respect, three are one, and in another respect, that that one is three, is certainly no contradiction. That God is, in res-

* Mr. Sherman, of Mansfield, (Conn.)—† See Epist. 73 ad Jubaianum, et de unitate Eccl. as quoted by Ridgely and others.

pect of his modes of existence, three, and, in respect of his essence, one, is not a contradictory proposition. This is what we assert. The doctrine of the Trinity does not appear more inconsistent, to the Unitarian or Socinian, than some demonstrable truths in mathematics, to a man uninstructed in that science. "To say that a curve line, setting out from a point within a hair's breadth of a right line, shall run towards that right line as swift as thought, and yet never be able to touch it, seems contrary to common sense; and, were it not clearly demonstrated,——could never be believed."* There are few positions in religion, natural or revealed, which we can so explain, as to free from apparent inconsistency, in the view of a dispute, of this world. God is a free agent; yet he is necessarily good. It is impossible for him to love or do evil. These propositions every good man believes. But can he remove all seeming inconsistency between them? He cannot; yet he believes them both. So we may say of moral agency in man, and sovereignty in God.

Obj. 2. The doctrine of the Trinity cannot be conceived of, and is therefore practically useless.

That with God a thousand years are as one day, and one day as a thousand years; that God is not older now than 5000 years ago, nor younger at present than he will be 5000 years hence, cannot be easily conceived of. Shall we because of this, deny these things? Shall we say, because we cannot fully conceive of God's infinity, eternity, and omnipotence; therefore the belief of these perfections is of no practical utility? Can the objector, without hesitation, say, that no article of faith is practically useful, except what he can readily have a full conception of? Should he reply in the affirmative, I again ask, can he have a full conception of the Deity, and of all his glories? Should he be satisfied with admitting the practical utility, of a partial apprehension of the mysteries of the Divine Being, and excellencies, the practical usefulness, of a similar apprehension of the mystery of the Trinity, may be allowed to satisfy the believer in that doctrine.

NOTE NO. VII.—SEE PAGE 35.

The Gnostics were a description of philosophers, that prevailed in the countries of the east. They derive their name from a Greek word, which signifies science. They talked of the knowledge of the Deity being lost, and boasted of restoring it. They acknowledged one Supreme Being, possessing divine excellency. They saw evil in the world, and referred it, immediately to matter, to which they supposed it essentially to belong. Some of them talked of two eternal beings, one good, the other evil. They, however, united in the opinion, that this world was not the workmanship of Him who was supremely good. The Creator was at best a mixed character, consisting of qualities good and bad. Him they denominated, DEMIURGE. Man they admitted to be a compound of depraved matter, and of a spirit of celestial origin. This spirit was in bondage to earthly principles. They expected a messenger from heaven, of remarkable sanctity, whose office it should be to instruct man in divine knowledge, and, through his agency, to emancipate him from the tyrants of the world. They conceived of some such character as Socinians describe Jesus Christ to have been, and were really as orthodox christians, as European and American unitarians.

When the Gnostics saw the miracles that were wrought, in the name of Jesus, they apprehended that he must have been the expected deliverer. They assumed, many of them at least, the christian name, blended their philosophical absurdities with the doctrines of the apostles, and thus early corrupted the religion of Christ. The Gnostic christians denied the Divinity of Christ, though they confessed him to be the Son of God. They also were compelled, by their previous opinions, to deny the reality of his humanity. The Gnostics were not recognized as belonging to the church of Christ. With Cerinthus, one of the leaders in that heresy, John the divine, as ancient history relates, would not abide under the same roof, lest some mark of vengeance should fall upon him, while so near such an enemy of his Saviour. Polycarp, the disciple of John, would not salute Marcion, another corrupter of the gospel, in the street. "Own us," said Marcion, petulantly; The apostolic man replied; "I do own thee to be the first born of Satan." This conduct was a practical comment on the inspired injunction; "If there come any unto you and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house: neither bid him God speed."†

* Deism revealed, in Edward's Observ.—2 John 10.

NOTE NO. VIII.—SEE PAGE 35.

It is objected that Col. i. 16, does not mean a real creation. The *all things created*, are no other than the *all things* said to be *reconciled*, in ver. 20.—The material creation did not need, nor was it capable of reconciliation. It means no more than a moral reformation among Jews and Gentiles.

The illustrations in the text will enable the reader to detect the fallacy of this objection, in addition to which, observe further, that the objector assumes as certain, what might be justly scrupled; that the *all things* mentioned, ver. 16, and the *all things* spoken of ver. 20, are precisely the same. But suppose it to be so, the Socinian conclusion is incorrect. There is an obvious sense, in which *all things* may be said to be reconciled to God, by the blood of the cross. To understand this, consider, that the sin of man deranged the whole actual constitution that God gave to the universe at first. Holy intelligences were at variance with man, because he was at variance with God. The ground was cursed for his sake, and the elements of nature became ministers of vengeance. Man also became the enemy of man. How different this scene of conflict from that delightful consistency established at the beginning. The blood of the cross removes the curse, which justice imposed. Man is reconciled to God and to every upright being; the sun shines, to him, with more genial beams, the elements of nature combine to serve him, and even irreclaimable enemies are controlled, so far as to promote the designs of grace. There is no part of God's extended empire, to which, in some respect, the influence of the great redemption does not reach. Understand aright the system of grace, and there is no objection of the enemy you cannot silence.

I add, as a specimen of Socinian exposition, the following illustration of Col. i. 15, 16, by a famed advocate of Unitarianism. It was written while Napoleon directed the affairs of continental Europe. "Of a certain person (Bonaparte) who now makes a very considerable figure in the world, it may be said with truth, so far as the civil state of the continent of Europe is concerned, that he is the creator of all these new distinctions, high and low, whether thrones, or dominions, or, &c, all these things are made by him, and for him, and he is before them all, takes precedence both in time and dignity, and by him do all these things consist. Yet who would infer from such language as this, that the present ruler of France is a being of superior order to mankind, much less that he is the maker of the world? The language which is true of Bonaparte, in a civil sense, is applicable to Jesus Christ in a moral sense; "but it no more implies pre-existence, or proper creative power, in one case than in the other."!!! Belsham's letters on Arianism, as quoted by Dr. Magee. Writers of this school have frequently compared the Saviour to Socrates, and seemed doubtful which of the two to place the highest. They are improving. Bonaparte, while he triumphed, in Mr. B's view, had a claim to similar honours with Jesus; since the fall of Napoleon, those honours have been, *piously*, by others, transferred to Alexander of Russia. Rare times!

NOTE NO. IX.—SEE PAGE 40.

Rom. ix. 5. explicitly asserts the Deity and humanity of our Lord. It is vain to object, that the expression employed by the apostle, ver. 3. "Kinsmen according to the flesh," respecting himself, proves that he had two natures, as clearly as this used in reference to our Lord proves him to have two. It will be observed that there is nothing asserted respecting Paul's being *God over all*, as is done respecting Christ. It is true that the apostle had brethren of two descriptions, the one according to the flesh, the other of the household of faith.

NOTE NO. X.—SEE PAGE 57.

The word *anastasis* signifies resurrection; but it does not signify this only, nor in this place, is the resurrection the most prominent idea presented by the term. *Future life* is the translation of Dr. Campbell.—See Campbell's note on Mat. xxii, 28.

NOTE NO. XI.—SEE PAGE 80.

To account for the introduction of moral evil into the empire of God, has defied the ingenuity of man. The scriptural account of it recommends itself, not less to sound reason than to faith. The human family became subject to sin, and its accompanying woes, by the transgression of one man. See an able defence of the doctrine of the scriptures on this head, by President Edwards, a name venerable in

the church of God, and, of itself, sufficient to silence the illiberality of European vanity and ignorance, which allege the tendency of American climes to degrade the human mind.

NOTE NO. XII.—SEE PAGE 87.

Upon the necessity of the death of Christ, in order to the forgiveness of sinners, I have not spoken very decisively. The point has been disputed by the greatest and best of men. Rutherford and Owen took different sides. The modesty and caution of Dr. Magee, on this subject, are worthy of praise, and, perhaps, of imitation. "To enter into the councils of the Almighty," says this learned Divine, "and to decide what infinite wisdom must have determined, under a constitution of things different from the present, were a speculation not less absurd than it is impious." That the atonement is made, and that, through it alone, God forgives the sinner, is admitted by all christians. This is safe ground.

NOTE NO. XIII.—SEE PAGE 92.

Does God purpose that all, universally, shall be saved? If this be answered in the affirmative, then, if all, universally, be not saved, we can account for the failure in one of two ways only: That omnipotence could not accomplish the purpose, or that the Deity changed his plan. The former will not be readily asserted by any, who fear God. The latter will not be avowed by any who consider, that, if there be a change in the purpose of the Divine Being, it must be either for the better or for the worse; to admit either of which does not seem consistent with the immutable perfection of God; for, if the change be for the better, past imperfection is implied; if for the worse, present imperfection appears. Neither of the alternatives can be allowed. The scriptures resting our salvation wholly upon grace, forbids the idea of relieving the difficulty, by supposing that man is delinquent in fulfilling the condition.

That there are resources in the gracious power of God, to regenerate every sinner whom he purposes to save does not seem to be easily refused; that there is merit in the death of Christ to secure pardon for all such, is taught in scripture; that, in the renovated heart of the pardoned sinner, God can carry on the good work of sanctification, is not unreasonable for a christian to suppose; and, that such are reconciled to God, and shall be saved, the gospel promise allows us to believe. If any one of the blessings now recounted be wanting, salvation is impossible. If these be granted, it is impossible not to be saved. Mistakes prevail upon this subject from not considering what salvation implies, and not admitting that it is of grace and not of ourselves.

Let none say that the view we have taken of the subject is cruel. The Calvinistic system has much more liberality in its constitution, than that adopted by its opponents. The Calvinist grants as much to those who shall never see life, as his opposer will to the most favoured. We admit and contend, that all are moral agents, free in every volition; that conscience has an influence; that the gospel dispensation is accompanied with operations of the spirit; these, however, we maintain not to be necessarily accompanied by unfeigned faith, and so do our opponents respecting all influences of grace; that the gospel and its blessings are generously proposed to all where they are dispensed; that if this gospel be refused, it is voluntarily refused; that this refusal is the proper result, "*not of any purpose of God, or act of God, but of a depraved soul.*" Calvinists grant all this to all: Arminians, do you grant more to any? You really do not. Yet all this gives no security that any shall be saved. In what is our system more liberal than the Arminian? In this; we grant to all as much as they do; to some we grant more. To an innumerable company we contend, that certainly and effectually, the benefits of redemption shall be applied. And while we contend, that this application shall be infallibly certain, we also contend, that this certainly is fully consistent with that liberty which is necessary to the constitution of a moral agent. I now ask, whether is that system which, in a full consistency with man's freedom, makes infallibly certain the salvation of, perhaps, a countless majority of mankind, or that which gives assurance for the salvation of none, the more liberal? The former, undoubtedly. And more especially it will appear so, when it is considered that those not saved, are, by it, placed on as good a ground, as Arminians allow to any.

We cannot, indeed, deny the certainty of God's knowledge of all future events. Arminians hold, that "God has thought proper to poise some things on the possibility of being or not being, leaving it to the will of intelligent beings to turn the scale." And accordingly he has determined, *not to know* any event, in which mor-

al agents, as such, are employed. Of all such events, according to this system, God is pleased to remain ignorant, until the volitions of his creature shall reveal the mystery! Such a view of the subject we cannot admit. We believe that God knoweth "the end from the beginning, and from ancient times, the things that have not yet been. The infallibility of God's knowledge establishes the certainty of all future events. "His counsel shall stand, and he will do all his pleasure." We cannot admit that the Saviour, *intentionally*, died for any, to whom God had *not purposed* effectually to apply the merits of his death; and who, he certainly knew, would never be interested in it without such application. A denial of this view, implies an opposition to what essentially belongs to the atonement. It should be understood, that, SEPARATED FROM THE DIVINE INTENTION, AS TO ITS END, THERE WAS NO MERIT IN THE DEATH OF CHRIST. Inattention to this truth, has led to much perplexity on the subject of the atonement.

NOTE NO. XIV.—SEE PAGE 93.

In scripture it is never intimated that atonement is made to the offender, but always to the *offended*. Such is the idea universally attached to it. Reconciliation is procured by the sacrifice of Christ. To whom was that sacrifice offered? To the offender, or to the offended? Was not God displeased at the sin of man? Was not the atonement made to turn away from the sinner this displeasure and its effects? Was it not made to him whom we had offended? But it is objected, that God is never said to be reconciled to man, but always man to God; as in 2 Cor. v, 20. "Be ye reconciled to God." That is, lay down your enmity against him. Is this indeed, the whole meaning of the expression, *to be reconciled*, in the New Testament? Consult Mat. v. 23, 24. Here our Lord describes a person who had given just cause of offence to his brother; he comes to worship; he remembers that his brother has, justly, a charge against him. What is he to do? Hear the direction; "Go thy way: first BE RECONCILED to thy brother"—How? Certainly, by making to him a satisfaction for the injury done, as well as by laying down his enmity against him. The sacrifice of Christ effects this for the sinner. Satisfaction is thereby made to justice for sin,† and grace to remove enmity from the heart is procured by that offering. "It is given in the behalf of Christ to believe on him."‡ Our reconciliation is actually perfected by presenting to God that atonement of Christ, made in our place, this presentation of the atonement is made, by that faith which indicates a heart submissive to the righteousness of God our Saviour.

NOTE NO. XV.—SEE PAGE 98.

Fallen man is prone to be wise beyond what is written. It has before been intimated that by mingling, at an early period, a false philosophy with the doctrines of christianity, that holy system, in many places, was corrupted. The inventions and spurious combinations of past ages, leave but little room for the ingenuity of HERESIARCHS in modern times. The doctrine of the Trinity and the incarnation of Christ were denied, if not in the first, certainly in the second century, with greater and smaller degrees of absurdity, as best suited the views of those who found it convenient to lay aside the authority of scripture. In the third century, the advocates of error, respecting the Trinity, became more numerous. NOSTRIUS, SABELLIUS and others, advocated the opinion broached in the preceding age by PRAXEAS at Rome, who denied any real distinction between the Father, Son and Holy Spirit. About the same time, Paul of Antioch expressly denied the Deity of Christ, and in A. D. 269, was, by the judgment of the ministers of the Church, degraded from his office. The real distinction between the persons of the Godhead had been, uniformly, maintained by the church, and the opposers thereof had been censured. Attempts to explain to the comprehension of man, what is *not* comprehensible, the modes of the Divine subsistence, produced farther heresies. ARIUS arose in the following century, and avowed Christ to be no more than a highly dignified creature. These controversies gave rise to terrible scenes both in Church and State. The Arian heresy has had its advocates also in modern times. But the Arians have chiefly been melted down into the Socinian sect.

The sentiments of this sect, according to some, originated from a Society formed in A. D. 1546 at Venice and Vicenza, in Italy. The essential parts of their system

* See Dr. Adam Clark's commentary on Acts, ii. 23, with his remarks at the end of the chapter. Dr. Clark is an Arminian Methodist, a learned man, and a bold Theologue. The above is the spirit of his sentiments on the *determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God*.—† Rom. v. 10.—‡ Phil. i. 29.

is believed to have been formed by **LAELIUS SOZINUS**, a native of *Tuscany*, who died in **A. D. 1562**, and from whose writings his nephew, **FAUSTUS SOZINUS**, chiefly formed that system which has since been known under the name of *Socinianism*, and which its advocates dignify with the appellation of *Unitarianism*. Its leading dogmas are, that, in the Godhead, there is but one person; that Jesus Christ is a mere creature; that he was instructed to teach mankind more perfectly the will of God; that he confirmed the truth of his doctrines by his death; that mankind have power to obey his instructions; that such as obey him shall, at some future time, in new bodies, be happy in heaven; that such as are disobedient shall, after being punished for a time, be annihilated; that the doctrine of the resurrection is the great distinguishing article of christianity.

The mortality of the soul was held by some visionaries who professed the christian name, in the third century. The opinion was opposed and condemned by a full council in Arabia. The name of the author was too obscure to reach us. Perhaps he resembled the present advocate of this *mortal* doctrine among us. The opinion of Christ's personal reign, in human nature, on earth for one thousand years, had for its author one worthy of being associated with E. Smith; it was **CERINTHUS**, of whom mention is made in Note vii. In the violent opposition discovered, by this successor of **CERINTHUS**, against literature, he has the *worthy* example of **MONTANUS** in the second century. He imagined himself to be the *Comforter*, promised by our Lord to his disciples. He was for banishing from among christians all philosophy, arts and polite literature. Among his followers, says the historian, "ignorance reigned." In his public services, too, this obscure Phrygian, like our E. Smith, had his female aids. **PRISCILLA** and **MAXIMILLA**, ladies more remarkable for some other qualities than their virtues, united under the banners of **MONTANUS**, prophesied like him, and imitated his various extravagancies.*

NOTE NO. XVI.—SEE PAGE 99.

It is not enough for E. S. and his followers that a doctrine be found in scripture. However evident it may be, unless found in express terms, it will be rejected. To be consistent all their discourse, upon religious subjects, should be precisely in scripture language, and, as none of the inspired writers of scripture, wrote in English or any modern language, they should use the word of God in the original tongues only. Upon their ground, it is dangerous to take a version made by man, and especially by men, who may have been educated in a College.

NOTE NO. XVII.—SEE PAGE 101.

E. S. informs us that he was some years a preacher among the Calvinistic Baptists. How could he be so long among them, and not know how they hold the doctrines of grace? I conclude that he is either destitute of a common share of brain, or possessed of an uncommon share of dishonesty. One or other of these, if not a combination of both, can alone account for his numerous misrepresentations of Calvinistic doctrine. Take the following as a specimen, which he represents as a common sentiment of those who advocate that system. "Some are made to be damned and some to be saved, *without any regard* to believing or disbelieving."†—I dare assert, that such a sentiment never was exhibited, by the most unguarded preacher or writer on the side of Calvinism. The man, who is capable of such unqualified misrepresentation, was unworthy of any place in a society so respectable as that, which claims as its own, a Gill, a Keach, a Booth, a Stoughton, &c.

*See Mosh. Eccles. Hist. vol. i. p. 231-233.—†See E. Smith's 2d Ser. on Election.

ERRATUM.

The distance of the author from the press has been the occasion of some oversights escaping it. The reader will be good enough to correct the following:

Page 7. before *deism* delete the comma, and insert of—p. 10. l. 6. for *cause* read *course*—p. 12. l. 13. after *part* insert of—p. 26. l. 36. for *saved* r. *served*—p. 27. l. 1. for *when we hear*, r. *where we have*—do. l. 24. for *N. J.* r. *N. T.*—do. l. 29. for *confirmation*, r. *conjunction*—p. 39. l. 40. for *humility*, r. *humanity*—p. 32. l. 33. for *these* r. *three*—p. 34. l. 5. for *refuted*, r. *refused*—p. 37. l. 4. from the foot, for *man* r. *men*—p. 40. l. 37. delete the words, *of Christ*—p. 42. l. 20. for *It* r. *He*—p. 48. l. 33. for *apostles*, r. *apostle*—p. 66. l. 23. for *furnishing*, r. *punishing*—p. 67. l. 3. for *ye*, r. *we*—p. 71. l. 29, for *objection*, r. *objections*—p. 75. l. 10. for *The view*, r. *This view*—p. 100. for *women* r. *woman*. Some errors in punctuation have also escaped, which the intelligent reader will easily correct.

