

Reformed Presbyterian and Covenanters.

VOL. XXVII.

JUNE, 1889.

No. 6.

ORIGINAL.

THE CURSE REMOVED.

BY JOHN BROWN, A. M., CASCADE, IOWA.

"And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment: so Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time, without sin unto salvation."—Heb. 9: 27, 28.

"It is appointed unto men once to die." This appointment is recorded in Gen. 2: 17; 3: 19. *Before* the fall, "Jehovah God commanded the man, saying, of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat; but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die," or, "dying thou shalt die." *After* the fall God said to Adam, "Because thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife, and hast eaten of the tree of which I commanded thee, saying, thou shalt not eat of it: cursed is the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life, * * In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground; for out of it wast thou taken: for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return." But Adam was constituted the representative of the race, and as all mankind descended from him by ordinary generation, the curse was pronounced on his posterity as well as on himself, because they were considered as being in him. Rom. 5: 12-21. It is appointed, therefore, unto men once to die.

The Greek adverb rendered "once," means, "*once for all*;" and is often so translated in the New Testament. It implies, that death shall not be repeated; that men shall not die a second time. The materialistic doctrine, therefore, which teaches that the bodies of the wicked shall be raised from the dead, at the second coming of Christ, in order to die again—in order to be annihilated, or struck out of existence—is false; for that would be to die twice, whereas, the text asserts that men die only once, or once for all.

ing, and affectionate of the races? Who ever came among us with a sincere desire to do us good, that we did not receive with warmest friendship and cordiality? We have no prejudice against friendly whites. We speak your language. From the city of Pittsburgh, which, I understand, is considered the center of your church, at an expense of say fifteen dollars in money and thirty-six hours of time, you can reach the heart of the south, where, though there may be a nominal Christianity, yet a real heathenism prevails; a mere form of godliness while the power is denied. Darkness covers this south land, and gross darkness the people. Come and enlighten us. No longer hide your light under a bushel, but set it on a candle-stick, that it may shine for us as well as you. You profess to maintain the whole truth as it is in Jesus, as no other denomination does. I beseech you, impart to us a knowledge of that truth, that Christ Jesus came to bear witness to, that we may be free indeed.

On your arrival here, as soon as you get your dinner, you can take your bible and go out among the people and begin your missionary work. You can open a Sabbath school the next Sabbath, and preach too, if you are a minister. But that is all too cheap and too easy is it? Not far enough away. There is not distance to lend enchantment to the view. O, if we were only afar off in some of the islands of the sea! Our race-troubles are great, and instead of growing less are increasing. Alcohol and politics are the source of most of them. We obtain no benefit by political action. We seem to be serving the devil for nothing politically. Come and present us your views of the proper relations of Christians to the government of the United States. I hope they may prove the solution of our race troubles. Pity us and help us. The Lord is very pitiful. From this American Ethiopia, I stretch these dark hands to you, and, as I trust, through you to God. O, that I had a voice as the sound of many waters, and as the sound of mighty thunderings, with which to utter the Macedonian cry, Come over and help us!

VOTING ON PROHIBITION AMENDMENT.

BY REV. D. S. FARIS.

I have not said much in Synod on the question of voting for amendments, nor do I desire to keep this matter hot before the church, if it did not come up from the other side. I feel that while the brethren of the opposite view labor to draw the members of the church into what seems to me to be a fatal snare, I cannot innocently remain silent. The following argument is a part of a letter written by myself in answer to an inquiry by an elder in the church, on this topic. The reply has been written in the freedom of personal and private correspondence, and possibly makes the points more clearly than an argument addressed to the public. I therefore copy this part of the letter for publication in your magazine.

As to your question, I am afraid of voting for amendments; although I have not been in favor of applying the discipline of the church to that act, as in many minds, where there is an undoubted purpose to be faithful, a different opinion is held. But if the act has in it the same kind of sin that belongs to the direct support of a christless constitution, it will work as a corrupting leaven, till our political dissent will cease to be held. This is my first objection, that many do not see the difference, and it becomes a snare to their souls.

Another objection is, that to my mind it is the endorsement of the constitution in its present christless condition, as one fit to be administered by christians until they have a better. I hold, that without Christ in it, christians, (not merely Covenanters), but all that are for Christ, should stand aloof; and that they sin against him by not doing so. The question comes up as to voting for *temperance* amendments, not the *Christian* amendment. We are asked to put a Christian principle of temperance in a Christless constitution. That is, while the people claim the right to rule without Christ, christians join with them on this platform. Now they propose to add such a temperance-amendment as will be acceptable to the majority of the people on this basis. It is evident to my mind that this is making the fruit good without making the tree good, whereas Christ says, make the tree good that the fruit may be good also.

Again, our original dissent was not against a constitution without prohibition of liquor in it. This has been an after-thought. Our dissent came from the fact that the constitution does not bind the nation to govern itself by christian law. Just when the nation adopted the christless policy, we entered our dissent. Now, shall we join again to amend that instrument, before the reason of our dissent is removed. The object of a temperance amendment is to give effect to the temperance principle, by the present constitution. Is this not to accept the constitution as a fit basis for a temperance law, (not a mere temperance *opinion*), but a law to be enforced? That is, those that vote to amend the constitution or the law, accept these as they are in *force*, to give force to the *new* law they engraft upon them. The temperance amendment would be worth nothing without the virtue of the constitution in it; hence the voter necessarily accepts the *legal force* of the constitution to make his amendment effectual; or the amendment would be a spasm. It is precisely this purpose the voter has in view. It is not to hold up a principle that ought to be accepted; but it is to put that principle where it will have the *immediate* effect of *law*. The voter then *legislates* to add to the powers of a constitution, whose present powers he refuses to administer on a christless basis. If this is consistent in a dissenter my mind cannot see it; and I am persuaded the greatest part of the church will fail to see the distinction.

Again, the question arises, as to the amendment of a state con-

stitution, while the United States constitution remains as it is. It is too evident that those who endorse the state constitution adopt that of the United States as well. For support of the United States constitution is the formal condition of the admission of a state. We could not, therefore, act to make a state constitution christian as long as it contained the contradictory principle of support of the United States constitution, as it is without Christ. If the amendment proposed was to make the constitution of the United States christian, and no unlawful condition prescribed, I think we might vote. Thus we would go back and begin where we broke off; but to begin at another point and travel backwards, is, to my mind, grossly inconsistent. I think the agitation of this question has done more to unsettle the church as to our political dissent than anything else. I had hoped that the voters had taken the position of silent acquiescence; but now the question breaks out afresh, in quarters liable to involve the largest section of the church, and that part of the church relied on as the most faithful Covenanters.

THE FOUNDATION LAID IN ZION.

BY PROF. SPROULL.

In the April number of this magazine, I presented as the basis on which the evangelical churches can be united, that which is of divine authority. Is. 28: 16. "Thus saith the Lord Jehovah, Behold, I have founded in Zion a stone, a tried stone, a precious corner stone, a foundation, a foundation, he that believeth shall not make haste." (*Lit. trans.*) It remains to be shown that the Lord Jesus Christ as Mediatorial King, is that foundation.

In the imagery of the passage before us, we find this not obscurely presented. A stone is the proper emblem of firmness, strength and durability. By a stone or rock, our Lord is repeatedly exhibited in the Scriptures, and generally as the object of trust. "The Lord is my rock, and in him will I trust." Ps. 18: 2. "Trust ye in the Lord for ever, for in the Lord Jehovah is an everlasting rock." Is. 26: 4, *rev. ver.* "Rock of ages," (*Marz.*) He is "a tried stone." All the cunning and power of the adversary have failed to remove this foundation, or overturn the church built on it.

It is "a precious corner stone," rejected indeed by the builders, but made "the head of the corner." Ps. 118: 21, 22; Matt. 20: 42. And the repetition of the word "foundation," as it is in the Hebrew, emphasizes the idea of solidity and permanence. In the interpretation of the vision of the great image, Danl. 2, He is the stone cut out of the mountain without hands, that smote and destroyed the image, and became a great mountain, and filled the whole earth. (vs. 34, 35.) In Zech. 3: 8-9, God says of his servant the Branch, "Behold the stone that I have laid before Joshua; upon one stone shall be seven eyes: behold I will engrave the graving thereof."